

RELATING TEACHER'S ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TO YOUNG LEARNERS' UPTAKE: A CASE STUDY IN A YOUNG LEARNER EFL CLASSROOM

Elis Homsini Maolida

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Suryakancana University, Indonesia

E-mail: elishomsini@unsur.ac.id

APA Citation: Maolida, E. H. (2017). Relating teacher's oral corrective feedback to young learners' uptake: A case study in a young learner EFL classroom. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(2), 181-192.

Received: 14-05-2017

Accepted: 20-06-2017

Published: 01-07-2017

Abstract: This study explores various types of oral corrective feedback in relation to learners' uptake in a young learner EFL classroom in Indonesia. It employed a qualitative research design embracing the characteristics of a case study. The data were mainly collected from 540 minutes video recording and observation to capture types of teacher's oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake in the classroom interaction. Teacher's lesson plans were also analyzed to look at possible contribution on teacher's choice of corrective feedback and learners' uptake. The first finding reveals that the teacher employed seven types of oral corrective feedback; recast, elicitation, clarification request, explicit correction, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and paralinguistic signal. As result, the students responded by various types of uptake such as repair and need repair. The distribution of learners' uptake following different types of oral corrective feedback shows that output prompting feedback strategies tend to be more successful in encouraging learners' uptake than input provided by feedback strategies. It is also noteworthy that elicitation and repetition led to be the highest number of repair. The fact that input providing feedback strategies result in fewer uptakes, however, tends to be resulted from the teacher's choice to continue the topic in a certain context which shows the influence of learning contexts and teacher's objectives on the choice of teacher's corrective feedback and the occurrence of uptake.

Keywords: *oral corrective feedback, learners' uptake, young learner*

INTRODUCTION

The importance of corrective feedback (CF) in classroom has been discussed in many studies. In this case, CF is claimed to serve as a valuable input in interaction (Long, 1996), it gives opportunity for learners to stretch their interlanguage to meet targeted output (Swain, 2007), it also functions as noticing tool (Schmidt, 2010), and attention getting device (Gass, 1991). Furthermore, corrective feedback is considered as having a facilitative role to assist learners through self-correction to achieve self-regulation (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). In the context of young learners' English learning, corrective feedback is

considered useful in expanding conversation and negotiating meaning (Maolida, 2013a). In relating the function of corrective feedback to learning, Ellis (2010, p. 346) states that "learning is viewed not as an outcome (i.e., something that results from correction) but rather as a process that occurs within the enactment of a corrective episode."

The effectiveness of different types of feedback is often determined by whether or not a technique results in uptake, especially when it results in successful repair (Tatay, 2002). In this case, uptake is regarded as proof for

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

learners noticing (Egi, 2010) in (Choi & Li, 2012) and representation of Swain's 'pushed output' concept (Choi & Li, 2012). Uptake can also be viewed as a kind of contextualized practice (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). In addition, Mackey *et al.* (2002) in (Sheen, 2004) affirm that learners' uptake serves as evidence that learners have understood the corrective nature of the interlocutor's move and that uptake may help learners notice the gap between an interlanguage form and the target form. Therefore, several researchers use uptake, especially repair, to be one of major measures of the effectiveness of corrective feedback such as Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), and Sheen (2004).

Talking about feedback, Sheen and Ellis (2011, p. 593) define corrective feedback as "the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language (L2)." It should be acknowledged, however, that this study only focuses on oral feedback in the classroom interaction where English is used as a foreign language, not a second language. Regarding types of corrective feedback, this study applies categorization of corrective feedback from Lyster and Ranta (1997) added by one category from Ellis (2009). There are six types of oral corrective feedback taken from Lyster and Ranta (1997),

including recast (reformulating a student's utterance with the correct one), repetition (repeating a student's erroneous utterance), clarification request (indicating that a student's utterance is misunderstood or incorrect), explicit correction (indicating the error and providing the correct form explicitly), elicitation (eliciting the correct form from the learners by completing the utterance such as 'fill in the blank' activity, using questions to elicit correct form and asking learners to reformulate their utterance), and metalinguistic feedback (giving comments, information, or questions regarding the correctness of the student's utterance, without giving the correct form explicitly). A category is added from Ellis (2009) that is known as paralinguistic signal (indicating an error by using a gesture or facial expression or giving the clue of the correct answer).

Regarding input providing and output prompting categorization, oral CF is considered as input providing where learner is provided by the correct form. In contrast, it is considered as output prompting when the teacher tries to elicit the correct form from the learner. These different types of oral CF will be simplified and displayed in the table below which is adapted from Ellis (2009), and Sheen and Ellis (2011).

Table 1. *Taxonomy of oral CF strategies*

Input-Providing	a. Recast, including explicit and implicit recast b. Explicit correction, including explicit correction which is accompanied by metalinguistic comment
Output-Prompting	a. Repetition b. Clarification request c. Metalinguistic clue d. Elicitation e. Paralinguistic signal

The table shows that recast and explicit correction are categorized as input providing feedback while clarification request, metalinguistic correction, elicitation and paralinguistic signal are grouped into output prompting feedback.

In the study of corrective feedback and uptake, Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 48) define uptake as “a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance.” The uptake is categorized as repair if the uptake successfully repairs the initial error. Repair includes four types of responses: repetition (it occurs when the learner correctly repeats the teacher’s reformulated error), incorporation (it occurs when the learner repeats teacher’s modification of error, then he/she incorporates it to a longer sentence), self-repair (it occurs when the learner responds the teacher’s feedback by doing self-correction), and peer-repair (it happens when the correction generates somebody else, other than the student who makes error, to repair the error).

Meanwhile, the uptake is categorized as need repair if the uptake has not successfully repaired the initial error which means the erroneous part still needs repair. Need repair includes acknowledgement (it occurs when the learner responds to the teacher’s feedback only with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’), same error (it occurs when learner repeats the error s/he makes in response to the teacher’s feedback), different error (it occurs when learner responds to teacher’s feedback by producing different error from the initial error), partial error (it occurs when learner corrects some parts of the errors following teacher’s feedback), and hesitation (it occurs when learner

hesitates in responding to the teacher’s feedback). When student did not react to the teacher’s oral corrective feedback either because the student initiated to continue the topic or the teacher initiated to continue the topic, it was categorized as no uptake. When there is no uptake, then there is topic continuation. In this case, topic continuation can be initiated either by teacher or learner.

The result of the studies on the effects of corrective feedback on uptake is dominated by the fact that several types of oral corrective feedback tend to lead to learners’ uptake while the other do not. Elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition are shown to be good precursors to uptake, and recast is the least type of feedback that results in uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Surakka, 2007; Taipale, 2012). Furthermore, the occurrence of uptake and repair also can be influenced by learning context. Conducting a study on corrective feedback and learners’ uptake by involving four communicative classrooms, Sheen (2004) reveals that in contexts where language is oriented as an object uptake and repair tend to appear more often than in contexts where the teachers concerned more with content.

Those previous studies, however, were mostly conducted in CLIL, speaking contexts in ESL and immersion formal education settings. Therefore, this study is expected to fill the gap of previous studies by revealing types of oral corrective feedback in relation to learners’ uptake in a young learner EFL classroom in Indonesia.

METHOD

This study applied a qualitative approach by taking transcripts of lessons to find the teacher’s strategies of oral corrective feedback and learners’ uptake in

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

classroom interaction. This study was conducted in a young learner EFL Classroom in Indonesia. The students involved in this research are ranging from 9 to 10 years old and their first language is Sundanese while their second language is Indonesian. The teacher was an English teacher with more than five years teaching experience.

The data were mainly collected from observing and recording teacher-students interaction in several lesson meetings which cover approximately 540 minutes. In addition, teacher's lesson plans were also analyzed to look at possible contribution on teacher's choice of corrective feedback and learners' uptake. For the purpose of this study, the interaction transcript only covered speaking sessions, especially those that focused on oral-oriented skill.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first part describes the types of teacher's oral corrective feedback and learners' uptake found in the classroom interaction. The aim of relating the use of corrective feedback to learners' uptake is realized in the second part which discusses the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback.

Types of oral corrective feedback

The result of analysis reveals that the teacher used various types of corrective feedback in classroom interaction. The following are the description of each type of oral corrective feedback employed by the teacher in the young learner classroom interaction.

Recast

In line with the definition of recast as "teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus error," (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46), the teacher

employed various recast strategies to correct learners' erroneous utterances. First, the teacher reformulated the ill-formed and implicitly infused the reformulation in the conversation. This type of recast is categorized as conversational recast and classified into input providing feedback (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). One of the examples is shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #1

No	Participants	Talks
53	T	Look, it's four...what time is it?
54	Ss	Four past sixteen
55	T	Yes, Sixteen past four. What day is it today?
56	Ss	Friday

As shown in the excerpt 1, the teacher tries to give a corrected answer without disturbing the flow of communication. Different from the implicit type of recast that was shown in the previous excerpt, the teacher sometimes made recast more explicit. This second type of recast, which is called didactic recast, was employed by reformulating and emphasizing a specific erroneous item, even though there was no communication problem (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). In this case, the definition that refers recast as an implicit type of feedback (Panova & Lyster, 2002) cannot be applied.

Excerpt #2

No	Participants	Talks
60	M	Where are you going /going/?
61	T	Going /gouing/
62	M	Going /gouing/

The excerpt shows that a student (M) mispronounced a word that was responded by the teacher's corrective feedback. In correcting the erroneous utterance, the teacher isolated the word to be corrected and it was successfully recognized by the student who repeated the teacher's corrected word. In this

case, the illocutionary force of the teacher to give correction was strengthened by word isolation. The tone and emphasis may also result in a more salient correction for young learners.

Explicit correction

The second type of oral corrective feedback used by the teacher was explicit correction. In this case, the teacher provided the correct form with a clear indication of what was being corrected (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), as shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #3

No	Participants	Talks
104	B	/grou·sɔ:ri stɔ:r/
105	T	no, bukan /grou·sɔ:ri stɔ:r/, it's /grou·sə·ri stɔ:r/
106	B	/grou·sə·ri stɔ:r/

The excerpt shows that a student (B) mispronounced a word. Then the teacher clearly indicated that the student's pronunciation was incorrect and directly provided the correct pronunciation. Responding to the teacher's correction, the student successfully repeated the correct pronunciation of 'grocery store.' Even though it is categorized under similar category with recast as input providing feedback, Ellis and Sheen (2006) state that the explicit technique can be more effective than implicit techniques such as recast. It is possibly because teachers are explicit about what is expected of students (Emilia, 2010) and the instruction elements used are clear, unambiguous wording, and terminology to reduce possible confusion (Archer & Hughes, 2011).

Elicitation

The third type of employed oral corrective feedback is elicitation by directly eliciting the correct form from students without providing the correct answer (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). One of the elicitation strategies employed by the

teacher is eliciting the completion from students as shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #4

No	Participants	Talks
203	F	T-shirt?
204	T	No, it's a ss...
205	B	Skirt
206	T	Yes, skirt. What color is the skirt?

In the excerpt, the learners and the teacher were playing with a dice. When a student (F) stepped on a picture, the teacher asked what the picture was. The student gave a wrong answer and the teacher tried to elicit the correct word from the student by allowing the student to complete the utterance which resulted in a peer repair. This type of corrective feedback was identified as elicit completion (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Metalinguistic feedback

The fourth type of oral corrective feedback utilized by the teacher was giving the information about the nature of error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) or commonly known as metalinguistic feedback. The use of metalinguistic feedback can be seen in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #5

No	Participants	Talks
232	T	What's that?
233	B	Tooth
234	T	Tapi itu banyak
235	A	Teeth

In the excerpt, the students were playing the board game with pictures. When the student stepped on the picture of teeth, the teacher asked the student what picture that was. Instead of answering 'teeth', the student answered 'tooth'. Responding to the erroneous reply, the teacher corrected it by giving metalinguistic clue on the plural nature of word without directly giving the correct answer. In this case, the teacher used the sentence '*Tapi itu banyak*'

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

instead of utilizing technical terms such as 'singular' and 'plural' to make it easier for young learners to understand what should be corrected. As a result, another learner recognized and corrected the erroneous form. The effectiveness of Metalinguistic clue in focusing learners to grammatical aspect is also acknowledged by Rezaei and Derakhshan (2011) and Rassaei and Moinzadeh (2011) in their experimental study.

Clarification request

The fifth type of oral corrective feedback employed by the teacher is clarification request. In this case, the teacher indicated that certain utterances were either not understood or were ill-formed so a repetition or reformulation was needed (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The use of clarification request is shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #6

No	Participants	Talks
136	M	Movie theatre /'mu:fi 'ti:.ə.tə/
137	T	Yes?
138	M	Movie theatre /'mu:vi 'ti:.ə.tə/

The excerpt shows that a student (M) made a phonological mistake. Responding to the mistake, the teacher indicated that the student's pronunciation was erroneous by saying 'yes?' As we can see, the student understood the teacher's attempt of correction and tried to correct her pronunciation even though the corrected answer still contained a partial error.

Repetition

The sixth strategy that the teacher employed was repetition. In this case, the teacher repeated the erroneous utterance in isolation and usually adjusted her intonation to emphasize the error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The use of

repetition is indicated in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #7

No	Participants	Talks
25	T	Ah what time is it?
26	H	It's three fifty
27	T	What? Three fifty?
28	H	Three fifteen
29	T	Three fifteen! Go to sleep, Gogo!

The excerpt shows that a student (H) made a lexical mistake. Responding to this, the teacher repeated the erroneous part with a higher intonation as to highlight the mistake. The student noticed the gap between what she said before with the correct target. As a result, she did a self-repair.

Paralinguistic signal

The seventh strategy that the teacher utilized was paralinguistic signal. In this case, the teacher used non-verbal signal to indicate an error or to elicit the correct answer (Ellis, 2009). It is shown by the following excerpt.

Excerpt #8

No	Participants	Talks
415	Ss	There's a star above the apartment building
416	T	What is above?
417	B	<i>Melihat</i>
418	T	No,
419	M	<i>Err, tinggi</i>
420	T	The book is above me (the teacher gives paralinguistic clue by putting the book above her)
421	A	<i>Atas, atas</i>
422	T	That's right. Above the apartment building. Apartment?

The excerpt shows that a student (B) made a lexical error. Responding to this, the teacher employed metalinguistic feedback that was responded by another student with a different lexical error.

Then, the teacher used a paralinguistic signal to elicit the correct answer. As a result, another student (A) made a peer repair.

Types of Learners' uptake

The result of observation and video recording show that the students responded the teacher's feedback with uptake, including repair and need repair. In some occasions, the teacher decided to directly continue the topic which results in the absence of uptake. The following illustrates each type of uptake performed by the students.

Repair

The uptake is categorized as repair when the student correctly reformulates an error or mistake as uttered in a student turn (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.49). In this case, the student repeated the teacher's correct reformulation (repetition), as shown in Excerpt #3 in which the student successfully repaired her pronunciation error by repeating the teacher's correct pronunciation of 'grocery store'.

The second type of uptake given by the students was incorporation. In this case, the student repeated the teacher's modification of error then she incorporated it to a longer utterance. This uptake is shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt #9

No	Participants	Talks
454	T	Are they going to the park?
455	Ay	No, they is not
456	T	No, they're not.
457	Ay	No, they're not, they are going to the restaurant

The third type of repair that was identified from the interaction was self-repair. In this case, the learner responded the teacher's oral corrective feedback by doing self-correction as

shown Excerpt #7. In that case, the teacher only repeated the learner's lexical error with a higher intonation and the learner recognized it as a corrective feedback. As result, the learner directly repaired her answer.

The fourth type of repair that was found in the interaction was peer-repair. Different from self-repair, it happened when the corrected utterance was given by a learner, other than the one who made the initial error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), as shown in Excerpt #4, #5, and #8. From those excerpts, it can be seen that there was another learner (s) who repaired the error(s) as a result of the teacher's corrective feedback to a learner's error.

Need repair

The uptake given by the students was not always immediately successful. The observation reveals that to get to the correct answer, the students sometimes made previous responses that led the teacher to give another correction. The following excerpt shows the example of two types of need repair. The first is the example of partial error and the second is the example of same error.

Excerpt #10

No	Participants	Talks
136	M	/ 'mu: .fi 'ti: .ə. t̚ə /
137	T	yes?
138	M	/ 'mu: .vi 'ti: .ə. t̚ə /
139	T	one more time
140	M	/ 'mu: .vi 'ti: .ə. t̚ə /

The excerpt shows that the student had a phonological inaccuracy in pronouncing 'movie theatre'. As a response, the teacher utilized clarification request to make the student notice the gap and repair her pronunciation. The student successfully noticed the gap but only did partial repair which resulted in partial error. Then, the teacher tried another type of

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

CF by utilizing elicitation strategy. Unfortunately, the student repeated the same error.

The next type of needs repair identified from the interaction was different error. In this case, the student responded the teacher's feedback with a different error.

Excerpt #11

No	Participants	Talks
236	T	What's that?
237	F	It's a flower
238	T	Flower is bunga but this is daun. What is daun in English?
239	B	Grass

The excerpt shows that a student (F) made a lexical error and the teacher utilized explicit oral corrective feedback. Another student (B) tried to give another answer but her answer did not correct nor repeat the initial error. Instead, a different error was made.

The fourth type of needs-repair was hesitation. In this case, the student hesitated when responding to the teacher's feedback.

Excerpt #12

No	Participants	Talks
64	M	What are you..
65	T+F	Where are you...
66	M	Where..err.. (hesitate)
67	T	Come on, one more time
68	M	Where are you... (hesitate) where are you going?

The excerpt shows that a student (M) made a lexical error. Responding to the error, the teacher and another student corrected the error by using recast. However, M hesitated to repeat the corrected word. Therefore, the teacher tried another strategy by using elicitation feedback.

Relating teacher's oral corrective feedback to young learners uptake

To look at the potential relation of teacher's oral corrective feedback to learners' uptake, the following table displays the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback.

Table 2. *The distribution of learners' uptake following teacher's oral corrective feedback*

Feedback Types	Uptake											No Uptake		
	Repair				Total	AC	SE	Needs Repair					Total	
RP	IN	SR	PR	DE				OT	HE	PE				
Recast (n=42)	9 (21.4%)	10 (23.8%)	0	0	19 (45.2%)	2 (4.8%)	0	0	0	2 (4.8%)	5 (11.9%)	8 (19.1%)	27 (64.3%)	15 (35.7%)
Elicitation (n=18)	0	6 (33.3%)	6 (33.3%)	4 (22.2%)	16 (88.9%)	0	0	2 (11.1%)	0	0	0	2 (11.1%)	18 (100%)	0
Metalinguistic (n=18)	0	5 (5.6%)	4 (22.2%)	6 (33.3%)	11 (61.1)	1 (5.6%)	0	5 (27.8%)	0	0	5 (5.6%)	7 (38.9%)	18 (100%)	0
Clarification Request (n=16)	0	0	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	7 (43.8%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (12.5%)	0	6 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	9 (56.3%)	16 (100%)	0
Explicit Correction (n=17)	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	0	0	9 (52.9%)	1 (5.9%)	0	0	0	2 (11.8%)	0	3 (17.7%)	12 (70.6)	5 (29.4%)
Paralinguistic Signal (n=12)	0	0	3 (25%)	4 (33.3%)	7 (58.3%)	0	0	3 (25%)	0	0	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (100%)	0
Repetition (n=9)	0	0	7 (77.8%)	1 (11.1%)	8 (88.9%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	9 (100%)	0

The data in the table reveal that recast results in 64.3% of learners' uptake, explicit correction results in 70.6% while elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal result

in 100% of learners' uptake. It is important to note that among those that result in 100% uptake, elicitation and repetition led to the highest percentage of repair (88.9%). Referring to the categorization of output prompting

(elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal) and input providing feedbacks (recast and explicit correction) from Ellis (2009) and Sheen & Ellis (2011), it can be seen that output prompting corrective feedbacks are more successful comparing to input providing feedbacks in leading students to perform an uptake.

The result that output prompting feedbacks are successful in leading to learners' uptake shows that output prompting CF can push learners in their output (Ellis, 2009; Sheen & Ellis, 2011; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In employing those output prompting feedbacks, the teacher often changed the tone of her voice and added gesture which seems as efforts to make the focus of correction more salient, even for young learners. The success of those output prompting strategies in leading to a hundred percent of learners' uptake may also relate to their potential force to make the learners pay attention to specific error which they were exposed to. In this case, Schmidt (2010) states that people learn about the things that they pay attention to and do not learn much about the things they do not attend to and output prompting feedback strategies were used by the teacher to make the learners pay attention to and learn from their error. By providing oral corrective feedback that led to learners' uptake, the teacher also seems to try to trigger learners' attention of the gap between their interlanguage and the target language (Tatawy, 2002). In this case, the teacher utilized output prompting feedback to make the students notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target output, especially the accuracy.

From those output prompting strategies that were successful in triggering learners' uptake, the emphasis is given to elicitation and repetition which led to the highest number of

repair. Different from uptake that was considered as having speculative contribution to language learning, repair is believed to contribute to language learning since they provide opportunities to retrieve learners' target language that already existed in learners' cognitive system and lead to revision of learners' output (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). As discussed in previous paragraphs, output prompting strategies tend to lead to more learners' uptake comparing to input providing strategies thus they also led to more repair. In this case, elicitation and repetition leading to a high number of learners' repair show that they are able to push the young learners to produce the correct output. It means that they fulfill their function as an attention getting device (Gass, 1991) since the learners can notice the gaps that were indicated by uptake and repair. In addition, it can be said that they accomplish role as noticing tool and triggering to make the learners aware of linguistic problem by modifying their output to reach the targeted output (Swain, 2007). The success of elicitation in getting learner repairs was also probably because it was explicit enough for young learners to identify the corrective function of elicitation such as 'filling in the gap' strategy (look at Excerpt #4) as a way to elicit the correct response.

Another possibility of the high rate of repair in response to elicitation and repetition might be due to the learners' familiarity of the corrected topic since the teacher tended to apply elicitation and repetition in correcting learners' erroneous utterances that were the main language targets in the lesson. In this case, the learning context, especially where the focus of learning becomes the main target, influences the teacher's choice to apply more output prompting, thus, lead to more uptake and repair as a way of drilling and language practicing

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

for students which is in line with Sheen's (2004) statement about the influence of context on the feedback episode, including the occurrence of uptake. It also supports that the teacher's objectives in teaching tends to influence the way the teacher builds oral interaction pattern (Maolida, 2013 b), including teacher's choice of corrective feedback that leads to certain type of uptake.

Regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback in leading to uptake, recast as the most frequent employed feedback strategies was the least one that led to uptakes (64.3%). The fact that recast is the least successful strategy to encourage uptake confirms the findings from previous studies (Choi & Li, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Surakka, 2007; Taipale, 2012). It explains why some researchers such as Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) assert that recast has weakness in terms of its less success in generating learners' uptake since recast is considered as less perceptible and ambiguous for the learners. However, as revealed from observation, the low rate of uptake was more related to the teacher's choice to directly continue the topic without disrupting the flow of communication. Instead of explicitly stated that the learner's utterance was incorrect, the teacher directly reformulated the erroneous utterance with the corrected version and continued the conversation. In this case, the teacher often initiated to continue the topic after giving feedback in interaction events that focused more on the routine (not main activity) as shown in Excerpt #1 and at the events that focused more on content (not form) and fluency. The teacher's choice to continue the topic without giving more time for students to uptake influences the occurrence of uptake and repair.

Again, it supports Sheen's (2004) theory about the contribution of learning contexts and Maolida (2013b) about the influence of teacher's teaching objectives on oral interaction in classroom.

In addition, the result of analysis shows that not all recast strategies failed in encouraging uptake since more than fifty percent of them led to uptake. A close observation on the pattern of recast reveals that explicit recast tends to lead to uptake and implicit recast tends to lead to topic continuation. In this case, explicit recast seems to function as a corrective tool while implicit recast more as a supportive tool in young learners' classroom interaction. By applying both types of recast, the teacher likely maintains two focuses between accuracy and fluency and this is in line with the language learning targets in teacher's lesson plan to improve not only the learners' accuracy, but also concerns on their fluency. Furthermore, the use of recast which has the strength of not distracting the flow of communication (Long, 1996) is in some ways, suitable to maintain the young learners' motivation to involve in the classroom oral interaction. In the context of young learner classroom, corrective feedback strategies that have less potential to dampen learners' motivation to speak are likely suitable to give (Cameron, 2001; Linse, 2005). In that case, the use of recast fits with teacher's objective in her lesson plan to encourage students to actively involve in a meaningful interaction by using the main target vocabularies and expressions.

The fewer uptakes are also shown to be attributed to the use of explicit correction. This result is in line with previous studies (Choi & Li, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002). Similar with the low uptake rate of recast, the fewer uptakes of explicit correction were mostly due to the

teacher's decision to continue the topic without giving opportunity for the learners to give uptake. In this case, the teacher often gave explicit correction after she utilized more implicit types of oral corrective feedback. The similar result is also shown by Choi and Li (2012) that in the context of young learner classroom, the teacher tends to provide explicit correction in extended sequences involving multiple feedback moves.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings above, it can be said that the types of oral corrective feedback utilized by the teacher likely influence learners' uptake. In this case, output prompting feedback strategies such as elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and paralinguistic signal are shown to lead to more uptake than input providing feedback strategies such as recast and explicit correction. The result also shows that elicitation and repetition led to higher number of learners' repair. However, the fact that input providing feedback generates fewer uptakes is often due to teacher's choice to directly continue the topic, especially in learning sessions which focus more on routine, content, and fluency. It implies that there is also an influence of learning context and teacher's objectives on the teacher's choice of CF and the occurrence of uptake and repair.

REFERENCES

- Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching language to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, S. Y., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learners' uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal*, 43(3), 331–351. DOI: 10.1177/0033688212463274.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition.

- Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600. DOI: 10.1017/S027226310606027.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 1-18. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3>.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 335-449. DOI: 10.1017/S0272263109990544.
- Emilia, E. (2010). *Teaching writing: Developing critical learner*. Bandung: Rizki Press.
- Gass, S. M. (1991). Grammar instruction, selective attention, and learning. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. S. Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 124-141). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Linse, C. T. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: Young learners*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learners' uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 37-66. Retrieved from http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func=db-in-jump-full&object_id=19364&local_base=GEN01.
- Maolida, E. H. (2013a). A descriptive study of oral corrective feedback in an ESL young learner classroom in Indonesia. *K@ta*, 15(2), 117-123. DOI: 10.9744/kata.15.2.117-124.
- Maolida, E. H. (2013b). The influence of teacher's instructional objectives on variations of exchange patterns in an EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 68-80. DOI: 10.17509/ijal.v3i1.661.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL QUARTERLY* 36(4), 575-595. Retrieved from http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/webclient/StreamGate?folder_id=0&dvs=1496286119632~880.
- Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English Wh-question forms by Iranian EFL learners.

Elis Homsini Maolida

Relating Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Young Learners' Uptake: A Case Study in a Young Learner EFL Classroom

- English Language Teaching*, 4(2).
DOI:10.5539/elt.v4n2p97.
- Rezaei, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2011). Investigating recast and metalinguistic feedback in task-based grammar instruction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(3), 655-663. DOI:10.4304/jltr.2.3.655-663.
- Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, L. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, *Proceedings of classic 2010*, Singapore, December 2-4 (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learners' uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Hinkel, E. (ed). (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.593-607). New York: Routledge.
- Surakka, K. (2007). *Corrective feedback and learners' uptake in an EFL classroom* (Master Thesis, University of Jyväskylä). Retrieved from: https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37544/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-201203121409.pdf;sequence=4.
- Swain, M. (2007). *The output hypothesis: Its history and its future* [PowerPoint Slide]. Retrieved from: <http://www.celea.org.cn/2007/keynote/pp/Merrill%20Swain.pdf>.
- Tatawy, M. E. (2002). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Tesolalwebjournal*, 2(2), 1-19. Retrieved from: www.tc.columbia.edu.
- Taipale, P. (2012). *Oral errors, corrective feedback, and learners' uptake in an EFL setting* (Master Thesis, University of Jyväskylä). Retrieved from: https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37544/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-201203121409.pdf;sequence=4.