**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

1. **Conclusions**

Based on the data analysis and the results of the study, following conclusions were drawn.

1. Teacher used eight different types of feedback: repetition, form-related comment, elicitation, recasts, explicit correction, clarification request, praise, and clue.
2. The most dominant feedback type used by teacher was repetition. The repetition occurred in many forms; teacher repeated student’s correct answer without intonation change, teacher repeated student’s correct answer with intonation change, teacher repeated student’s incorrect answer with intonation change. The next frequently used feedback type was form-related comment, followed by elicitation, recasts, explicit correction, clarification request, praise, and the least frequently used feedback type was clue.
3. Explicit types of feedback (elicitation and explicit correction) are more effective as they indicate the locus and nature of the error. Thus students can notice the existence of the errors and/or revise their utterances accordingly. On the contrary, implicit types of feedback, provided often in the form of recasts, is less beneficial as it involved students in a lot of guesswork of the erroneous part. Repetition, specifically, would be more effective if the teacher were to incorporate new information into feedback.
4. The most effective type of feedback is elicitation, since it is the one that generates the most uptake and repair. The next is explicit correction, followed by clarification request, form-related comment, repetition, recasts, clue, and the one that generated the least uptake and repair was praise.
5. Most exchanges observed are teacher-centered IRFs. Teacher did not give enough opportunity for student to react or respond to the feedback given.
6. The most important thing about giving feedback is that it should only be given when necessary and must be given when necessary.
7. **Suggestions**
8. **Suggestions for Teachers**

In order to perform as a good facilitator of learning process, teachers must equip themselves with required qualifications. Feedback, as one of the important parts of learning process, should not be taken for granted by teachers. Teachers must know criteria of good feedback, when and how to address good feedback, and what certain type of feedback should be addressed in certain situation.

1. **Suggestions for Next Researchers**
2. This research is a preliminary research of teacher’s feedback and its effects on student’s uptake and repair. It focused on the effectiveness of feedback adressed by teacher in one-to-one classroom. Other researchers could carry out a research in bigger classes.
3. This research only focused on verbal feedback, whereas non-verbal feedback was also found during the classroom interaction. Other researchers could carry out a research which focuses on both verbal and non-verbal feedback type.
4. The subjects taught in the observation were language and art, mathematics, and science, while the skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) were integrated. Other researchers could carry out a research which compares the effect of each feedback type in some different lessons and/ or compares that in classes which teach unintegrated skills.
5. This research used young learners (Kindergarten B and Primary 1 students) as respondents, without comparing one age group with the other age group, other researchers could carry out a research using age as one of the variables and compare each of age group.
6. **Pedagogical Implications**

Based on the data analysis and the results of the study, following pedagogical impilcations were proposed.

1. The results of the research indicate that the error treatment is not sufficiently effective. Most of the times, teacher uses repetition which is mistakenly accepted by the students as an acknowledgement that their utterance is correct and therefore no uptake or even repair is necessary to be supplied. Repetition should be given only after incorrect answer and with intonation change to highlight the error so that the learner is able to self repair his utterance and the teacher should repeat the correct sentence, providing him with encouraging feedback. Feedback must be selected carefully in order to get an expected result, which is student uptake with repair.
2. The results of the research also indicate that the students were offered little opportunity to respond to the feedback, let alone to produce self-corrected utterance. This lack of opportunity was far from being appropriate. Hence the teachers could make an opportunity for self correction rather than just give feedback or correction. When opportunities for self correction do come, the teachers could use them to push their students to output, to explore English rather than using them as the platform to display the teacher’s knowledge. Besides, as well as improving the quality of feedback messages, teachers should focus much more effort on strengthening the skills of self-assessment and self-generating-feedback in their students.
3. Teachers could also collect audio- or video-taped data of their interaction with the students. Based on the data they collect, they could analyze what feedback types enhance the quality of teacher-student interaction and promote students’ language development and what practices hamper students’ opportunities to develop their language ability. A teacher training program with teachers as “researching practitioners” implemented through the collaborative work of colleagues under the guidance of a more experienced practitioner would also be an effective way. There are also some other specific means of assisting the teacher’s performance, e.g. organizing regular conferences to review video- or audio-taped lessons or lesson transcriptions; setting up regular workshops to provide peer counselling on each other’s interactive behaviours and decision-making.