

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the overall findings of the research. It also provides the recommendation for the practical use and future investigation on the field. The conclusion is drawn as the answer of the research questions discussed in chapter IV, while the recommendation is provided based on the burning issues and gaps that might not be filled by this research.

5.1 Conclusion

This research mainly aims to investigate teachers' use of corrective feedback strategies to address their students' oral errors. Investigation on why certain corrective feedback strategies are used to address the errors is also conducted, thus deeper understanding of the use of corrective feedback strategies can be revealed.

In general, the students committed all types of errors categorized by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Yang (2016) namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and use of L1 errors. In general, the occurrences of errors in the classes observed seem to be related with the low exposure that EFL countries tend to have (Jenkins, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2010). As the students do not encounter English in their daily life, they could not know the proper use of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and L2 aside from what they learn limitedly in the class. Among all types of error found in the research, pronunciation error is the most frequently committed by the students, followed by grammar, vocabulary, and use of L1 errors which occurrence varies slightly in each class observed

To address the errors committed by the students, the teachers used six types among eight corrective feedback strategies proposed by experts (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Ellis, 2009), namely recast, elicitation, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and paralinguistic signal. The corrective feedback strategies not used by the teachers were translation and

clarification request. Among all types of corrective feedback, recast and elicitation are found more frequently than other corrective feedback strategies. This finding echoes some other researches reporting the favoritism of recast such as Ellis (2009) and Maolida (2013). In terms of uptake, the corrective feedback strategies used by the teachers seems to be effective as the average rate of uptake tend to be more than 60%. However, recast has low rate of uptake compared to other corrective feedback strategies such as elicitation and metalinguistic feedback which rate of uptake was more than 90%.

As for the considerations of using particular corrective feedback strategies to address the students' errors, the teachers generally explain that in general, the factors affecting the selection of corrective feedback strategy are learning factors such as syllabus and topics of the lessons which direct their methods of teaching, learner personal factors such as proficiency and motivation of the students, and also certain types of errors such as grammar and vocabulary errors. Pedagogically, the teachers used corrective feedback strategy to correct the errors pertained to the objectives and topics of the lessons. The teachers also selected corrective feedback carefully to avoid inhibition and maintain the student's motivation to learn and involve in the activities in the class. Although the teachers' considerations are generally similar, they view several factors differently. Ms. Rini explained that the priority of the correction should be grammar errors, while Mr. Adi and Ms. Dwindi asserted that vocabulary and pronunciation errors should be corrected the most because they can hinder the understanding of messages. In terms of time, Ms. Rini explained that the correction should be given frequently and immediately, while Ms. Dwindi and Mr. Adi suggested that errors might be ignored and correction could be delayed until the students finished speaking or even after the end of the lessons.

Based on the research findings summarized above, the conclusion that can be drawn pertaining to teaching practice in the class is that teachers need to be aware of the frequent errors that the students make. Hence, they can prevent the errors from occurring, for instance by choosing topics and designing activities which can limit the occurrence of errors. By knowing the frequent errors that occur in the class, teachers can also select corrective feedback strategies which are

suitable for the type of errors that students frequently commit. Moreover, learning factors such as syllabus and topics of lessons and learner factors such as proficiency and motivation need to be comprehended deeply, thus they can be used to predict what errors students will possibly make. When teachers are fully aware of the most frequently committed errors, factors contributing to the occurrence of errors, learning factors, and learner factors, corrective feedback strategies can be used to address students' oral errors more effectively.

5.2 Recommendations

This findings of the research have shown the types of errors the students committed, corrective feedback strategies that the teachers use, and the considerations behind the selection of certain corrective feedback strategies. The findings can be used as the basis of recommendations for the practical and academic uses.

From the findings on the oral errors committed by the students, the teachers can reflect on their own students' oral errors and then plan the corrective feedback strategies which are suitable for treating the most-frequently errors committed by their students. Teachers then can consider the findings of corrective feedback strategies use by the teachers in this research to reflect on its efficacy on addressing the students' types of error. The rate of uptake on certain types of error can be used as the basis for determining which corrective feedback is suitable for each teacher's own condition.

From the teachers' explanation regarding their considerations of using particular corrective feedback strategy, teachers can also reflect on their own learning and learner factors. They may look at whether or not they have focused on certain errors related to syllabus, or addressed all errors indistinctively. The way the teachers in this research consider the students' motivation and also anxiety is also worth to note as those two factors might influence the efficacy of the corrective feedback strategies that teachers use.

As for academic interest, the future research can focus on investigating why particular errors are more effectively addressed by certain corrective

feedback strategies and not the others. Most of the research was conducted with quantitative methods, thus the conclusion is drawn based on the number of frequency occurring for the types of error and corrective feedback strategies. The future research can investigate the quality of corrective feedbacks strategies in addressing the errors, thus teachers can get more detailed picture of what corrective feedback strategies should be used by them.

5.3 Concluding Remarks

The last chapter of this paper presents the conclusion of the research and recommendations for practical and academic use. In conclusion, the errors committed by the students in frequency order are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and use of L1 error. As for the corrective feedbacks strategies, the teachers tend to use recast and elicitation most frequently, while explicit correction, translation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and paralinguistic signal tend to have low frequency in use. Learning factors and learner factors influence their decision subconsciously. It is recommended that teachers reflect from their students' errors and use of corrective feedback to optimize the efficacy of their corrective feedback strategies. The teachers may conduct need analysis to identify the factors that need to be considered when giving corrective feedback to students in their context.