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Abstract

Grammar is a crucial element and it is very helpful for effective language learning processes. Learners of foreign languages face difficulties in acquiring such grammatical features of that language. The present study aims at investigating the effect of explicit vs. implicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of the irregular past tense among second year LMD students at the department of English at Chadli Ben Jdid University, El Taref. In order to examine the research hypothesis that written explicit corrective feedback has a positive impact on learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense in comparison to the implicit corrective feedback, and the alternative hypothesis that the implicit written corrective feedback has a positive effect on the acquisition of the irregular past tense, a quasi-experiment was conducted for learners besides a questionnaire was administered to teachers. The quasi-experiment requires a pre-test, treatment period, and a post-test. The final results suggest that the independent variable (explicit corrective feedback) has a significant impact on the dependent variable (the irregular past tense) more than the implicit one. Because the positive effect of ECF, teachers need to use this type of feedback for students to help them acquire the grammatical features easily.
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General Introduction

1. Statement of the problem

Learning a foreign language is a process, in which the learner adopts the various substances, structures and skills of that specific language. Writing is “an intricate and complex task, it is the most difficult of the language abilities to acquire.”(Allen & Corder, 1974, p. 177). Unlike the speaking skill that can be acquired either inside or outside the classroom, writing is necessarily acquired inside the educational settings. Undoubtedly, EFL learners will find problems and make errors while using the different grammatical aspects to produce written compositions. Especially, those are committed on the use of English tenses. Consequently, the occurrence of such errors will be an obstacle to the mastering of English grammar. Thus, this kind of errors must be well identified and treated rapidly.

EFL learners from the department of English at Chadli Ben Jdid University are facing difficulties in using the English tenses, specifically the irregular past simple tense. The difficulty may be related to: first, the nature of the verb itself, unlike the regular verbs whose their past simple is constructed by adding “ed” to the infinity of the verb; the irregular ones has no exact grammatical rule to be followed. Second, the techniques of teaching and correcting such verbs which have been used are hypothetically not effective.

There has been a disagreement among researchers about the impact of feedback, and which type of written Corrective Feedback is more effective in enhancing the acquisition of English grammar. Many researchers agreed that the explicit written corrective feedback has a positive impact on learners’ grammatical performance (Leeman, 2003; Bitchner, 2005; Russel & Spada, 2006). Other field workers, found that
implicit corrective feedback has a positive influence more than the explicit one (Ashwell, 2000; Ellis, 2006; Ferris and Robert, 2001; Sampson, 2012). However, (Kepner, 1991; Truscott, 1996, 2004; Fazio, 2001) did not find a relevant difference between those who do and do not receive written corrective feedback. Therefore, this research will be carried out to investigate which type of corrective feedback (implicit or explicit) has more effectiveness on the acquisition of English irregular past tense for EFL second year LMD students at Chadli Ben Jdid University, El Taref.

2. Research Question and Hypotheses

2.1. Research Question

The present investigation tackles the following question:

• Which type of written corrective feedback is more effective for EFL learners to gain English irregular past tense accuracy?

2.2. Research Hypotheses

On the basis of the aforementioned questions, it is predicted that:

The Research Hypothesis:

• Compared to implicit feedback, explicit feedback is more likely to have a positive influence on improving learners’ acquisition of English irregular past tense.

The Alternative Hypothesis:

• Compared to explicit feedback, implicit feedback is more likely to have a positive influence on improving learners’ acquisition of English irregular past tense.

The Null hypothesis:

• Both explicit and implicit corrective feedback would have no effect on learners’ acquisition of English irregular past tense.
3. Aim of the Study

In this study, our first purpose is to gain a better understanding about the importance of corrective feedback for students’ writing skills. It seeks also to investigate the possible correlation between EFL teachers ‘written corrective feedback types (explicit & implicit) and learners’ acquisition of irregular tense. In other words, to ascertain which kind of corrective feedback is more beneficial to enhance the use of correct irregular past tense.

4. Methodology

4.1. Population and setting

The study addresses the second year LMD students in the department of English at Chadli Ben Jdid University, for the academic year 2014-2015. The targeted Population consists of 130 students.

4.2. Sampling

The Selection of Participants:

• Selection of Students

A sample consists of an experimental group and a control group. Participants in the groups will be randomly chosen to take part in the investigation.

• Selection of teachers

In this study, EFL teachers of grammar, teachers that taught grammar before, and those who seek to teach grammar in the future, are handed a written questionnaire which aims to ask their attitudes, opinions and feelings towards the role of corrective
feedback, and the favorable types or manners they use to correct students’ errors in relation to the irregular past tense.

4.3. Data gathering instruments

Because the study seeks to investigate the relation between written corrective feedback types and the irregular past tense achievement in writing skill, it seems that the experimental study is the suitable methodology to be used. Like other quantitative studies, the data are going to be collected through a series of tests; the pretest, the treatment and the posttest. Students in both groups receive 3 hours of grammar per week. During the treatment period, which is going to be approximately 8 weeks, each group will be exposed to a number of activities and written tasks; to be corrected and handed back to students each according to the CF he/she received. Besides, a questionnaire will be administered to teachers as a second tool, to see the extent to which the results are consistent or contradictory.

5. The Structure of the Thesis

The research will be divided into two main chapters: the first main chapter addresses different methods and approaches related to teaching EFL grammar, and then moves to discuss the concept of Corrective Feedback, its types, and its significance to the process of language learning. Also, it tackles some studies and empirical frame works related to the topic.

The second chapter will be devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the findings. It begins with addressing the analytical procedures, the population, the sample, and then it ends up with a discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER ONE: THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

Section one: The Importance of Grammar Teaching in FL

Approaches and Methods of Teaching

1.1. Grammar Translation Method
1.2. The Audio-lingual Method
1.3. Communicative Language Teaching

Section two: Corrective Feedback

2.1. Definition of Corrective Feedback
2.2. Types of Written Corrective Feedback
   2.2.1. Direct (Explicit) CF
   2.2.2. Indirect (Implicit) CF
   2.2.3. Metalinguistic CF
   2.2.4. Focused and Unfocused CF
   2.2.5. Electronic CF
   2.2.6. Reformulation CF
2.3. On the Role of Corrective Feedback in L2 Instructions
   2.3.1. Behaviorism Theory
   2.3.2. Nativism Theory
2.3.3. Interactional Theory

Section three: Literature Review

3.1. Proponents vs. Opponents of using CF in ESL/EFL Classes

3.2. Empirical Frame Works on the Effectiveness of Explicit vs. Implicit WCF

Conclusion
Introduction

Error correction, or more specifically written corrective feedback (WCF), is a crossroads in which many different interests conflict as Ellis (2010) stated “The study of oral and written corrective feedback constitutes an area where theory and practice interface” (p. 336). While providing grammatical CF may not be a favorite job for EFL teachers, most of them spend a long time responding to learners’ errors in hopes of motivating and helping them to write more accurately. Enginarlar (1993) stated that providing CF about errors committed by learners is considered as one of the teachers’ most difficult tasks.

Interestingly, this chapter shed light on CF and specifically WCF in SLA/FLA. Also, it describes the importance of grammar in SL/FL teaching methods and approaches. It ends by mentioning some empirical frame works in relation to the topic.

- The Importance of Grammar in ESL/EFL Teaching Approaches and Methods

Teaching grammar has been regarded as a basic part in foreign languages teaching/learning Processes, since it is, first considered as the glue that holds the language together to represent the external shape of language and permit learners to use it. Therefore, there are numerous language methods and approaches which appreciate the crucial rule of grammar and focus on the grammatical explicit teaching as a prior practice. These methods and approaches are going to be our focus in this section.
• Grammar Translation Method

In the context of EFL, teaching grammar has traditionally been dominated by the Grammar Translation method. It is one of the earliest methods of teaching foreign languages, which dominated in Europe from 1840s to 1940s. In such method learners are required to learn about grammar and vocabulary of the target language. In addition, it assumes that mastering a language depends on mastering its grammar (Krashen, 1982). In other words, grammar is treated as a vital aspect for learning; that is why it should be taught at the very beginning till the advanced levels of the learning process as explained by (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). In GTM, the case of grammar is deductively taught; the rules are presented and studied, learners are asked to memorize these rules, and then asked to apply them on practical examples that are given. Another topical and irreplaceable characteristic within this method is that translation is of a great value; L2 sentences and patterns are frequently translated into L1 and the opposite. Undoubtedly, errors took a considerable status and consequently detected immediately and explicitly by the teacher, guiding and re-directing students to the right answer is a very important goal for GTM.

• The Audio Lingual Method

It is a style of teaching used in teaching FL based on the behaviorist theory, and which emerged by the mid-fifties after the second world war. Like the direct method, the Audio Lingual method advised that students should be taught the language directly without using students’ native language to explain new vocabulary or grammar rather it is more beneficial to use the target language directly. However, when teaching vocabulary was the main concern of the direct method, communication and drilled grammar were the focus of the Audio Lingual teachers. It aims at developing the
Aural/oral skills through practicing and drilling language (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 53). Charles Fries believed that learning grammar was the starting point for the students to learn a second or a foreign language. Unlike GTM, the Audio Lingual method used the inductive approach to teach grammar; in which learners are exposed to a given material or examples, and asked to induce grammatical rules to be explained later on. Since the method holds the belief that learning is a habit formation; mistakes or wrong patterns are forbidden in order to build their habit on correct information rather than incorrect ones. (ibid. p. 58)

- **Communicative Language Teaching**

CLT emerged in the 1970s and early 1980s in Europe and the United States as a result of many disparate developments in these areas. It was first a theory of language as communication, which seeks to develop the communicative competence of learner i.e., the ability to use language in speech community (Richards and Rodgers, 1986. P, 70). Nevertheless, this approach appreciates the value of grammar and never neglected its role in communication. Then, learners should have a grammatical background that is needed for the sake of improving their communicative competence. Moreover, CLT consider errors as a crucial step that each learner should pass through to achieve a healthy and correct communication form. Richards (2006) stated “Be tolerant of learners’ errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his/her communicative competence” (p. 13). According to Richards, it is not shame learners make errors because errors are a normal part in the process of building a communicative competence.
Corrective Feedback

Definition of CF

Written corrective feedback is clearly crucial to students’ growth as writers, and it is one of the fundamental components of ESL/EFL writing. The term corrective feedback is defined differently by many linguists and researchers:

Before the emergence of the concept CF as a well known academic term, Chaudron (1988) introduced the term “Error Treatment”, which is defined as “Any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of errors” (Tatawy, 2006). In other words, error correction or what is called CF is explained to be the teacher reaction that follows errors produced by learners, this reaction aims to inform learners about the nature of errors exist in their oral or written performance, this what Chaudron refers as “teacher behavior”.

Harmer (2001) stated another definition to the concept, which is different in the term of goals, and it is more detailed in comparison to the one stated by Chaudron.

Harmer defines CF as:

Feedback encompasses not only correcting students, but also offering them an assessment of how well they have done [...] the way we assess and correct students will not depend only upon the kind of mistakes being made(and the reasons for them), but also on the type of activity the student are taking part in. (p. 99)

In Harmer’s perspective, feedback is not always negative evidence rather its ultimate purpose is to encourage and reinforce learners to do their best by inform them positively
how perfect they do in terms of evaluation. Moreover, Harmer indicates that when correcting or giving feedback to students, teachers should not just rely on the erroneous utterances and mistakes produced, but also the type of activities students are emerged in. The same issue (to provide positive CF) discussed in (Hall and Flynn, 2006) “Feedback should be corrective in nature; that is should provide students information on what they are doing correctly” (p. 7).

Lightbown and Spada (2006) defined CF as:

Any indication to learner that his /her use of the target language is incorrect; this includes various responses that the learner may receive. When a second language learner says “He go to school every day” corrective feedback can be explicit, for example “ no, you should say goes, not go”, or implicit “yes, he goes to school”, and may or may not include metalinguistic information for example do not forget to make the verb agree with the subject (p. 197).

For Lightbown and Spada CF is a process of demonstrating and highlighting learners’ performance that contains errors, transferring correct information instead of the incorrect ones produced by the learners, and giving corrections in terms of explicit or implicit CF or even by including explanation or advices about those errors as it is mentioned in the definition.

Ellis (2007) by his turn views CF as a strategy of responding learners’ utterances that include a linguistic error .i.e. CF is any reactive behavior from the teacher to the learners’ committed errors, and this response may be explicit, implicit or even metalinguistic information.
After reading, understanding, and analyzing the aforementioned definitions of the concept CF stated by different linguists and specialists in the domain of Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition, the current study researcher would modestly summarizes and gives his own perspective and definition to the term CF as following “CF takes the form of any responsive information regarding a linguistic error made learners, this reaction aims at aiding learners acquiring the different aspects of a language correctly”.

### 2.2. Types of Written Corrective Feedback

Providing CF in L2 classes is a hard task for any teacher and especially SL/FL teachers, this difficulty goes back to many factors; pedagogical ones like time constraints that governs the educational schedule, and even physical factors that affects teachers in a harmful way; since keeping each time correcting all the learners’ errors will results in consuming a lot of energy for teachers. Thus, teachers should select the appropriate type of CF that serves firstly the academic goals like the course objectives, the type of the task, and at the same time goes in harmony with the aforementioned conditions.

Many researchers have adopted various categorization of CF but most of them employed a combination of six types which were first proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997): recasts, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition.

Ellis (2009) by his turn proposed six main types that are somehow different than the ones mentioned by Lyster and Spada in 1997. Ellis classified CF as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>The teacher provides learners with the correct form in the place of the incorrect form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Categories of Written Corrective Feedback (adapted from Ellis 2009)

2.2.1. Direct (Explicit) CF:

Explicit CF which is one of our focuses in the study is a process of offering learners the correct form of the target language instead of the incorrect one. i.e., errors are crossed out and explicitly corrected. This explicit response is the most preferred type for beginners because they are not practiced enough and may not be able for self-correction. L2 learners of English could produce a sentence like:

- He wants to travel abroad.

The teacher may say:

- Yes, he wants to travel abroad.
Some field workers that explicit CF is more effective and beneficial for learners’ grammatical acquisition more than the other types. Ellis and Schmidt (2004) claim that this kind of CF gives the learner the direct and the exact location of the error beside the clear correction. However, others (Van Beuningen et al. (2012) argue that it decreases the opportunities to acquire the language, and it encourages the learner to become more dependent on his/her teacher by pushing them to be more independent and practice what is called “self-correction”.

2.2.2. Indirect (Implicit) CF:

Indirect CF includes the indication of learners’ errors without any kind of correction. This can be by underlying, highlighting or circling the erroneous utterances/items, or by noting without providing the exact location of the error. In this type specifically, the teacher may follow many correction strategies such as: code correction; there some symbols used by teachers to inform learners about the type of errors produced. As shown in this figure in (Hyland, 2003):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Incorrect spelling</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>Something has been left out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrong word order</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Something is not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Wrong tense</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Meaning is not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Concord (subject and verb do not agree)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The usage is not appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Punctuation is wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wf</td>
<td>Wrong form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/f</td>
<td>Singular or plural form wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Correction codes (adapted from Byrne 1988)
Proponents of implicit CF declare it to be an effective strategy. For instance, Ferris and Robert (2001) claimed that implicit CF in the case where the error is not located might be more effective than the direct indication; where the location of the error is shown, because this will encourage learners to engage in a deep processing for self-correction and self independence.

2.2.3. Metalinguistic CF:

The metalinguistic CF takes place when students are provided with explicit comments or explanations about errors they have done. These explanations can take the form of codes as shown in (table1) which can be placed in the margin or in the error location. For example the learner may say “she eated the cake” and the teacher corrects for him by saying we say: “she ate the cake, do not forget that the verb to eat is an irregular verb not regular, we do not add ‘ed’ to the irregular verbs”. According to Ellis, metalinguistic CF contains two types of comments: the first one is to provide correction codes in the margin of the text. The second one is numbering the errors in the text, and then giving explanations at the bottom of the paper.

2.2.4. Focused and Unfocused CF:

Focused and unfocused CF refer to the numbers and amounts of errors done by the learner in a written composition and targeted from the teacher explicitly or implicitly. Focused CF, by its name, is a strategy of selecting/focusing on specific kind of errors. For instance, in this study I focused on the errors related to the use of the irregular past tense since learners even at an advanced levels still face problems when dealing with this grammatical structure. However, unfocused CF is a strategy in which teachers identify all kinds of errors in the text without any specification. In this respect, Ellis argues that focused CF allows learners to concentrate just on one type of errors, and
help them each time to understand its nature not just raising their attention to it. It is true that unfocused CF is beneficial in the case of identifying errors as one block, but it might not be effective like the focused one because when teachers focus on correcting the same error for many times the student performance will be improved much better than treating each time all the errors.

2.2.5. Electronic CF:

Electronic CF is related to a very advanced level of technology in language teaching, because it needs the use of computer to correct written errors. In this type, the teacher is provided with software programs which him/her to give explanations and comments on learners’ written texts, and then these written productions are returned back to learners to check them and compare their use of language with the correct form. One among several studies that have investigated the positive results of electronic CF, is the one carried by Yoh and Lo’s (2009) in a Taiwanese college; in which they have chosen an experimental group to receive the electronic CF, and a control group to receive a traditional paper CF. At the end of the study, they found that the group who received electronic CF outperformed the control group and they conclude that this type of CF is effective in treating students’ errors. (Timothy, 2010).

2.2.6. Reformulation CF:

Reformulation has been defined by Cohen (1989) as following “Reformulation CF involves a native speaker who revises students’ texts in a way as to preserve as many of writers’ ideas as possible, while expressing them in his/her own words so as to make the piece of native-like”. In other words, this kind of CF is based on rewriting the L2 students’ texts by native speakers without modifying the tone and the meaning of the original texts, and then students correct their errors according to the native speakers’
corrections. Table 3 is adapted from Luchini and Roldan (2007, p.236), showing an original text and its reformulated version:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Reformulated Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was a beautiful spring day and the boys and girls still be in the camping. The sun was shining and the sky was blue. The teacher, Susan, wake the student up and they started the day.</td>
<td>It was a beautiful spring day. The sun was shining and the sky was blue. The children had spent an exciting night and they were enjoying the camp. Their teacher, Susan, had woken the children up and they started with the activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Example of Reformulation - (Luchini and Roldan, 2007)

2.3. On the Role of CF in L2 Instructions:

The role of written CF in the process of acquiring SL/FL has been a considerable controversy issue among theorists and linguists. Therefore, many views have been raised differently regarding the importance of CF as a pedagogical tool in L2 instructions, these views are stated as follow:

2.3.1. Behaviorism Theory

Behaviorism is a theory of language learning dominated in both psychology linguistics in 1950s. It is primarily concerned with observable and measurable aspects of human behavior. B.F. Skinner (1957) is perhaps the best known figure in the behavioral theory, who believed in habit formation as a vital practice to language learning. In this respect, the learning process is described as an activity of forming a stimulus-response-reward chain (feedback). In this theory, CF is of a great value; since it shapes the targeted knowledge that should be correctly formed i.e. when the response
(the answer) is correct learners are rewarded (positive reinforcement), and thus using this response again and soon to become a habit. However, when they use a wrong pattern in the new language, learners are provided with CF for the sake of not repeating the wrong pattern again. “Correct students’ errors immediately, use reinforcement, repetition and imitation till the student masters the problem” (Kartchava, 2013). Therefore, wrong patterns or errors committed by learners should be immediately treated using the appropriate feedback to help students to use a correct language.

2.3.2. The Nativist Theory

The Nativist linguistic theory holds that humans are biologically programmed to gain knowledge. The father of most nativist theories of language acquisition is Noam Chomsky (1959) who proposed that all humans have a language acquisition device (LAD); this latter contains the knowledge of any language grammar rules, and allows children to understand these rules in whatever language. In this theory, Chomsky (1975) as a nativist argues that CF has no impact or role in L2 acquisition, and the center idea that makes language acquisition possible is the Universal Grammar “The system of principles, conditions and rules that elements of properties of all human languages” (Tatawy, 2006).

In addition, Krashen (1981-1985) argues that L2 acquisition is ultimately determined by the comprehensible input i.e., SLA has no relation to explicit teaching or CF. Moreover, CF is not only unnecessary, but also harmful to language learning. Krashen (1985) “Humans acquire language in only one way by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input”. That is, students acquire language structures or competence by exposure to language that is both understandable and meaningful to them; this input goes just a little bit beyond their current knowledge, such in Krashen
demonstrative terminology (i+1), where the ‘i’ represents the language at the students’ current level of competence, and (i+1) refers to what the learner acquires.

In his noticing hypothesis, Schmidt claimed “Mistakes in foreign language are the result of either not knowing the rules, forgetting them, or not paying attention” (1995, p. 2). For Schmidt, a high value should be given to noticing and correction in language learning, because written errors correction may serve as a noticing facilitator that may raise awareness for L2 effective learning.

2.3.3. Interactional Theory

The interactionists hold a belief that language development is both biological and social, also that language learning is affected by the child’s desire to communicate with others. Proponents of this theory focus on Vygotsky’s model of collaborative learning “Collaborative learning is the idea that conversation with elder people can help children both cognitively and linguistically” (Schaffer, et al., 2002).

Micheal Long the first, who proposed the interactional theory, emphasized the importance of the explicit CF during the process of communication; because these corrections and modifications are of a vital role in learner-learner interaction or native speaker-learner interaction. In other words, if students are encouraged to use the language and learn the fact that it is permitted to make errors, they will be able to discover for themselves how to combine words and phrases to form full and correct dialogues.

- Literature Review
The importance of CF in SLA theories has devoted an increasing in the number of investigations and studied that examine the possible relation between feedback and L2/FL learning. In 1980, first researches started to be conducted regarding the aforementioned concern. Since the first researches, a heated debate on the notion of errors and CF has launched to become a controversial issue, and research in this area has a long history because of these reasons: 1) one of the main reasons is that both terms are peculiar and have been defined differently by researchers. 2) Another reason is that, findings in the researches concerning CF have been conflicting and even contradicting, mainly due to many factors like the types of writing and feedback provided, the widely varying of population, and the different research design used (Hyland, 2006).

3.1. Proponents vs. Opponents of Using CF in ESL/EFL Classes

An important early contribution was that of Truscott (1996), the main opponent of error correction, in which he argues that CF has no place in SLA and it is not only harmful or ineffective, but even counterproductive and should be abolished due to the following reasons: Research evidence shows it to be ineffective or helpful in any interesting sense. b) This lack of effectiveness has been proved by research findings. c) For both theoretical and reasons, grammar correction has significantly negative effects. Moreover, Truscott questioned learners’ willingness and ability to accept or to use the feedback in an effective way, and if so, he still doubts whether teachers are capable to provide feedback adequately and consistently. He argues that teachers when providing CF adopt a “Simplistic view of language learning as essentially the transfer of information from teacher to student” (Truscott, 1996, p. 342) instead of noticing that interlanguage development is a difficult and gradual process.

All in all, Truscott’s position regarding CF became more obvious especially after his claim in (2004) in which he assures that error correction imposes much more stress
on learners, thus discouraging them to engage in writing tasks. Moreover, CF can only be considered harmful, because it diverts time away and consume energy for both teachers and learners, instead of constructing more activities such as additional writing practices.

Three years later, Ferris started to stand against Truscott’s ideas in her article “The case of Grammar Correction in L2 classes: A Response to Truscott 1996” in which she appreciates the efficacy of teacher grammar correction in L2 writing classes “The issue of helping students to develop their writing is too important to be ruled on hastily. As teachers, we can only hope that we will continue to find answers and discover ways to respond more thoughtfully and effectively to our student writers’ needs” (p. 8). In other words, she argued that teachers should continue to provide grammar correction because it could be useful to improve the accuracy and overall writing of learners. Ferris (2002), to some extent agreed with Truscott’s assertions that are related to the researches evidences. In her opinion, results from prior researches have shown to be unrepresentative, because of the inadequate methodologies besides, the absence of a proper control group in most studies. Therefore, she argued that researches must be adequately designed before drawing any conclusions about the (in) effectiveness of CF in enhancing students’ writing.

Adopting a similar critical position, Guenete (2007) found that the inconsistency of findings reached in previous studies about the CF “Rather than evidence that feedback does not work” (p. 41) could be related to the ineffectiveness of either the methodologies adopted or the research design itself, as well as the existence of extraneous variables than those in the designs of different studies.

Lightbown and Spada (1990) studied the effects of corrective feedback and form focused instruction on SLA. The overall aim of the study was to examine relationships
between instruction, interaction which is the CF, and acquisition. The participants in this study (N=100) were all native speakers of French enrolled in five months intensive ESL courses. The findings suggested that language skills especially writing are best developed through meaning-based instruction in which form focused activities and corrective feedback are provided.

Lee (1997) has focused on investigating the reaction of EFL college students in Hong Kong, using multiple methods of data gathering collection, both qualitative and quantitative. He found a positive effect in the group of students whose errors were underlined, compared with the groups who received no corrective feedback or only marginal notes. Ashwell (2000) found that CF aids the development of grammatical accuracy in written compositions; he conducted an evaluation of CF on learners’ essays in which feedback was given by circling or underlying grammatical errors. This feedback was provided in the first and the second draft of compositions. Ashwell found two major results: firstly, students seem to be more interested in the form feedback than the content feedback. Secondly, while revising their essays, students took into consideration ¾ of feedback they receive on form.

Bitchener and Knoch (2009) carried out a study of written corrective feedback for the period of 10 months. The research investigated the effect of feedback on the English article system (the definite article ‘the’ and the indefinite article ‘a’). The participants were 52 students from the English language department of a university in Auckland. Most of the students were from Asian countries. Four groups were randomly placed, each group 13 students. Group 1 was given direct error correction with written and oral meta-linguistic explanation, whilst the second group was given direct correction with written meta-linguistic explanation. The third group, however, received only direct error
correction, and the control group which did not receive any feedback. The findings of
the research shows that the experimental groups outperformed the control groups on all
post-test results i.e., the groups with exposure to CF showed a positive progress than the
control group. However, no difference was found in the effectiveness of the type of
feedback given between the treatment groups. Table 4 below is a summary of studies of
corrective feedback, providing details of research focus and findings, and also there are
some studies that review previous articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies on the (in) effectiveness of CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis et al. (2008) (System, 36, p. 353-371)</td>
<td>The effect of focused and unfocused corrective feedback compared with no feedback.</td>
<td>Group 1: Focused feedback on articles Group 2: Unfocused feedback Group 3: Control</td>
<td>Focused and unfocused CF improved students’ accuracy but no difference between the two types of feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers should provide corrective feedback to students.


**Review Articles**

| Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) (Freshman English News, 10, p. 1-4) | A review article comparing between different types of Instructor’s comments on L1 writing. | None of the comments had much influence on students’ writing. |
| Keh (1990) (ELT Journal, p. 294-304) | A review article of studies on different types of feedback. | Written feedback is useful for specific errors and for explanation. |
| Leki (1990a) (In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom.) | A review of research on written commentary on students’ writing. | No usefulness of written commentary and difficult to interpret and act upon. |
| Truscott (1996) (language Learning, p. 327-369) | A review article of research on grammar correction. | Grammar correction is ineffective and can have harmful effects. |
Table 4-Studies on the (in) effectiveness of CF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Interestingly, over the last 18 years, quite proliferation of studies on various questions surrounding the value of CF has been generated and still under debate, even more dramatic, the gap between research and real world applications continues to exist.

3.2. Empirical Frame Works on the Effectiveness of Explicit vs. Implicit WCF

Despite the increase in the studies on teacher written feedback, most of these studies were conducted in L1 and ESL (Furmeaux, Paran, Fairfax, 2007); studies on written feedback have been relatively few so far (Ferris et al.; 1997; Goldstein, 2005). According to Chiang (2004) “It is hoped that more research can be conducted in an EFL setting so as to provide EFL teachers with more insights into giving effective feedback” (p. 10). Therefore, there is a need of more studies in the context of EFL on the” various ways that students incorporate feedback into their language learning processes” because such studies enrich our understanding about feedback and help EFL teachers providing the appropriate feedback to learners. (K. Hyland, 2003, p. 229) thus, the present study seeks to spark the gap in this area of research. Table 5 below is a summary of studies that compare different types of feedback treatments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies Comparing the Effect of Different Types of Written Feedback</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Group 2: Content CF  
Group 3: Direct CF and content CF  
Group 4: Indirect coding | No difference was found between the four types of treatment. |
Group 2: Indirect coding  
Group 3: Indirect highlighting  
Group 4: Indirect marginal error totals | No difference was reported between the four types of treatment. |
Group 2: Indirect feedback  
Group 3: Writing practice  
Group 4: Self-correction revision | Long-term effect of direct error correction is more than the other types. On short-term, direct and indirect feedback are both effective. |
<p>| Ferris and Roberts (2001) (Journal of Second Language) | An investigation into the | Group 1: Errors marked with codes from five different | No difference between codes and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Question/Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing, 10(3), p. 161-184)</td>
<td>Effectiveness of explicit and implicit feedback on students’ writing.</td>
<td>Error categories Group 2: Errors in the same five categories underlined but not otherwise marked Group 3: Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitchener et al. (2005) (Journal of Second Language Writing, 14, p. 191-205)</td>
<td>An investigation into the effects of different types of indirect written feedback applied in advanced proficiency levels.</td>
<td>Study 2: Direct correction and simple underlining of errors are significantly superior to describe the types of errors for reducing long-term error. Direct correction is best for accurate revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct error correction’s effect on students’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
feedback on students’ writing.   

circling  
Group 3: Direct meta-linguistic explanation and oral explanation  
Group 4: Control  
writing is retained for a longer period of time and both direct and indirect feedback have the same effect in the short-term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Experimental Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Direct corrective feedback</td>
<td>Self-editing but no feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Implicit feedback</td>
<td>No self-editing and no feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 1</td>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 2</td>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Van Beuningen et al. (2012) (Language Learning, 62(1), 141)  
An investigation on the effect of Explicit and Implicit feedback on writing accuracy.  
Explicit and implicit feedback improved writing accuracy. Explicit CF is effective for better grammatical accuracy and implicit feedback is better for non grammatical accuracy.

Table 5: Summary of studies that compare different types of CF treatments

Some particular studies have been selected from Table 5 above for detailed discussion. These studies are (Bitchener et al. (2005), Chandler (2003), Ferris and Roberts (2001), and Van Beuningen et al. (2012). These studies have been selected on the bases of the following criteria: a) they are relevant to the current study, b) they have a sound of methodology and experimental design, c) most of them are recent and reached a variety of influential results, and e) The studies are arranged on the following order based on date (older to recent) and author.

- Ferris and Roberts (2001)
Ferris and Roberts (2001) carried out an experimental study to investigate whether corrective feedback should be more or less explicit and to investigate its effect (i.e. of corrective feedback) on students' writing accuracy and overall quality of their writing. The participants were 72 students enrolled in ESL classes at California State University. All students were assigned to one of three treatment groups (two experimental and one control). Experimental group contains 28 students, and the second experimental group contains 25 and the control group 14 student.

In week 1, all students were asked to write a composition in 50 minutes to give their opinion and support it. Five categories of error were corrected in the compositions of experimental groups 1 and 2: a) noun ending errors, b) verb errors, c) article errors, d) wrong word and e) sentence structure. Errors made by students in experimental group 1 were underlined and Coded (coded implicit CF). Errors made by students in experimental group 2 were only underlined but not coded (uncoded implicit CF). The control group received no feedback. Two weeks later, students received their compositions with corrections. All three groups received instruction sheets.

Students in experimental group 1 were given instructions which explain the meaning of the codes on their compositions. Students in experimental group 2 were given prompts to guide them studying all the corrections made. Students in the control group were given instructions to re-read their compositions, look for errors and correct them. After 20 minutes students were asked to write the corrections and these were then collected again. The statistics comparing the mean scores between the pre-test and the self-edited compositions were calculated by means of ANOVA and t-test. The results showed that the experimental groups outperformed the control group in accuracy and the quality of writing, but no difference was noticed between the two treatment groups.
Ferris and Roberts (2001) found that both types of corrective feedback given helped students improve their writing accuracy.

• Chandler (2003) – Study 2

   In his second study, Chandler (2003) examined the effect of four types of corrective feedback on students’ accuracy. The participants were 36 students from two sections who attend reading and writing courses in English. The first group contained 20 Asian students and 1 Hispanic and the second contained 15 students from different East Asian language backgrounds. They were asked to write 40 pages of compositions.

   Each student received four types of corrective feedback throughout the semester: a) direct CF by providing the correction of each error, b) underlining with description of error type by drawing a line under each error and indicating its type by symbol or code (coded implicit CF), c) description of error type only and d) underlining only (implicit CF). After providing the treatments, all students were asked to correct their errors. After students had finished writing all the required compositions, a t-test was conducted to find the difference between the mean scores. The results showed that direct corrective feedback was best for a better revision and producing accurate second drafts, while students claimed that they benefited more from simple underlining.

Bitchener et al. (2005)

   Bitchener et al. (2005) investigated the effect of explicit corrective feedback and student-researcher conferencing on accuracy in the use of prepositions, the definite article and the simple past. The learners were 53 adult post-intermediate migrant students. Most of the participants came to New Zealand two years before the research was carried out. The researchers assigned them to three treatment groups. 19 students
were assigned to the experimental group, 17 to experimental group 2 and 17 to the control group. The experiment lasted for 12 weeks and in weeks 2, 4, 8 and 12 each student asked to write four compositions on the same topic. Each task was to be done in 45 minutes. Compositions written by students in experimental group 1 were corrected using explicit CF; underlining and correcting all errors of preposition, the simple past and the definite article. When the students in this group received their compositions back, they were asked to revise the correction of their errors. Also, compositions written by students in experimental group 2 were corrected by underlining all errors of the same aspects of group 1, but the students were not required to revise their compositions.

After analyzing the compositions, the results showed that experimental group 1, which received explicit corrective feedback and conferencing, significantly outperformed the other two groups in the use of the simple past and the definite article. Bitchener et al. (2005) concluded that combining direct corrective feedback with revising errors by learners could improve accuracy on patterns such as the simple past and the definite article. They also claimed that explicit corrective feedback, if combined with revising, could have a greater effect than implicit corrective feedback.

Van Beuningen et al. (2012)

Van Beuningen et al. (2012) have investigated the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students’ accuracy, grammatical accuracy, non-grammatical accuracy, grammatical complexity and lexical diversity in L2 writing. The sample consisted of 268 students from four secondary schools in the Netherlands. They were assigned to 4 treatment groups, two experimental and two control groups. The first experimental group received explicit corrective feedback by indicating the corrections
of errors above the original errors. The second experimental group received implicit corrective feedback by indicating the location and using the coding strategy. The students in control group 1 received no feedback but were asked to revise and self-correct their compositions. The students in control group 2 received no feedback. The experiment consisted of a pre-test, a post-test and a delayed post-test. Students were required to write four compositions on biology related topics.

In week 1, all the students were given a vocabulary test to evaluate their language proficiency, and a writing task for 20 minutes. The compositions were then collected and corrected based on the aforementioned treatments. The compositions of the control group groups were not corrected. In week 2, the compositions were handed back to learners with corrective feedback and were asked to copy the text again after revising all the errors. The students in control group 1 were required to do a self-correction for their compositions of the pre-test, and the students in control group 2 were given a new writing task. All the groups were then given 20 minutes to finish the new writing task. A post-test and a delayed post-test were then conducted in weeks 3 and 6. Differences between the groups were calculated by ANCOVAs test and the results were as follows.

In improving grammatical and non-grammatical accuracy, explicit and implicit feedbacks were more useful as both experimental groups outperformed the control groups. For overall accuracy, the impact of explicit corrective feedback was greater than implicit one as experimental group 1 outperformed experimental group 2. For grammatical complexity and lexical diversity no significant difference was found between all groups in lexical diversity structural complexity.

Research on written corrective feedback and its types has resulted in a variety of findings. The aforementioned discussed researches covered some of the findings on the
effectiveness of written corrective feedback such as Kepner (1991). However, the studies of Ferris and Roberts (2001) found no significant difference between explicit and implicit written corrective feedback in the sense that both of them helped learners to improve their writing. Van Beuningen et al. (2012) also found that both explicit and implicit written corrective feedback were helpful for improving accuracy but also argued that explicit corrective feedback in comparison to the implicit one was better for achieving overall accuracy.

There are also some investigations that found a positive impact in favor of explicit written corrective feedback on writing accuracy if it is combined with other feedback methods. For example, Bitchener et al. (2005) found that explicit corrective feedback could improve writing accuracy when accompanied by short learner-teacher conferencing, and Suzuki (2012) argued that explicit corrective feedback has a more significant effect on learners' accuracy in writing if combined with languaging or justification activities; it means, when learners write a composition to explain the corrected errors or to state why their errors were corrected. Chandler (2003) argued that learners believe that they benefit more from implicit corrective feedback by simple underlining of errors than explicit treatment since the results showed that implicit corrective feedback was more useful for writing. However, there are studies (Kepner, 1991, Truscott and Hsu, 2008) which found that written corrective feedback has no impact on writing accuracy.

As mentioned above, we may conclude that investigations on written corrective feedback have resulted in conflicting conclusions, even though the tendency seems to be that corrective feedback is effective and helpful for the improvement of writing accuracy.
This plethora of the studies concerning the issue of WCF make a challenge out of the writing classes and EFL grammar acquisition, one finds that this topic deserves a research in order to clear the blur picture and to overcome limitations suggested by previous studies.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, we tackled the main points concerning corrective feedback in general and particularly focusing on the written explicit and implicit corrective feedback. Starting by the place of grammar teaching in the foreign language teaching methods and approaches, in addition to an overview about the corrective feedback to move on to a review of some empirical frame works in relation to the topic investigated in the present study.
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Resumè
Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the research design and instruments used to undertake the selected frame work of the investigation which is an experimental study that includes students, besides a questionnaire for teachers to investigate their attitudes towards the topic. This chapter is divided into two main sections; in the first part the design of the experimental study is discussed, explaining the experiment variables, the subjects of the study and the treatments employed. The procedure followed in the experimental study and the measures used to analyze students’ errors of the irregular past are also explained. Then, the second part describes the instruments and procedures used in data collection.

1. The Research Design

1.1. The Choice of the Method

As discussed in the literature review, most of the aforementioned studies utilized either a quantitative method such as survey design (Ferris, 1997; Ferris, Pezone, Tade and Tinti, 1997; Montgomery & Backer, 2007) or qualitative method (Semke, 1984; Hyland, 1998, Diab, 2005) In addition, very few studies on this topic incorporated both teachers and students both as participants.
Based on Table 1, it can be clearly noticed that just a small number of studies investigated written corrective feedback incorporated both teachers and students have used mixed method approach. The fact that most of the aforementioned studies conducted either a purely qualitative method or a quantitative one, presents a valid advantage for the current study. An example of a mixed approach design is Lee’s (2004) investigation that studied the L2 writing teachers besides students’ perceptions and attitudes towards WCF. A questionnaire as a qualitative method was submitted to 19 teachers, and quantitative data was collected by utilizing survey and interview with 320 students.

The lack of adequate methodologies, research designs, and subjects in the previous studies limited the depth of investigating the effectiveness of WCF and the impact of its types. Yet, reaching each time different results, and sometimes drawing controversial conclusions. Therefore, this study seeks to bridge these gaps found in the previous methodologies such as (using only quantitative or qualitative methods, and incorporating either only teachers or students as participants) and has chosen to conduct this research using a combined mixed approach which holds both teachers and students as subjects in the study

### 1.2. Research Tools
To conduct this study and achieve the research aims, we have selected a combined mixed approach (an experimental study and a questionnaire). The selection of these instruments was imposed by the nature of subjects being investigated; the experimental design was chosen specifically for the students for the following reasons: from personal experience, and since our EFL students sample includes second year at the university, it was predicted that learners would not be quietly serious while responding to a questionnaire in comparison to adult teachers. Also, students may not understand very well the questions/statements mentioned in the questionnaire, which may cause a deviation in the direction of the whole research and then reaching meaningless conclusions and results. Hence, it is more valid to control them under an experimental framework.

A questionnaire was administered to EFL teachers to investigate their attitudes and beliefs on WCF. Questionnaires are defined by Mackey and Gass (2005) as “any written instrument that presents respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers.” (p. 92). We have used a questionnaire for the following reasons: first, questionnaires are exclusively used as research tools for the studies carried in the field of linguistics. Second, they help the researcher to collect a large amount of data within a short period of time. Last, questionnaires are not energy consuming while processing them, especially in our case where a mixed approach is conducted. The advantages of the questionnaire were stated by Dornyei (2003) “the main attractions of questionnaires is their unprecedented efficiency in terms of (a) research time, (b) research effort, and (c) financial resources.” (p. 9). The table 2 sets out to show the structure of participation with the appropriate research tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Experimental Design</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3. Data collection Outline

The current study contained the collection of different forms of data (qualitative and quantitative). Table 3.2 illustrates the time frame for the data collection instruments of the present study. The duration of each data gathering procedures is illustrated in number of weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months (2015)</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: The time Frame work for the data collection instruments

Section One: Students in Action

- Population and Sampling

The population targeted in this study consists of 130 second year LMD students in the department of English at the University of Chadli Ben Jdid, El Taref, for the academic year
2014/2015. Since it is impossible to study the entire population, and so a sample consists of two groups has been chosen to represent the whole population.

The sample consists of 46 participants; this size was selected to be representative for the targeted population. It is divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group, each of them consists of 23 students.

- 1. The Target Structure

The grammatical structure that is chosen to be the focus of the present study is the irregular verbs in the past tense. We have chosen to work with the aforementioned structure for the reason that: Many EFL learners have problems with the use of this kind of verbs, this related to the nature of the verb itself, unlike the regular verbs which their past simple is constructed by adding “ed” to the infinity of the verb; the irregular ones has no exact grammatical rule to be followed.

1.2. The Design of the Experimental Study

The design of the experimental study aims to provide a specific answer to the research question “which type of WCF (explicit or the implicit) has greater influence on the acquisition of the irregular past tense”. The components of the experiments are explained below:

1.2.1. Experimental variables

In this study the independent variable is the type of treatment (corrective feedback) given to students, while the dependent variable represents students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense.

| Independent variable | Dependent Variable |
Giving feedback (explicit error correction, underlying and circling the error without explicit correction)

**Figure 1: The Experimental Variables**

As mentioned in figure 1, there is one independent variable with two conditions; the first condition is explicit (direct) error correction, and the second is implicit (indirect) correction.

1.2.2. The experiment Structure

As shown above the design that is used in this study is a quasi-experimental design which includes 3 phases for each group; a pre-test, a treatment period, and an immediate post-test as explained in Mackey and Gass (2005). The scheme of the design as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Phases of a quasi-experimental design**

- The experimental group: Consisted of 23 participants.
- The control group: Consisted of 23 participants.
1.2.2.1. The Pre-test

Both the experimental and the control group were subject in the pre-test during the first week. The pre-test consisted of four activities: the first activity contains 10 sentences, each sentence contains one irregular verb, and learners were asked to put the verbs between brackets in the past simple tense which is our focus. In the second activity the participants were given 5 disordered sentences requested to reorganize the sentence elements to form correct and meaningful sentences bear in mind that verbs are in the infinitive form. The third activity includes 10 verbs, 5 verbs are correct and conjugated in the past tense, and 5 are not conjugated in the past tense; learners were asked to pick or circle the correct verbs in the past tense. In the final activity, learners were supposed to write a short paragraph in which they describe how they spent their winter holiday using 5 irregular verbs in the past tense. As it is mentioned above, the pre-test was for the two groups exactly the same in all respects; number and type of activities, and time (40 minutes).

1.2.2.2. The Treatment

After the pre-test both groups have received a treatment session for 60 minutes during the first week of treatment; learners have been taught the same instructions by receiving a lesson concerning the past simple tense especially the irregular past as they were informed about its uses as well as its forms. In addition, they were given illustrated examples and asked to give their own examples. In the following session, participants received written activities contained irregular verbs; these activities were made by the researcher herself and some were taken from websites and modified to serve the focus of the research, and learners were given 20 minutes to answer the tasks before collecting the answers to be corrected by the researcher. The next session the corrected activities were handed back to students each according to the
type of corrective feedback he/she receives, and they were requested to read the correction for 10 minutes. Later on, learners received other activities about the irregular past, after 20 minutes, the activities were then collected to be corrected by the researcher. This process continued throughout the whole 5 weeks.

2.2.2.1. Feedback Procedures
As explained above, students received two types of WCF, the experimental receives explicit correction, which meant that their errors in relation to the use of the irregular past were clearly corrected. The procedures followed in giving this type of CF was that every time the activities were collected, the researcher went through all the copies and read them carefully, then the errors related to irregular past were crossed and the corrections were written for the students next to the error. The same procedures made with the control group, except that learners in this group received implicit correction by underlying the errors.

1.2.2.3. The Post-test

The post-test was administered for both groups during the 8th week. Undoubtedly, the conditions were also applied in the post-test (same number and type of activities, same level of difficulty, and same scoring schedule) without repeating the same format of the pre-test to avoid the possibility of testing effect which might be a threat to the internal validity of the research.

1.2.2.3.1. Obtaining writing Samples: pre-posttest

Concerning this issue of the samples writing validity, Delarios, Murphy, and Marin (2002) present different approaches to collect representative sample of L2/FL writing:

there is considerable debate about what constitutes a representative sampling of second language writing, whether brief tasks or
students’ written samples collected during a period of time
in a few cases researchers collected a number of course-related
assignments on the assumption that this procedure would be in
consonance with ordinary class writing (Edelsky, 1982; Zamel,
1983), the vast majority of studies, in line with the problem solving
approach followed (Pozo, 1989), opted for short time-compressed
compositions. (De Larios, Murphy and Marín, 2002, p. 17)

They also mentioned further factors that may affect the validity of the written collected samples; such as the type of topics and texts students are asked to write, the available time to answer, and whether if they can use external aids or not. Since the type of data collected is written, the aforementioned conditions (time, topics that students asked to write about, and whether they can use external aids) have been controlled while conducting the pre and post-test as follow: All students seated in the amphi theatre, in a way that allowed enough space between them, the table in front of each student should contain nothing except a pen or a corrector pen and the draft paper that is provided by the researcher with the question paper, in order to avoid the use of any external aids. The students were given a standard duration to answer the tasks (50 minutes) which is the enough time for them to answer comfortably. By the end of time students were asked to stop writing, put their answers on their tables and leave the amphi theatre. The answers were collected by the researcher and the responsible teacher who is without his help in controlling the students the pre and the post-test would not be practiced in an adequate way.
3. Data Analysis

In this part all the collected data in the experimental study will be presented and analyzed using statistical procedures that are very common in the social sciences. T-test was conducted to investigate which type of treatment (explicit WCF or implicit WCF) affects their post-test performance in comparison to the pre-test.

- **The frequency of the Pre and Post-tests’ Scores for Both Groups:**

The following table shows the frequency of the pre and the post-tests’ scores of experimental and the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>The Experimental group</th>
<th>The control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The frequency of experimental and control group pre and post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Experimental group | The control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>post-test</th>
<th>pre-test</th>
<th>post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4: The frequency of experimental and control group pre and post-test

- Control Group vs. Experimental Group Scores on the Pre-test:
First we compare the results of the pre-test for both groups to have an idea about their level, we calculate the mean for both groups (in which $e$ means the experimental group’s mean and $c$ means the control group’s mean) as following:

$e = 6,48$ and $c = 6,67$.

When we compare the of the two groups, we find that their performance was approximately the same $6,48 \approx 6,67$. This will help us later on in the post-test, since both groups started approximately from the same level; the results of the post-test will confirm that any change or progression in the results is due to treatment. For the total 46 participants, we have the percentage of the scores below and above the average (10) for both groups on the pre-test.

**Control Group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental Group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 1: The Control and Experimental Group’s Scores on the Pre-test**

For the pre-test’s frequency that is shown in graph 01 we can notice that, the lowest mark in the experimental group is 0 as a starting and it ends at 13,5 as a highest mark with a two peaks at 3, 4 and 6 and three peaks at 5, four peaks at 7, 5 (the most frequent scores) on the other hand, the control group’s starting point is 0 and it ends at 14 with three peaks at 3,5 and 6,5.
• **Control Group Post-test vs. Control Group Pre-test:**

When comparing between the control group pre-test and post-test’s scores, it is noticed that scores below the average in the pre-test are more frequent than those above the average. Just like the pre-test, the post-test scores show an advantage for scores below the average.

For the total 23 scores, we have:

**Control group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>78, 26 %</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 15</td>
<td>21, 74 %</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>82, 60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 15</td>
<td>17, 40 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control group recorded a post-test’s mean \( p_0 = 7.06 \) which is approximately the same as the pre-test’s mean \( p_r = 6.08 \), in which \( p_0 \) means post-test and \( p_r \) means pre-test.

In order to study the significant progression from pre-test to post-test, difference scores for each subject we have calculated by subtracting the pre- from the post-test score, as it is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 5 we notice that the control group recorded a slightly high post-test mean $c_{po} = 7,06$ than the pre-test mean $c_{po} = 6,67$, and the mean difference score is $c_{po} = 0,42$ which means that the improvement in the learners’ ability to use irregular verbs in past tense was not significantly improved. We can notice that there was a slight difference between the marks of the pre-and post-test, as shown in figure. While in the pre-test the highest mark was 14 and the lowest was 0 with three peaks at 5, and four peaks at 7,5. In the post-test it has been marked 13.5 as the highest mark and 2,5 as the lowest mark with three peaks at 6 and 7. Since the control group did not show a significant improvement in the mastery of the target structures with the absence of explicit correction of errors (feedback), we conclude that the later has significant effect on subjects’ grammatical knowledge about the target structure more than the implicit error correction.

**Graph 2: The control group’s scores of pre-test and post-test**
Experimental Group Post-test vs. Experimental Group Pre-test

From table 5 and figure 03 we can notice that the experimental group’s scores improved significantly between the pre- and post-test; in the sense that scores above the average are more frequent in the pre-test than those below the average. However, the post-test shows the opposite.

For the total 23 scores, we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82, 60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>17, 40%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>39, 13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>60, 87%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experimental group recorded a post-test mean $p_0 = 10.5$ which is higher than the pre-test mean $epr = 6.48$. In order to study the significant improvement of the experimental group from the pre-test to post-test, we have calculated the difference score for each subject by subtracting the pre-test from the post-test scores as it is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Experimental group’s pre-test, post-test, and difference scores

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>epr = 6.48</td>
<td>po = 10.5</td>
<td>= 4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph 3: The experimental group’s scores of pre-test and post-test

The experimental group’s pre-test scores start at 0, and ends at 13.5 as a highest mark with a three peaks at 3.5 and 6.5. However, the post-test scores begin with 3 and ends at 16.5 as a highest mark with three peaks at 11. In addition, the experimental group recorded a post-test mean $\text{epo} = 10.5$, and it is higher than the pre-test mean $\text{epr} = 6.48$. The mean difference = 4.02 is extremely significant. Unlike the control group, the experimental group recorded a highly significant progression in the post-test scores; this result suggests that the type of the treatment 1 (explicit WCF) has a significant effect on learners’ performance and knowledge of the target structure.

In order to confirm whether this improvement in learners’ performance is mainly caused due to the independent variable 1 (explicit WCF) or simply due to chance or to the interference of other extraneous variables; to do so we conduct the paired samples t-test to see whether to reject the null hypothesis or to accept it.
• The Paired-Samples T-test:

As explained by Makey and Gass (2005), the paired-samples t-test is used to make a comparison between one group’s means in different two test scores (the pretest and the posttest); i.e. subjects of the same group participate in two tests, pre-test and a post-test, in other words the participants of the same group are paired with themselves on the tests; with a condition that should be a treatment period between these two tests. The main reason behind using the paired-samples t-test is to compare the examined group’s mean before and after the treatment period, in addition to that, it is used to compare the obtained result from the paired-samples t-test with those stated in the t-tables which helps the researcher to decide whether the differences obtained are due to the impact of the written corrective feedback or occurred due other extraneous factors or variables.

• Procedure for Carrying out the Paired T-test:

The following procedure allows us to see whether the difference between the sample s’ Scores (pre and posttest) before and after the period of treatment is simply due to the treatment or merely due to chance:

• The first step is to calculate the difference between the pre-test and posttest scores for each participant by subtracting the pre-test from the post-test score. It is important to distinguish positive (+) and negative (-) differences.

• Calculate the mean difference:

• Calculate the standard deviation of the differences, S which is needed to calculate the standard error of the mean difference, SE (d). Under the null hypothesis, this statistic follows a t-distribution at N-1 degrees of
freedom.

- Enter a table of the t-distribution at N-1 degrees of freedom, choose the level of significance required (normally $p = 0.01$) and read the critical t-value.

- In case that the t-value exceeds the critical t-value, the differences between the two tests’ scores are significant at that level of probability. So, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

By following this procedure, a paired-samples t-test has been carried out to compare and to calculate the mean difference of the groups’ scores on the pre and post-test.

In the following table shows the mean difference of the participants’ scores on the pre and post-test, and its square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Square difference $d^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>42,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>20,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>12,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>12,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>20,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>2,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d = 92,5)</td>
<td>(= 478,75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The mean difference of the participants’ scores on the pre and post-test, and its square.

- The mean difference :

\[
= \]

Equation 1: The mean Difference.

: the mean

\(d\) : difference scores

\(N\) : number of subjects
The Standard deviation of the differences

$S_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sum \text{differences}^2}{n-1}}$

Equation 2: The Standard deviation

Where:

$S$ : variance

$\sum$ : sum of the square difference scores

$S_d = 2.16$

The standard error of the mean difference

$SE() = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$

Equation 3: The Standard Error

$SE() = 0.45$

The t-statistic
Now, after calculating the t-statistic, we check the t-distribution table to determine the t-value. Since N = 23, the degree of freedom N-1 = 22. The p-value which is used is p = 0.01; therefore the critical t-value would be 2.818. Now we compare the critical t-value with the observed t-value to find that: The observed t-value largely exceeds the critical t-value.

$$8.93 > 2.81$$

As it is shown the observed t-value is more than the critical t-value, we can notice that the difference between the experimental group’s scores on the pre-test and the post-test is highly remarkable and significant. In other words, the obtained results are due to the independent variable (explicit corrective feedback) and not due to chance or other extraneous variables. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis, and we can conclude that corrective feedback has a positive effect on learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense.

3.5. Experimental Group vs. Control Group’ scores on the Post-test.
Table 03 and the figure 04 show that the experimental group improved their performance and obtain higher scores than the control group in the posttest. The experimental group recorded a post-test mean = 10,5 that is higher than that of the control group’s mean = 7,06.

**Graph 4: The experimental group and control group scores of posttest**

From figure 4, it can be noticed that the post-test frequency of the control group starts at 3 and ends at 14.5 with more than three peaks at 6.7. The experimental group’s frequency starts at 6 and ends at 18 with three peaks at 15 two peaks at 7.5 and 8, that is higher than the control group’s peaks. In order to test the significance of the difference between the experimental and control groups’ post-test mean scores, we have used the independent-samples t-test.

- **The Independent-Samples t-test**

  The independent-sample t-test is used to find out the difference between the mean scores of the two groups, the experimental and the control group, on the post-test. Just like the paired-samples t-test, the independent-samples t-test aims at identifying the impact of the independent variable (explicit, implicit CF) on the dependent variable (irregular past tense). This t-test is presented by the formula:

  
  \[ t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s_{\bar{X}}(n_1 + n_2 - 2)^{1/2}} \]

  - The variance

  The experimental group
Equation 5: The variance of the Experimental Group

\[
\text{Experimental Group} = 12.34
\]

Equation 6: The variance of the Control Group

\[
\text{Control Group} = 6.80
\]

The control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Experimental Group Scores</th>
<th>Square Scores X_e</th>
<th>Control Group Scores X_c</th>
<th>Square Scores X_c^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>272.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Square post-test scores of both groups.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>30,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>110,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>156,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>182,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

241,5 = 2807,25 162,5 = 1297,75

3.6.3. The t-value:

\[
\text{Equation 7: The T-value}
\]

\[
= 3,68
\]

\[
= 3,68
\]

To identify the t-value, we check the t-distribution table. The degree of freedom is 44, since \( N_c = N_e = 23 \) and degree of freedom is presented as \((N_c+N_e)-2\); which means that the critical t-value is the value that matches between the p-value which is presented as 0.01 and the degree of freedom 44: The critical t-value = 2.69. It is found that the observed t-value is more than the critical t-value; i.e.

\[
3,68 \geq 2,69
\]
Since the difference between the post-test means of the two groups is significant, the null hypothesis is rejected, while the research hypothesis is proved. There is 99% probability that the current results are true and obtained only because of the effectiveness of the independent variable (explicit CF) and not the interference of external factors, while 1% probability of the results are occurred due to chance or other extraneous variables. From that we can conclude that explicit corrective feedback has a positive significant impact more than the implicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of the irregular past tense.

Discussion

This study aims at investigating the impact of the explicit and implicit corrective feedback on students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense. The main question that is addressed in this research was: which type of written corrective feedback (explicit or implicit) affects students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense? To answer this question the following hypothesis was hypothesized:

: The explicit written corrective feedback has a positive impact on the acquisition of the irregular past tense more than the implicit written corrective feedback.

: The implicit written corrective feedback has a positive effect on the acquisition of the target structure more than the explicit one.

: The explicit and the implicit written corrective feedback would have no effect on the acquisition of the irregular past tense.

To test this hypothesis the results of the study are analyzed as following:

On the one hand, in a comparison between the control group scores on the pre-test and the post-test, we found that there is no really significant improvement in scores
which means that the absence of explicit corrective feedback (even if they are provided with the implicit CF) affects students’ performance of the target structure; this is proved when we compare the means of the pre and post-tests of the control group. When the mean of the pre-test is $= 6.67$, the post-test’s mean is $= 7.06$ mean difference between the two means is $d = 0.42$, which indicates that the control group does not show a highly improvement in the tests.

On the other hand, unlike the control group, the experimental group scores a totally different post-test’s mean $= 6.48$ in a comparison to the pre-test’s mean $= 10.5$ the mean difference between the two tests is $d = 4.02$, which means that the experimental group shows a significant improvement after the treatment period where it receives an explicit corrective feedback on the target structure.

In a comparison between both groups, experimental group and control group, we notice that they score approximately the same mean in the pre-test, i.e. before the treatment (explicit and implicit), in which $= 6.48$ and $= 6.67$ and the mean difference between the pre-test’s means of both groups is $d = 0.19$. However, in the post-test, after the treatment, they have scored totally different means in which $= 10.5$ is higher than $= 7.06$. In other words, the treatment that has been given to the experimental group shows that it has a significant effect more than the group that receives implicit WCF. In addition to that, the both t-tests, the paired-samples t-test and independent t-test, have proved the research hypothesis $H_1$ and rejected both the alternative $H_2$ and the null hypothesis $H_0$; in addition to that, the standard deviation which scores $S_d = 2.16$ it is more than 1 it means that there is an improvement in the participants’ performance of the target structure in the experimental group.
From all that findings we conclude that the explicit corrective feedback has a positive impact on students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense.

Section Two : Teachers in Action

Sampling:

This study involves 12 EFL teachers from different universities (the university of Chadli Ben Jdid, EL TAREF, and the university of Badji Mokhtar, ANNABA). The table 1 illustrates the profile of the teachers with their demographic information including age, gender, number of years teaching English (experience years), and qualifications.
Table 1: Profile of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Academic Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M.A Linguistic</td>
<td>El TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>M.A Linguistic</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M.A Civilization</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P.H.D Didactics</td>
<td>ANNABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>M.A Linguistic</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P.H.D Linguistic</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>M.A Linguistic</td>
<td>ANNABA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M.A. Civilization</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>P.H.D Translation</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>M.A Linguistic</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>License Tourism</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>M.A Translation</td>
<td>EL TAREF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Description of the Questionnaire**

The description of the questionnaire was based on previous studies (e.g. Elawar and Corno, 1985; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007; Tunstall and Gipps, 1996). However, some questions were either modified or adjusted to serve the aims of the study. The teachers’ questionnaire consisted of 14 items. The questions fell into different types, there were questions with a Likert scale with five responses (Strongly agree, Agree, Don’t know, Disagree, Strongly disagree). There were questions with a scale of four responses (always, often, sometimes, never), which require respondents to
indicate the frequency of practices in relation to written corrective feedback. Another question format which demands either different types of answers or open-ended questions that require respondents to explain and justify their selections in their own words.

**Part one: Personal Background information (Q1 Q2)**

This part consists of three questions, which seek to obtain demographic background information about the participants “teachers” (their names, gender, and age).

**Part Two: Academic information (Q3 Q5)**

This part seeks to solicit information about each teacher, it provides us with information about their qualifications, years of experience, and the academic department in which they are working.

**Part three: Teachers’ Actual Use of WCF in EFL classes (Q6 Q13)**

This section aims at investigating general information about WCF, besides teachers’ actual behaviors of the error correction activity; to see the extent to which EFL teachers are using WCF. This part begins with a question about the frequency of providing students with CF by their teachers (Q6). Then teachers are asked if they provide WCF on the basis of form, also it is important to know if they provide it for all the errors or only the major ones (Q7 Q8). In (Q9) teachers are required to indicate the most repeated kinds of errors found in the students’ written productions. To be more specific, it is important to know about which tenses are difficult for learners to acquire
(including the irregular verbs which are our focus in this study) and which tense receives their total response (Q10 Q11). In (Q12) teachers are required to indicate the type of WCF they use more frequently to treat the errors in relation to the misuse of the irregular past tense verbs.

**Part Four: Beliefs about WCF benefits and effectiveness (Q13 Q16)**

The current section aims at investigating teachers’ perspectives (not actual behaviors and practices) about the impact of the WCF on EFL learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense (Q13 Q16). The (Q 13) aims at discovering what teachers believe and think about the importance of WCF in EFL classes, and also its role in the acquisition of the irregular verbs, this question is to check the teachers’ position and opinion towards the value of WCF (its advantages and disadvantages), and whether their beliefs are demonstrated in their correction practices. In the (Q14) the researcher aims to find out which type of WCF teachers think is the most appropriate for learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense. The (Q15) seeks to discover the teachers’ opinion about students’ views towards the WCF they receive from teachers. The final question (Q16) aims to find out whether it is the teacher duty to correct learners’ grammatical errors or not, especially those which are related to the irregular verbs past use.

- **Data Analysis**

**Section One: Personal Background information**

**Q1:** Specify your gender

a) Male

b) Female
**Table 1 teachers’ gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Teachers’ Gender**

Table 1 and figure 01 show that the sample contains both male and female teachers. Seven (58%) of the teachers are females and five (34%) are males. This difference between the two sexes is due to the fact that the number of females in all schools is greater than the number of males (nature of society).

Q2: Specify your age

**Table 2: Teachers’ Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25, 35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 02, students have different age; 6 teachers (50%) are between the age of twenty five to thirty five years. Four teachers (33%) are thirty five and forty five years, and the rest are between forty five and fifty five years (17%).

Section two: Academic Background

Q3: Indicate your qualifications

Table 03: Teachers’ qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Linguistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Civilization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.H.D. Didactics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.H.D. Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.H.D. Translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of teachers (42%) hold a M.A. in the field of Linguistics, two teachers (17%) hold M.A. in Civilization, just one teacher holds (8%) M.A. in the field of Translation, one teacher (8%) holds P.H.D. in Literature, one (8%) holds P.H.D, two other teachers (16%) hold P.H.D. the first in Didactics and the second in the field of Translation.

Q4: Specify your experience years in teaching English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Teachers’ years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Teachers’ years of experience

From table 5 and figure 5, we notice that half of the teachers (50%) have from one year to ten years experience in the field of teaching English as a foreign language, four teachers (33%) have from ten to twenty years experience, and two teachers (17%) are considered as experienced teachers because they have from twenty to thirty years in this field.

Q5: Specify your academic department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Teachers’ academic department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of teachers (83%) are from the department of English, El Taref, and the rest (17%) are from the department of English of Annaba.

Section three: Teachers’ Actual Use of WCF in EFL classes

Q6: Do you give written feedback on your students’ writing?

Table 6: Teachers use of WCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Teachers use of the WCF

Eleven teachers (92%) said that they always provide their students with WCF. However, only one teacher (8%) often gives her learners WCF. As it is noticed the majority of teachers provide their learners with WCF.

Q7: Do you give feedback on form?

Table 7: Teachers feedback on form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: Teachers feedback on form**

The majority of teachers (75%) always correct the learners’ errors on the basis of the written composition form, two teachers (17%) often make their WCF on form, and just one teacher (8%) declare that she sometimes correct errors on the writing form. From this, we conclude that teachers focus on the form errors.

**Q8: Do you mark all errors?**

**Table 8: The amount of marked errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Errors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Errors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8: The amount of marked errors**

Eight teachers (62%) correct the major errors found in the learners’ written production on form. However, four teachers (38%) take in consideration all errors in the learners’ piece of writing.
Q9: What kinds of errors are most repeated in learners’ writing?

Table 9: Learners most repeated errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure9: Learners most repeated errors

The table 10 and the figure 10 above show that students do not agree on specific kind of errors. Seven teachers (58%) indicate that the most repeated errors are related to use of tenses, and this is a proof that learners face problems in using tenses while writing. Two teachers (17%) indicate that learners misuse the appropriate vocabulary, the same percentage of teachers agree that most errors found in learners’ writing are in relation to spelling errors. Concerning punctuation errors, only one teacher (8%) state that he found this kind is the most repeated in his students’ writing.

Q10: In case of errors related to the use of tenses, which tense is the most difficult for learners to use in their writing?

Table 10: Learners errors in using tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular past tense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular past tense</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10: Learners errors in using tenses

Nine teachers (75%) declare that their learners misuse of the irregular past tense, two teachers (17%) indicate that their learners do face problems while using the present tense, and just one teacher (8%) finds the regular past errors are the most misused by learners. The majority of teachers agreed upon the learners’ misuse of the irregular past, and this is a proof that learners do face problems concerning this structure.

Q11: Which tense receives your WCF mostly?

Table 11: Teachers’ WCF in relation to the use of tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular past tense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular past tense</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Teachers WCF in relation to the use of the tenses

Seven teachers (50%) emphasize the correction of errors in relation to the irregular past tense, four teachers (42%) emphasize the correction of the present tense errors. Only one teacher (8%) states that her feedback heavily touches the regular past tense errors. We conclude that teachers focus on the errors of irregular past in first, and the present tense in second.

Q12: Which way you used to correct errors related to the use of the irregular past tense?

Table 12: Teachers Correction of irregular past errors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12: Teachers correction of the irregular past errors**

Eight teachers (67%) use the implicit WCF when treating the learners’ errors in relation to the irregular past tense, three teachers (25%) utilize the explicit way to deal with such errors, and the last teacher uses comments (neither explicit nor implicit). In this case we conclude that most teachers use the implicit WCF to treat this structure.

**Section Four: Beliefs and attitudes about WCF benefits in EFL writing**

**Q13:** WCF is beneficial for students’ irregular past tense acquisition, and why?

**Table 13: Teachers Opinions towards WCF value for the acquisition of the Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13: Teachers’ opinions towards CF value in acquiring irregular past tense**

Nine teachers strongly (75%) believe that WCF is beneficial for the acquisition of the irregular past tense. However, the rest (25%) believe that WCF has a negative impact on learners’ acquisition of the irregular past. This is mean that teachers have
different views about the role of WCF in EFL classes, in this question teachers gave their justifications in order to discover the advantages and the disadvantages of the WCF.

Q14: Explicit WCF is more effective than the implicit WCF for the acquisition of the irregular past tense, and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14: Teachers’ opinion towards explicit and implicit WCF**

Seven teachers (58%) think that the implicit WCF is more beneficial for learners to acquire the irregular past tense, four teachers (34%) believe the opposite i.e. the implicit WCF is more effective than the explicit one. One teacher (8%) strongly agrees and appreciates the value of explicit WCF in EFL writing.

Q15: Students value the WCF they receive from you (whatever its type)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Teachers attitudes towards Students evaluation of the WCF**
Figure 15: Teachers attitudes towards students’ evaluation of the WCF

Seven teachers (58%) believe that their students do not take in consideration the WCF they receive from teachers, three teachers (25%) strongly believe that students neglect the WCF they receive. However, only two teachers (17%) strongly believe that students appreciate the WCF they receive from teachers. The answers assure that teachers think that their learners do not value the WCF.

Q16: It is the duty of teachers to always provide WCF on students’ errors related to the misuse of English tenses (especially the irregular past tense)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: The teachers’ duty to provide WCF

Eight teachers (67%) strongly agree that it is the duty of teachers to provide students with WCF. Three teachers (25%) agree that it is their duty to provide students with WCF, just one teacher (8%) believe that it is not their duty to provide WCF. The teachers’ answers prove that most of them agree that it is the duty of teachers to give WCF to their learners.

2.4. Discussion
By analyzing the repeated patterns from the responses of teachers regarding WCF during the questionnaire, the researcher was able to identify three key themes from the teachers' responses: a) the importance of CF b) The advantages and disadvantages of both explicit and implicit WCF.

- **The importance of WCF in general**: all teachers in the questionnaire agreed upon the importance of WCF in their justifications; it improves the learners’ writing accuracy, encourages them to read and write more, and help them to better acquire the different aspects of foreign languages.

- **Advantages of implicit WCF**: teachers who believe in the importance of the implicit WCF argued that it promotes independent learning and encourages students to search and find out the correction of their errors by themselves.

- **Disadvantages of implicit WCF**: students have different learning style, and not all of them have the same degree of curiosity or motivation to acquire foreign language, and giving them implicit feedback would demotivate them. Also, students may not understand this type because it does not provide a clear and direct correction to the error.

- **Advantages of explicit WCF**: helps learners to revise their writing more efficiency, generates awareness of their errors by providing them with a direct and clear correction.

- **Disadvantages of explicit WCF**: teachers who believes in the efficiency of implicit WCF argued that explicit is time consuming in comparison to the implicit way (underlying and circling). In addition, they argued that explicit WCF suits students in the middle and secondary school. However, the implicit WCF is more appropriate for university students; because learners at the university level are
much more practiced to use the language and aware enough to do self correction, so they do not need a direct treatment.

- **Comparison of the findings**

  The analysis of the students’ experiment, just like of the teachers’ questionnaire, has shown some similar directions (teachers’ responses corroborated the experiments findings) or a link between the teachers’ attitudes and beliefs with the students results in the experimental study, or if we can say that some teachers’ opinions in relation to the explicit and implicit WCF have been realized in the experiment. However, there are some contradictory results between teachers’ thoughts and learners applications and practices.

  First, all of the teachers (100%, Q13) have a strong belief that WCF have a positive impact on the acquisition of FL features (irregular past tense) and this was shown in the students’ results of the experiment. Second, (75%, Q10) teachers believe that students face difficulties in the use of the irregular past tense, this was demonstrated in the results of the pre-tests for both groups since both groups recorded very low means $e = 6,48$ and $= 6,67$.

  However, there has been some contradictions in between what teachers believe (practice) and what students need in real classroom practice; for instance the type of the WCF teachers think is appropriate for learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense (implicit) (58% Q14), did not show any significance while applying it on students’ treatment in the experimental study, since the control group who received an implicit correction did not record a significant improvement in the post-test $c = 7,06$. Unlike, the implicit WCF group, the explicit WCF which was neglected by teachers, because they thought it is not beneficial for second year learners writing, proves the opposite of what teachers believe since the experimental group
who received explicit correction recorded a high or a significant improvement in comparison to the control group = 10.5.

Therefore, the majority of EFL teachers agreed upon the effectiveness of the implicit WCF in comparison to the explicit one. However, students performance in the experimental study showed the opposite i.e. the explicit WCF was much more beneficial for the acquisition of irregular past tense more than the implicit one.

- **Limitation of This study**

There are some problems and limitations occurred while conducting the present study, which aims at investigating of the effect of explicit vs. implicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of the irregular past tense they are as follows:

1. The study lasted for only 8 weeks (6 weeks treatment), which is probably insufficient to establish whether regular feedback had an effect on students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense but it was not possible to use the research subjects for more than 8 weeks and, therefore, I had to conduct this research within the period of time allowed.

2. One factor which makes it difficult to compare this study with previous studies is that the participants in the research had a low level of English due to the nature of the university education outcome. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) raised the question of whether the L2/FL learning background of students could affect their benefits from written feedback and described this task as being “under-explored” (p. 70). That is why it is possible that students’ low level in English made it difficult for them to benefit from feedback.
3. Although the number of the research subjects was higher than many previous studies, it is possible that a sample of 46 students was not enough to show significant differences between the two groups. It is possible is the study used a larger sample, the results might have been different.

4. The presence of the researcher in the classroom for observation in the experiment may have emphasized the students and led to bias or anxiety, which might affect the results of the study as students may, for instance, behave or look for certain answers to please the researcher…etc

2.7. Suggestions for Further Research

After presenting the results of this research and the limitation that we have seen, we would like to recommend some suggestions for further research. First, we would like to mention for further research that it is preferable if the number of the participants would be larger in order to be more representative (also, other researchers will be well served to investigate the same phenomenon in other contexts or to examine other aspects of language…etc) for the whole population and to gain enough data about the effect of the explicit vs. implicit written corrective feedback on learners’ acquisition of the irregular past tense.

Furthermore, using long period of time for providing treatment, because this will help the researcher to collect more valid data about the real influence of explicit and implicit WCF. Since this study is concerned or limited only to investigate the impact of EWCF in comparison to IWCF, it will be more interesting to examine the impact of other types of CF on the target structure, or even using other research tools to see which type is more suitable and helpful for learners to acquire the irregular past tense.
Conclusion

This chapter has presented the results and the analysis of the conducted experiment and the questionnaire in order to investigate the effect of explicit in comparison to the implicit written corrective feedback on learners' acquisition of the irregular past tense. The results of the experimental study show that explicit corrective feedback as a strategy correcting learners’ errors has a positive effect on the acquisition of the target structure which confirms the research hypothesis. However, the results of the questionnaire show that teachers think and believe that implicit written corrective feedback is more beneficial for the acquisition of the target structure more than the explicit WCF. It reveals that, ECF raises learners’ awareness about their errors. These results make it necessary to state some recommendations and suggestions for further research.
**General Conclusion**

Acquiring grammatical aspects in EFL learning in general and the irregular past tense in particular is considered as a difficult process that most learners fail to master even in advanced levels; an explicit written corrective feedback may interfere and play a great role in this case. Therefore, this study is aimed at investigating the impact of the explicit corrective feedback in comparison to the implicit written corrective feedback, as a strategy of detecting learners’ errors, on the acquisition of the irregular past tense. To fulfill this aim a quasi-experimental study was carried out. The results that are obtained from this study support both hypotheses the research and the alternative hypothesis since the students proved the effectiveness of the explicit WCF, and teachers have shown an emphasise on the implicit WCF.

These results doesn’t mean that teachers should rely only on the explicit corrective feedback as a strategy to help learners acquire grammar rules, but they should try to combine it with appropriate instructional materials; for instance, an explicit instruction of such grammar rules.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Pre-test

Exercise 01: Write verbs between brackets ( ) in past simple

1. Jack (to see) Emily at the party.
2. The football coach (to choose) the white shirts.
3. The bird (to fly) high in the sky.
4. Lucy (to by) a news paper.
5. The doctor (to give) me some medicine.
6. Mohamed (to send) yacine his photographs.
7. The tutor group (to win) a prize.
8. We (to be) in hurry yesterday.
9. She (to read) the announce.
10. My parents (to hear) the good news.

Exercise 02: Form meaningful sentences using these words

- They /a/ song/ to sing
- Homework/ Steven/his/ to forget
- Coffee/ her/ to drink/ Julia
- The / to/ we/ to run/ house
- My/ a lot/to make/ brother
Exercise 03: Circle the correct verbs

- Led
- Caught
- Thought
- Sweared
- Bent
- throw
- understood
- layed
- Came out
- keeped

Exercise 04: Write a short paragraph in which you describe how you spent your last winter vacation (the activities, the places) using 5 of the following verbs: To do, to go, to have, to leave, to meet, to take, to ride, to take, to tell, to feel, to get.
Appendix B1: An Introduction to Irregular past tense

- What is the irregular past tense?

In English, the simple past tense is used for actions or situations that began and ended before now. There are three ways to make simple past tense. The first case is what happens with the verb *be*: *am* and *is* change to *was* and *are* changes to *were*. The second one is what happens with regular verbs: most regular verbs add *-ed* or *-d* to the base (simple) form, but some verbs ending in *y* change *i* and then add *-ed*. The third case is for irregular verbs. Irregular verbs do not make their past tense by adding *-d* or *-ed* or by changing *y* to *i* and adding *ed*. Instead, they make their past forms in several ways:

- For some irregular verbs, the simple and past forms are the same. Here are a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beat</td>
<td>beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bet</td>
<td>bet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burst</td>
<td>burst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit</td>
<td>hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurt</td>
<td>hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set</td>
<td>set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For many irregular verbs, the simple and past forms have different vowels. Here are a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arise</td>
<td>arose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become</td>
<td>became</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For many irregular verbs, the simple verb and the past form have different endings (and often different vowels):

- begin: began
- break: broke
- choose: chose
- dig: dug
- draw: drew
- eat: ate
- fall: fell
- feed: fed
- find: found
- fly: flew
- forget: forgot
- freeze: froze
- get: got
- give: gave
- hide: hid
- hold: held
- know: knew
- lead: led
- lie: lay
- meet: met
- ride: rode
- ring: rang
- rise: rose
- take: took
- tear: tore
- weave: wove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bend</td>
<td>bent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring</td>
<td>brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch</td>
<td>caught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creep</td>
<td>crept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do (does)</td>
<td>did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have (has)</td>
<td>had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose</td>
<td>lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>meant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pay</td>
<td>paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek</td>
<td>sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>slept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend</td>
<td>spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>stood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few irregular verbs have more than one past form. Here are a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dream</td>
<td>dreamed, dreamt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit</td>
<td>fit, fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kneel</td>
<td>knelt, kneeled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leap</td>
<td>leaped, leapt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light</td>
<td>lit, lighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shine</td>
<td>shone, shined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speed</td>
<td>sped, speeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spit, spat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wake</td>
<td>woke, waked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a few irregular verbs, one past form tends is more common in American English and a different one is more common in British English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>burned</td>
<td>burnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lean</td>
<td>leaned</td>
<td>leant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn</td>
<td>learned</td>
<td>learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell</td>
<td>smelled</td>
<td>smelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoil</td>
<td>spoiled</td>
<td>spoilt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common irregular verb “go” has a completely different past form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Went</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simple and past forms of read have the same spelling, but they are pronounced differently: **simple:** read (pronounced the same as **reed**) **past:** read (pronounced the same as **red**)

There are no easy rules to help you learn the past forms for irregular verbs quickly. Unfortunately, you will have to memorize them!
Appendix B2: Practice on the irregular past tense

Exercise 01: Turn the verbs between brackets into the past tense.

She (to bring) some chocolates to the party.
My sister (to hear) a new song on the radio.
I (to read) three books last week.
They (to speak) French to the waitress.
My son (to understand) during the class, but now he doesn’t understand.

Exercise 02: Imagine that you had a trip or a picnic with your family members,
Write an E-mail to your friend on Facebook in which you inform him/her about
this adventure, using 5 verbs from the following list: to go, to see, to come, to
catch, to find, to get, to give, to spend, to take.
Appendix B3: Practice on the Use of the irregular past tense

Exercise 01: Form meaningful sentences using the following words (use the past tense).

To keep/ promise/ friend/ his/ my
Some/ to buy/ milk/ she/ to forget
My/ to have/ a baby/ teacher/ month/ previous/ the
In/ to sleep / children/ the/ my/ car
To lose/ they / last/ keys/ their/ week

Exercise 02: Circle the correct verbs

- Threw
- Wrang
- Toren
- Sowed
- Lended
- Wepten
- Stood
- Put
- Grewn
Appendix B4: Practice on the Use of the irregular past tense

Exercise 01: Form meaningful sentences using the following words (use the past tense)

To swim 500 m they
a age the 23 she to become at of doctor
the Julia to know yesterday answer
that to live me El Kala to tell he they in
20000 DA Maria to lend company the

Exercise 02: you were invited to a one of your family member enjoyable wedding.
In a short paragraph, narrate and describe the events that you have witnessed,
using 5 verbs of the following verbs: to sing, to eat, to wear, to drink, to choose, to
begin, to feel, to do.
Appendix B5: Practice on the use of the irregular past tense

Exercise 01: Turn the verbs between brackets into the past tense.

1. My teacher (drink) too much coffee yesterday
2. We (to fly) to Oran.
3. She (to drive) to Tunisia.
4. I (to teach) English at the University.
5. He (to feel) terrible just after eating the sandwich.

Exercise 02: Form meaningful sentences using the following words (use the past tense)

the cat / to run/ after / the dog
what / he / to have / for lunch
noise/ to make/ a lot/ brother/ of/ my
in/ restaurant/ the/ parents/ to be/ her
a/ Jasmine/ picture/ to draw
Appendix B6: More practice on the use of the irregular past tense

Exercise 01: Circle the correct verbs

- Ground
- Swang
- Fleed
- Shut
- Thrust
- Blew
- Shoke
- kosten
- Beated

Exercise 02: Turn the verbs between brackets into the past tense.

We (to left) the house at 7 a.m.
I (to gave) my mother a gift in her birthday.
Did you (to see) my little cat?
The hotel room (to be) very nice.
She (to forget) to do her home work.
Appendix D: Post-test

Exercise 01: Write verbs between brackets ( ) in past simple

1. I (to fall) from the tree.
2. The child (to break) his arm.
3. Yesterday, Karim (to fight) with his neighbor.
4. How they (to ride) this horse?
5. The poet (to write) a very romantic verses.
6. The NASA scientists (to make) a new type of space ship.
7. The student (to be) not satisfied about her marks.
8. My husband (to buy) a new car.
9. The young man (to steal) a very expensive diamond.
10. The sniper (to shoot) a citizen.

Exercise 02: Form meaningful sentences using these words (use the past tense)

- Man/ a / house/ to build/ rich/ new/ the
- To hold/ he/ breaths/ his
- Just / my/ to pay/ I /for/ tickets
- The/ of/ to come out/ house/ they
- This / she/ to be/ morning/ late
Exercise 03: Circle the correct form of verbs

- Sat
- Meaned
- aten
- sang
- Showed
- Teached
- Spread
- finded
- Slewn
- Taught

Exercise 04: Imagine you had an unlucky day yesterday. Write down a short paragraph in which you describe hour by hour all the unhappy events that interrupted your daily activities. Using 5 verbs of the following list: to break, to get, to do, to lose, to fall, to fight, to forget, to go, to hold, to leave, to run.
Appendix 2

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear Teachers,

My name is Boumendjel Amel and I am Master 2 student at Larbi Ben M’Hidi university-Oum El Bouaghi. I would like to thank you for your co-operation by accepting to respond to this questionnaire. I am conducting an investigation that examines the impact of two different types of written corrective feedback on students’ acquisition of the irregular past tense. Administering this questionnaire is one of the means that I am using to collect data. Your response to all the questions will be of great significance for the study. Please do not hesitate to express your own attitudes when responding to each question, because the main purpose behind this questionnaire is to collect data for academic research and so I am not seeking or looking for best answers. I assure you that your responds will remain confidential and anonymous and that the data you provide will not be used but for research purposes. Responding to this questionnaire will not take more than 20 minutes. Please make sure that you provide all the required demographical and academic information and that you do not skip any question as this could harm the findings of the study. The questions are easy and self-explanatory. Yet, feel free to ask me if you find any of the questions unclear or confusing.

Thank you again for your co-operation,

Boumendjel Amel

April, 2015
Section 1: Demographical Data

Teacher Name:
1- Gender: Male / Female
2- Age:

Section 2: Academic Data

3- Teacher qualifications
4- Years of experience
5- Academic Department

Section 3: Teachers’ Actual Use of WCF in EFL classes

Put a tick under the answer that best describes your response to the questions or the statements:

6- Do you give feedback on your students’ writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a- Always</th>
<th>b- Often</th>
<th>c- Sometimes</th>
<th>d- Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7- Do you give feedback on form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a- Always</th>
<th>b- Often</th>
<th>c- Sometimes</th>
<th>d- Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8- Do you mark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a- All errors</th>
<th>b- All major errors but not minor ones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9- What kinds of errors are most repeated in your students’ writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Vocabulary</th>
<th>b- Tenses</th>
<th>c- Punctuation</th>
<th>d- Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10- In the case of tenses, learners are frequently fall in errors while using:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Present tense</th>
<th>b- Future tense</th>
<th>c- Regular past tense</th>
<th>d- Irregular past tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11- You feedback is heavily adresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Present tense</th>
<th>b- Future tense</th>
<th>c- Regular past tense</th>
<th>d- Irregular past tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12- Which way you used to correct errors in relation to the misuse of irregular past tense?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Explicitly</th>
<th>b- Implicitly</th>
<th>c- Other types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Four: Beliefs and attitudes towards written corrective Feedback benefits

13- WCF is beneficial for learners’ acquisition of grammatical structures (specifically the irregular past tense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Strongly Agree</th>
<th>b- Agree</th>
<th>c- Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>d- Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14-Do you think that explicit WCF is more effective in comparison to the implicit WCF for the acquisition of the irregular past tense, and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Strongly Agree</th>
<th>b- Agree</th>
<th>c- Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>D- Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15- Students value the WCF they receive from teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Strongly Agree</th>
<th>b- Agree</th>
<th>c- Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>D- Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16- It is the duty of teachers to provide their learners with WCF on students’ errors related to the misuse of the irregular past tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- Strongly Agree</th>
<th>b- Agree</th>
<th>c- Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>D- Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Résumé

La grammaire est un élément crucial et il est très utile pour les processus d'apprentissage des langues efficaces. Les apprenants de langues étrangères confrontées à des difficultés dans l'acquisition de ces caractéristiques grammaticales de cette langue. La présente étude vise à étudier l'effet de rétroaction corrective explicite vs. implicite sur l'acquisition du passé irrégulière tendue entre des étudiants de deuxième année LMD au département d'anglais à l'Université Ben Jdid Chadli, El Tarf. Afin d'examiner l'hypothèse de recherche qui écrit rétroaction corrective explicite a un impact positif sur l'acquisition du passé irrégulière tendue des apprenants par rapport à la rétroaction corrective implicite, et l'hypothèse alternative que la rétroaction corrective écrit implicite a un effet positif sur l'acquisition du passé irrégulière tendue, une expérience quasi a été réalisée pour les apprenants en plus un questionnaire a été administré à des enseignants. La quasi-expérience nécessite un pré-test, la période de traitement, et un post-test. Les résultats définitifs suggérer que la variable indépendante (rétroaction corrective explicite) a une amélioration significative sur la variable dépendante (le passé irrégulière tendue) de plus que celui implicite. Depuis l'effet positif de l'ECF, les enseignants ont besoin d'utiliser ce type de rétroaction pour les étudiants pour les aider à acquérir facilement les traits grammaticaux.
ملخص

تعد قواعد اللغة عناصرًا فعالة خلال تعلم أي لغة أجنبية و مع هذا يواجه الكثير من طلبة اللغات الأجنبية صعوبات عند استعمال هذا العناصر الهام كحل لهذه المشكلة تزويج الطلبة بالملاحظات الكتابية التصحيحية قد تكون مفيدة و فعالة في هذه الحالة تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى تقصي و إيجاد مدى فعالية الملاحظات التصحيحية المباشرة بالمقارنة مع الملاحظات التصحيحية الغير مباشرة على اكتساب الأنشطة النحوية للأفعال الفعل غير منتظمة في صفقة الماضي في حالة طلبة السنة الثانية في قسم الإنجليزية بجامعة السيواني بن جديد الطارف.

لغرض إثبات الفرضية المطرحية أجرينا تجربة مصغرة و التي تضم مجموعتين المجموعة الأولى تتلقي ملاحظات تصحيحية مباشرة و المجموعة الثانية تتلقي ملاحظات تصحيحية غير مباشرة، إضافة إلى مجموعة الأسيلة تلقها بعض الأساتذة في خضم الموضوع.

كانت النتائج المتحصل عليها من الاختبار الثنائي و المستقل أن الملاحظات التصحيحية المباشرة لها دور فعال بالمقارنة مع الملاحظات التصحيحية الغير مباشرة في مساعدة طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية على اكتساب القواعد النحوية للأفعال غير المنتظمة في صفقة الماضي لذلك يجب على الأساتذة استعمال هذا النوع من التصحيحات لتسهيل اكتساب القواعد النحوية بطريقة فعالة.