

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter discusses about the conclusion of this research regarding of the kind of self-repairs' percentage and the type of teacher's corrective feedback available in the class. Alongside of the conclusion, this chapter also contains the suggestion regarding the research for students, lecturers, and also the next researchers.

#### A. Conclusion

In regard of the research findings, the researcher draws conclusions about the research questions of this study:

##### 1. The Kind of Self-repairs in Students' Speaking Performance

From the research finding, it has been shown that among 29 students, only 13 of them did D-repairs, 21 of them did A-repairs, while almost all of them, 28 students, did E-repairs. In the term of frequency, among the total of 135 self-repairs E-repair also shows the most frequency in 65,2%, followed by A-repair in 22,2% and the last is also D-repair which goes by 12,6%. E-repair occurred by most students and hence become the most frequent kind of self-repair in this study. It also indirectly means that students made more monitoring in linguistic error rather than contextual in their speech. However, from the indication about the content of Lecturer's corrective feedback which mostly shows domination in the concern of pronunciation and few grammatical correction instead contextual rightfulness of students' speech, it can be showed that students had much struggle and need improvement in dealing with linguistic errors.

The research finding also shows that among five lecturer's feedback sessions, only 3 among 5 feedback sessions contains any form of corrective feedback. Also, among six types of corrective feedback, the lecturer uses only two types: Explicit correction (69%) and Elicitation (31%). Explicit correction is given in order to utilize the time usage, since the

feedback time is indeed limited and the feedbacks didn't only contain corrections. Even though the lecturer didn't use all types of the feedbacks, explicit correction and elicitation make a good combination since it means that the lecturer had already implemented both explicit feedback and implicit feedback. Also, it is not necessary for the lecturer to deliver corrective feedbacks in every type in order to deliver the correction of students' errors.

## **B. Suggestion**

Based on the result of the study, the researcher proposes some suggestions that may be considered:

### **1. For Students**

The occurrence of self-repairs indicates that students undergo a monitoring process in language production. The more self-repairs made means the higher the capability of students' self-monitoring. However, when self-repair occurs too often, the obvious distinction especially in phonological error repairs made by the speaker may disturb the listener. While the self-repair comes as the indication of language learning, the students may need to improve their linguistic knowledge in order to minimize their errors.

### **2. For Lecturers**

Although the types of corrective feedback told by the teacher didn't really vary, it can indicate that the forms of corrective feedback given by the teacher show consistency while maintaining both explicit and implicit feedbacks. In the future, the lecturers may need to take more consideration in students' self-repairs, since self-repairs indicate on how far the students can detect their mistake and how far the students can repair them within their current ability. By taking more attention to students' self-repairs, it would be easier to find the points about students' speaking ability that need to be utilized by directly guiding and which point needs implicit guidance in the case students' already have a hint of awareness via self-repairs.

### **3. For Future Researchers**

For the future researchers, since this study has a lot of weakness, the researcher would be very glad if the next researcher would complement this research. Especially in regard of the correlation between self-repairs as main concern and corrective feedback as additional finding in this research. The new challenge is to find whether corrective feedback can actually improve students' speaking through their raising awareness in doing self-repairs or not.

For this research about self-repairs, in which counted as basic one since there has been yet no topic regarding of this field in UIN Sunan Ampel, it would also become exciting matter if the self-repairs is paired with other variables in language teaching and learning field. For example with students' speaking proficiency, perceptions, or even correlating with the language error itself. Also, it would be totally appreciated if the trait of self-repairs can somehow be utilized as viewpoint in creating teaching media, tool, or instruments in order to increase students' speaking ability.

