CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION, LIMITATION, AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter disclose conclusions of the data analyses and discussions that are presented in the previous chapter. It provides the answers for the research questions that have been directing this paper. It also reveals several gaps in some areas. These gaps are discussed as limitations of the study. Then, the limitations provide several recommendations for further studies in the same area.

5.1 Conclusion
This study reports various types of oral corrective feedback used by a teacher and their distribution in classroom interaction. This study also explores types of learner uptake and their distribution following the different types of oral corrective feedback. The study was conducted in a young learner EFL classroom in an English course in Bandung. The findings of discussion can be described as follow:

First of all, the teacher employed seven types of oral corrective feedback in the interaction with young learners: recast, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, explicit correction, paralinguistic signal and repetition. The distribution shows that recast was the most preferred oral corrective feedback while at the same time it was identified as the least feedback type that resulted in uptake. This finding is parallel with the results of previous studies (see Lyster&Ranta, 1997; Panova&Lyster, 2002; Surakka, 2007; Taipale, 2012; Choi&Li, 2012) that the teachers tend to prefer recast than other types of feedback even though recast leads to less number of uptakes. In this case, teacher’s preference of recast is confirmed to give valuable input for the students (Long, 1996) by giving them models to copy and fulfill the objective of prioritizing fluency over accuracy (Linse, 2005) without distracting the flow of conversation (Cameron, 2001). Meanwhile, the fact that recast as the most favored feedback resulted in the least number of uptakes is possibly due to its potential ambiguity.
since the learners may perceive recast as affirmation of their utterance (Lyster&Ranta, 1997; Panova&Lyster, 2002), especially in the context of young learner where the learners might not be able to recognize less salient corrective feedback. In addition, the teacher’s providence of correct answer likely contributes to the less number of learner uptakes (Choi&Li, 2012). It is also found that in employing oral corrective feedback, the teacher considered several aspects such as learner’s proficiency, types of spoken error and learning objectives. Furthermore, it is revealed that in employing oral corrective feedback, the teacher was led by several motives such as professional consideration, the benefit of feedback for language learning and the intention to avoid fossilization.

Responding to the teacher’s various types of oral corrective feedback, the learners used various types of uptake: repair which includes repetition, incorporation, self-repair, peer-repair and needs repair which includes partial error, same error, different error, hesitation and acknowledgement. In this case, input providing feedback such as recast and explicit correction resulted in the less number of uptakes comparing to output prompting feedback such as elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal that resulted in 100% uptake. It is also noteworthy that among those that resulted in 100% uptake, elicitation and repetition led to the highest percentage of repair. The finding that output prompting feedback led to more uptake and repair than input providing feedback corroborates the findings from previous studies (see Lyster&Ranta, 1997; Panova&Lyster, 2002; Surakka, 2007; Taipale, 2012; Choi&Li, 2012). The reason is likely because output prompting feedback has the characteristic of pushing learners in their output (Ellis, 2009; Sheen& Ellis, 2011; Lyster& Ranta, 1997) by giving the learners opportunity to uptake the feedback while input providing tends to provide learners with the correct answer (Choi&Li, 2012).

The results imply that the types of oral corrective feedback utilized by the teacher influence the types of learner uptake. In this case, output prompting
feedback strategies such as elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal are shown to be more effective than input providing such as recast and explicit correction in drawing learner uptake. It can also be identified that output prompting feedback strategies tend to be more successful in encouraging learner uptake since they give the opportunity for the learners to restructure and modify their utterance. On the other hand, input providing strategies are shown to be less successful in encouraging learner uptake since they often skip the opportunity for learners to restructure and modify their utterance due to the teacher’s decision to directly provide the correct version of utterance and continue the topic. In the case of recast, fewer uptakes may also result from the ambiguity of its illocutionary force as a corrective feedback since learners may perceive recast as an affirmation and another way of saying something. It is different from recast, explicit correction gives a clear highlight on what to correct so the less number of uptakes for explicit correction is mostly caused by the teacher’s direct providence of the correct answer and topic continuation.

5.2 Limitation of the Study
This present study is limited in some ways. First, this study is limited in terms of context and time. As acknowledged in chapter three, this study was conducted only in a young learner EFL classroom. Therefore, the result cannot be generalized to other contexts.

This study is also limited in terms of content coverage for it only focuses on teacher’s oral corrective feedback and learner uptake. In this case, the types of error have not been covered by the present study. Finally, the empirical result is also considered as limitation of study. The result of this study cannot be used to claim whether certain types of oral corrective feedback are beneficial for language acquisition since this study only provides conjectures of the benefit of oral corrective feedback in relation to learner uptake for language learning.
5.3 Recommendation

This study offers several recommendations that provide some spaces for further studies in the field of oral corrective feedback and several practical suggestions that can be applied by teachers in their classroom.

First, the research on oral corrective feedback and uptake is suggested to be applied in various contexts and settings to look at the possible similarities and differences of the result. Since this study focuses only on the occurrence of oral corrective feedback and uptake in young learner context, further study in another context such as adult level will give a significant contribution to the topic of corrective feedback. Besides, a longitudinal study is recommended since it can give a promising result on the corrective feedback for it may result in a pattern that gives a clue on the influence of oral corrective feedback for acquisition. Second, the study on the whole aspects of error treatment is suggested since it can give a more holistic picture on the phenomena of oral correction. Finally, more laborious research that gives empirical data on the benefit and drawbacks of corrective feedback is recommended since it can give more convincing information on the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback.

Furthermore, this study suggests several practical guidelines for teachers. First, this study recommends teachers to recognize different types of oral corrective feedback and apply them in their classroom interaction by suiting with learners’ proficiency, language development and needs. Second, in line with the findings mentioned above, this study suggests that teachers need to employ output prompting strategies to give learners opportunity for self and peer-repair by involving their existing knowledge. In this case, output prompting strategies are likely to be more effective to correct the errors that result from the failure in performing the competence but less effective for the failure that results from lack of knowledge or competence. It does not mean that teachers should omit input providing strategies since they may be beneficial in certain contexts. Since it is potentially disruptive for correcting every error, especially in young learner context.
context where the learners are in the beginning stage of learning foreign language, recast can be advantageous to give a correct model for the learners. Its function as corrective feedback can be highlighted by changing the tone, using gesture, providing wait time or isolating the error. Explicit correction can also be effective to correct errors that result from the failure from lack of knowledge by directly giving the learners clear correct unambiguous information.