**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part presents conclusion, limitation and implication for future research.

1. Conclusion

Based on the finding and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher comes to the following conclusion:

The study discovered that the six types of corrective feedback developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) were also performed by the teachers in the current study, namely explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. However, the teacher also performedother two types of corrective feedback, namely peer repair request and giving option. Totally, the teachers perform eight types of corrective feedback.

. The finding showed a big difference with the previous related studies. Most of the previous student revealed that recast is the most frequently used feedback. This research on the other hand showed that, metalinguistic is the most frequently used corrective feedback and recast is the second most frequently used feedback.

The findings furthermore surprisingly show that types of corrective feedback mostly followed by uptake. All the types of uptake introduced by Lyster & Ranta (1997) were used by the student. The types of uptake are repair which involve repetition, incorporation, self-repair and peer-repair, and need repair uptake which involve acknowledgement, same error, different error, off target, hesitation and partial repair. While in other study such as Safari (2013), Leiter (2010) found that repetitiion appeared to be the number one uptake performed by the student, the current studyrevealed that self-repair is the highest rate of uptake performed by the student and different error is the lowest rate.

Regarding to the effect of teachers’ use of corrective feedback to the students’ uptake, there is no durable data showed how teachers’ corrective feedback directly affects the students’ uptake. However it was understood that in this small cases study peer repair request successfully lead repair uptake although its occurrence shows rarity. Explicit correction then recast appeared to be the next feedback leads repair uptake. Metalinguistic feedback surprisingly comes as the most overwhelming used of corrective feedback which successfully lead self-repair in which contribute to students’ comprehensible output while recast merely achieved repetition.

Based on the finding, explicit correction and recast are seen to lead more repetition. It is assumed that it is due to those two types of corrective feedback provide the correct form; it is ease the student to have the repair uptake by repeating the correct form. Contrary, metalinguistic seen to successfully leads self-repair, it is assumed that it is due to this type of uptake more lead the student, by giving guiding question or even information about the error, hence the student get new insight and therefore they can fix the error after having guidance by the teacher. Hence, it can be assumed that metalinguistic is better to lead the student to produce self-repair which is helpful for the student’s language acquisition, while explicit correction and recast leads more which is show lower contribution to student language acquisition.

With regard to the extent to which the teacher English proficiency level and experience to the types of corrective feedback, it can be conclude that teacher with higher proficiency level present better performance in regard to error treatment then the teacher with lower English proficiency. It also fund that, teaching experience does not guarantee that the teacher have good performance regarding to corrective feedback. Teachers’ educational background and their proficiency level strongly affect the way teacher perform effective corrective feedback.

1. Suggestions, limitations and Implication

Based on the findings and discussions of the research, the researcher offersideas which are addressed to the EFL teachers and the next researchers.

The result of this research can be used by the EFL teachers as a reminder to apply the use of corrective feedback in the classroom. To have them realize that corrective feedback is not always make the student feel hesitate to participate in oral interaction in classroom. Contrary, it can contribute to their comprehensible output and language acquisition.

This small case research research is restricted tofour EFL teacher and seven EFL classroom at high school in Indonesian context and the result can not be seen as universal but rather as an image of what the situation is at the represented school.Furthermore, more research can be conducted with more specific analysis, especially the relationship or the effect of teachers’ corrective feedback and the students’ uptake, also, on how the teachers’ corrective feedback help the student regarding to their language acquisition. Moreover, the further research can be conducted in investigating the teacher vs student preference of corrective feedback.

Moreover, as this study has several main constrain in terms of the number of participant, it is recommended to the further study to have more number of participant with different range of English proficiency level and teaching experience.

Moreover, this study did not consider gender as the factors correlate with the teachers’ corrective feedback; it is also recommended to the future research to research the relationship or correlation between teachers’ gender and their corrective feedback.

In addition, this study also has limited data collection method that only involves use video and audio recording. Therefore, it is recommended to the future research to use interview to gain more data about teachers’ corrective feedback and learners’ uptake.