CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter presents three main points. The first point draws conclusions of the data analysis and discussion that are presented in the previous chapter. The major findings of the research are presented on the basis of research questions. The second point reveals several gaps and weaknesses in some areas of the study, which are discussed as the limitations of the study. Then, the last point outlines several recommendations for classroom practice and further studies in the same areas.

5.1 Conclusions

This study explores the use of oral corrective feedback in an adult EFL speaking classroom. Focusing on teachers as feedback providers, this study examines teachers' strategies in correcting students' spoken errors in the classroom. Moreover, the present study explores their preferences toward oral corrective feedback to see whether or not their beliefs are reflected in their teaching practices. Students' attitudes are also investigated in this study to see if teachers' pedagogical practices meet students' expectations.

There are three significant conclusions that can be inferred from this study. First, both teachers put high emphasis on providing corrective feedback for grammatical errors than other type of error. It can be seen from its frequent occurrence (48.5%) during teaching and learning process. Other types of errors that teachers focus on are phonological and lexical. Regarding the types of oral corrective feedback used by teachers in responding those errors, five types of oral corrective feedback were identified. The most commonly used type of oral corrective feedback is recast, which accounts for over half (60%) of the total number of teachers' turns containing feedback. The other feedback types are distributed in decreasing frequency

1

as follows: elicitation (16%), metalinguistic feedback (10.5%), explicit correction (9%), and clarification request (4.5%).

Second, the conclusions are drawn in relation to teachers' preferences in employing oral corrective feedback strategies based on five main points as presented in the previous chapter.

1. The first point is regarding the necessity of oral corrective feedback. Findings form the interview show that the two teachers have positive attitudes toward correction of oral error, hence error correction receives considerable attention from both teachers as reflected in their teaching practices. However, both teachers believe that giving too much correction might demotivate students and bring down their self-confidence in using the target language. Consequently, they agree to provide a fair portion of correction.

2. The second point is related to the types of errors that should be corrected. Both teachers agree that they do not correct all of students' errors but prefer to correct them selectively, thus, they choose to correct the repetitive and serious errors. Specifically, Teacher #1 asserted that she prefers to focus on phonological and interpretative error while Teacher #2 prefers to correct grammatical and phonological errors rather than any other types of error.

3. In terms of the types of oral corrective feedback that should be used in correcting students' oral errors, the two teachers have their own preferences. Teacher #1 prefers to use two types of oral corrective feedback: clarification request and metalinguistic feedback. In sharp contrast, Teacher #2 prefers to use explicit method in correcting students' oral errors.

4. The next is related to the timing in providing oral corrective feedback. The two teachers have a contrast perception of it. Teacher #1 believes that delayed feedback is more effective than the immediate one. On the contrary, Teacher #2 prefers to provide immediate feedback in responding to students' spoken errors.

2

5. The last point is related to the question of who should provide the correction. From three sources of correction (teacher, peer and self-correction), Teacher #1 encourages students to do self-correction. Subsequently, she emphasized on peer correction and lastly teacher correction as the final feedback. On the other hand, Teacher #2 encourages teacher correction among the three sources of correction and considers peer feedback ineffective since it has some limitations.

The third conclusion is related to students' attitudes toward the teachers' oral corrective feedback. Data from the questionnaires indicate that students have positive attitudes towards oral error correction. Consequently, they are in favor of receiving oral error correction. Moreover, the majority of students are interested in having all types of errors corrected. They also express their agreement regarding the correction of error that interferes with the communication. In addition, the result shows that they have positive attitudes towards peer correction and generally supported peer feedback. As regards the types of error, the result shows that grammatical errors account for the highest percentage (90.9 %), with phonological errors in the second place (84.84 %) followed by lexical errors (78.78 %), interpretative errors (75.75 %) and lastly pragmatic errors (72.72 %). Thus, grammatical error tends to be the most favored errors and students wanted teachers to correct their errors in grammar most of the time. Further, among six type of oral corrective feedback, explicit and metalinguistic feedback are the most popular method for students. Additionally, the least favored method from the students' perspectives are recast and clarification request. As regard to three componential attitudes, they view oral corrective feedback as a good thing and very beneficial. Furthermore, they felt happy when they received oral corrective feedback from their teacher. Then, they were motivated to improve their speaking skill after receiving the correction.

Based on the conclusions above, it is clear that both teachers and students have positive attitude toward oral error correction and they consider oral corrective feedback as an important part in language teaching and learning. However, there is a

gap between Teacher #1 error type's preference and her error type's focus. Data from observation show that the types of error that she focused on are grammatical and phonological errors while according to the interviews, interpretative error is her preferred type of error. In addition, there is also inconsistency between interview and observational data regarding types of oral corrective feedback used in correcting students' spoken error. Both teachers used recast most frequently during the teaching and learning process, but none of them mentions this method as their preferred method of correction.

Furthermore, the findings reveal that there is a mismatch between students' expectation and teachers' pedagogical practices in the term of types of oral corrective feedback used in correcting spoken error. Data from classroom observation show that the single largest category of oral corrective feedback that teachers frequently use is recast while recast is one of students' most unfavorable correction methods. On the other hand, students expect teacher to use explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback in responding their errors.

5.2 Limitations

The present study has some limitations in relation to the methodologies and research design. Firstly, this study involves a small number of participants and specific in the context. This study was conducted in one class of English education students in one of state university in Bandung, which only contains thirty-three students. Therefore, the result of this study cannot be generalized. In addition, there are only two teachers who were involved in the study. As the data were only collected for short period of time, the observation was only conducted in four meetings for teacher #1 and three meetings for teacher #2. If it is conducted in a longer period, the result of this study will be richer and as a result, it will provide a clear picture of teachers practice in using oral corrective feedback.

Secondly, this study does not utilize stimulated recall interview with both teachers and students as one of data collection method. Thus, the thought they had during corrective feedback episode at the time of recording could not be discussed. The data will be more reliable if this study makes use of stimulated recall interview to find out students and teachers motives for their action during the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, this study only investigates students' attitudes toward the use of oral corrective feedback without looking at students' individual differences. Some specific moderators should also be taken into account while examining students' attitudes regarding oral error correction such students' proficiency level, anxiety, gender, age, culture and educational background. To obtain a deeper view from the students' perspectives, further research can be conducted by inserting these variables. However, these limitations seem to provide suggestions for further research on how oral corrective feedback might be further investigated.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and the limitations of the study mentioned above, this study offers several recommendations for the classroom practice and further study in the field of oral corrective feedback. For the classroom practice, it is important for the teachers to carefully select the type of oral corrective feedback to correct students' errors for more satisfactory learning outcome. This study also recommends that teachers employ oral corrective feedback by taking into account the students' expectation regarding types of error and methods of correction. In addition, the teacher should consider the students' individual factors such as their proficiency levels, age, culture, anxiety, gender and educational background. Therefore, teacher can choose what is the best corrective feedback that should be given. Aside from the recommendations above, it is suggested that the teachers explain the purposes of their corrections and consequently both teachers and students will have similar perceptions about oral corrective feedback.

For future studies, four recommendations are given. First, it is important for the future research to have a large number of participants so that the research can have more convincing generalization. Second, it is also important to conduct the research in various contexts and settings. Thus, the similarity and differences of the result can be found. Third, further research in a longer period of time is needed to give a more holistic picture of the phenomenon of oral corrective feedback. Lastly, the researcher can utilize stimulated recall interview with both teachers and students as one of data collection method. Thus, the thought they had during corrective feedback episode at the time of recording could be discovered.