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Abstract

The effects of direct and indirect feedback on second language (L2) writing have especially received attention from researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). With both direct and indirect feedback on all errors made by students being unmistakably a large burden on teachers’ time and energy, there is a pedagogical importance of investigating the effects of grammar explanation as opposed to providing such feedback. For this reason, the current research aims to look at the effect grammar explanation has on students’ accuracy in English composition writing. Using a pretest-treatment-posttest research design with 111 Japanese university students of English as a foreign language (EFL), we compared effectiveness of direct feedback and grammar explanation on explicit understanding of past hypothetical conditionals in English. Results show (a) improvement was seen from the pretest to the posttest, regardless of the group participants belonged to, and (b) there were no salient differences in how much each group improved. These results are discussed with reference to theories and empirical evidence in SLA. Limitations, future directions, and some pedagogical implications are also discussed.

1. Introduction

There are often discussions amongst English teachers around the world regarding the most effective way to give students feedback on linguistic errors in their written compositions. Questions are often raised as to whether teachers should correct all errors (i.e., unfocused feedback), or concentrate on one or a few particular grammatical features (i.e., focused feedback). Furthermore, whether the teacher decides to correct all errors or concentrate on one type, they are faced with another dilemma of either giving the correct form of the errors (i.e., direct feedback) to
students or simply locating where the problem is, allowing students to correct the errors themselves (i.e., indirect feedback). Another possible method of feedback lies in grammar explanation, where errors indicated by teachers are accompanied by a brief commentary related to the incorrectly used grammatical properties. In addition, factors related to the proficiency level of students and their enthusiasm to learn affect decisions regarding the type and amount of feedback teachers give students. Teachers may tend to give direct feedback to students with lower proficiency, yet indirect feedback to those with higher proficiency. They may also feel that students who have little motivation to learn would be inclined to ignore feedback on linguistic errors, and therefore praise such students simply for making the effort to write, or just make comments related to the content of the students’ compositions. There has been much research in SLA with the goal of providing a deeper understanding of effective ways of giving feedback in order to help students use correct form in writing. The current paper aims to strengthen the understanding of feedback in SLA by presenting data comparing the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback or error correction and grammar explanation.

2. Literature review

In recent years, the effects of two varieties of corrective feedback have especially received attention from researchers in the field of SLA: direct feedback, where instructors write grammatical errors in their correct form for the student to see clearly, and indirect feedback, in which teachers simply locate errors by, for example, underlining, highlighting, or coding the error, giving no information to students as to the correct way of writing (Ferris, 2012). According to Ferris (2002), indirect feedback seems to be more effective, as students are encouraged to consider the correct language required, triggering more profound cognitive processes (e.g., noticing) in students’ learning than would occur when using the direct feedback method. Although there are some studies that give evidence to support this view, the majority of studies show direct feedback to be a more compelling argument in improving the grammatical accuracy of students’ written compositions (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Fazio, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). In fact, contrary to the thought that indirect feedback would encourage students’ cognitive processing and thus be a more attractive method, it is now widely accepted in SLA that giving direct feedback is more beneficial for students (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). A reason for this could be that in the case of students who lack enthusiasm for learning, it may be difficult to consider the correct form required when errors are only pointed out using indirect feedback. In such cases, it can be concluded that using direct feedback and giving the correct form to students is more beneficial to their learning. Therefore, in the current research, considering the proficiency level of the participating Japanese university students to be intermediate low, we have concentrated on using direct feedback, rather than indirect.
As mentioned earlier in this paper, despite there being ample research comparing the effectiveness of direct feedback and indirect feedback, with the exception of some (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Shintani & Ellis, 2013), there seem to be few studies that explore the benefits of adding a grammatical explanation to enable students to understand the reasons behind their linguistic errors. In Bitchener’s (2008) study on feedback for students’ article errors in their English writing, for example, three groups were created for the research project (i.e., direct correction, written metalinguistic explanation, oral metalinguistic explanation group; direct correction, written metalinguistic explanation group; and direct correction only group) in addition to a control group, which received no feedback at all. The accuracy of students’ article usage was analyzed immediately after and two months after they had been given feedback on a passage they had written. All three groups showed significantly greater accuracy over the control group in both immediate and delayed writing tasks. However, Bitchener (2008) failed to verify whether only providing a grammatical explanation is sufficient to improve students’ writing accuracy. Shintani and Ellis (2013), on the other hand, investigated feedback on the use of definite and indefinite articles, comparing grammar explanation and direct correction. In this case, students who were provided with a grammar explanation for their errors were able to produce more accurate writing in both a revision composition and a new piece of writing. Research into the effects of presenting a grammatical explanation is still in its early stages, but with both direct and indirect feedback on all errors made by students being unmistakably a large burden on teachers’ time and energy, there is little doubt of grammar explanation being a convincing substitute for previously popular methods. Therefore, there is a pedagogical importance to investigate the effects of grammar explanation as opposed to providing corrective feedback. For this reason, the current research aims to look further at the effect grammar explanation has on students’ accuracy in English composition writing.

Finally, there has been much discussion in recent years regarding whether all errors should be corrected (i.e., unfocused feedback), or the range should be limited to a particular linguistic feature (i.e., focused feedback). It could be said that many teachers prefer to correct every error, rather than directing their feedback to one or two points. However, SLA research (e.g., Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen et al., 2009) has shown focused feedback to be more advantageous than unfocused feedback, as it centers learners’ attention on one or two characteristics of their writing. In a study concentrating on feedback on errors related to article usage, Sheen et al. (2009) discovered that in a new piece of writing, compared to the unfocused feedback group, the focused feedback group showed more significant improvements in the accuracy of not only articles, but also be copula, regular past tense, irregular past tense, and prepositions. Although they do not conduct comparisons with unfocused feedback, Bitchener and his colleague have looked at both the short-term (i.e, two months) and long-term (i.e., 10 months) effects focused feedback has on the accuracy of students’ writing (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). Comparisons of the linguistic outcomes resulting from focused feedback and unfocused feedback are still in the
early stages of this research area, and a much deeper understanding is necessary. Consequently, in the current research, we concentrated on focused feedback, which has been deemed both theoretically and in practice to be the most constructive method of feedback.

Based on the above literature review, the current paper attempts to address the following three research questions:
1. Does providing direct feedback on errors in L2 writing facilitate knowledge of the past hypothetical conditional in English?
2. Does providing grammar explanation on errors in L2 writing facilitate knowledge of the target structure?
3. Is providing direct feedback more effective than grammar explanation in developing knowledge of the target structure?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The current research was conducted in the first university semester of 2012. The participants in the present study were 111 first- and second-year university students majoring in a variety of courses (including those related to English) at a national university in northeast Japan. The students were randomly put into three groups (i.e., direct feedback group, grammar explanation group, and control group). Due to some students being absent at some stages of the experiment, the data for 27, 29 and 34 participants respectively were available for analysis. Table 1 shows a summary of the sample numbers in the current research project.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct feedback</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Linguistic target

The current study uses the past hypothetical conditional (e.g., If I had had some money, I would have bought a new computer.) as the target grammatical feature. Because there are no conditionals in the Japanese language, it is difficult for Japanese EFL learners to master such sentence structures. The past hypothetical conditional is especially difficult; due to an “if clause” being used as the sentence subject and a lot of information being conveyed, many students remark how formidable they find such complex syntax in their learning.
3.3 Design and procedures

Table 2 shows an outline of the pretest-treatment-posttest design used over the five weeks of this study. In the first week, students in all three groups were given a grammar test and L2 writing task 1. Students were allowed as much time as required to complete the grammar test, which took an average of approximately 20 minutes. Students were given 30 minutes to reconstruct a given text. Immediately after completing the writing task, one of the researchers corrected all past hypothetical conditional errors, but no other grammatical aspects, prior to week 2 of the experiment. More details related to the writing task are discussed in section 3.4.1 of this paper.

In the second week of the experiment, the direct feedback group had their papers returned with direct corrections and were given five minutes to peruse their errors and how they had been corrected. The grammar explanation group was asked to read through prepared explanations written in Japanese of grammatical points related to errors that had appeared in students’ written texts. After this, students were required to complete L2 writing task 2, which, similar to the writing task 1, took approximately 30 minutes. The control group only participated in L2 writing task 2, without any feedback related to L2 writing task 1.

In week 4, all three groups were required to complete L2 writing task 3, which, like the writing tasks 1 and 2, took approximately 30 minutes. In the fifth and final week of the experiment, in addition to completing a grammar test, which was the same as that conducted in week 1, students were asked to answer survey items related to their gender, age and study abroad experience.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct feedback</th>
<th>Grammar explanation</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar pretest + Writing task 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Direct feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct feedback</td>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing task 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing task 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar posttest + Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Materials

3.4.1 L2 writing tasks

A dictogloss was used in the current research as a method of having students produce an English written texts\(^2\). Three passages using similar structures and vocabulary were prepared, with the titles being, *The bachelor* (see below), *A trip abroad*, and *University majors*. The lengths of the passages were 188 words, 207 words and 223 words respectively, and each included the target
grammatical feature six times. The variety of topics were chosen in order for there to be counterbalance between the participants.

A Bachelor’s Life
Koji Nonaka is 40 years old and a bachelor. When he was younger he had a lot of girlfriends and they all wanted to marry him but he rejected them. There was Norika. She came from a rich family. If he had married her, he would have lived in a big house. Then there was Sayaka. She was a great cook. If he had married her he would have enjoyed fantastic meals every night. Maria was a very beautiful Italian girl. If he had married her he would have gone to live in Italy. Natsue was a great conversationalist. If he had married her he would have had lots of fun talking to her. But the most special woman was Atsuko. She became a very successful actress. If he had married her he would have met lots of famous people. Now he often thinks about all these women and the life he might have had. But he always concludes that it is really better to stay single. He knew that if he had married any of them, he would have had a lot of problems!

All participants listened to a recording of the passage twice, while taking notes on a handout that had been given to them at the beginning of the experiment (see Appendix A). After this, using the notes they had taken while listening to the recordings, participants used another handout (see Appendix B) to reconstruct the text they had heard as accurately as they could.

The authors chose a dictogloss for this research in order for there to be sufficient errors of the target grammar feature. Because a dictogloss requires students to reconstruct the text they have heard, they are forced to produce the language targeted by the researchers. Thus, it was hypothesized that by using a dictogloss, the students, who were not used to writing English regularly, would produce many errors in their use of the target grammar. On the other hand, if a free-writing exercise had been used, it was thought that the participants would tend to avoid using difficult grammatical structures such as the one being focused upon in the current research, resulting in a lower number of errors. With few errors, there would be little need for feedback, and consequently, it would be difficult to affirm its effect.

3.4.2 Corrective feedback in writing
The present study uses direct correction and grammar explanation as the methods of corrective feedback on writing. Direct feedback in the current study refers to, as shown in the example below, feedback where the language instructor drew a line through errors in past hypothetical conditionals used by the students and wrote the correct form nearby. Red pen was used for the feedback, and errors in other grammar features, such as majored in law in the below example, were not corrected.
Ex) If I **have** majored law, I would have become a lawyer.

had

The grammar explanation was, as shown in Appendix C, conducted by providing a brief explanation about the past hypothetical conditional in Japanese.

3.4.3 Grammar test and analysis

The grammar test on past hypothetical conditionals used in the present study included 14 multiple-choice items (see below for an example, and Appendix D for the remaining items). Each correct answer was given a score of one, and incorrect answers were marked zero.

Ex) If he (________) her, he would have had fantastic meals every night.

a) had married  b) married  c) marries  d) has married

4. Results and discussion

The results of the pre- and post-grammar test can be found in Table 3. The direct feedback group scored 10.67 out of a maximum of 14 in the pretest and 12.96 in the posttest. The grammar explanation group scored 11.62 and 12.21 and the control group 9.97 and 11.09 respectively. A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed the main effect of time ($p < .05$), but not the main effect of group nor the interaction between time and group. A post-hoc analysis showed no significant differences between the groups in the pretest or posttest. In other words, regardless of the group participants belonged to, improvement was seen from the pretest to the posttest, but there were no salient differences in how much each group improved. These results will now be discussed based on the research questions indicated earlier in this paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Grammar test results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Correction</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Explanation</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first research question asked if providing direct feedback on errors in L2 writing improves Japanese EFL learners’ knowledge of the past hypothetical conditionals in English. As no significant difference was observed between the direct feedback group and the control group, it can be concluded that direct feedback does not develop explicit knowledge of the target structure.
This shows different results to previous findings, which suggested the direct feedback group would improve more greatly than the control group (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). A reason for the differing results may lie with retrieval practice (Karpicke & Roediger, 2008). Retrieval practice through testing seems to improve students’ memory strength more so than listening or writing information. In the present research, because students were able to score on average between 70 and 80 percent in the pretest, it could be said that they already had a relatively high mastery and explicit understanding of the past hypothetical conditional, therefore retrieving the targeted grammar through testing only improved accuracy. Moreover, through repeatedly hearing the target grammatical feature in the dictogloss task, students may have become more aware of the target item, and this resulted in an increase in participants’ average scores in the posttest.

The second research question investigated whether providing grammar explanation on errors in L2 writing improves the EFL learners’ knowledge of the targeted grammar. In results resembling those of research question one, the grammatical explanation group did not show any significant improvement over the control group in the posttest, suggesting that presenting grammatical explanations to students does not bring about more accurate understanding of the target structure. Once again, this shows differing conclusions to those of previous research (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Shintani & Ellis, 2013). The effects of retrieval practice and/or repeated exposure to the targeted items through listening can also explain the results of the current study, suggesting that grammar explanation does not arise to language improvement. Also, because the paper explaining the past hypothetical conditional also included commentary on the use of indefinite articles, participants had to concentrate on two different grammatical points, which may have made it difficult for them to gain a deeper understanding of the grammatical rules for these syntactic structures.

Research question three asked if direct feedback is more effective than grammar explanation in developing the participants’ knowledge of the past hypothetical conditional in English. The data show similar results with no significant difference between the two groups, suggesting neither to be a more powerful method of giving feedback than the other. Despite their being no significant improvement when compared to the control group, it is worth mentioning that without correcting every mistake in the composition, the grammar explanation method and direct feedback method saw similar results in the posttest. Giving direct feedback for every error in a composition puts an immense burden on teachers’ time and energy. Although the scope of the current study is rather limited, based on these results, we might wish to make the suggestion of the grammar explanation method to be one that lessens the burden on teachers, while bringing about similar benefits to that of the direct feedback method. This follows previous research, which gave the same recommendations. Bitchener (2008), for example, proposed that although the effects of the grammar explanation method (both oral and written) alone are yet to be firmly validated, it does show similar benefits as the direct feedback method in new pieces of writing. According to
Shintani and Ellis (2013), students whose compositions were given feedback using the grammar explanation method displayed significant improvements in accuracy in both a revision and new piece of writing. Furthermore, it has been shown in oral feedback research (e.g., Murano, 2000) that when teachers provide a simple grammatical explanation to accompany a recast or clarification request during communicative interaction, it has a significant effect on the acquisition of the target linguistic items. Also, Nassaji (2007) indicates that teachers’ oral explanations on errors in written compositions have beneficial effects for developing L2 knowledge. There is a need to conduct further research regarding feedback on EFL learners’ linguistic errors, not only in the areas of direct and indirect feedback, but also in the success of providing a grammar explanation.

5. Limitations and future directions

This paper concludes by mentioning its limitations and future directions. First, because the university students participating in this research had rather strong explicit knowledge of the grammar point being focused upon, it may be unwise to apply the findings to lower proficiency learners such as junior high and high school students in Japan. Obviously, students who do not have some kind of explicit grammatical knowledge would not be appropriate (e.g., Bigelow, DelMas, Hansen, & Tarone, 2006). Replication studies are thus necessary.

The second limitation is the validity of the grammar test used. The multiple-choice test might not have elicited the learners’ grammatical knowledge precisely. Other studies tend to use error correction tests rather than multiple-choice test, in which answers could be guessed (e.g., Sheen, 2007). This could be one reason why no significant differences were found among the direct feedback and grammar explanation groups.

Third, it should be added that a dictogloss is a memory task and therefore it can justifiably be argued that it is not an output task in the pure sense. Because a dictogloss is conducted by listening to a passage and remembering the content and language used, it is cognitively demanding and the listening ability of the participants may affect their results. On the other hand, a free-composition task does not require any listening proficiency or memorizing skills, and therefore can be called a true output task. Although we acknowledge that this point is important in SLA, it is clearly beyond the scope of the current study.

Fourth, there is a need to explore whether similar results to those in the current paper would be seen if a less complex grammatical structure were used. In a study investigating the effect of an output task, Uggen (2012), for example, claimed that complex structures (e.g., past hypothetical conditionals) bring about greater results than simpler structures (e.g., present hypothetical conditionals). Although Uggen’s study did not concentrate on feedback, as it and other studies (e.g., Bitchener et al., 2005; Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014) do suggest that different results
may be seen depending on the complexity of the language chosen, there is a need for further study with this in consideration.

Finally, because the present study does not take into account individual difference amongst participants, there is a need to add this factor to future developments. For example, there is room for further understanding as to what degree aptitude (i.e., linguistic analytic skill) has on the effect of corrective feedback. Sheen (2007) remarks that for students with high linguistic analytical skills, the grammar explanation method is more beneficial than the direct feedback method. On the other hand, Erlam (2005) suggests that those with high linguistic analytical skills are able to inductively create rules for the language based upon the feedback they receive. Kormos (2012) declares that relationships between written feedback and individual differences (e.g., aptitude, learning motivation, language anxiety, proficiency levels) be a vital area of future research.

Notes
1. This paper is a part of a large scale study which examined effectiveness of different types of feedback on acquisition of past hypothetical conditionals as well as indefinite articles (e.g., My friend has a little daughter. She wants to be a pianist.) However, the present paper focuses only on past hypothetical conditionals.
2. Although it is not reported in the present paper, feedback given to students on L2 writing task 1 may also have an effect on the writing performance of L2 writing tasks 2 and 3. See Shintani, Ellis, and Suzuki (2014).

Acknowledgements

The current research was funded by the Miyagi University of Education President’s special research grant. Our sincere thanks go to the students and teachers for their participation in this study. Part of this paper was presented at the 2013 annual conference of the Japan Society of English Language Education. We would like to thank Konomi Ariji, Rod Ellis, Moe Hashiba, and Natsuko Shintani for their assistance throughout this project. Finally, we are grateful for the helpful comments from the three anonymous reviewers of ARELE.

References


59


Appendix A: Task sheet

You will now hear an English passage read twice. As you are listening, feel free to take notes in the space provided below. You can take notes in either Japanese or English. After listening, use your notes to write the complete passage you heard as accurately as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>If he had married…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norika</td>
<td>rich family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atsuko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If he had married any of them…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachelor: a man who has never been married
Conversationalist: someone who talks about intelligent, amusing, and interesting things

Appendix B. Writing sheet

Name
A Bachelor’s Life
Appendix C. Grammar explanation

For you to rewrite last week's passage move accurately, you need to review two grammar rules. Please read the following instructions instructions carefully, and check these errors in your essay.

(Rule 1) When do you use the indefinite article ‘a’?
Japanese learners of English tend to forget the indefinite article ‘a/an’ because the article system in English does not exist in Japanese language. Here are the two common uses of indefinite articles that Japanese often forget to put in a sentence.
1. To describe a common singular noun as a nonspecific referent for an interlocutor or reader.
   e.g., I bought a Toyota car. (An interlocutor hears a Toyota car for the first time.)
2. To describe a noun as someone’s occupation or character.
   e.g., He is an accountant. (occupation) She is a perfectionist. (character)

(Rule 2) To express regret for something that occurred in the past.
I am sure everybody has experienced this at one time or another, i.e., “if you had/had not done something at that particular time”. For example, “If I had left ten minutes earlier, I would have caught the last train.” (Actually I did not leave early, so I did not catch the last train.)
To describe conditions and results that were unreal or untrue in the past in English, you have to use a special grammatical structure. Check the essential four steps in English below.
Think about the meaning of the sentence you want to describe carefully. Imagine a situation which did not occur in the past.
A sentence consists of two clauses.
1) An if clause: If + subject + had+ past participle,
   e.g., If I had left 10 minutes earlier,
2) A main clause: subject + would/ could + have+ past participle
   e.g., I would have caught the last train.
Take a closer look at the sentences above.
In the if clause, use had + past participle
In the main clause, use past tense auxiliary verbs (would/could/might) + have + past participle (these past tense auxiliary verbs describe your regrettable feeling about the past). By using perfect tense (have + past participle) after past tense auxiliary verbs, people can understand that you are talking about the past.
You can start a sentence with either the if clause or the main clause. So, you can say the sentence above in the following two ways.
If I had left ten minutes earlier, I would have caught the last train or I would have caught the last train if I had left ten minutes earlier.
Appendix D: Grammar Test

1. If he ( ) her, he would have had fantastic meals every night.
   1) had married, 2) married, 3) marries, 4) has married

3. He failed the mathematics course. If he had attended two more classes, he ( ) the course.
   1) would have pass, 2) would have passed, 3) would pass, 4) had passed

6. He went to Turkey but didn’t have time to go to Istanbul. If he ( ) to Istanbul, he would have bought some jewelry in the Bazaar.
   1) goes, 2) has gone, 3) went, 4) had gone

8. He liked Mary very much but never married her. If he ( ), he would have been very happy.
   1) married her, 2) had married her, 3) has married her, 4) marries her

9. His computer suddenly stopped working and he lost all the data. If he had saved his data, he ( ) his data.
   1) wouldn’t have lost, 2) wouldn’t have lose, 3) wouldn’t be losing, 4) wouldn’t lose

11. He missed his plane so he couldn’t go to Egypt. If he had gone to Egypt, he ( ) the pyramids.
    1) would have visit, 2) would have visited, 3) would visit, 4) would be visiting

13. He quit a soccer team when he was 10 years old. If he ( ) playing soccer, he would have become a professional soccer player.
    1) had continued, 2) continued, 3) has continued, 4) continues

15. He always wanted to open a restaurant but knew it was impossible. If he ( ) a restaurant, he would get a best restaurant award.
    1) opened, 2) had opened, 3) has opened, 4) opens

17. The guests of the restaurant got sick after eating the steak. If the restaurant hadn’t used the old steak, the guests ( ).
    1) wouldn’t have got sick, 2) wouldn’t get sick, 3) wouldn’t have get sick, 4) wouldn’t be getting sick

19. Lindsay was a beautiful actress but Mike didn’t marry her. If he ( ) her, he would have met lots of famous people.
    1) has married, 2) marries, 3) married, 4) had married

21. He wanted to become a teacher but ended up becoming a post officer. If he had become a teacher, he ( ) a happy life with his students.
    1) would lead, 2) would have lead, 3) would have lead, 4) would be leading

22. He had a serious car accident on his way home after school. If he ( ) the busy road, he would have arrived home safely.
    1) hadn’t used, 2) doesn’t use, 3) hasn’t used, 4) didn’t use

24. He didn’t have enough money to travel England. If he had gone to England, he ( ) the Queen of England.
    1) would have met, 2) would have meet, 3) would meet, 4) would be meeting

26. Tom had a big operation to take out the tumor. If he ( ) a medical check earlier, he wouldn’t have needed the operation.
    1) has had, 2) had had, 3) had, 4) has
    (distractors are excluded)