CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is presented to conclude the overall findings and provide recommendation for further research. The conclusion is drawn from the answers of the research questions discussed in the previous chapter while the recommendations are provided as a contribution for further research and teaching practices related to corrective feedback strategies.

5.1 Conclusions

This research reports various corrective feedback strategies used by teachers as well as its distribution in the classroom interaction. The teachers' reasons for providing certain corrective feedback strategies used in their classroom were also explored in order to provide additional data. This research also examined learners' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback as supported information. The data were collected in EFL classrooms involving four teachers and twelve students as participants in an English course in Bandung. The conclusion of the findings and discussion can be described as follows.

First of all, in general, all corrective feedback strategies, namely recasts, translation, explicit correction, elicitation, repetition, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and paralinguistic signal were employed by the teachers. The findings revealed that recasts became the most frequent strategies used which is parallel with other previous studies (Hampl, 2011; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Maolida, 2013b; Pandu, 2014; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Taipale, 2012). The result also showed that all teachers employed input-providing feedback, namely recasts, translation, and explicit corrections while the distribution of prompts was varied among the teachers.

Recasts have been popular among teachers as they offer various advantages for students (Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Lyster & Panova, 2002). First, it will not break the flow of communication, hence the fluency can still be maintained. Second, they help students to notice the differences between the error

and the well-formed utterances. Moreover, they also provide correction without the risk of embarrassing the students.

As teachers faced different students and classroom situations, the teachers' reasons for providing corrective feedback strategies were also varied. Moreover, the frequency of corrective feedback is closely related to the teachers' pedagogical focus (Chaudron, as cited in Taipale, 2012). From the interview, it was revealed that teachers have shown some awareness concerning the type of errors, learning factors such as the lesson objective and its learning activity, as well as learner factors such as their proficiency and anxiety level. This is in line with the relevant theories that stated those influential factors should be taken into account in relation to the provision of corrective feedback (Harmer, 2007b; Havranek & Cesnik, 2001; Taipale, 2012).

In this research, learners' perception of teachers' corrective feedback strategies were also investigated concerning the fact that there is usually a discrepancy between teachers' and students' views (Ur, 2000; Lightbown & Spada, 2011). The findings revealed that students perceived corrective feedback as beneficial for their learning since it allowed them to learn better through the correction. The students were generally happy when the errors on their utterances were pointed out, especially when the correct form was provided. Furthermore, they also preferred explicit correction to the other corrective feedback strategies as they can notice the error easier while also are provided by the well-formed utterances. It is argued that explicit correction makes students learn better through its metalinguistic explanation rather than other corrective feedback which is rather brief, like recasts which become the most preferred strategy by the teachers.

5.2 Recommendations

This research offers several recommendations in the field of corrective feedback for further research and application that can be applied in the classroom settings. First of all, it is suggested that the research on corrective feedback is applied in various settings and contexts, so that the possible similarities and differences can be explored. Since this research focuses on teachers' corrective

feedback strategies, their reasons for providing those strategies, and students' perception of the corrective feedback strategies in a non-formal EFL education setting, further research in different contexts such as in the formal EFL education setting involving adolescents can be beneficial for the contribution in the field of corrective feedback. In addition, the research on the whole aspect of correction feedback is also recommended to provide the wider picture of the phenomena of error correction.

In terms of practical suggestions, it is recommended for teachers to recognize different strategies of corrective feedback (Shirazi & Sadighi, 2012) and apply them in the classroom by considering several aspects such as the types of error, learning goals, activities, as well as learners differences comprising students' age, proficiency, and affective factors. In addition, teachers are suggested to provide various corrective feedback strategies, such as output-prompting feedback which was less likely to be used in the classroom since it is likely to be effective in promoting student-generated repair.

Output-prompting feedback such as elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal, is likely to be effective to encourage learner generated repair which is considered to be more effective for their language development. Moreover, they are also effective to correct students' errors that resulted from their failure in the competence performance. However, it will not be effective when students' errors are resulted from the lack of knowledge. Hence, teachers should consider the students' proficiency level regarding this issue.

At last, teachers are also suggested to find out the students' perception as well as their preferences, so the provision of corrective feedback can be adjusted that may increase its effectiveness on learning. In this research, it was revealed that students preferred to be corrected through explicit correction while the teachers mostly used recasts to correct their errors. Regarding this issue, since teachers cannot provide explicit correction all the time, teachers should be selective when they want to correct learner errors explicitly. It is recommended for teachers to

take notes on the most common errors made by the students, and they can review and give the explicit explanation on certain errors some other time, like in the beginning of the following meeting.

The discrepancy between teachers' and students' preferences may happen in any other circumstances. Teachers should be aware that students' preferences should be taken into account as Ur (2000) suggests that they have sufficient knowledge to realize which correction works best for them. Even so, she further adds that teachers who are also experienced and have superior knowledge should have enough sensitivity why and when they should disregard students' expectation to make corrective feedback works for students' language development.

5.3 Concluding Remarks

The last chapter of this paper concludes the significant aspects of the research and offers several recommendations regarding corrective feedback. In conclusion, it was revealed that the most frequent strategy used was recast. In addition, only the input-providing strategies were applied consistently by all teachers. Teachers also have shown some awareness concerning the provision of corrective feedback as they took several factors into account during the classroom interaction. Furthermore, the students generally perceived corrective feedback to be beneficial for their language learning. For further application, teachers are suggested to vary the use of corrective feedback strategies, especially for the output-prompting strategies which are considered more beneficial to support second language acquisition.