

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In this chapter, the concluding thoughts based on the findings already elaborated in the previous chapter are presented. Having the conclusion being drawn, suggestions are also pointed out. The suggestions comprise the suggestion for the teaching of writing in higher education as well as suggestion for further studies in respective subject.

I. Conclusion

After receiving two feedbacks, the difference of effect between the two compared error-marking strategies was proven statistically significant implying the use of comment to facilitate better progress. This finding was also validated by the finding suggesting that the use of comment facilitated better revision towards most of Dulay, Burt & Krashen's categories of errors. However, under the circumstance where the feedback was only provided once, there was no significant difference between the two strategies. Despite such statistical finding, the use of color was also facilitative in assisting participants to revise their grammatical error. It was shown from the noteworthy percentage of error reduction in experimental group A and the insignificant difference between the two error-marking strategies in the first CF provision.

According to the essay records, it was also revealed that there were several circumstances where the two strategies caused futile revisions. From the scrutiny of 10 randomly chosen participants' essays, it was revealed that majority of the futile revisions were caused by participants' grammaticality. There were minor cases where the futile revisions were identified under the circumstances as follow: 1) inexistence of similar marking in one's essay; 2) two different markers put side by side; 3) one marker to represent a rather complicated error; 4) the use of unknown term; 5) domino effect caused by inaccurately marked error.

II. Suggestions

1. Suggestions for the teaching of writing in higher education

As suggested by VanBeuningen (2010) and Ferris (2010), students tend to make broad range of error thus the provision of focused CF is not suitable to be applied. This research had provided evidence regarding the effectiveness of unfocused feedback through comparing two techniques of such CF method, thus there should no longer be doubt on the use of unfocused CF to treat undergraduate students' grammatical errors. As for the implicit counterpart, the two techniques being compared in this research may not be the most practical techniques to be applied. Regardless, through the comparison of these two techniques, it was vividly seen that undergraduate students were able to comprehend such implicit instructions.

2. Suggestion for future research on unfocused-implicit corrective feedback

Firstly, it is to be noted that to justify the need of further research on respective topic, reference to urgency of English-writing mastery which implies necessity to provide a facilitative learning needs to be made. Then, reference on the state of CF debate inconclusiveness should also be fused into the brainstorming. Thus, given the urgency to keep on peeling off the layers to get to the core revealing how corrective feedback is best provided, further studies on respective topic should keep on being actively conducted. Preferably, further research focusing on unfocused-implicit corrective feedback is highly suggested regardless possible negative findings that may be resulted. This research is not without flaw and limitation, henceforward, the followings are suggestions to be taken into consideration in designing and conducting researches focusing on similar topic, unfocused-implicit corrective feedback.

1. One of the limitations in this research was the lack of inter-rater reliability given that the researcher also played the role as the corrective-feedback provider. For further studies on respective subject, it is expected that the

inter-rater reliability aspects is taken more into consideration in designing the research.

2. This research has only attempted to scrutinize the effectiveness of unfocused-implicit CF through the comparison of effects of two different techniques under such CF provision method. Extraneous factors such as level of grammatical knowledge, working memory, long-term memory and attention (as suggested in Hayes' writing model (2012)) were not included in the scrutiny, thus these extraneous factors should be further analyzed.
3. This research couldn't put strong claim towards the cases of complex marking to be the main cause of futile revision, thus another research on respective subject should be conducted.
4. This research has attempted to study the subject only from language learning perspective, thus no effect of the treatment on grammatical acquisition was analyzed. Henceforth, it is highly suggested for the future research, investigating ineffectiveness of unfocused-implicit corrective feedback, to go an extra mile and see the longer-term effect of this seemingly less fruitful CF strategy in terms of whether or not the strategy help learners towards language acquisition.
5. To know exactly the detail of progress dynamics taking place as result of unfocused-implicit corrective feedback provision is considered essential in addition to investigating statistical significance value in attempting to understand the effect of respective subject. Thus, a research designed in mixed-approach focusing more on the qualitative aspects is preferably conducted.
6. The two techniques compared in this research may not be the most practical techniques to be applied. In future research, the use of underlining as a more practical mean of unfocused-implicit CF provision should be analyzed.