Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in a Young Children Bilingual Classroom

Adesia Kusuma W.
Sanata Dharma University
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v4i2.2307

ABSTRACT

Most research on corrective feedback and learner uptake inspired by Lyster and Ranta (1997) has been conducted with students belonging to various age groups. This study was undertaken to investigate the occurrence of corrective feedback and uptake in young children bilingual context whose age ranged from 5 to 6 or children in bilingual kindergarten in Indonesia. Transcripts of 100 minutes of lessons in Blossoms class of Satya Wacana Children Centre, Salatiga, were analyzed to answer these two research questions: (1) What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback in young children bilingual classroom? and (2) what is the uptake rate of each type of feedback and the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and learner uptake? The results revealed that the majority feedback provided for grammatical errors was repetition. The majority feedback given on phonological errors was recast. Then, explicit correction was the most frequent feedback for lexical errors. This study also found that elicitation and repetition led to the highest uptake rate. Although recast in this study did not lead to a high uptake rate compared with other types of feedback, in the case of phonological errors, recast did lead to a high uptake and repair rate. This study also provided an integrated picture about the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and learner uptake. Overall, there were differences in the patterns of feedback and uptake between this study and previous studies, which were interpreted with the reference to the unique characteristics of the instructional context.

Keywords: *bilingual young children, corrective feedback, uptake*

INTRODUCTION

Research on corrective feedback and learner uptake has grown dramatically over the last 10-15 years. It was started by prominent researchers in this subject matter, i.e. Lyster and Ranta in 1997. They conducted a study on corrective feedback and learner uptake in four immersion classrooms at the primary level, particularly grade 4, 5, and 6. In their studies, teachers were having an overwhelming tendency to use recast in spite of its ineffectiveness at eliciting student-generated repair. They also found that four other feedback types, i.e. elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition, lead to student-generated repair more successfully and are thus able to initiate what they characterize as the negotiation of form. Lyster and Ranta's study in 1997 has evoked a number of research on corrective feedback and learner uptake to date. Recent research on corrective feedback and learner uptake inspired by Lyster and Ranta (1997) are studies conducted by Tsang (2004), Suzuki (2005), Sheen (2006), and Choi & Li (2012).

Tsang (2004) analyzed 18 non-native English lessons on teacher feedback and learner uptake at secondary levels in Hong Kong, particularly Forms 1 to 5 (equivalent to Grades 7 to 11) and different types of lesson (reading, writing, speaking, and general English.). The results of Tsang's study showed that: (1) recast and explicit correction were the most frequent types of feedback; (2) none of the student-generated repairs resulted from recast or explicit correction, and the most frequent student-generated repair followed repetition; and (3) most grammatical repairs followed from negotiation, and phonological followed equally frequently from recast and explicit correction.

According to Tsang (2004), those results implied that (1) recast may give way to other types of feedback moves (elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition) which may be more effective than the provision of correct form and (2) while recast and explicit correction are more appropriate for phonological errors, negotiation facilitates grammatical repairs.

Another study on corrective feedback and learner uptake inspired by Lyster and Ranta (1997) is a study conducted by Mikiko Suzuki (2005) which investigated the relationship between feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. In this study, the participants aged from 20 to 50. Suzuki's study showed both similarities and differences to Lyster and Ranta's study. The distribution of types of corrective feedback following learner errors in Suzuki's study showed no major difference from Lyster and Ranta's report, but the ratio of uptake following certain corrective feedback types greatly differed from Lyster and Ranta's. The differences in the results were caused by some aspects which differed to some extent from Lyster and Ranta's study, such as classroom setting, students' ages and their motivation in participating in the lan guage learning programs, teaches' experience and the target language.

In 2006, Younghee Sheen also conducted a study on corrective feedback and learner uptake. Sheen (2006) presented a taxonomy of the recast that arose in communicative ESL and EFL classrooms in her study. The participants of this study were New Zealand students aged from 18 to 21 who were in an undergraduate program or a collage-prep course; and Korean students aged from 29 to 36 who had a college education background or higher. Sheen's study revealed that explicit recasts led to more uptake or repair because they were focused on a single linguistic feature and the reformulated item was salient to learners.

The most recent study on corrective feedback and learner uptake was conducted by Seung-Yi Choi and Shaofeng Li in 2012. Choi and Li (2012) investigated the occurrence of corrective feedback and uptake in child ESOL classes. The participants in this study aged from 6 to 12. The results of this study revealed that there was a clear preference for recast and explicit correction, and there was a lack of prompts. The two most frequent feedback types resulted in relatively high uptake rates because of a high percentage of the recast was corrective (as opposed to supportive) and many cases of explicit correction subsumed multiple, hybrid (input providing as well as output-prompting) corrective moves. Their study showed that phonological errors led to a high repair regardless of feedback types, and grammatical errors mainly received recast, most of which were not followed by repairs.

In most cases recent research on corrective feedback and learner uptake inspired by Lyster and Ranta (1997) were conducted with adult ESL/EFL learners aged from 18 to 50 or children in Grades 2 to 11 or children aged from 6 to 17 or children in Primary level. The current study was under

taken to investigate the occurrence of corrective feedback and uptake in young children bilingual context whose age ranged from 5 to 6 or children in bilingual Kindergarten in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective Feedback

Information given to learners which they can use to revise their language is called as 'feedback' in language acquisition. Then, 'feedback' can be distinguished into 'positive' and 'negative' feedback. Negative feedback is sometimes referred to as 'negative evidence'. It refers to information that indicates a hypothesis is incorrect. Then, 'corrective feedback' is used in preference to negative feedback. According to Ellis (2008) corrective feedback can be implicit or explicit; it can also be input-providing or output-prompting. Therefore, corrective feedback refers to negotiation strategies for discourse repair in Ellis (2008).

According to Choi and Li (2012), corrective feedback constitutes a form-focusing device. It can consist of an indication of an error, provision of the correct target language form, or metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these (Ellis et al., 2006 in Choi & Li, 2012). Choi and Li (2012) also put that the provision of feedback is affected by the nature of the linguistic target and also constrained by whether it occurred in a focused or unfocused event (or task). In addition, Gass (1997) stated that corrective feedback prompts learners to notice the gap between their erroneous L2 production and the target form and make subsequent interlanguage adjustments.

Suzuki (2005) in her paper on corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms, asserts that modified output can be manifested in the form of learner uptake, or learner reaction to teachers' corrective feedback given to learners' error in the context of teacher-learner interaction, and thus corrective feedback is a pedagogical means of offering modified input to students which could consequently lead to modified output by students.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six types of feedback: recast, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, and repetition. Recast and explicit correction are referred to as input-providing because they contain the correct forms. The other types of feedback, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, elicitation, and repetition, are described as output-prompting because they encourage learner repairs. These six types of feedback also stand in the implicit-explicit continuum depending on whether learners' attention is overtly drawn to linguistic forms. Recast stands at the implicit end and metalinguistic correction and explicit correction at the explicit end.

Previous descriptive research on corrective feedback conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Lyster (1998), and Lyster (2001) showed that the occurrence of corrective feedback varied across instructional settings. Former experimental studies demonstrated that learner-external and learner-internal factors had some effect on feedback. For instance, a study conducted by Lyster and Saito (2010) found that younger learners benefitted more from feedback than older learners, indicating the influence of age on the effects of feedback.

In addition, according to Ellis (2010), cognitive interactionist theories (e.g., Long, 1996) claim that corrective feedback assists acquisition by helping learners establish target-like form-meaning mappings while they are engaged in the effort to communicate. Skill learning theories (e.g., DeKeyser, 1998) also see a role for corrective feedback assisting learners to proceduralize their declarative knowledge of the L2.

Uptake

According to Ellis (2008), uptake refers to the response move in the negotiation sequence in discourse repair. In other words, uptake is a move undertaken by the learner in response to the feedback the learner receives from another speaker on his/her previous utterance that contained an error. Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined uptake as the student's reactive move that immediately follows the teacher's feedback. Moreover, according to them, uptake has been regarded as an indicator of the effectiveness of feedback because they may serve as proof for the learner's noticing and incorporation of the provided feedback. In addition, Swain (1995) put that uptake constitutes a type of 'pushed-output' through which learners are likely engaged in metalinguistic reflection, hypothesis testing, and active rehearsal of recently or previously acquired linguistic items.

Uptake can involve 'repair' or 'no repair' depending on whether the learner successfully corrects his/her original error. In line with that, Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished two broad types of uptake: (1) 'repair' as the correct response of the learner when his/her utterance successfully repairs the initial problem, and (2) 'needs repair' as the incorrect response of learner which fails to successfully repair the initial utterance.

Sheen (2004) in Ellis (2008) showed that both uptake and repair vary according to setting. They occur more frequently in contexts where learners are oriented to language as an object (such as adult EFL learners) than in contexts where the interlocutors are predominantly concerned with content (such as immersion classrooms). One reason for this appears to be that in classrooms where there is a strong focus on message content, teachers often do not allow time for students to uptake their recast, preferring instead to continue with topic development.

Moreover, learner uptake of feedback is also more likely in a teacher-fronted lesson than in a pair work situation because many of the recasts in the pair work situation consist of confirmation requests where the appropriate response is simply 'yes' or 'no' (Oliver, 2000 in Ellis, 2008). Hence, the extent to which uptake with repair occurs depends to a large extent on the instructional or social context of the interaction.

In addition, repaired uptake indicates that noticing has taken place. When learners' original errors have been self-corrected through incorporating the target forms from the recast, it means that learners have noticed those forms at one level or another. However failure to repair the original errors cannot be taken as evidence of a failure to notice the target forms.

Bilingual Education for Young Children

Ellis (2008) defines bilingualism as the use of two languages by an individual or speech community. Bilingual education, according to Richards et al. (1992), refers to the use of a second or foreign language in school for the teaching of content subjects. In Indonesia, institution which offers bilingual education program for young children is now mushrooming. Parents are likely to send their children to a preschool or kindergarten which use Bahasa Indonesia as well as English for conducting teaching-learning activity or in teaching content subjects. Cummins (2000) states from data of four other experts that there is a tendency of the bilingual program students obtained better achievements than those in monolingual program. In Indonesian context as multilingual society, where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL), such bilingual program has become significant breakthrough, encouraging the use of English in non-English subjects.

In spite of the significant breakthrough that bilingual education program brings, there

has been not much research on the occurrence of feedback and uptake in this context, particularly in a young children bilingual classroom. Furthermore, the pattern of feedback and uptake of young children aged from 5 to 6 will also be different from children older than 6 and even adult. Hence, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback in young children bilingual classroom?
2. What is the uptake rate of each type of feedback and the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and learner uptake?

METHODOLOGY

Instructional Context

This study was conducted in Satya Wacana Children Centre in Salatiga, Central Java Indonesia. It is a bilingual-kindergarten school which uses *Bahasa* Indonesia and English as the medium of instruction. The students were very young English learners aged from 2 to 6 years old. The teacher used English to teach and to give written and oral announcement. Satya Wacana Children Centre has 3 levels of class; *Twigs* (Pre-school aged 2-3 years old), *Buds* (Pre-school aged 3-4 years old), and *Blossoms* (Kindergarten aged 4-5 and 6 years old). This study was conducted in *Blossoms* class (Kindergarten) because the courses, such as *music, reading and writing, art and craft, drawing, science, mathematics,* and *social studies*, were taught in English. In addition, some extracurricular activities such as English Club were also conducted in English. Due to the time constraint, the observation only took place in *reading and writing* class and *English club* class.

Participants

The participants of this study were the students of *Blossoms* class in Satya Wacana Children Centre. The participants' ages ranged from 5 to 6 years old. The total number of participants was 13 students. The teacher participants were two female non-native English speakers (Indonesian). Ms. A (a pseudonym) was the first teacher participant and Ms. B (a pseudonym) was the second one. Ms. A had taught for six years and Ms. B had taught for one year in Satya Wacana Children Centre. Both of them graduated from English Department. The teacher participants were informed that the study would examine aspects of classroom interactions but not that the specific focus was on corrective feedback and uptake.

Procedure

The data for this research was obtained through observation in *Blossoms* class, particularly when the students were having *reading and writing* lesson and also *English Club.* Altogether 100 minutes of lessons were observed and recorded by using a digital audio-recorder. The researcher was present during the observation as a non-participant observer. Moreover, the researcher as a non-participant observer kept field notes to report any noteworthy instances during the recording. After the observation done, the recorded data was transcribed and coded and presented the results. Moreover, the data were elaborated based on the researcher's interpretation and related to the literature review. All in all, a conclusion was drawn toward the study that has been done.

Coding

The coding scheme of this study was based on Lyster and Ranta's (1997) error treatment sequence, which starts with a learner utterance containing at least one error. The learner error was followed either by teacher's corrective feedback or topic continuation. If feedback was provided then it was either followed by learner uptake or topic continuation. If there was uptake, then the learner's initial error was either repaired or

still needed to be repaired. Below was the table of the coding scheme.

Table 1. Coding Scheme for Error Treatment Sequence

Sequences	Categories
1. Learner Errors	Grammar
	Lexical
	Phonological
2. Teacher Feedback	No feedback
	Recast
	Clarification request
	Explicit correction
	Metalinguistic feedback
	Elicitation
	Repetition
3. Learner Uptake	No uptake
	Uptake: repair/need repair

All student turns were coded as either having an error or not. Short turns with little or no potential for error were excluded, such as *yes*, *no*, *thank you*, *please*, *ok*, and so on. Error turns were classified as phonological, lexical, or grammatical. Below is a description of error types based on Lyster's scheme (1998) with examples from the database of the present study.

1. *Grammatical errors* were errors in tense, verb morphology, auxiliaries, pluralization, question formation, word order, subject/verb agreement, and the use of closed classes such as preposition, pronouns, and determiners.

Example 1

S (Student): I want sleep on Thursday. (grammatical error)

T (Teacher): I want sleep?

S: Eh eh …, I want to sleep on Thursday.

2. *Lexical errors* were inaccurate and inappropriate choices of lexical items in open classes such as nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives.

Example 2

S: Miss, my ruler is high, Jeje's pencil is short. (lexical error)

T: Your ruler is longer than Jeje's pencil.

S: Iyes.

3. *Phonological errors* were mispronunciation in reading aloud or spontaneous conversations.

Example 3

S: I want to bate (phonological error)

T: bathe.

S: bathe.

All teacher turns within an error treatment sequence were classified as one of the following six corrective feedbacks moves: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. The six types of feedback are exemplified below.

1. *Recast* was reformulation of all or part of a learner's erroneous utterance without changing its original meaning.

Example 4

S: Miss, color the wes black or brown?

T: vest. (recast)

S: color the vest black or brown?

2. *Explicit correction* was the provision of the correct form with a clear indication of what was being corrected.

Example 5

S: Whose has red pencil?

T: Not, 'whose has' but 'who have red pencil?'.

S: Who have red pencil?

3. *Elicitation* was techniques to elicit the correct form from the students without providing the correct form such as 1) 'elicit completion' moves ('It is a …'), 2) elicitative question ('How do we say X in English?'), or 3) reformulation request ('Can you say it another way?')

Example 6

S: I want play monopoly.

T: I want ….. (elicitation)

S: to play

4. *Metalinguistic feedback* was metalinguistic information regarding the student's erroneous utterance

Example 7

Since there was no example of metalinguistic feedback in the database of the present study, the example below was taken from the research article by Choi and Li (2012)

S: She has best friend and her friends pretended that they are gonna … have her friends.

T: Just be careful when you are telling a story that you keep to the same tense. (metalinguistic feedback)

5. *Clarification request* was a move that indicated to learners that their utterances were either not understood or were ill-formed such as 'Sorry?' or 'Pardon?'

Example 8

There was no example of clarification request in the database of the present study, and thus the example below was taken from the research article by Choi and Li (2012).

S: It's a red bird?

T: Sorry? (clarification request)

S: It's a red bird?

6. *Repetition* was a repetition of the student's erroneous utterance.

Example 9

S: I want to rid a car.

T: to rid? (repetition)

As in Lyster and Ranta (1997), multiple feedback moves were coded as follows:

- recast or explicit correction + metalinguistic feedback=explicit correction
- recast or explicit correction + elicitation = explicit correction
- metalinguistic feedback + elicitation = elicitation

Uptake is classified as follows:

1. *Repair* was uptake that leads to the correct reformulation of an error as response to feedback.

Example 10

S: Miss, the wes black.

T: the vest is black.

S: the vest is black.

2. *Needs repair* was uptake that does not entail the correct form.

Example 11

S: I want go to church on Sunday.

T: I want to go.

S: Iyes Miss.

3. *No uptake* was when the student did not provide any response to the teacher feedback and carry on topic continuation; these cases were coded as 'no uptake'.

Example 12

S: omos done Miss.

T: omos? Almost.

S: (silent)

RESULTS

Errors and Feedback

During the 100 minutes of lessons, student turns were produced both in English and Bahasa Indonesia. This study focused on student turns in English only. Totally 151 student turns were produced, out of which 54 contained error (36%). The errors were committed by all of the participants, though some of them were less talkative than others. In the Table 2 below, the average feedback rate (98%) can be seen.

Table 2. Errors and Feedback

Error Type	No. of Errors	No. of Feedback Moves	Rate of Feedback
Grammar	28 (52%)	27 (51%)	27/28 (96%)
Phonological	22 (41%)	22 (41%)	22/22 (100%)
Lexical	4 (7%)	4 (8%)	4/4 (100%)
Total	54 (100%)	53 (100%)	53/54 (98%)

Moreover, Table 2 also presents the number and percentage of student errors, feedback moves by error type, and the rate of feedback for each error type. Of the 54 total error turns, 28 (52%) error turns were related to grammar, 22 (41%) error turns were related to phonological, and 4 (7%) error turns were related to lexicon. Then, of the 53 (98%) total feedback moves, 27 (51%) feedback moves were provided for gram

matical error, 22 (41%) feedback moves were provided for phonological error, and 4 (8%) feedback moves were provided for lexical error. Furthermore, the results related to the rate of feedback can also be seen in Table 2. It shows that both phonological and lexical errors always received feedback (100%) and grammatical error almost always received feedback (96%).

The reports of teachers' use of different types of feedback in response to the errors are presented in Table 3 below. Of the total 53 feedback moves, 29 (55%) were recast, 10 (19%) were explicit correction, 3 (5%) were elicitation, and 11 (21%) were repetition. Metalinguistic feedback and clarification were not used by the teacher to give any feedback towards children's errors.

Table 3. Distribution of Feedback Types

	Total (N=53)	**Percentage**
Recast	29	(55%)
Repetition	11	(21%)
Explicit correction	10	(19%)
Elicitation	3	(5%)
Metalinguistic feedback	0	(0%)
Clarification request	0	(0%)

To determine what type of feedback was provided to each type of error, the related data were cross-tabulated, and the results appear in Table 4. As shown, for the 27 grammatical errors, the teachers provided 9 recasts (33%), 5 explicit corrections (19%), 3 elicitations (11%), and 10 repetitions (37%). Of the 22 phonological errors, 19 received recasts (86%), and 3 received explicit corrections (14%). For the 4 lexical errors, 1 recast (25%), 2 explicit corrections

(50%), and 1 repetition (25%) were provided. Thus, teachers used more recasts for

phonological errors than for the other errors.

Table 4. Distribution of Errors Receiving Feedback (N=53) across Feedback Types and Error

	Grammatical (n=27)	**Phonological (n=22)**	**Lexical (n=4)**
Recast	9 (33%)	19 (86%)	1 (25 %)
Explicit correction	5 (19%)	3 (14%)	2 (50 %)
Elicitation	3 (11%)	0	0
Repetition	10 (37%)	0	1 (25 %)
Metalinguistic feedback	0	0	0
Clarification request	0	0	0

Uptake

The second research question consisted of two parts: the uptake rate of each type of feedback and the relationship between errors, feedback, and uptake. The relationship between feedback type and learner uptake/repair (which refers to successful uptake) can be seen in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Uptake and Repair Following Teacher Feedback

	Uptake		Repair	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Recast (n=39)	21	54%	18	46%
Explicit correction (n=10)	7	70%	5	50%
Elicitation (n=3)	3	100%	3	100%
Repetition (n=11)	11	100%	11	100%
Metalinguistic feedback (n=0)	0	0%	0	0%
Clarification request (n=0)	0	0%	0	0%
Total (N=53)	42	79%	37	70%

It can be seen that the highest uptake rate (100%) went to elicitation and repetition (although the number of cases for these two feedback types is small), followed by explicit correction (70%), and recast (54%). With respect to learner repairs, elicitation and repetition yielded the highest repair rate (100%), followed by explicit correction (50%), and recast (46%).

The rate of uptake and feedback after different error types are presented in the Table 6 below.

Table 6. Uptake and Repair after Feedback for Different Error Types

Error (N=54)								
Feedback	Grammatical Error (n=28)		Phonological Error (n=22)		Lexical Error (n=4)		Total Repair	
	Uptake/ Provided	Repaired	Uptake/ Provided	Repaired	Uptake/ Provided	Repaired		
Recast (n=29)	5/9 (56%)	5 (56%)	15/19 (79%)	13 (68%)	1/1 (100%)	0	18 (62%)	
Repetition (n=11)	10/10 (100%)	10 (100%)	0	0	1/1 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (100%)	
Explicit correction (n=10)	4/5 (80%)	3 (60%)	2/3 (67%)	2 (67%)	1/2 (50%)	0	5 (50%)	
Elicitation (n=3)	3/3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0	0	0	0	3 (100%)	
Metalinguistic feedback (n=0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Clarification request (n=0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total feedback (N=53)	22/27 (81%)	21/27 (78%)	17/22 (77%)	15/22 (68%)	3/4 (75%)	1/4 (25%)	37 (70%)	

Error Type	Uptake/Feedback (n)	Uptake Rate	Repair/Feedback (n)	Repair Rate
Grammatical	22/27	81%	21/27	78%
Phonological	17/22	77%	15/22	68%
Lexical	3/4	75%	1/4	25%

Table 6 shows that 77% of phonological feedback resulted in uptake and 68% in repairs; 75% of lexical feedback led to uptake and 25% to repairs; 81% of grammatical feedback was followed by uptake and 78% was followed by repair.

The results for the second research question which asked about the relationship between error type, feedback type, and learner uptake are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Relationship between Errors, Feedback, Uptake/Repair

In terms of the relationship between error type and uptake/repair, grammatical error, the most frequent error type, received feedback (27/28, 96%) almost always and resulted in the highest uptake rate (81%) and repair rate (78%). Phonological errors, the second most frequent error type, received the teachers' feedback in all of (22/22, 100%) cases where they were committed; about 77% of the feedback was taken up and 68% of feedback led to repairs. Lexical errors were the least frequent error type, received feedback (4/4, 100%) always, invited uptake in 75% and repairs in 25% only of the cases where feedback was provided.

From the perspective of feedback, recast were the most frequent feedback type and led to a relatively high uptake rate (56%, and 79%, for grammatical errors and pho

nological errors respectively) and repair rate (56% and 68% for grammatical errors and phonological errors respectively). Then, recast led to the highest uptake rate for lexical errors (100%) but not for repair rate (0%). Repetition was the second most frequent feedback type and led to the highest uptake and repair rate for grammatical errors (100% and 100% respectively) and for lexical errors (100% and 100% respectively). The third most frequent feedback type was explicit correction and led to a relatively high uptake rate (80% and 67% for grammatical errors and phonological errors respectively) and repair rate (60% and 67% for grammatical and phonological errors respectively). Elicitation was less frequent (3) but led to the most uptake and repair for grammatical errors (100% and 100% respectively). Elicitation did not lead to any uptake and repair rate for both phonological and lexical errors.

DISCUSSION

Feedback

The first research question concerns the relationship between error type and feedback type in young children bilingual classroom. It was found that grammatical errors were the most frequent and almost always received feedback (96%). Phonological errors were the second most frequent error and always receive feedback (100%). Lexical errors were the least frequent errors but always received feedback (100%). All errors tended to invite recast and explicit correction.

Actually, all of the errors received feedback from the teachers, even though one grammatical error did not receive any feedback. The size of the class, which was not too big, provided opportunities for the teachers to pay attention well to every kid's turns. Yet, one grammatical error was missed from the teacher's attention because the teacher was busy taking the worksheet at that time so that she didn't notice that error. It seems that in an unfocused event, error did not receive any feedback. Thus, it was in accordance with what Choi and Li (2012) put that whether an error received feedback or not was also constrained by whether it occurred in a focused or unfocused event (or task). Furthermore, one of the lessons observed in this study had linguistic focus so that the teacher paid attention to the children's turns or children's turns were monitored in the focused event. However, in child classes, even when a lesson has a linguistic focus, there may be many unfocused events as children's talk can go a bit wild. Then, during the unfocused events, children were mostly using Bahasa Indonesia and the teacher did not give any feedback to their Indonesian turns. Since this study focused only on children's turns which was in English, therefore their Indonesian turns were not counted.

In this young children bilingual class, the teachers almost always paid attention on the children's turns. Grammatical errors (52%) as the most frequent errors occurred in the lessons observed invited 27 (96%) feedbacks which consisted of 9 (33%) recasts, 5 (19%) explicit corrections, and 13 (48%) prompts. Thus teachers tended to give prompts toward grammatical errors. Moreover, those prompts consisted of 3 (11%) elicitations and 10 (37%) repetitions. It can be seen that repetitions were the majority of feedback provided for grammatical errors. As what has been discussed before that one of the lessons observed had linguistic focus in which the children learnt about days and what they want to do on the certain day by using expression "*I want to* _____ *on*_____." Below is the example illustration.

Example 13
T: What do you want to do on Sunday Marcell?
S: I want read a book on Sunday.
T: I want read?
S: Emm…, I want to read a book.

In that scenario the grammatical error occurred when the student missed *to* after *want*. Knowing that error, the teacher gave feedback in the form of repetition. The teacher gave prompt by repeating the student's erroneous utterance. Regarding to what Ellis et al. (2002) put that online negative feedback is one of many form-focusing strategies and other remedial options are available to prevent fossilized errors. Then, I interpreted that the teacher tended to give repetition feedback for grammatical error because the teacher wanted to build or to raise the students' awareness on specific properties of L2. In other words by repeating the children erroneous utterances, it could make them realize their mistake and then gave them prompt to repair that erroneous utterance.

Phonological errors as the second most frequent errors invited 22 (100%) feedbacks comprised 19 (86%) recasts and 3 (14%) explicit corrections. There was no prompt given for phonological errors. The majority feedback for phonological error was recast. Teacher tended to directly give the reformulation of all or part of a learner's erroneous utterance without changing its original meaning. According to Loewen and Philip (2006) recast is time-saving, less threatening to students' confidence, and less disruptive to the flow of interaction in comparison with other types of feedback. Furthermore Lyster (2004) also contended that recast in communicative classroom are used not only as 'corrective moves' but also as 'supportive, scaffolding help' that serves to move the lesson ahead when the target forms are not available in the students' current production ability. In this study, children's production abilities particularly their pronunciations of certain or new words were still inadequate and then it directed the teachers to give recasts as feedbacks in order to provide the assistance for the children to be able to pronounce word fluently so that it would not consume the time, would not threaten the children's confi dence, and would not interrupt the flow of interaction in the class. Thus, in this present study, the occurrence of phonological errors which was mostly treated with recasts reflects Lyster' argument (2004) which is in accordance to Loewen and Philip (2006).

The least errors were lexical errors which invited 4 (8%) feedbacks. Feedbacks given for lexical error were 1 (25%) recast, 2 (50%) explicit corrections, and 1 (25%) repetition. For lexical errors, the teacher provided explicit correction more than any other types of feedback. Example 14 below illustrates the feedback given for children's lexical error.

Example 14
S: Miss, my ruler is high. Jeje's ruler is short.
T: Not high, Vino, not 'my ruler is high' but 'my ruler is long".

From the Example 14 above, it can be seen that the teacher provided the correct form with a clear indication of what was being corrected. The tendency of choosing explicit correction for lexical errors in this present study might be caused by two factors: the instructional context and the children's age. First, this study was conducted in a bilingual school uses Bahasa Indonesia and English particularly in the class which lesson was more language-oriented. Therefore, the teacher's tendency to use explicit correction was the way to draw children's attention to linguistic forms. By giving explicit correction, teacher helped the children to understand that the suitable adjective for ruler was not *high* but *long*. Second, the children age in this study ranged from 5 to 6 years old. Thus, the participants of this study were considered as very young learners whose collection of lexis were still limited and they were still in the process of learning. Because of that, providing explicit correction which made the explanation clear could help those young learners to understand, to take it into their brains, and to remember it.

Overall, recast was the most frequent feedback among all (55%) in this study. The finding that recast was the most frequent feedback type was also obtained in previous study (Lyster and Ranta, 1998; Choi and Li, 2012). The second most frequent feedback in this study was repetition (21%). It was different from the previous study conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which only found 5% repetition. Even in Choi and Li's study (2012), repetition was not found. Moreover, there was 19% explicit correction found in this present study which was higher than previous study conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Explicit correction in Lyster and Ranta' study (1997) was only 7%. Yet, in Choi and Li (2012), explicit correction was the second most frequent feedback (27%) and it was higher than the present study. Furthermore, striking difference between this present study and other previous studies is on the absence of metalinguistic feedback and clarification request. The absence of metalinguistic feedback and clarification request found in this study might be caused by participants' age which is much younger than the participants in other studies and the duration of the lesson which is quite short. Metalinguistic feedbacks were not used by teachers to provide feedback because young learners' metalinguistic information still limited. Then, since the duration of the lesson is short, clarification request seemed to be avoided because it would be time-consuming and disruptive the flow of the interaction in the class. Hence, the pattern of feedback of young children aged from 5 to 6 is different from children older than 6 and even adult. Table 8 below present the difference of the pattern of feedback given to young children aged from 5 to 6, children older than 6, and adult.

Table 8. Feedback in Different Studies

Types of Feedback	**Present Study**	**Lyster and Ranta**	**Choi and Li**
Recast	55%	55%	58%
Elicitation	5%	14%	8%
Clarification request	0	11%	3%
Metalinguistic feedback	0	8%	4%
Explicit correction	19%	7%	21%
Repetition	21%	5%	0

Uptake

The second research question of this study is asking about the uptake rate of each type of feedback and the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and learner uptake. The uptake rate was 54% for recast, 70% for explicit correction, 100% for elicitation, and 100% for repetition. There was no metalinguistic feedback and clarification request found in the data base. Elicitation and repetition led to a high uptake rate in this study.

The high uptake rate of elicitation was not a surprise since it also occurred in other studies (Lyster and Ranta, 1997 and Choi and Li, 2012). In this study, repetition also led to a high uptake rate and its repair rate was high too (100%). The high uptake rate of repetition indicated that children realized their errors and then it lead to their attempted to repair it. Consequently, the high repair rate indicated that the children realized their errors and then understood what part should be corrected as well as understood the correct form that should be produced. Thus, it seemed that when the children successfully repair their errors meant that they

realized understood or the errors and understood the correct form.

The uptake rate for explicit correction in this study was 70% which was more or less similar with the finding in Choi and Li's (2012) study (80%). Yet, explicit correction in this study led to a bit low repair rate (50%) compared to previous study conducted by Choi and Li (2012). This occurred because when the teacher provided the correct form with a clear indication of what is being corrected, the children thought that their 'job' to repair had already done by the teacher so that they only responded with "*iyes, ohya, etc*" (uptake which needs repair) or even silent (no uptake) and then continued the topic discussed in the class.

What stood out in this finding was that recast led to a low uptake rate (54%) compare to other types of feedback in this study. Based on the interpretation and observation, the uptake rate for recast was low compare to others; because the children thought that their 'job' to response or to repair their grammatical and lexical errors was already done by the teacher since the teacher already provide the reformulation. However, in the case of phonological error, the uptake rate for recast was quite high (79%) and it lead to the 68% repair rate. Related to this case, there was a noteworthy tendency regarding to the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and uptake that phonological errors primarily invited recast and resulted in a high uptake rate irrespective of feedback types, even after recasts (Choi and Li, 2012). The repair rate of recast for phonological error is quite high (68%) because the children tended to repeat the correct pronunciation provided by the teacher as their nature which is imitating. Furthermore, the uptake rate of recast in lexical error was high (100%) since the error was only one. Yet, the repair rate was 0 because the response is not the correct reformulation but only '*iyess*'.

The finding of this study shows different pattern of uptake of young children aged from 5 to 6 is different from children older than 6 and even adult. The differences were caused by two factors; the characteristics of the participants and the context. The higher uptake rate in this study is perhaps the context in this study was more form-focused and thus the students were more sensitive and receptive to feedback. Table 9 below shows the difference of uptake and repair rates in different studies.

Table 9. Uptake and Repair Rates in Different Studies

	Elicitation		Repetition		Explicit correction		Recast	
	Uptake rate	Repair rate	Uptake rate	Repair rate	Uptake rate	Repair rate	Uptake rate	Repair rate
Present study	100%	100%	100%	100%	70%	50%	54%	46%
Lyster and Ranta	100%	43%	78%	31%	50%	36%	55%	18%
Choi and Li	100%	83%	0	0	80%	69%	59%	52%

CONCLUSION

This study found that repetition was the majority feedback for grammatical errors. In providing feedback for phonological

errors, the teachers tended to give recasts. Then, explicit correction was the most frequent feedback for lexical errors. The finding related to the uptake rate of each type of feedback shows that elicitation and repetition led to the highest uptake rate and then followed by explicit correction and recast. Even though the overall uptake rate of recast was low compare to other types of feedback, in the case of phonological errors the uptake rate of recast was quite high. By investigating the relationship between learner errors, feedback, and learner uptake, it provided an integrated picture about construct under investigation.

Furthermore, this study which attempted to investigate the corrective feedback and learner uptake in a young children bilingual classroom obtained somewhat different results from previous studies (Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Choi and Li, 2012). The pattern of feedback and uptake in this study was somewhat different from the previous studies. The differences were due to the distinctive characteristics of the context and participants.

It could not be denied that there were weaknesses in this study. First, the duration of the observation was too short so that the data base obtained from the observation was not sufficient enough even reliable enough because the data for lexical errors for example was only a few. Second, the observation was not followed up with such interview to the teachers in order to ask their comments toward their choice of feedbacks in certain episode of the recorded lessons. Third, this study did not consider the role of individual differences in the occurrence of errors and provision of feedback.

It is not clear whether certain ethnic and linguistic backgrounds were more likely to produce certain errors or whether the teacher varied the type and amount of feedback in accordance with the learners' personal traits or dispositions. Thus, my suggestions for the further research related with this topic was that the further research could investigate the corrective feedback and learner uptake in a young children bilingual classroom by observing and recording the lesson in sufficient duration complete with follow up interview toward the teachers comments on their choice of feedbacks and also by considering the role of individual differences so that the results and the finding will be more holistic and reliable.

REFERENCES

Choi, S. Y., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in a child ESOL Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 43:331.

Cummins, Jim. (2000). [Online] *Educational research in bilingual education.*

Available: http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/ educationalresearch.html

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., &Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System* 30:419-432.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2010). A Framework for Investigating Oral and Written Corrective Feedback. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32:335-349.

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Loewen, S., Philip, J. (2006). Recast in adult English L2 classroom: characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal* 90(4):536-556.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recast, explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in

immersion classrooms. *Language Learning* 48(2):183-218.

Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recast, explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning* 51(supplement 1): 265-301.

Lyster, R. (2004) Differential effects on prompts and recast in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28:269-432

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32:265-302.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the Relationship between Characteristics of Recast and Learner Uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10:361.

Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Adult ESL Classrooms. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, Vol.4, No. 2.

Swain, M. (1995) Three functions of output in second language learning. In: Cook G, Seidlhofer B (eds) *Principles & Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125-144.

Richards, Jack C., John Platt and Heidi Platt. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.

Tsang, W. K. (2004). Feedback and Uptake in Teacher-Student Interaction: An analysis of 18 English Lessons in Hong Kong Secondary Classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 35:187.