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Abstract
The study investigated (1) the relationship between corrective feedback types and errors by bilingual elementary students in speaking; (2) corrective feedback type that leads to high uptake; (3) uptake commonly made by bilingual elementary students in response to incidental corrective feedback; and (4) perspectives of elementary classroom teachers and bilingual young learners on the provision, frequency, and timing of corrective feedback. The qualitative and quantitative research involved classroom teachers from grades 1 to 5 and bilingual elementary students. A total of 20 classroom teachers and 362 elementary students able to speak English, Bahasa Indonesia, and Chinese from a school implementing an international curriculum participated in the research. The study revealed that (1) different corrective feedback types, namely recast, explicit correction, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, and elicitation were not specifically linked with phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors in speaking; (2) recast led to high uptake in the form of incorporation but not student-generated repair; (3) repetition was the most common type of uptake by bilingual elementary students; and (4) classroom teachers and elementary students wanted teachers to correct errors and give delayed error correction but have different perspectives on the frequency of doing it. For classroom teachers, learners’ errors have to be corrected all the time but for students, errors have to be corrected sometimes. Peer application of corrective feedback and repeated error by another student are new kinds of uptake based on the results of the classroom-based research.
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Introduction
Teachers provide corrective feedback when learners make errors in speaking. The main role of language teachers is often regarded to be the giving of both error correction, which is a type of negative feedback, and
positive sanctions or approval of learners’ production (Chaudron, 1988). For teachers in foreign language situations, wherein there is limited exposure to English or practice available in the community, error correction is an expected role (Hedge, 2000), and second language learners are known to long for corrective feedback (Han, 2002).

Language teachers correct the errors of their students for them to learn proper pronunciation, grammar, etc. (Mings, 1993). Most second language learners commit grammatical, lexical, and phonological errors in speaking (Carranza, 2007). In every learning environment, errors of students are unavoidable.

Corrective feedback remains a topic that generates interest. Correcting errors of students is a dilemma for language teachers, particularly when it comes to speaking, as one can say that it is often hard to know when to correct students and how to go about it (Villalobos, 2010).

The study was motivated by a polarized discussion on the process, nature, and role of corrective feedback in language teaching and learning.

The review of previous studies shows that research on corrective feedback mainly involved adult learners. Research involving elementary classroom teachers and bilingual young learners using English as the medium of instruction and corrective feedback in classrooms where the language teaching is integrated with mathematics, science, and social studies has not yet been conducted.

The study investigated the following research questions:
1. To what extent is the relationship between types of corrective feedback and errors of bilingual elementary students in speaking?
2. Which corrective feedback type leads to high uptake?
3. What categories of uptake are commonly made by bilingual elementary students in response to incidental corrective feedback provided by classroom teachers?
4. How do classroom teachers and bilingual elementary students view corrective feedback, particularly its provision, frequency, and timing?

Theoretical framework

Corrective feedback has various definitions. One of the earliest definitions came from Chaudron (1977, p. 31) and for him, corrective feedback is “any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance”. For Choi and Li (2012), corrective feedback refers to responses to learners’ errors. The responses, as pointed out by Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), can consist of (a) a signal that an error has been made, (b) giving of the
correct target language form, or (c) metalinguistic information about the
nature of the error, or any combination of these three components. The
responses to learners’ erroneous second language production, for Li (2013),
can be provided by teachers and peers.

For Sheen and Ellis (2011), as quoted by Pawlak (2014, p. 6),
corrective feedback is “the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic
errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language”.

Russell and Spada (2006, p. 134) stressed that corrective feedback is
“any feedback provided to a learner, from any source that contains evidence
of learners’ error of language form”. Corrective feedback can be oral or
written as well as implicit or explicit (Russell & Spada, 2006).

Teachers use different types of corrective feedback, which refers to a
response to a learner utterance that has a linguistic error (Ellis, 2009). In
classroom situations, teachers choose to provide certain types of corrective
feedback to their students (Kennedy, 2010). One teacher may prefer explicit
correction while another teacher has a strong preference for recast.

This study focused on incidental corrective feedback, initiated on the
spur of the moment. Incidental corrective feedback is the spontaneous
correction of learner’s errors in the course of classroom interaction (Keck &
Kim, 2014). In incidental corrective feedback, the linguistic structures that
will be corrected are not planned.

The definition of errors as the use of a linguistic item such as a word
or a speech act that a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as
faulty or proof of incomplete learning (Richards & Schmidt, 2002) was
adopted. The definition of errors by Richards and Schmidt (2002) was used
as the distinction between an error and a mistake is problematic. Identifying
a mistake and an error in spontaneous classroom discourse entails a complex
study. Li (2013) noted that it is hard for teachers to differentiate errors from
mistakes in spontaneous classroom discussion.

In this study, errors by the students and corrected by the teachers
were classified based on the three types by Lyster and Ranta (1997), namely
(1) phonological, (2) lexical, and (3) grammatical. Below is a description of
the three error types with examples from the database of the present
research.

1. **Phonological error** – mispronunciation in reading aloud or
spontaneous conversations

   Example 1
   Student: Friction can be a [ˈnɑːsəns]
   Teacher: **Nuisance**
2. **Lexical error** – inaccurate and inappropriate choice of lexical items in open classes such as nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives
   
   Example 2
   
   Student: Zakah, to purify our *wealthy* by
   
   Teacher: To purify our *wealth*

3. **Grammatical error** - error in tense, verb morphology, auxiliaries, pluralization, question formation, word order, subject/verb agreement, and the use of closed classes such as prepositions, pronouns, and determiners
   
   Example 3
   
   Teacher: What’s the problem in the story?
   
   Student: Goldilocks *eat* porridge.
   
   Teacher: Goldilocks *ate* porridge.

The corrective feedback taxonomy by Lyster and Ranta (1997) which included explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition was used for the research since it provides a framework for analyzing the oral corrective feedback type given by teachers.

Uptake has numerous definitions. In the literature on corrective feedback, uptake has been defined as response by learners after being provided with corrective feedback. Loewen (2004, p. 153) considers uptake as the “learners’ response to the provision of feedback after either an erroneous utterance or a query about a linguistic item within the context of meaning-focused language activities”. Uptake may also occur overtly or covertly (Egi, 2010).

Uptake, for Heift (2004), is the student responses to corrective feedback in which, in case of an error, they attempt to correct it. For Bargiela (2003, p. 90), uptake “reveals the learner attempt to work on the feedback received”. Uptake has been regarded as a proof that learners notice the form (Lightbown, 2000). Moreover, uptake is the learners’ modification of their original utterance following the provision of feedback through recasts or negotiation by the native speaker (Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). Corrective feedback, however, is not only given by native speakers of the language but also by non-native speakers.

Uptake in the study refers to learner responses after the feedback, including responses with repair of the non-target items and utterances still in need of repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Uptake indicates what the learner tries to do with the corrective feedback. Uptake among learners differs. One possibility is that these differences indicate dissimilarities in learners’
attitudes towards the importance of correctness in general and to corrective feedback in particular (Ellis, 2010).

As uptake is an optional student move, it does not necessarily occur after the provision of linguistic information (Loewen, 2004). Uptake can also be successful or a failure. Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified uptake into repair and needs-repair. In their approach, an uptake represents repair if the learner successfully corrects his or her erroneous output following corrective feedback, otherwise it is regarded as in need of repair. In needs-repair, no repair is seen in the learner’s response and the utterance is still in need of repair (Safari, 2013). For Lyster and Ranta (1997), repair and needs-repair have sub-categories. The following list, as elaborated by Pawlak (2014, p. 172), shows the sub-categories of repair and needs-repair that were used in the present study.

**Repair**
1. Repetition – learner repeats the given corrective feedback
2. Incorporation – learner incorporates the repetition of the correct form in a longer utterance
3. Self-repair – self-correction by the learner, who produced the initial error, in response to a corrective mode that did not supply the correct form
4. Peer-repair – a student other than the learner who produced the inaccurate form performs the correction in response to the given feedback. It also refers to correction provided by the whole class.

**Needs-repair**
1. Acknowledgement – a student says ‘yes’, ‘aha’, ‘oh’, or ‘no’
2. Same error – learner produces the same error one more time
3. Different error – learner fails to correct the original error and in addition produces yet another inaccurate form
4. Off target – student responds by circumventing the teacher’s linguistic focus, which might involve modifying a different part of the utterance
5. Hesitation – student hesitates in response to the feedback
6. Partial repair – learner only partly corrects the initial error

**Methodology**

The study involved 362 bilingual elementary students between the ages of six and 11, and 20 classroom teachers from a school in Indonesia that is implementing the International Baccalaureate curriculum and teaching three languages.
The students came from different nationalities but the majority are Indonesians. The students spoke English as the language of instruction, Bahasa Indonesia as the host country language, and Chinese as an additional language.

The teachers integrated the teaching of English language with mathematics, science, and social studies. Eighteen out of the 20 teachers were bilingual and non-native speakers of English. The remaining two teachers, both Americans, can only speak English.

Class observations, questionnaires, and interviews were used for collecting data. Before the actual research, a pilot study was conducted.

To answer the first research question, student utterances that have errors and received corrective feedback from teachers during whole class, small groups, and one-on-one discussions were transcribed. Errors of students in speaking were coded as phonological, grammatical, or lexical. Errors related to content were not analyzed as the research interest was on focus-on-form.

The forms of feedback provided by teachers were classified and analyzed according to the corrective feedback types from Lyster and Ranta (1997), namely explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

Uptake has been categorized by Lyster and Ranta (1997) as repair and needs-repair. In this study, repair is referred to as high uptake and needs-repair as low uptake.

For the second research question, the corrective feedback type resulting in high uptake was analyzed. High uptake refers to learner response that leads to repair of the error after a corrective feedback. High uptake includes the sub-categories of repair by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which are (1) repetition, (2) incorporation, (3) self-repair, and (4) peer repair.

Low uptake is student response to a corrective feedback that is incorrect and still needs repair. Low uptake consists of the sub-categories of needs-repair by Lyster and Ranta (1997), particularly (1) acknowledgement, (2) same error, (3) different error, (4) off target, (5) hesitation, and (6) partial repair.

For the third research question, the sub-categories of repair and needs-repair were used in analyzing the different forms of uptake frequently made by students.

For the fourth research question, responses by teachers and students to the questions on provision, frequency, and timing of corrective feedback were grouped. Similarities and differences of teachers and students’ responses to the questions were analyzed.
Results and Discussion

The relationship between types of corrective feedback and errors of bilingual elementary students in speaking

The study revealed that the six corrective feedback types were not specifically linked with phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors in speaking. Teachers did not use a certain corrective feedback type for a specific learner error. Neither recast nor explicit correction was connected with phonological error. Likewise, neither clarification request nor metalinguistic feedback was associated with grammatical and lexical errors.

In correcting a specific kind of learner error, teachers used various corrective feedback types. In the research, teachers utilized recast, explicit correction, repetition, and clarification request to correct phonological errors and recast and explicit correction for grammatical errors. To correct lexical errors, recast, explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback were used.

The results of the study differed from the research findings by Choi and Li (2012), which revealed that recasts, explicit correction, and elicitation are commonly used to correct grammatical, phonological and lexical errors.

Out of the six corrective feedback types by Lyster and Ranta (1997), explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition were used by teachers in the study. Elicitation was never used by the teachers in correcting phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors. Recast has the highest frequency of use at 67%; explicit correction at 25%; repetition at 4%; clarification request, 2%; and metalinguistic feedback, 2%.

Teachers in the study emphasized that elicitation is time-consuming because students need to think and reconstruct their utterances; entails more student-talking time which teachers may not be used to; and reduces talking time of teachers. Teachers also underscored that students may make the same or another error when elicitation is used because they lack the knowledge.

Teachers added that elicitation was not used because it directly tells students that an error has been made; gives explicit signals to students to do the required correction; distracts the attention of other students; and draws attention to errors of students and authority of teachers over students. By not using elicitation, teachers argued that they did not want students to be intimidated.

Corrective feedback type and resulted uptake

Since recast was the most frequently used corrective feedback type in the research, it resulted in high uptake. The finding that the use of recasts led to
high uptake supports the argument by Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada (2001), as quoted by Lochtman (2005, p.348), that “recasts appear to be more effective in contexts where it is clear to the learner that the recast is a reaction to the accuracy of the form”.

The research by Lyster and Ranta (1997) also showed that recast is the most common type of error correction used by language teachers (Russell, 2009) even though it rarely resulted in uptake.

High uptake resulting from recast in the study was neither self-repair nor peer repair. High uptake resulting from recast was mostly in the form of incorporation. In incorporation, students repeated the correct form and included it in a longer utterance as shown in excerpt 1.

**Excerpt 1**

Student: I have 2 x 7. Who *have* …
Teacher: Who *has*? (recast)
Student: Who *has* 7 x 7? (incorporation)

In this research, only clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition led to self-repair and peer repair. Panova and Lyster (2002) emphasized that self-repair and peer-repair result from elicitative kinds of corrective feedback like clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition but not from recast and explicit correction. Unlike recast and explicit correction, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback and repetition do not give learners the correct form but they provide a clue that the utterance of the learner consists of an error and therefore prompts the correct form.

This is also the reason why clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, repetition and elicitation are called “prompts” (Abedi, Mahdavi, & Hassaskhah, 2015). The four interactional moves are also referred to as negotiation of form while recasts and explicit correction are considered reformulations (Lyster & Mori, 2006). Recasts and explicit correction are reformulations because they provide learners with target reformulations of their non-target output (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013).

**Uptake commonly produced by bilingual elementary students in response to incidental corrective feedback**

The study revealed that repetition was the most common type of uptake made by bilingual elementary students. Based on the study, 38% of the 29 learner uptake moves were repetition.

The finding that repetition was the most frequent uptake was validated by the participating teachers and students. Students explained that
they like to repeat the correction provided by teachers, as it is like students correcting their own errors and repetition is a form of practice. Students emphasized that when they repeat the correction given by teachers, they learn what to say and what not to say. Students added that repeating the correction helps them remember the correct forms and pronounce the words correctly.

One reason for the high occurrence of repetition is the explicit prompting of teachers for students to repeat the corrective feedback by using trigger words or phrases like “say it again”, “again”, and “c’mon”.

Teachers explained that they wanted students to repeat the corrective feedback they have given so students will remember it, practice the language in a correct manner, redo what they have done and do it in a right way, and avoid the same error. In instructing students to repeat the corrective feedback they have given, teachers want students to notice and process the correction.

The move by teachers instructing students to repeat the corrective feedback also reflects their authority and position of power. For students, the act of teachers to provide the correct utterance and ask students to repeat it is “helpful”. Students mentioned that repeating the correction given by the teacher helps them to remember the correct form and avoid making the same errors in the future and is a way of showing to the teacher that they understand the correction. Students added that repeating the correction is similar to correcting themselves.

The high incidence of repetition was also due to the corrective feedback type that was provided. In the research, recast was the most frequent corrective feedback used by teachers in correcting phonological and grammatical errors. Loewen (2004) noted that recast does not lead to student-generated repair but involves learners in repeating the information given by the teacher. Similarly, Baleghizadeh and Abdi (2010) stressed that recast does not result in any self-repair or peer repair. However, when there is repair, the student or the learner can only repeat the teacher’s reformulation (Baleghizadeh & Abdi, 2010).

The second most frequent type of corrective feedback used by teachers in the study was explicit correction. Like recast, explicit correction leads to repetition (Panova & Lyster, 2002). Both recast and explicit correction encourage learners to respond by repeating the corrective feedback given by teachers (Lee, 2007). Recast and explicit correction result in repetition because they give the students with the correct forms (Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012). In the study, neither of the recasts nor explicit correction led to student-generated repair, particularly self-repair and peer repair.
Incorporation was the second type of uptake frequently made by bilingual elementary students. Out of the 26 high uptake occurrences in the study, eight moves were incorporation. In doing incorporation, students were able to notice the correct form, which they have embedded in a longer utterance.

The occurrence of repetition and incorporation following the giving of recast and explicit correction was in agreement with the finding of Panova and Lyster (2002, p. 585), who underscored that repetition and incorporation usually transpire after recast and explicit correction because “these feedback types include the target form, which can be repeated or incorporated in a longer utterance”. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) also highlighted that recasts and explicit correction can only result to repetition of correct forms while prompts consisting of clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, repetitions, and elicitations can lead, not to repetition, but either to self-repair or peer-repair.

As shown in the study, uptake after a recast and explicit correction is different from uptake following a clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. Uptake after a recast and explicit correction is repetition while uptake following a clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition comprises of self-repair and peer-repair.

Two new types of uptake were identified in the research. Peer application of corrective feedback and repeated error by another student are the two new kinds of uptake.

Peer application of corrective feedback is another form of high uptake. As illustrated in excerpt 2, peer application of corrective feedback happens when another learner uses the given corrective feedback.

**Excerpt 2**

Student 1: The cat jumped *at* the jungle.
Teacher: The cat jumped *in* the jungle. Ah! It’s a wild cat
Teacher: Alright. Another.
Student 2: The cat jumped *in* the ocean (peer application of corrective feedback)

Repeated error by another student belongs to low uptake. As shown in excerpt 3, repeated error by another student occurs when another learner makes the same error that was already corrected.

**Excerpt 3**

Teacher: This is called pre-writing
Student 1: It’s *[pre]*. 
Teacher: **Pre**, not *prey*, pre-writing

Student 2: *[friː]* (repeated error by another student)

Peer application of corrective feedback and repeated error by another student were not part of the sub-categories of repair and needs-repair by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In the study, there were three occurrences of peer application of corrective feedback and two instances of repeated error by another student.

*Teachers’ and students’ view on corrective feedback: provision, frequency, and timing*

The majority of the teachers and students agreed that teachers have to correct errors. Both teachers and students favored the giving of corrective feedback and acknowledged that corrective feedback is important in language learning. The finding of the study was in agreement with the research of Schulz (1996). The favorable approach by teachers and students in the research towards corrective feedback substantiates the statement by Keck and Kim (2014, p. 155) that “whether planned or incidental, implicit or explicit, corrective feedback has the potential to facilitate the L2 grammar acquisition process”.

Teachers in the research argued that correcting errors will make students aware of their errors, prevent them from committing the same errors, and help students master the language and clearly convey their message. Teachers also emphasized that errors need to be corrected so the errors will not be fossilized and become permanent.

Students argued that teachers need to correct errors for them to learn, prevent repetition of same errors, help improve speaking and writing skills, and avoid embarrassment. Students in the study viewed error correction as the responsibility of teachers. In agreeing that errors should be corrected by teachers, students provided such comments as: ‘If a student says something wrong and the teacher just stays quiet, the student will think he/she is correct. So every day, the student speaks the wrong grammar and pronunciation and it will be a habit and he/she won’t stop. Secondly, teachers are meant to correct the student error. If the teacher does not correct the student, what kind of a teacher he/she is?’; ‘Students need to know how to say the word right in school. It is also good for the students to say the right word so they can speak English well. It will also help students to talk in another city and when they do group work’; and ‘When teachers correct students, it helps the students know more grammar rules, vocabulary and word choices in speaking. It helps the students to know more and improve in English grammar.’
For the timing, the majority of teachers and students believed that corrective feedback has to be given after the learners complete what they wanted to say. Thirteen out of 20 teachers and 224 of the 362 students wanted to have their errors corrected after completing their utterances.

The study revealed that immediate corrective feedback was not favored by most of the teachers because it disrupts utterances of students. Delayed corrective feedback was strongly preferred by both teachers and students as it allows students to finish their utterances. The other reasons given by teachers and students for favoring delayed corrective feedback include allowing the students to think and focus, encouraging students to do own repair of their errors, showing respect to the students and valuing their opinions. The additional reason given by teachers and students for the use of delayed corrective feedback is to avoid breakdown in communication, allow students to continue talking and convey the message, and focus on fluency. Mendez and Cruz (2012) noted that teachers who implement a focus on meaning instruction and encourage fluency in their classrooms choose to delay corrective feedback.

Applying immediate error treatment was viewed by the students as disruptive and frustrating as it interrupts them in mid-sentence. This supports the statement by Allwright and Bailey (1991) that immediate correction could inhibit the learner’s willingness to speak in class at all. Students in the study highlighted that they feel embarrassed, frustrated, and lose their concentration and confidence when teachers correct them in the middle of their utterances. Students underscored that it is “impolite”, “disrespectful”, “distracting”, and “annoying” if teachers stop them just to correct their errors.

The preference of teachers for delayed corrective feedback matched their classroom practice. Based on the classroom observations, most of the teachers corrected the spoken errors after the students completed their utterances. A total of 40 utterances or 78% of the 51 utterances with errors were corrected by teachers after the students completed what they wanted to say.

On the frequency of corrective feedback, teachers and students have different views. The majority of the teachers preferred to correct errors in speaking all the time, but most of the students wanted to have their errors corrected sometimes.

Students emphasized that they want their errors to be corrected not all the time because they feel “degraded” and “belittled” when teachers correct their errors all the time. Students expressed that they feel like not doing anything right and lose their self-esteem if teachers have to correct their errors all the time. Students also pointed out that correcting their errors all the time implies that they are not able to learn. The preference of students
for teachers not to correct their errors all the time supports the argument by Touchie (1986) that frequent correction of errors disrupts the process of language learning.

The preference of teachers to correct students’ errors in speaking all the time was in contrast with what they practice in the classroom. Of the 92 student utterances with errors, errors corrected by teachers totaled 51 instances. The remaining 41 utterances with errors were not corrected by teachers. The non-correction of 45% of student utterances with errors shows a disparity between what the teachers believe in and what they do in the classroom.

**Corrective Feedback Diagram**

As a result of the research, a diagram showing the process of giving corrective feedback and uptake was developed. The diagram shows that corrective feedback episodes consist of (1) a trigger in the form of a learner error; (2) a feedback move from the teacher, another learner, or from the rest of the class; (3) uptake; and (4) topic continuation or topic change initiated by the teacher or student.

Figure 1 shows the proposed corrective feedback diagram. The diagram shows that corrective feedback starts with an erroneous utterance. There are seven outcomes that could happen when a learner makes an error in speaking. The first outcome is that when the error does not receive corrective feedback, topic continuation or topic change arises as shown in excerpt 4.

**Excerpt 4**

Teacher: What’s your guess, Keisha?
Student: I think the story is about a boy who is really lazy and he only wants to sleep *in* his bed and not learning anything.
Teacher: Okay, lazy.

As shown in excerpt 5 below, the second outcome if a learner makes an error is that immediate corrective feedback is provided and there is high uptake. After the occurrence of high uptake, topic continuation or topic change occurs.

**Excerpt 5**

Student: The smart kids learnt a hard lesson *on*
Teacher: *in* the
Student: *in* the museum
As illustrated in excerpt 6, the third outcome if a student commits an error is that delayed corrective feedback is provided and there is high uptake. After high uptake is made, topic continuation or topic change transpires.

*Excerpt 6*

Student: Tom has 94 apples *together*.
Teacher: **Together** or **altogether**?
Student: **Altogether**.
Teacher: Okay. Very good.
As shown in excerpt 7, the fourth outcome when a student makes an error is that immediate corrective feedback is provided, but there is low uptake. Following the low uptake, topic continuation or topic change occurs.

*Excerpt 7*

Student: We can also say to the government
Teacher: Yes, but government is not one person. Government is an organization. If you are talking about Jakarta, then you talk to the governor.
Student2: Government
Teacher: Not government. Government is an organization made of a lot of people. Governor is a person. President is a person.

The fifth outcome if a student makes an error is that delayed corrective feedback is given, but there is low uptake. After the occurrence of low uptake, topic continuation or topic change occurs as shown in excerpt 8.

*Excerpt 8*

Student: When he speak, he bite his tongue, and then he got mad.
Teacher: He bit his tongue when he slept and then, he got. Can you speak clearly? Say it well.
Student: When he speak, he bite his tongue.
Teacher: He bit his tongue. His what? One more. Are there some more?

As illustrated in excerpt 9, the sixth outcome when a student makes an error is that immediate corrective feedback is provided, but there is no uptake. If no uptake transpires, topic continuation or topic change occurs.

*Excerpt 9*

Student: The bicycle was old because maybe it is never or never been
Teacher: The bicycle is old because. Is that really a sentence because there are a lot of. Just a simple sentence. The bicycle is old. Right? That’s it. Very good!

The seventh outcome when a student commits an error is that delayed corrective feedback is provided but there is no uptake. If no uptake emerges, topic continuation or topic change occurs as shown in excerpt 10.
Teacher: What did you do during the assembly?
Student: We *sing*.
Teacher: We *sang*.
Teacher: So we can put singing here.

Based on the study, corrective feedback is provided by a teacher, peer, or the rest of the class. Immediate or delayed corrective feedback is given in the form of explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation or repetition. Topic continuation or topic change occurs when the error is not corrected and if there is no uptake.

High uptake, low uptake, or no uptake happens when corrective feedback is provided. High uptake consists of repetition, incorporation, self-repair, peer-repair, and peer application of corrective feedback. Low uptake comprises of acknowledgement, same error by the same student, different error, off target, hesitation, partial repair, and repeated error by another student. Both peer application of corrective feedback and repeated error by another student are new types of uptake discovered in the study. No uptake can be a result of no think time or no opportunity provided by the teacher to process the given corrective feedback.

**Pedagogical Implications**

One implication of the study is that different corrective feedback types such as recast, explicit correction, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition can all be used to correct phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors of students in speaking. There is no single type of corrective feedback assigned to a specific learner error. The use of only one type of corrective feedback is not applicable in correcting phonological, grammatical or lexical errors. The use of different types of corrective feedback indicates that there is no one-size-fits-all approach when it comes to correcting the phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors of students in speaking.

Another implication of the study is that teachers need to model the use of correct language as students are inclined to repeat the corrective feedback they provide. The study revealed that repetition was the most common uptake made by bilingual elementary students. The second type of uptake frequently made by students in response to incidental corrective feedback was incorporation, which also involves the repetition of the correct form and embedding it in a longer utterance.

The third implication of the research is that corrective feedback has an important role in language learning. The study highlighted that classroom
teachers and bilingual elementary students agreed that teachers have to correct errors of students. In the study, students recalled their experiences when they were corrected and remembered the correct grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation provided by their teachers. Students preferred and expected to be corrected by teachers. Reasons shared by students for wanting to be corrected by teachers include avoiding the same errors in speaking in the future and improving their English skills, including writing. Students in the research in fact identified explicit correction as the most helpful corrective feedback type as they are told clearly that they made an error and are also provided with the correct form. For students, clarification request is the least helpful corrective feedback type as they find it confusing. Students explained that clarification request does not inform them what they made wrong and they do not get what the teacher is trying to imply. For corrective feedback to be helpful to students, it has to be clear and specific.

The fourth implication of the research is that students have to be provided delayed corrective feedback, not immediate correction. Research findings showed that both classroom teachers and bilingual elementary students agreed that errors have to be corrected after students finish their utterances. The giving of delayed corrective feedback indicates that students do not want to be stopped and corrected in the middle of a sentence when they commit errors in speaking. Teachers should not be interrupting or cutting off the students just to provide corrective feedback or do error correction. Among others, providing delayed corrective feedback encourages students to do self-repair or peer-repair. Letting the students to complete what they wanted to say before giving corrective feedback also helps them process the information. Allowing students to finish what they wanted to say before giving corrective feedback is less disruptive and intrusive. Interrupting the students for corrective feedback to occur is viewed by the students as “impolite”, “rude”, “frustrating”, “disrespectful”, and “annoying”.

The finding that bilingual elementary students wanted to be corrected not all the time indicates that students be allowed to correct their own errors. In the research, students were capable of correcting their errors. Students just have to be given wait time, also known as think time, of more than three seconds to respond to the corrective feedback provided by teachers. The present research showed that classroom teachers either continued or changed the topic without giving enough time as well as opportunity for learner uptake. In the study, time for cognitive processing for bilingual elementary students to uptake the correction was lacking. For learner uptake to happen, teachers have to consciously allocate think time of more than three seconds. Giving adequate wait time is important especially since the corrective
The other implication of the study is to reduce teacher talk. One main reason for the few number of student utterances with errors is that teachers in the study did most of the talking in teacher-student interactions. As teachers did most of the talking, bilingual elementary students ended up doing less talking. If fluency is the aim of teachers, excessive teacher talk should not occur. Without student talk, it is hard for teachers to check for student understanding. With teacher doing the talking most of the time, students will have less time and limited opportunity to express their thoughts and use the language. With more student talk and less teacher talk, teachers can listen to what the students are saying and provide feedback, not only corrective feedback but also feedback on student learning.

Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted only in one school where the majority of the students belonged to one nationality and culture, and the results may not be generalizable. The majority of the participating students are Indonesians, and their use of language can be culture-bound.

The research was a cross-sectional study, not a longitudinal research which follows participants over a period of time. As the study design was cross-sectional, it captured information based on a single point in time.

Nevertheless, the study is of use to educators as the research involved classroom teachers and bilingual elementary students using English as the medium of instruction, conducted in classes wherein the teaching of language was integrated with mathematics, science, and social studies, and focused on the occurrence of corrective feedback and learner uptake in real and natural teacher-student interactions.
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