CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The first chapter is an initial description that sets the nature of the present research in exploring various types of oral corrective feedback in relation to learner uptake in a young learner EFL classroom. It starts with the background of the study on oral corrective feedback and learner uptake. This section is followed by research questions and aims of the study. The subsequent section is the significance of the study, scope of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the paper.

1.1 Background
Corrective feedback has been discussed for decades in the realm of language teaching. Ellis (2009, p.3) states that most theories of second language learning and language pedagogy give a place for a role of feedback, “In both behaviorist and cognitive theories of L2 learning, feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. In both structural and communicative approaches to language teaching, feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy.” However, nativist such as Krashen (1981) questions the role of feedback by stating that error correction is not useful for language learning and harmful for learners’ affective factor. This dilemma, to certain extent, can bewilder EFL teachers in giving corrective feedback to their learners (Rezaei, Mozaffari, Hafif, 2011).

Responding to the dilemma, experts on language teaching such as Brown (2001), Harmer (2007), and Riddell (2001) welcome the use of corrective feedback in the class with several notices. Brown (2001) asserts that too much negative cognitive feedback often leads learners to shut off their attempts at communication. On the other hands, too much positive cognitive feedback serves to reinforce the errors of the speaker-learner that may lead to the persistence and eventual fossilization. Therefore, he suggests that teachers need to provide a
balance of positive feedback to encourage communication and negative feedback to call attention to the crucial errors. Harmer (2007) adds that in giving oral corrective feedback, teachers should consider the stage of the lesson, the activity, the type of mistake made and the particular student who is making mistake. Furthermore, Riddell (2001) asserts that teachers should focus their correction on mistakes involving the target language, repeated common mistakes, and significant mistakes. Those general points on the use of oral corrective feedback suggested by the experts need to be described in a more practical way with some real examples. This study is clearly useful for that purpose.

The importance of corrective feedback in classroom is recognized by cognitive theories (Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2010) and sociocultural theory (Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). Cognitive theories claim that CF serves as a valuable input in interaction (Long, 1996), it gives opportunity for learners to stretch their interlanguage to meet targeted output (Swain, 2007) and it functions as noticing tool (Schmidt, 2010). Meanwhile sociocultural theory considers corrective feedback as having a facilitative role to assist learners through self correction to achieve self regulation (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Both perspectives endorse that “learning is viewed not as an outcome (i.e., something that results from correction) but rather as a process that occurs within the enactment of a corrective episode” (Ellis, 2010, p. 346).

To date, studies on corrective feedback have covered several different areas such as different effects of corrective feedback in classroom interaction (Chu, 2011; Campos, 2011), the application of corrective feedback in different contexts (see Chu, 2011; Magilow, 1999; Nabei, 2005; Campos, 2011; Fu, 2012; Pany, et al., 1981; Bower, 2011; Erel & Bulut, 2007; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Khaerunisa, 2002; Maolida, 2012; Sheen, 2004; Nabei, 2005), teachers’ and students’ perception on corrective feedback (Guennete, 2009; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Harris, et al., 2012), the application of corrective feedback in different levels of age (see Panova & Lyster, 2002; Surakka, 2007; Choi & Li, 2012; Diaz, 2009) and
the strengths and weaknesses of recast as a corrective strategy (Carpenter, 2006; Leeman, 2003). More relevant to this research are studies on oral corrective feedback and uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Choi & Li, 2012; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Diaz, 2009; Nabei, 2005; Surakka, 2007; Sheen, 2004; Taipale, 2012). The last type of research focuses more on the occurrence of oral corrective feedback and uptake and catch a glimpse of the potential relation between the corrective feedback and uptake.

However, most studies on oral corrective feedback and learner uptake listed above were conducted in CLIL speaking contexts in ESL and immersion formal education settings. None of these were conducted in young learners’ speaking class in EFL informal education settings such as English courses in Indonesia. Then, this study is expected to fill the gap of previous studies by revealing types of oral corrective in relation to learner uptake in young learner speaking sessions in an English course where learning circumstances are, to a certain extent, different from formal educational settings (e.g., school).

1.2 Research Questions
To reveal various types of oral corrective feedback in relation to learner uptake in a young learner EFL classroom, there are two research questions posed in this study:

1. What are the types of oral corrective feedback and their distribution in a young learner EFL classroom?
2. What are the types of learner uptake and their distribution following different types of oral corrective feedback?

1.3 Aims of the Study
Relevant to the research questions, this present study aims:

1. To explore various types of oral corrective feedback and their distribution in a young learner EFL classroom.
2. To explore various types of learner uptake following different types of oral corrective feedback.

1.4 Significance of the Study
This study is potentially significant in three aspects of contribution. The first is its theoretical contribution to research in corrective feedback. The second is its practical contribution to practice in teaching and learning in Indonesia. And the third is its professional contribution to teacher’s development.

Theoretically, this study offers some information on the application of oral corrective feedback in a young learner EFL classroom in an English course that is rare since the studies on corrective feedback in young learner classroom context are dominated by ESL and immersion formal education context. Therefore, this study attempts to fill in the gap of previous studies.

Practically, this study is advantageous for teachers to recognize different types of oral corrective feedback and apply them in their classroom interaction by suitting with learners’ development and needs. In this case, Allwright (1975, in Panova and Lyster, 2002) states that study on corrective feedback is able to show the effectiveness of instructional process in the classroom and it can also describe how language learning happens. In this case, this study is expected to enable teachers to see the potential effectiveness of certain oral feedback in initiating uptake and how the feedback may influence young learners’ language learning through interaction in the class.

Professionally, this study can be a reflection for the researcher and other teachers in giving oral feedback to the learners. It is hoped that this study can give information for teachers about various types of oral corrective feedback and give the teachers hints in choosing certain type of oral corrective feedback. The
skill of choosing appropriate types of oral corrective feedback can be put in teacher training program to improve teaching quality in the classroom as stated by Riddell (2001) that all teachers need to know the skills of correction, and trainee teachers are assessed on their ability to recognize and correct both spoken and written mistakes.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is exploration of oral corrective feedback strategies employed by a teacher in a young learner EFL classroom in an English course and identification of various types of learner uptake following the teacher’s oral corrective feedback strategies. By answering those questions, the occurrence of oral corrective feedback and learner uptake are revealed and the relation between them is disclosed.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

a. Corrective feedback is “The feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral production in a second language” (Sheen and Ellis, 2011, p. 593).

b. Uptake is “A student’s utterance that immediately follows the teachers’ feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance“ (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p. 49).

c. Young Learners in this study refer to 10 years old learners who learn English as a foreign language in level 4 (Gogo 4).
1.7 Organization of the Paper

This paper consists of five chapters. Chapter I provides a general description for the present research. This introductory chapter consists of background, research questions, aims of the study, significance of the study, definition of key terms, and organization of the paper.

Chapter II deals with literature review concerning several theories underpinning the study. It covers the definition, categorization, and discussion of corrective feedback and uptake. It also discusses the notion of corrective feedback and uptake in regard to cognitive theories including interaction, output, and noticing hypotheses.

Chapter III elaborates research method of the present study. It presents research questions and develops research design for this study. It also explains data collection for the present study by means of audio-video recording and stimulated recall interview. Lastly, it explains the analysis process of the collected data to answer the stated research questions.

Chapter IV presents and analyzes findings from the result of recording and stimulated recall interview. The findings are discussed to find out types of oral corrective feedback employed by the teacher in classroom interaction and types of learner uptakes following different types of oral corrective feedback. Finally the findings and analysis are synthesized to answer the research questions.

Chapter V elaborates conclusion, limitation, and recommendation. It concludes the synthesis of data analysis and discussion in the previous chapter. It also presents the limitation of the study. Lastly, it mentions several potential topics for further research in the same vein of study and several suggestions for teachers in applying oral corrective feedback in the classroom.