

forms of feedback, such as underlining or error codes. Shintani and Ellis (2013) studied the use of the indefinite article with groups that received DEC and ME. They found that the ME group outperformed the DEC group in terms of explicit knowledge (in an error correction test) but not in terms of implicit knowledge in the second writing task or a delayed third writing task. Rummel (2014) reported similar results and no difference between DEC, ME and indirect feedback when dealing with the past simple and present perfect tenses. Finally, Shintani, Ellis and Suzuki (2014) took Shinani and Ellis' (2013) work with articles as a starting point and updated it, adding the hypothetical conditional as another target structure. They reported that DEC was more effective than ME after two weeks and in later revisions. Although these results contradict their previous year's findings, they suggested that "DEC may be more helpful to lower proficiency learners for complex structures like the hypothetical conditional" (Bitchener & Storch, 2016, p. 52).

## CONCLUSION

This theoretical background lays the foundation of the following empirical study. Taking into account what other authors have reported on the matter, and since the degree of explicitness of different types of feedback has been a topic of interest in SLA throughout the years, the second part of this study compares Direct WCF and ME in a two-session TR activity with vocational training students. The results obtained are then discussed and compared to the existing research on the matter.

## Bibliografía

- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on the language learning potential of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 348–363.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*, 37, 322-329.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2010) Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 207-2017.
- Bitchener, J. & Storch, N. (2016). *Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effect of error correction in L2 writing: not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 136-140.
- Bruton, A. (2010). Another reply to Truscott on error correction: Improved situated designs over statistics. *System*, 38, 491-498.
- Coombe, C., Folse, K., Hubley, N. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Assessing English Language Learners*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63, 97-107.
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14, 445–463.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-10.
- Ferris, D. (2004). The 'grammar correction' debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 49–62.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, 161-184
- Goldstein, L. M. (2016). Making use of teacher written feedback. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 308-434). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Hirvela, A. (2011). Writing to learn in content areas: Research insights. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp.37-59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hyland, F., Nicolás-Conesa, F. & Cerezo, L. (2016). Key issues of debate about feedback on writing. In R. M. Manchón & P. K.

Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 433-452). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter

- Kang, E. & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 1-18.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Manchón, R. M. (2011a). Situating the learning-to-write and writing-to-learn dimensions of L2 writing. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 3-14). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Manchón, R. M. (2011b). Writing to learn the language: issues in theory and research. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 61-82). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Manchón, R. M. (2014). The distinctive nature of task repetition in writing. Implications for theory, research, and pedagogy. *ELIA*, 14. 13–42.
- Manchón, R. M. & Williams, J. (2016). L2 writing and SLA studies. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 567-586). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter
- Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction controversy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 375–389
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
- Shintani, N. & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 286-306.
- Shintani, N., Ellis, R. & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64, 103-131.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A Response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8, 111–122.
- Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10, 1–27.