Charles Darwin University

EAP corrective feedback in an EMI setting

Student and teacher beliefs

Weekly, Robert; Pollard, Andrew; Macpherson, James

EAP corrective feedback in an EMI setting: Student and teacher beliefs

Robert Weekly [a,*], Andrew Pollard [b], James Macpherson [a]

[a] *University of Nottingham, Ningbo, China*
[b] *Charles Darwin University, Australia*

A B S T R A C T

This study examines the oral corrective feedback (CF) beliefs of Chinese students and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) tutors in an English Medium Instruction (EMI) setting in China. Despite considerable variation in spoken English around the world many EAP tutors tend to correct students' spoken language in relation to native speaker norms, while for students the native model is constructed as the ideal model. This exploratory study looks at listening and speaking classes on an EMI undergraduate preparatory course at a Sino-British University in China. This paper focuses on classes delivered by three different EAP teachers and draws on the beliefs of these teachers and their students, as expressed through interviews. The study revealed variation in students' opinions about CF, with some asserting the limited importance of CF and an acceptance of language variability, with others stressing the importance of accurate language. For their part, the EAP teachers feel it is important to correct students because of language policy, assessment, and student expectations, while also being open to language variation. This paper proposes that CF needs to be reorientated to reflect the changing social environments in which English is spoken, from the current 'form focused correction' to 'meaning focused correction'.

1. Introduction

Despite empirical evidence that corrective feedback (CF) has a positive effect on students' language use and knowledge (Li, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013; Mackey & Goo, 2007), the foundations of CF research stem from a fundamental misunderstanding of language. When researchers find positive evidence of improvement in students' language this is identified as progression towards a prescribed *written* language standard, derived from emergent language features codified predominantly between the 18th and 19th century (Hobsbawn, 2000; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). Epistemological orientations to a standard language ideology have been undermined in multiple linguistic research fields such as World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), multilingualism, critical linguistics, language ideologies and complexity theory within Second Language Acquisition (SLA). However, the recognition of variability in the English language, and the criticism of Standard English (SE) ideologies, appears to have had minimal impact on the practice of English teaching, with British English (BrE) and American English (AmE) models maintaining precedence in the classroom, and teachers expected to correct their students' English in relation to these norms. This is evident within English Medium Instruction (EMI) institutions in China, which claim to be 'international' and promote 'diversity' but maintain a national Anglo-centric approach in relation to language (Jenkins, 2014). Students are expected to conform to BrE or AmE in both spoken and written forms, despite this being their second or third language, and they may be using emerging norms from their own social context. With multiple norms emerging in different contexts, including EMI, it seems imperative to examine ways in which English for Academic Purposes (EAP) can respond to this reality that are beneficial to students.

---

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: robert.weekly@nottingham.edu.cn (R. Weekly).

As Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018) highlight, there are discrepancies between researchers' focus and the concerns of teachers. While researchers have been overwhelmingly focused on the effectiveness of different types of CF in varying contexts and settings, teachers recognise that the provision of CF needs to operate 'against the backdrop of the social world that is always lurking behind every learning and teaching process' (Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2018, p. 464). Teachers need to consider other factors such as students' emotional needs, classroom management and constraints in terms of time and materials. Therefore, it is necessary to move beyond research that engages with CF only in terms of its effectiveness. With this in mind, this paper focuses on the beliefs of three EAP teachers and their Chinese students in a Sino-British University in China.

2. Literature review

2.1. Theoretical underpinning of CF

Researching CF in language teaching has been an important strand of investigation over the past forty years. Much of this research has been instigated by several hypotheses within SLA and testing these hypotheses of how second languages are acquired and learned, and the extent CF contributes to this. Krashen (1982, 1985), for example, asserted that CF is only worthwhile if it is aimed at student errors which are part of their conscious knowledge, and therefore argued that CF has negligible classroom value. In contrast, Swain (2005) asserts that CF is beneficial for learning, providing information for learners and contributes to learners' output. Likewise, the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 1995, 2001) also supports the use of CF in the classroom by suggesting that CF helps to raise learners' awareness of the gap between their interlanguage (Selinker, 1972, 1992) and the target norm, which may become intake for learning (Loewen, 2012; Mackey, 2006; Rassaei, 2013; Russell & Spada, 2006; Shegar et al., 2013).

Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis also stresses an important role for CF, as it provides both direct and indirect information, and positive evidence about the language. Classroom interactions between peers and teachers may initiate conversational modifications that could lead to focusing on a language feature and enabling students to notice the difference between their interlanguage and the target feature. Long (1996, pp. 451–452) argues that CF facilitates L2 learning through the negotiation of meaning, especially where this involves interactional modifications by the more competent speaker because it 'connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways'. However, the amount of CF that involves negotiation of meaning is questionable; recasts,[1] for example, are the most widely used CF by teachers, but are unlikely to involve negotiation of meaning. Nevertheless, there is theoretical support for CF within SLA, not just in cognitive and interactional SLA theories, but also in socio-cultural approaches (Lantolf, 2011).

2.2. Investigating the effectiveness of CF

There is a substantial body of empirical studies that have sought to test different hypotheses and their relationship to CF. Although these studies have tended to find conflicting results, Sheen (2007), Lyster and Saito (2010) Ellis (2012), Lyster et al. (2013) Lee (2016) and Li and Vuono (2019) all agree, that overall, they indicate a positive role for CF in the classroom. Nevertheless, as García Mayo and Alcón Soler (2013, p. 224) highlight, CF's contribution to second language acquisition is 'mediated by [the] degree of explicitness, type of interlocutor, and target grammar structure'. In fact, studies have highlighted multiple variational factors involved in CF research and the attempts by researchers to control these variables (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, 2007; Li, 2010; Li et al., 2016; Loewen, 2012; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Rassaei, 2015; Russell & Spada, 2006; Sato & Loewen, 2018; Sheen, 2008; Zhao & Ellis, 2022).

With so many variables to consider when conducting CF research, it is difficult for researchers to, firstly, control these variables, secondly to argue that any findings can be replicated in other contexts, and thirdly to give anything but rudimentary recommendations for the real classroom context. For example, the laboratory setting has been shown to be more effective for recasts than the classroom context (Lyster et al., 2013; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Sheen, 2008). However, recasts continue to be recommended for language teachers as a form of CF, being non-intrusive and therefore viable for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Harmer, 2015). Other aspects which determine the effectiveness of a recast is if students notice and interpret the recast as a correction (Egi, 2007; Ellis et al., 2006; Philp, 2003; Rassaei, 2013), whether students are developmentally ready (Ammar, 2008; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Goo & Mackey, 2013; Han, 2002; Lee, 2013; Loewen, 2012; Lyster et al., 2013; Sheen, 2004, 2008; Trofimovich et al., 2007) and the degree of explicitness in the delivery of the recast (Nassaji, 2007; Sato & Loewen, 2018; Sheen, 2006; Yilmaz, 2013; Zhao & Ellis, 2022).

Although recasts can vary in their degree of explicitness, as the least intrusive form of CF, and perhaps because of the dominance of CLT within ELT, recasts have become the most popular CF choice due to the perception that they are the least likely to hinder students' communication (Loewen, 2012). However, it is questionable whether all recasts can be categorised as CF as they are a functional communicative structure. Recasts are observed in conversation analysis but are labelled repetition repairs (Clift, 2016) and are therefore, a feature of normalised discursive practice.

A further issue with most CF studies (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ellis, 2022; Ellis et al., 2006; Li et al., 2016; Rahimi & Zhang, 2016; Schmidt, 2001; Sheen, 2008) is that they are framed within the concept of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972, 1992). However, to compare students' interlanguage forms with the target form, and L2 learners with monolingual speakers is a comparative fallacy (Jenkins, 2007;

---

[1] The generally accepted understanding of what constitutes a recast, from Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 268), is the 'teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error'. Recasts are also understood as being on a continuum from implicit to explicit depending on the delivery.

Seidlhofer, 2011). Only 5–10% of second language learners are said to achieve the same level of fluency and accuracy as a native English speaker (NES) (Crystal, 1997), and therefore, it is questionable why the NES model is used as a target. Interlanguage is also semantically associated with another SLA concept, fossilization, which is understood as the involuntary long-term cessation of interlanguage (Han, 2013; Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Even so, the term fossilization is applied widely and indiscriminately and has simply become a useful metaphor for teachers to describe a lack of progress (Han & Odlin, 2006). As both Han (2013) and Long (2003) note, fossilization is an ambiguous term, as learners do not stabilize prematurely within and across each and every linguistic domain. Moreover, there is an implication in the concept of fossilization that it is a cognitive mechanism able to distinguish between native and non-native language while only applying to the latter, and allowing ungrammatical features to continue developing (Han, 2013; Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Nevertheless, SLA authors, such as Rezaei et al. (2011, p. 26), use fossilization as a reason for the importance of CF in discussions of whether teachers should correct errors as 'leaving students' errors might lead to fossilization of ill-formed structures'. Although less explicit in more recent CF research, there remains an underlying predisposition to viewing standard native English as the superior model and natural target for second language speakers (Li et al., 2016; Sato & Loewen, 2018; Thomas, 2018; Zhao & Ellis, 2022). Most CF studies fail to acknowledge the sociolinguistic reality of learners' exposure to the language, and therefore, as both Hall (2017) and Larsen-Freeman (2006, 2018) argue, researchers must consider language targets in non-monolithic terms and always moving. CF, being ideologically constructed as positive for language learning, and NES presented as the 'normalised target' is reflected in research which examines students and teachers' beliefs about CF.

2.3. Students' and teachers' CF beliefs

CF beliefs have been defined as 'attitudes, views, opinions or stances that learners and teachers hold about the utility of CF in second language (L2) learning and teaching and how it should be implemented in the classroom' (Li, 2017, p. 143). Both Ellis (2010) and Sheen (2007) argue that consideration of both teachers' and students' beliefs is important as CF appears to be more effective when learners are receptive to it and fundamentally, the noticeability of CF may be mediated by learner beliefs themselves (Kartchava & Ammar, 2014).

Research into CF beliefs tends to focus on either learners or teachers, although there are studies examining both (Jean & Simard, 2011; Kainvanpanah et al., 2015; Lee, 2013; Schulz, 1996, 2001). Studies of CF attitudes among L2 learners have reported positive attitudes across different educational backgrounds. For example, Oladejo's (1993) survey of attitudes at secondary and tertiary levels in Singapore showed that 90.4% of participants thought CF to be desirable, while large scale studies by Schulz (1996, 2001) at American and Columbian universities found similar levels of positive attitudes among students. Another large-scale survey at Michigan State University conducted by Loewen et al. (2009) revealed highly positive beliefs towards CF. More recently, Zhu and Wang (2019) conducted a large scale questionnaire of Chinese EFL learners in 15 different universities across China. While the results indicate a positive attitude towards CF, pragmatic errors were considered a higher priority than grammatical errors, which may be an indication of changing attitudes among the younger generation of EFL students. Similarly, while the Vietnamese students in Van Ha et al.'s (2021) study desired CF on all errors, they were less concerned with local grammatical errors.

In contrast to those of learners, research into teachers' CF beliefs has found more negative views. In Shultz's (2001) study, this misalignment was particularly pronounced, with only 30% of teachers feeling that CF should be provided for students' spoken errors compared to 90% of students holding the same belief. Lee (2013) also observed differences between teachers and students in terms of CF provision, with students' reporting a strong preference for immediate explicit feedback, while teachers prefer delivering implicit feedback. More recently, findings have suggested that negative CF beliefs are more prevalent among pre-service or novice teachers (Kartchava et al., 2020; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). In particular, Rahimi and Zhang's (2015) study of 40 language teachers at private language schools in Iran found that novice teachers held less positive views of CF (75%) compared to their more experienced counterparts (90%).

Other studies report that teachers have expressed concern about the potential for CF to provoke negative feelings in their students and reduce their motivation to learn (Kainvanpanah et al., 2015; Mori, 2011; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Yoshida, 2010). As a result, teachers have been found to express uncertainty about explicit forms of correction, favouring indirect forms of feedback, though the use of CF may be more balanced among experienced teachers (Junquiera & Kim, 2013; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015), depending on the cultural background of the teachers (Mahalingappa et al., 2021, pp. 1–21). Lyster et al. (2013) suggest that the divergence in teacher and student attitudes towards types of feedback could be due to teachers' feeling that the provision of CF constitutes an unnecessary interruption of a student's attempt to communicate. This would seem to be supported by other studies into beliefs about the timing of CF (Bell, 2005; Brown, 2009; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015; Roothooft, 2014), which indicate that teachers can be reluctant to provide immediate correction on student errors. Overall, while research suggests teachers' and students' view CF as a tool to enable students to approximate a native Standard English, accuracy is not the only, and perhaps not even the most important, factor for providing CF. Moreover, studies which show less positive beliefs towards CF among novice and pre-service teachers (Kartchava et al., 2020; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015) and a preference for CF on pragmatic errors (Zhu & Wang, 2019), could be indication of changing beliefs among the younger generation, some of whom have used ELF as the norm.

2.4. EAP in an EMI context

In China, EMI has been promoted by the Ministry of Education since 2001, though its 'top down' implementation has not always been consistent and coherent, lacking engagement between different levels of language management (Fang, 2018; Hu & Lei, 2014; Lei & Hu, 2014). It has also been observed that proficiency levels of teaching staff and students and linguistic diversity in China were not

fully considered prior to implementation (Fang, 2018; Hu et al., 2014; Zhao & Dixon, 2017). Despite some universities promoting EMI to recruit students, with the implication that learning English is one outcome of the University degree, the extent of English use is variable (Hu et al., 2014; Hu & Lei, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Macaro, 2020; Pecorari & Malmström, 2018). Depending on the level of students and the degree discipline, English may not be the sole language used by either the teachers or by the students in the classroom setting (Doiz et al., 2012; Macaro, 2020). Moreover, while the assessment output would be in English, the input through reading may come from different languages. Consequently, several authors have argued that instead of promoting an unrealistic EMI setting, universities should instead be instituting bilingual or plurilingual programs (Galante et al., 2020; Kirkpatrick, 2014). Furthermore, the English that is promoted by the universities is understood to be SE or native speaker English (Doiz et al., 2012; Fang, 2018; Jenkins, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Macaro, 2020), with little consideration that students and staff may use a different variety of English.

With EMI institutions adherence to NES norms, CF practices in preparatory courses that align with this variety are viewed as necessary by both teachers and students for language development. However, as Dafouz (2017) argues, greater consideration needs to be given to the Role of English in relation to other languages within multilingual universities, implying that providing CF using NES norms as a measure may not prepare students for their EMI degrees. For example, the students in Jenkins' (2014) study reported inconsistencies among EAP tutors about what constituted academic English and tended to provide negative feedback using native speaker norms as a measure. They also note that their creativity in language is restricted, and nonconformity is labelled as errors, while NES academics allow themselves 'poetic license' in their use of academic English. Consequently, within EMI institutions 'NNES students 'problems' – that is their English 'errors' – are therefore at best sometimes tolerated (provided the outcome is intelligible to a NES reader or listener), but never seen as legitimate forms of expression' (Jenkins, 2014, p. 13). Therefore, the flexible use of language within EMI settings advocated by several authors (Dafouz, 2017; Jenkins, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Shohamy, 2012) in terms of English and other languages, should also be reflected in EAP courses that prepare students for their EMI degree course. The current provision of EAP in EMI institutions is delivered on the basis that the 'English' the students need is NES norm-driven, and their language is corrected accordingly. Dafouz (2017) argues that learners and teachers need to engage in language awareness, which would include fostering a better understanding of the role of all their linguistic resources in effective interaction and communication and heightened intercultural awareness. We argue that a more nuanced approach to CF focused on meaning in EMI settings would serve to enable this. While Kuteeva (2020) notes that some definitions of EMI exclude the EAP component, in this study, we consider these EAP courses to be an integral part of the University and constitute an EMI setting. The research has been guided by the following research questions:

1. What differences are evident between EAP teachers and students in their CF beliefs?
2. To what extent does the context impact on teachers' and students' beliefs?
3. To what extent are teachers' and students' CF beliefs governed by a standard language orientation?

3. Methodology

As noted previously there has been limited research on oral CF in an EAP context, and the majority of EAP research in relation to CF has focused on written CF. Therefore, this exploratory study examines an under researched area of CF focusing on oral communication in an EAP classroom. The study was conducted in a Sino-British University in China where data was collected during the first semester of the 2018/2019 academic year in listening and speaking classes. The students in the study had recently arrived at the university, and the teaching approaches adopted at the university may be 'alien' to what they are used to in a Chinese high school. Teaching English in Chinese high schools tend to be more teacher fronted, have larger class sizes, restricted speaking opportunities, and the provision of CF might be more explicit than what they would encounter on an EAP course at an EMI institution (Mahalingappa et al., 2021, pp. 1–21).

Following the successful completion of the EAP course, students enter their chosen department, and most will encounter both NES and NNES. Within the university around 50% of lecturers are Chinese, and 50% are non-Chinese, including those from Anglophone countries as well as regions spanning Europe, South America, and Southeast Asia. Therefore, it would be fair to assert that the majority of academics at the university are NNES. However, within the English teaching unit, NES constitute a higher proportion. Approximately 75% of staff in the English language unit are NES, which leads to a predominant focus on NES as the standard model, despite the variety of NNES models students will encounter in their departments. While there are around 10% of non-Chinese students at the university, during the preparatory year, most international students pursue different courses, meaning that the classes are largely composed of first language speakers of Chinese. All students participate in the EAP courses, depending on their chosen degree program, and complete other additional courses.

This paper focuses on three listening and speaking classes, which constitute 3 h a week and run for 11 weeks in the Autumn Semester. The format of the classes is formulaic. In the first two lessons of the week, a topic and relevant vocabulary is introduced, and then students listen and take notes of a lecture lasting approximately 10 min. There are also discussions related to the topic before and after the lecture. The third lesson of the week is usually reserved to focus on an aspect of pronunciation, using the vocabulary they have learnt during the week. Despite the formulaic nature of the teaching materials, as we observed in our study, the teachers used the material provided in different ways, which reflected their different styles. The teachers who participated were recruited through a ten-statement questionnaire about their CF beliefs, using a Likert scale to rank the statements, and were asked to indicate if they would be willing to participate in the study.

We selected three teachers from a pool of approximately 80 teachers who completed the questionnaire, based on their responses, as the aim was to represent differing CF beliefs.[2] Specifically, we aimed for a balance between teachers whose beliefs were either form or meaning focused in their orientation, though we recognise this is not easily discernible from a short questionnaire. All the teachers who participated are NES. While the university has both NES and NNES EAP teachers, it was unfortunate that no NNES EAP teachers volunteered to participate. From this selection, we attended the class and approached the students about the study to gain their consent. The data produced by those who did not consent to the study was not used, and they did not participate in the group interviews or individual interviews. In total, 12 group discussions from the three classes were conducted in weeks 3–4, each of which were approximately 15–20 min each (see Appendix B). During week 3, classroom audio recordings were started, and these ran through to week 11 of the course. A digital recorder was attached inconspicuously to the teacher to record the CF provided in class. These recordings resulted in approximately 55 h of classroom recordings between weeks 3 and 11 across the three classes. In weeks 10–11, 31 individual interviews of approximately 10–15 min each in length were conducted. The three teachers were also interviewed individually, with these semi-structured interviews focusing on class delivery and CF beliefs and practices. The interviews were approximately 25–30 min in length. The beliefs unpacked in this paper stem from the initial student group discussions and final teacher interviews, and therefore, the classroom recordings and final student interviews will not be discussed.

The interviews and group discussions were fully transcribed, and read several times to get a sense of the data with open coding used to identify the main themes in the data (Bazeley, 2013; Charmaz, 2008). After identifying the main themes, focused coding was used, and after organising the themes in a hierarchical order, coding was confirmed by a second researcher to ensure consistency across coding and analysis. Following this, the cross-comparison method was used within and across the two data sets (Bazeley, 2013; Charmaz, 2008). The coding and analysis processes were inductive in nature to highlight the underlying beliefs of the participants.

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study consisted of both teachers and students, all of whom were attached to a Sino-British University in China. All teachers were experienced EAP teachers holding a master's degree in applied linguistics as a minimum and had between 8 and 15 years of English language teaching experience. Each teacher was responsible for conducting the listening and speaking classes in the Autumn semester of this study, and from this, access to the student participants was established. The student participants recruited for this study numbered 48 in total and were all in their first semester of tertiary study, though not all participated in every stage of the study, as noted above. The following table details the 12 group discussions alongside the respective teacher (see Fig. 1). Teachers have been anonymised as Teacher 1, 2 and 3 (T1, T2 and T3), and the number of students from each group discussion is listed. If extracts are used from students in this paper, they have been anonymised as Student 1 (S1), Student 2 (S2), etc. and the table indicates which group discussion they participated in. The extracts of data are coded according to the teacher and the number of the group discussion.

4. Data and analysis

4.1. Student beliefs

Group discussions conducted with students in week 3 of the course are underpinned by the theme of fluency vs. accuracy, and traverse areas of how students perceive the provision of CF alongside their needs. While students consider fluency and communication to be integral, much discussion focuses on the role of CF in pushing students towards accuracy. The term accuracy in this paper refers to how students and teachers understand the term; that is, as how close a language form corresponds to SE, native speaker English or BrE and AmE, all of which tend to be conflated in the data. Students identify how the provision of CF draws attention to areas for improvement and development in their language production, but they also indicate that CF could result in a face threatening act. Underpinning much of the discussion by students is the connection with the 'expert vs. novice' user and who has the adequate status to provide CF. In this area, the students tend to be open to receiving CF from all sources; however, they also feel it is necessary to check if a correction is 'accurate' before they would consider its uptake. Ultimately, despite an awareness of some aspects of global Englishes, the students tend to adopt NES ideals in assessing the value of CF. Overall, each of the CF preferences and beliefs voiced by the students are driven by their desire to improve their language production, which largely speaks of a preoccupation with accuracy rather than fluency.

4.1.1. Fluency
A focus on fluency was integral for students when considering the act of communication. In these respects, the students see communication as the goal and provided meaning and message are retained, an accurate production is not deemed essential. For

---

[2] We selected four teachers, and collected data from four classrooms, but due to space we will only discuss three teachers and their students in this paper.

Teacher 1 (T1)	Teacher 2 (T2)	Teacher 3 (T3)
Group Discussion 1 (GD1) 2 students	**Group Discussion 1 (GD1)** 4 students Student 11 (S11)	**Group Discussion 1 (GD1)** 2 students Student 7 (S7) Student 8 (S8)
GD2 3 students Student 2 (S2) Student 3 (S3)	**GD2** 2 students	**GD2** 3 students Student 1 (S1) Student 16 (S16)
GD3 4 students Student 6 (S6)	**GD3** 4 students Student 4 (S4) Student 12 (S12) Student 13 (S13) Student 14 (S14)	**GD3** 2 students
GD4 5 students Student 5 (S5) Student 15 (S15)		**GD4** 2 students Student 9 (S9) Student 10 (S10)
		GD5 5 students

Fig. 1. Student composition of group discussions and number in each group.

instance, S1 commented on whether correct grammar was a pre-requisite for being respected when speaking a second language.

S1:	I think it doesn't matter too much (.) because we often make some errors in our Chinese communication (.) but it doesn't influence our da- daily understand (.) some errors does not matter in daily communication so it's just an or- it's just a oral speaking (0.5) the only thing we need to do is to understand the key words (.) so I think some small errors is not important (T3 GD2)[3]

---

[3] Transcription conventions can be found in Appendix A.

The indication here is that 'small errors' will not impede communication and that these kinds of errors are also common in an interlocutor's L1, and therefore, are not required as a focus for corrective attention. Distinguishing between different types of error reflects recent findings of Van Ha et al. (2021) and Zhu and Wang (2019) that students in their studies seem to be less concerned with local errors that do not impede communication. Van Ha et al. (2021) highlight that although students desire CF for both global and local errors, SLA researchers are fixated on examining the effects of CF on local errors such as third person singular or pronouns (Sato & Loewen, 2018; Zhao & Ellis, 2022). The observations by S1 seem to imply a flexible belief to view language as a communicative tool, rather than a strict aim to achieve a native-like proficiency and is also evident in other group discussions.

S2:	that I think (.) er (.) different people have different reason to learn a second language (.) and, and I think one of the common (.) er (.) purpose of them is that they want to express themselves in different language and (.) erm (.) maybe sometimes if they can (.) if they can (.) express their points (.) er (.) well (.) to make some self-understood and err (.) grammar rules (.) sometimes it's not that (.) of importance (.)
I:	ok (.) so you were saying that it's not so important to be accurate all the time
S2:	yeah
I:	as long as (.) as long as you can be understood
S2:	yeah (.) sometimes it's tolerant to accept these errors
I:	uhuh (.) ok what do (.) what do you think about that (.) do you agree S3 (.)
S3:	erm (.) hm (.) hm [coughs] I think sometimes when we speak wrong something (.) er (.) something wrong (.) you can understand it and that is ok
I:	erm
S3:	but (.) but for example the vocabulary (.) the stress of the vocabulary ma- (.) maybe sometimes will change the meaning
I:	uh huh
S3:	so I (.) I think it need to be corrected (T1 GD2)

While S2 focuses on the importance of 'tolerance' towards errors, they also prioritise the essential aspect of successfully delivering the message. S2 explicitly notes 'grammar rules' as perhaps not being important as conveying meaning. It might be expected that students who had recently joined the university from a Chinese high school, which tend to have a strong focus on grammatical accuracy, would not hold such beliefs. This may imply experiences with English outside the classroom context where English is used as a lingua franca. This focus on meaning is expanded on by S3, who raises the necessity for correction if an error 'will change the meaning'. Interestingly, the example given by S3 about an error which would impact on meaning is related to word stress rather than grammatical accuracy, which is perhaps derived from their own experience of miscommunication. Jenkins (2000) notes that phonological differences are more likely to lead to miscommunication than grammatical ones, which leads to the question of why there is an

overwhelming focus in CF studies on grammatical features. This suggests that greater adherence needs to be paid to the context where English is being taught, where a strict adherence to NES grammatical norms may not be appropriate or even desired by students. Belief in the importance of communicating meaning are also evident in the following extract.

S4:	I think that if I am going to study or live in the UK (.) I think it is important to correct the errors (.) but mm I think umm English is just a tool to communicate with international people (.) so there are many accents and just styles of English in different parts of the world (.) so I umm (.) if I am going to live or study in different places (.) I don't think it is really matters (T2 GD3)

S4 acknowledges that variation in English is the norm and that through using English as 'a tool to communicate' there is not much urgency required in correcting perceived errors, which interacts with key propositions validating English's contemporary role and position (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Vettorel, 2018). S4 recognises English's role as an international language, and highlights that English is spoken differently in different parts of the world, again with a focus on pronunciation, and therefore asserts less concern if their own spoken language includes errors. Overall, there are indications from the students that they are welcoming of a fluency focus if effective communication can be maintained, a belief system which coordinates more with the central emphasis of much ELF research, rather than SLA.

4.1.2. Accuracy

Despite the assertions from some students giving weight to a fluency focus, the students tend to focus on the multiple roles that accuracy has in their English development beliefs. At its most fundamental level, the students identify CF as a key component of their developmental journey. Without CF being offered, the students claim that they would not have a directed base from which to improve. For instance, S2 and S5 are concerned about errors becoming embedded, or fossilized, in their production.

S2:	because if nobody correct (.) correct my errors (.) and I will always be on the wrong way and (.) er (.) maybe in a formal situation I said that and maybe (.) erm (.) it's something that make me feel more embarrassed than I was (.) er (.) correcting at the first time (T1 GD2)
S5:	when I make errors in speaking a second language (.) I like my teacher to correct them (.) because if the teacher didn't correct me (.) I will always make the same mistake (.) and I can't improve my language skills (T1 GD4)

The students indicate that they will 'always' produce errors if they are not identified via CF. While this notion suggests a relationship with the students' concern about potential fossilization, there are also underlying connections with who has the authority in the classroom. In both cases, the students are positioning themselves as novices seeking guidance from an expert in the classroom space, and their beliefs seem to signal that provision of CF is the key driver in furnishing them with additional language skills. In this area, S1 takes this a step further by stating how correcting errors is essential for avoiding the 'wrong habit'.

S1:	because if you do not correct your errors, you will make it again and again (.) and then you will develop a wrong habit (2.0) so I think it's (0.5) it's not correct (T3 GD2)

In order to progress with developing the correct 'habits', the students show an awareness of how they need to act on CF. Having an open attitude toward the reception of CF is highlighted as a contributing factor in the effectiveness of CF (Ellis, 2010; Sheen, 2007). However, the provision of CF itself can also negatively impact on the students through the potential threat to face, as expressed by S4.

S4:	maybe first feel a little shame and, then I think (.) mm (.) it can help me to improve and correct those errors (T2 GD3)

Here, S4 indicates that there is initial 'shame' when being corrected. Despite this, the positive weight of the CF in developing accuracy has the potential to overcome the negative aspect. S6 contributes to this by proffering that it may not be the act of CF provision that initiates a loss of face, rather, it may be related to the group dynamics of the classroom.

S6:	err (.) I don't worry about making mistakes (.) because I think my teachers are so nice (.) so it is no problem when I was correct by them (.) but if I make any mistakes (.) sometimes I will feel embarrassed (.) because I (.) I care about others' opinion (.) err
I:	right
S6:	err (.) my (.) my (.) when (.) I will wonder (.) err (.) how my classmates think
I:	right
S6:	so (.) I will feel embarrassed (T1 GD3)

This is explored in more detail by S6, who states that the 'teachers are so nice', which results in the CF provided posing 'no problem'. The fact that S6 continues by stating how they 'care about other's opinion' suggests it is not just a face threatening act but how this also relates to classroom dynamics and perceptions of what others may think. In contrast, a broader mindset is expressed by

S7.

S7:	emmm (.) because I think in my language (.) in my language class yes maybe almost every students errrm (.) have ever made some mistakes and I'm not the only one to make mistakes so I think it's not weird I think it is very normal so I don't worry about it (T3 GD1)

While S6 is influenced by what others may think of their errors, S7 suggests that their production is representative of the class and making mistakes is the norm. The belief here seems to indicate that in a language class, mistakes are to be expected with the mentality that the group is working towards a common goal, which may be an indication of the desire to develop one's English ability given the EMI context. With this though the question of who should be the provider of CF remains.

Whereas some students claim that anyone could correct their mistakes, they also judge the value of CF, which tends to suggest that not all CF may be of equal value. A position behind this claim may relate to not only the appropriacy of the CF in relation to the student's target language goals, but also in relation to the standing of the person providing the CF. This can be observed in an exchange with S9 and S10.

I:	who do you think should or should not correct errors do you think classmates or teacher or yourself (.) who do you think should or should not correct errors (2.0) between the teachers (.) classmates and yourself
S9:	if he have a standard pronunciation he can correct me (.) if his =
I:	= is this your classmate or your teacher
S9:	if they both can if they are right whether I accept them
I:	how do you know they are right
S9:	I have a dictionary @@@@
I:	@@@@ what do you think (.) do you think it is ok for your classmates to correct you
S10:	I will accept their er opinions and I will check it later to see if it is right (T3 GD4)

Here, the perception of the students is that CF can be offered, but it may not result in uptake until after they have made the determination of the validity of the CF provided. The comment from S9 that they 'have a dictionary' may have been intended to be light-hearted in nature, but behind the utterance there may also be an assessment that the 'accuracy' of CF depends on who holds the 'expert' card. Again, it should be noted here that S9 is guided by pronunciation and perceptions of what may or may not be 'standard' as a determiner in who might be an expert. Overall, the perception of the students tends to be that the teacher is the expert in this area, where the teacher is inadvertently acting as the gatekeeper, as is evidenced from the exchange with S4.

S4:	sometimes we cannot find errors by ourselves (.) but if the teacher point out that (.) err maybe I will avoid to (.) avoid making the same mistakes (.) next time (.) and if the classmates correct my errors (.) sometimes I don't agree with them (.) and we will talk about and may- maybe ask teacher (T2 GD3)

The assertion from S4 that they might not agree with peer-initiated CF or will confer with the teacher firmly identifies who the expert is in the CF space. Similarly, the belief that the teacher is the expert is exemplified through the exchange with S11, who also introduces the notion of NES.

S11:	yeah (.) actually (.) I'm very happy (.) because my teacher (0.3) after all (.) my teacher is a native speaker (.) and when my classmates correct me (.) maybe I am a little bit embarrassed (T2 GD1)

S11's belief appears to be that CF should be provided by the teacher, rather than their peers, positioning the teacher as the default expert due to their nativeness. This belief is closely connected with the ideological construction of the NES as the target (Ellis et al., 2006; Schmidt, 2001; Trofimovich et al., 2007). It is noticeable that S11 is embarrassed if corrected by classmates, which corroborates with S6 in the above extract that CF itself is not embarrassing, but how this is judged by peers. The students in this study also attempt to connect NES ideals and accuracy with the notion of respect, which is noticeable in the following exchange.

I:	what do you think about sentence four (.) people will respect me if I use correct grammar when speaking a second language
S4:	I agree with that
I:	why do you agree with it
S4:	mm, because maybe people respect me will make me happy and (.) umm (.) I will umm (.) learn correct (.) I will learn correct grammar (.) and mmm it helps me to know the way native speakers (.) mm (.) how they how they speak
I:	ok
S12:	maybe I will feel proud of myself (.) but I think erm (.) it's not the reason why you learn to speak a second language
I:	what is the reason you learn to speak a second language
S12:	mm just (1.0) learning
I:	what do you guys think
S13:	I think because we are learning (.) err so if I use correct grammar (.) it is the (XXX) being respected
I:	do you have anything to add S14
S14:	I think all of us are try to use the correct grammar as a native speaker (.) so every learner (.) ahh (.) whether they are using correct grammar or little errors (.) they are they should all be (1.0) respected (T2 GD3)

The connection with the NES is firstly touched on by S4, who introduces the notion of respect with 'correct grammar' and 'knowing the way native speakers speak'. Through this comment, it is clear that S4 classifies the NES as the expert in the equation. However, this view is not maintained by others in the exchange, who perceive language learning just as 'language learning', and not a goal to earn respect through using 'correct grammar'. Furthermore, S14 draws the conclusion that while all students may 'try to use the correct grammar as a native speaker', the presence of 'little errors' should not be a determining factor in whether respect is present or not. The closing comments here, while attending to accuracy overall, draw on hints of 'communication' and the function of English, which again, highlights the contemporary positioning of English (Jenkins, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011). Despite this, there still exist indications that NES connections within the CF paradigm continue to act as drivers. For instance, the exchange below begins by addressing how learning 'native speaker's pronunciation' is better.

S15:	but I think if I can learn the native speaker's pronunciation (.) it's better (.) yeah (.) and I think it's even better for me in communication with others (.) give me more confidence I think
I:	ok (.) right (.) does it matter where that native speaker is from (.) for example (.) do you have any preference (.) would you rather learn to speak like a American or like a British or Indian or Australian (.) do you have any preference
S15:	for me I think British and American maybe the best choice (.) because these English is more native
I:	more native
S15:	yeah
I:	what do you mean by that
S15:	because English is the first country to speak English (.) British (.) and because of some history issues (.) American then to speak English (.) so I think the two kinds of English is better (T2 GD3)

The exchange with S15 depicts not just how they believe NES pronunciation is 'better' but how it would also be 'better for communication'. This would indicate that these students are influenced by ideologies which present the NES model as international and intelligible, despite empirical research indicating that NES models of pronunciation are less intelligible in an international communicative context (Baird et al., 2014; Jenkins, 2007, 2014). S15's belief appears firmly embedded through the discussion surrounding the 'more native' varieties. The view held by this student seems to mirror those that promote a standard language or native target. Importantly, however, this view is not held by all, and a more open perspective is also voiced whereby flexibility between and across English varieties can be an element of CF in EAP to engage students with the broader sense of English. This sense appears ready for development, but in its current state, is still in its infancy, as introduced in the exchange with S1 and S16.

S1:	some of my friends say British English and some of others say American English (.) but we can understand each other well (.) so I think it's just different types of pronunciation and it doesn't matter so much (.) I don't think it is very important to distinguish between them
S16:	people from all of the world (.) often speak with different accents (T3 GD2)

In reference to the differences between British and American English, S1 observes that 'we can understand each other well', which highlights the perception of communicative efficacy across these two English varieties. While the belief is that these different types of pronunciation do not 'matter so much', it is worth noting that both varieties mentioned by the student are NES. It would be interesting to determine if these perceptions ran beyond the NES varieties into the wider communicative concept of English, and with that, to what extent accuracy remained a topic of focus. In this area, S16 touches on how different people 'often speak with different accents', and while this indicates an awareness of the nature of English, the utterance in its base form is purely descriptive. Despite this, displaying this kind of awareness warrants further discussion of how CF in EAP can accommodate global Englishes.

4.2. Teachers' CF beliefs

Interviews conducted with the three EAP teachers at the end of the course showed similarity to students' beliefs, with fluency and accuracy being the two main themes related to CF. However, teachers explained that attempts to create a balance on students' levels of fluency and accuracy not only determines decisions on the provision of CF, but also impacts other classroom practices such as class structure, division of classroom time and the identification of a task as being fluency or accuracy focused. While the teachers tend to argue that fluency, and a focus on meaning and communication are the determining factors in whether to provide CF or not, this did not seem to derive from ideological beliefs about language, but instead, from considering students' confidence and wanting them to speak. However, underlying their CF beliefs is that the NES model is the correct variety of the language. In addition, they tend to believe there is a need to provide CF to enable students to successfully pass the assessment, which suggests a belief that CF is an effective tool to modify students' language.

4.2.1. Fluency

For teachers, the priority in classroom management is to create a positive and cohesive environment, and avoid a negative atmosphere, which CF may contribute to if it impacts on the emotional state of the students through them perceiving CF as a criticism. T3 for example, focuses on encouraging students to speak any type of English, rather than adherence to SE norms.

T3:	

(*continued*)

	if you've got someone who is very reserved (.) and reluctant to speak (.) it seems that they might be erm very sensitive (.) maybe I would decide not to correct some error (.) but (.) I'd like to think mostly I give the feedback in a way that isn't too negative or critical
I:	like what though
T3:	so you know (.) like (.) offering a suggestion or
I:	right (.) ok (.) rather than say it's not like that
T3:	erm (.) erm and I think most often when it comes to word choice (.) I offer I offer an alternative (.) that I think sounds better to an English speaker erm (.) so I don't think I would ever give feedback in a way of where I'm saying that was wrong (.) it would be more often the right word or questioning it and getting them to resupply the correct word

The three teachers all note that they resist giving CF, because they do not want to damage students' confidence, and also want to avoid upsetting the students, with the main aim aligned with encouraging students to speak. Students are characterised by the teachers as shy, sensitive, and lacking in confidence to speak English, which provides justification for limiting the amount of CF the teacher would provide. This belief also impacts on the way the teachers give CF, in T3's case this is in a 'positive way', by suggesting alternative words, as well as questioning students' word choice. This questioning and suggesting act as clarification requests and reformulations, which would be a more implicit than explicit approach to CF. T3 also tends to treat interactions as natural conversation by avoiding interrupting students, focusing on meaning, and believes that correcting all errors would be demotivating for students, which aligns with the observations of Li (2017). This belief is also evident for T1 who perceives the primary aim of the course as encouraging conversation to help students learn discussion skills, with accuracy a lower-level aim.

T1:	that's something I'm really conscious of (.) and I don't like to correct students that I think are shy or maybe don't have a lot of experience speaking or a lot of experience interacting in English (.) I think (.) for me this semester's really encouraging them and this whole year is really about encouraging them to speak and to be confident and to try and communicate their ideas (.) er not about the exact grammar (.) it's about being able to communicate what they want to communicate (.) erm [...] I don't really want to correct them (.) unless I (.) but if I don't understand what they say (.) I do normally try and clarify (.) cause I think no one else is gonna understand them either (.) that's important (.) but if it's just erm something where it's very clear what they mean (.) but there's a little mistake (.) especially when it is little thing (.) I normally let it go

The students are transitioning into a different education environment, where speaking is encouraged, and teacher-fronted classes discouraged. This might be disconcerting for some students, but T1 is positioning themself as an expert by determining the preferred pedagogical approach based on their teacher training and language policies, even though it may not be the right approach for all students. This suggests a 'blanket' approach to teaching, derived from a CLT orientation (Harmer, 2015), and although it may have student interests at its foundation, perhaps some aspects of this approach could consider the nuances of the context more completely. There is also the implication that students are novices and do not know which approach is best for them. Within this, T1 has chosen not to focus on errors, irrespective of student needs, beliefs or desires. T1 also mentions a CF approach oriented towards meaning, asking for clarification and allowing small errors to pass. While this pedagogical approach is evident in CLT and task-based learning, it is also commensurate with an ELF approach to CF, where these pragmatic communicative events tend to occur (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Vettorel, 2018).

T2, during the interview, tends to draw a distinction with language features and whether to provide CF. They also suggest that in the classroom they primarily focus on correcting students' pronunciation with the implication that it is this which has the most direct impact on intelligibility. This also implies that other language features, such as lexis and syntax are not a focus of correction for T2 in the classroom, and instead students are allowed more freedom during classroom discussions.

T2:	but you try and do it in a way that's not just directed at that student (.) you would direct the correction at the whole class
I:	right
T2:	because it's probably not just that student who's struggling with it (.) yeah and often I would pre-warn them that (.) that this word is particularly difficult
I:	right
T2:	yeah (.) have a go at pronouncing it (.) erm (.) erm (.) erm (.) just the provide some comfort that if they did mispronounce it (.) it wouldn't matter so much
I:	uh-huh (.) have you ever decided not to correct a learner (.) because the correction might hurt their feelings
T2:	erm (.) well that's why I don't with fluency practice
I:	uh huh
T2:	because you are interfering with their communication and (.) and (.) and then you are shifting the focus directly (.) you see (.) and yeah (.) to a certain extent may hurt their feelings as well (.) yeah
I:	@@
T2:	@@
I:	ok (.) so how do you, how do you think you normally correct your students' errors
T2:	erm (.) normally (.) erm (.) so (.) so modelling the correct pronunciation (.) maybe telling them what mistake they made (.) like (.) like you pronounced it X when you should have pronounced it Y (0.5) maybe doing some kind of choral repetition where (.) where they have to repeat it after you, or the whole class repeats it after you (0.5) I guess that they're all different techniques

T2 considers the students feelings, indicating that they would, 'pre-warn' students of the pronunciation, reassuring them of the difficulty of the pronunciation, and that students' production may not be accurate. However, it should be noted that consideration of the students' feeling is prompted by the researcher, and the main consideration appears to restrict CF, to allow for communication, which would be interrupted by providing CF. They also mention using choral repetition, so as not to identify a particular students'

pronunciation. However, T2 discusses other CF strategies, such as providing a model answer and explicitly highlighting to students the correct and incorrect version of the language form. Therefore, while T2 indicates an orientation towards a focus on meaning, there is an underlying assumption of correct and incorrect forms of the language derived from a standard language ideology. T2 determines what is right and wrong in the classroom asserting a position as the expert, and in another part of the interview alludes to noticing, as justification for CF, so that students become aware of the errors that they are making, which appears to draw on concepts connected with the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 1995, 2001).

There is some consistency in the three teachers' beliefs about how they approach CF in the classroom, however they each also demonstrate their individuality, which is perhaps reflective of how CF is treated within teacher training. Clarification requests seem to be T1 and T3's preferred method, which is commensurate with a CLT approach to teaching (Harmer, 2015; Scrivener, 2005), but less evident in T2's belief system. The teachers tend to relate CF to classroom management, to build students' confidence in speaking and to avoid damaging their confidence, with an additional association being the potential promotion of learner autonomy, where through highlighting errors, students would potentially notice the error, and be able to self-correct.

4.2.2. Accuracy

Though the teachers tend to focus on meaning, this appears to be derived more in relation to building confidence than to language beliefs, and the teachers demonstrate an orientation to a standard language ideology, and towards a belief that the NES model is the accurate model, as noted by T3.

T3:	so sometimes you have to (.) sometimes you have to (.) step back and say I know what you mean I know what word you mean (.) but you mispronounced it (.) erm (.) and sometimes you can be in danger of just letting them go (.) but if it was a real world situation (.) maybe people wouldn't have that (.) so (.) maybe there's a reason to correct then but yeah (.) I'd say I'd say it comes down to communication

T3 seems to imply that students will encounter NES, and therefore T3 asserts the need to set aside personal levels of receptive intelligibility for a broader perception of intelligibility informed by a consideration of whether other people outside the classroom would understand or not. The claim here appears congruent with the role of English in international communication, where successful communication is a prime objective (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Vettorel, 2018). However, the construct of intelligibility is difficult to determine, and what may be intelligible to one individual, may be unintelligible to another. T2 mentions teachers can become attuned to the way the learners speak, perhaps reflecting a common perception among EAP teachers.

T2:	erm yeah (.) I mean I I I think that's (.) it is necessary to correct students' pronunciation yeah (.) that's all about communication (.) isn't it (.) like we want to be teaching our students to be able to communicate effectively if you notice they are doing it in a way that a native speaker wouldn't understand them

Although T2 asserts they focus on meaning, they would also correct errors that do not impact on meaning, because a NES might not understand. Therefore, through consistent interaction with students, errors that do not conform to NES norms have become intelligible to T2. However, T2 also assumes that certain errors would not be intelligible to other NES outside the context of the classroom. In effect, they are second guessing what is and is not intelligible, as their own ability to judge intelligibility has become blurred. T2 sees the NES as gatekeepers of the language joined with the assumption that the NES is more intelligible, though this is not supported by empirical research (Baird et al., 2014; Jenkins, 2007, 2014). Another strong motivator for providing CF is related to speaking assessment, which is measured against SE, and mentioned by all the teachers during the interviews.

T1:	like I'm always thinking about the assessment as well so if I think (.) yeah like the actual- the truth is you know to get a 60 or something for pronunciation it just is (.) it's clear (.) it doesn't need to be native-like (.) so I definitely do that as well actually (.) I think about what would this student get if you heard that kind of slip (.) if you heard that kind of mistake (.) and if it is like (.) well (.) they'd still be doing fine on the assessment (.) then I use that as a bit of a benchmark if I think actually you know this would probably be failing (.) then I would definitely give them guidance

Though noting personally that they are less concerned about students approximating NES, that NES is mentioned at all suggests an underlying consideration. The NES is mentioned by all the teachers during the interviews in some form, even if it is to argue that the NES model is not relevant to them personally. T1 goes on to note that the assessment is not all about language, and they give feedback on content. About 50% of the grade in the speaking assessment is based on the content of what they are saying, which might have a washback effect on the course that discourages an emphasis on providing CF.

It was evident that these teachers had some pedagogical training through their evaluations of CF provision, and for them, the decision on whether to provide CF or not, and the manner of CF, is based on wanting to develop their students' confidence to speak English, and to develop their fluency. It seems clear that these teachers are influenced in their approach to CF by a CLT orientation, which itself is influenced by SLA, and would seem to indicate that teachers require a more nuanced understanding of language in different contexts through teaching training. Two of the teachers believe that communication, interaction, and negotiation of meaning through clarification requests provides the impetus for second language acquisition. All three teachers believe that CF provides the opportunity for students to notice the difference between their language and the target, epitomised by the NES variety. While communication, interaction and the negotiation of meaning are key tenets of a Global Englishes pedagogy (See Rose & Galloway, 2019), their purpose is not as a means to acquire an approximated native English, but instead as strategies for English users to be able to

engage with each other across different varieties of English where intelligibility may become an issue.

5. Conclusion

This paper has evaluated EAP student and teacher beliefs towards CF provision in an EMI context. An underlying point of agreement across both students and teachers seems to be the default position of the teacher as the expert. This is evidenced through students showing deference to CF provided by other sources while the teachers are confident in displaying their professional standing in deciding what should or should not be corrected. In both cases, there is a strong alignment with NES or SE values underpinning CF desires and decisions. This also suggests that EMI context makes minimal difference to the CF beliefs of either students or teachers. While this might be expected from students, for their part the EAP teachers appear to draw on beliefs which could equally be applied to other English teaching contexts with no discernible consideration of the EMI context. Nevertheless, there is an indication that some students place value in the wider communicative applicability of English beyond these SE boundaries, which is also a view promoted by the teachers. This presents a starting point for moving forward with the promotion of wider exposure to English varieties to enhance student beliefs in this area while also guiding teachers in increasing the acceptance of this view, which holds the potential to further expectations in EMI contexts.

One possible way to initiate this kind of change could be through the revision of assessment practice. As the teachers alluded, oral production is often connected with SE values when under assessment, which influences teachers' CF practice to some extent and may also act as a contributor in informing student beliefs. Promoting a transition away from NES pronunciation descriptors towards a more equitable ELF focus to mirror the contemporary position of English may present students with an empowerment opportunity under the premise that intelligible production and effective communication take precedence over NES or SE norms. Moreover, a transition of this type would promote the international standing of English. Further, this could have the potential to have a washback effect on the provision of CF in the classroom from form focused CF to meaning focused CF and would be more congruent with ELF pedagogical orientations (Rose & Galloway, 2019; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2018). One aspect which we were unable to address in this paper is whether teachers are naturally responding in the interaction, and the extent that the teachers were conscious of providing CF.

In being unable to address the intent of teachers in providing CF, it does undermine CF studies, which code CF from classroom data without considering the purpose and motivation of teachers in their communication. It would seem that re-focusing teacher training to CF based on meaning, treating interactions in the classroom as natural, and recognising the connection between CF and natural discourse would be more reflective of the ELF encounters that students will experience outside of the classroom. However, it is also important to recognise that irrespective of what the teacher considers to be more beneficial to students' needs, students have their own beliefs about how they think teachers should be providing CF.

An additional point worth raising to progress the field is in relation to provision of CF itself. It is interesting to highlight how a recurrent theme from the teachers related to the decision to avoid CF in the hopes of not interfering with communication or to lessen the likelihood of placing negative stress on students. While it is true that these points were also raised by the students, a more powerful comment underscored the extent to which the students value CF and the role it plays in their language development. Fears from the students were housed in the understanding that CF would furnish them with the ability to progress beyond their current threshold and that if CF were not provided, they would not progress.

Author's statement

Acknowledgements

Appendix A

Transcription Conventions

s-	indicates an incomplete word.

(*continued*)

=	Latching
[	Overlapping speech
[…]	Gap between sections of the transcript that were not included.
[cough]	Indicates other verbal noise.
(.)	Indicates a pause in talk of less than 0.2 s.
(2.0)	Period of silence in tenths of second.
(XXX)	Indicates utterance which is unintelligible
@@@	Laughter: The length of the @ indicates the length of the laughter.

Appendix B

Guiding schedule for student discussion groups.
Which of the following are similar to how you feel about using a second language?

- I don't worry about making mistakes in language classes.
- I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
- I want to receive corrective feedback when I make an error.
- People will respect me if I use correct grammar when speaking a second language.
- When I make errors in speaking a second language, I like my teacher to correct them.
- Teachers should not correct students when they make errors in class.
- I like to be corrected in small group work.
- I dislike it when I am corrected in class.
- It is more important to practice a second language in real-life situations than to practice grammar rules.

Is it important to correct errors related to British English?
How often do you want teacher to give corrective feedback on errors?
When do you want your errors to be corrected?
How often should the teacher correct?

The following people should/should not correct my errors

- Classmates
- Teachers
- Myself

Which is the best response by the teacher to the following error in your opinion?
Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?
Student: I go to the park.

1. Teacher: Could you say that again?
2. Teacher: Go?
3. Teacher: "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here
4. Teacher: Yesterday I went
5. Teacher: Really? What did you do there?
6. Teacher: How does the verb change when we talk about the past?
7. Teacher: I went to the park

References

Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts: Differential effects on Second Language morphosyntax. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 183–210.
Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in SLA, 28*(4), 543–574.
Baird, R., Baker, W., & Kitazawa, M. (2014). The complexity of ELF. *Journal of English As a Lingua Franca, 3*(1), 171–196.
Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis*. SAGE.
Bell, T. (2005). Behaviours and attitudes pf effective foreign language teachers: Results of questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*, 259–270.
Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign Language Teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*, 46–60.
Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 81–110). SAGE Publications.
Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Continuum.
Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge.
Dafouz, E. (2017). English-medium instruction in multilingual university settings: An opportunity for developing language awareness. In P. Garrett, & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 170–185). Routledge.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2012). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 213–223). Multilingual matters.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114–138). Cambridge University Press.

Egi, T. (2007). Recasts, learners' interpretations, and L2 development. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in Second Language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 249–267). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in Second Language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339–360). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching, 43*(2), 182–201.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Wiley Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2022). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339–368.

Fang, F. G. (2018). Review of English as a medium of instruction in Chinese universities today: Current trends and future directions: New language policies to promote multilingualism and language support for EMI will be needed in Chinese tertiary contexts. *English Today, 34*(1), 32–37.

Galante, A., Okubo, K., Cole, C., Elkader, N. A., Carozza, N., Wilkinson, C., & Vasic, J. (2020). English-Only is not the way to go": Teachers' perceptions of plurilingual instruction in an English program at a Canadian university. *Tesol Quarterly*, 1–30.

García Mayo, M. D. P., & Alcón Soler, E. (2013). Negotiated input and output interaction. In M. Young-Scholten (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 209–229). Cambridge University Press.

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*(1), 127–165.

Hall, G. (2017). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. Routledge.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *Tesol Quarterly, 36*(4), 543–572.

Han, Z. (2013). Fossilization: A classic concern of SLA research. In S. M. Gass, & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 476–490). Routledge.

Han, Z., & Odlin, T. (2006). Introduction. In Z. Han, & T. Odlin (Eds.), *Studies of fossilization in second language acquisition* (pp. 1–20). Multilingual Matters.

Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Hobsbawn, E. (2000). *The age of empire 1875-1914*. Phoenix Press.

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-Medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education, 67*(5), 551–567.

Hu, G., Li, L., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction at a Chinese University: Rhetoric and reality. *Language Policy, 13*, 21–40.

Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: Students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals, 44*, 465–492.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as lingua Franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49–85.

Junquiera, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices: A case study of a novice and experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*, 181–206.

Kainvanpanah, S., Alavi, S., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *Language Learning Journal, 43*(1), 1–20.

Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). Learners' beliefs as mediators of what is noticed and learned in the language classroom. *Tesol Quarterly, 48*, 86–109.

Kartchava, E., Gatbonton, E., Ammar, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2020). Oral corrective feedback: Pre-service English as a second language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(2), 220–249.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). the language (s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism? *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 4–15.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Kuteeva, M. (2020). Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: Students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1637395

Lantolf, J. P. (2011). Integrating sociocultural theory and cognitive linguistics in the second language classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 303–318). Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Second language acquisition and the issue of fossilization: There is no end, and there is no state. In Z. Han, & T. Odlin (Eds.), *Studies of fossilization in second language acquisition* (pp. 189–200). Multilingual Matters.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Complexity and ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 51–60). Routledge.

Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41*(2), 217–230.

Lee, E. J. E. (2016). Reducing international graduate students' language anxiety through oral pronunciation corrections. *System, 56*, 78–95.

Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Is English-medium instruction effective in improving Chinese undergraduate students' English competence? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. 52*(2), 99–126.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365. https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00046.li

Li, S. (2017). Teacher and learner beliefs about corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji (Ed.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications*. Taylor and Francis.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System, 84*, 93–109.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(1), 276–295.

Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In S. M. Gass, & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 24–40). Routledge.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 91–104.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (2003). Stabilization and Fossilization in Interlanguage Development. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 487–535). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 35–66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*, 265–302.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1–40.

Macaro, E. (2020). Exploring the role of language in English medium instruction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(3), 263–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1620678

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 405–430.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in Second Language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 407–453). Oxford University Press.

Mahalingappa, L., Polat, N., & Wang, R. (2021). *A cross-cultural comparison in pedagogical beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The case of English language teachers in China versus the US*. Language Awareness. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1900211

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Multilingual mattersDisinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 1–42).

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System, 39*(4), 451–467.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning, 57*(4), 511–548.

Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal, 10*(2), 71–89.

Pecorari, D., & Malmström, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *Tesol Quarterly, 52*(3), 497–515.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap": Nonnative speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(1), 99–126.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System, 55*, 111–122.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). The role of incidental unfocused prompts and recasts in improving English as a foreign language learners' accuracy. *Language Learning Journal, 44*(2), 257–268.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System, 41*(2), 472–483.

Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System, 49*, 98–109.

Rezaei, S., Mozaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 1*(1), 21–29.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46*(1), 65–79.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. M. Norris, & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). John Benjamins Publishing.

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2018). Metacognitive instruction enhances the effectiveness of corrective feedback: Variable effects of feedback types and linguistic targets. *Language Learning, 68*(2), 507–545.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1–63). University of Hawai'i.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge Applied Linguistics.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 343–364.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 244–258.

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching.* Macmillian Education.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford University Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(3), 209–231.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage.* Longman.

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *Language Learning Journal, 46*(4), 483–500.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263–300.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of explicit corrections and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research, 10*, 361–392.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in Second Language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301–322). Oxford University Press.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning, 58*(4), 835–874.

Shegar, C., Zhang, L. J., & Low, E. L. (2013). Effects of an input-output mapping practice task on EFL learners' acquisition of two grammatical structures. *System, 41* (2), 443–461.

Shohamy, E. (2012). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196–211). Multilingual matters.

Sifakis, N. C., & Bayyurt, Y. (2018). ELF-aware teaching, learning and teacher development. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 456–467). Routledge.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Lawrence Erlbaun Associates.

Thomas, K. E. (2018). Comparing explicit exemplar-based and rule-based corrective feedback: Introducing analogy-based corrective feedback. *The Modern Language Journal, 102*(2), 371–391.

Trofimovich, P., Ammar, A., & Gatbonton, E. (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytical ability. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in Second Language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 171–195). Oxford University Press.

Van Ha, X., Murray, J. C., & Riazi, A. M. (2021). High school EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 11*(2), 235–264.

Vasquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 421–443.

Vettorel, P. (2018). ELF and communication strategies: Are they taken into account in ELT materials? *RELC Journal, 49*(1), 58–73.

Yilmaz, Y. (2013). Relative effects of explicit and implicit feedback: The role of working memory capacity and language analytic ability. *Applied Linguistics, 34*, 344–368.

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 293–314.

Zhao, J., & Dixon, L. Q. (Eds.). (2017). *English-medium instruction in Chinese universities: Perspectives, discourse and evaluation.*

Zhao, Y., & Ellis, R. (2022). The relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of 3rd person-s by Chinese university students: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 361–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820903343

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755

Robert Weekly is an Assistant Professor in the School of Education and English at the University of Nottingham Ningbo. He worked as EAP tutor in the UK, Turkey and China, before joining the school of Education and English in 2018. He currently teaches in the areas of Sociolinguistics, World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca, which are reflective of his current research interests.

Andrew Pollard is a lecturer in the College of Indigenous Futures, Education and the Arts at Charles Darwin University. His professional experience has spanned English, academic literacies and applied linguistics across Australia, China and Korea. Andrew's major research interests surround global Englishes and the development of language education practice and policy.

James has been teaching English since 2008, during which time he has worked in Indonesia and Italy and around the UK in both private language schools and universities. Before coming to Nottingham Ningbo in 2017, he completed an MSC TESOL at the University of Bristol, where he wrote his dissertation on the use of spoken feedback techniques in one-to-one writing tutorials with students of English for Specific Purposes.