

## **EFL Learner and Teacher Beliefs about Grammar Learning in Korea\***

**Dongho Kang**

(Seoul Nat'l Univ. of Science & Technology)

**Kang, Dongho. (2017). EFL learner and teacher beliefs about grammar learning in Korea. *English Teaching*, 72(2), 51-69.**

While many scholars paid attention to L2 learner beliefs about grammar learning and error correction, there has been little research on both teacher and learner beliefs about types of grammar instructions in Korean EFL contexts. This study aimed to investigate the beliefs about types of instructions as well as grammar learning and error correction using a questionnaire adapted from Jean and Simard (2011). A total of four hundred and eighty-seven participants in Korea participated in the study and were divided into five groups: three teacher subgroups (non-native Korean high school, non-native Korean college, and native college) and two student subgroups (high school and college). The participants in general highly valued accuracy in L2 learning, but they disliked grammar learning or teaching. While both students and teachers believed that grammar instructions such as discovery learning, and mechanical practice could be useful in grammar learning, Korean teachers reported more positive views on grammar instructions than Korean students. The majority of the participants reported that they had a tendency to prefer error correction in the written production rather than in the spoken one. The results also revealed opinion gaps among the subgroups. The pedagogical and theoretical implications will be discussed.

**Key words:** learner and teacher belief, EFL, grammar learning, grammar instruction, error correction

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Understanding learner and teacher beliefs about language learning was very important in

---

\* This study was supported by the Research Program funded by the SeoulTech (Seoul National University of Science and Technology).

designing L2 instructions or curriculum development since this information helped both L2 teachers and scholars assess how learners approach language learning (Horwitz, 1988). In general, what learners think about language learning could influence their ongoing and future behaviors as well as learning strategies in L2 (Oxford, Hollaway, & Horton-Murillo, 1992). Since Horwitz's (1988) pioneering research on learner belief of language learning, L2 literature showed that learner beliefs played an influential role in language learning and the differences between teacher and student beliefs might cause conflicts in the success of L2 learning (Oxford et al., 1992; Wallace & Oxford, 1992). In the last few decades, several scholars have moved their attention to specific areas of learner beliefs such as grammar learning and error correction (Inceceay & Dollar, 2011; Loewen, Li, Fei, Thompson, Nakatsukasa, Ahn, & Chen, 2009; Schultz, 1996, 2001). These previous studies examined L2 teacher and student beliefs about grammar learning and error correction (Jean & Simard, 2011; Kang, 2016; Nurusus, Samad, Rahman, Noordin, & Rashid, 2015; Peacock, 1998).

However, L2 learner and teacher beliefs about specific types of grammar instructions have seldom been studied in foreign language learning contexts in L2 literature. Recently, Kang (2016) found cultural differences by investigating the beliefs of both native and non-native teachers of English regarding grammar instruction and error correction in Korean college contexts. The finding showed that both native and non-native English teachers thought of grammar instruction as being necessary and essential, but Korean teachers of English valued accuracy more highly while the native English teachers emphasized communication and meaning. This finding indicated the opinion differences between the teachers from different cultural backgrounds. Future studies need to investigate the L2 learner and teacher beliefs about specific types of grammar instructions with different subsamples such as native and non-native English teachers and students at both high schools and colleges in Korea. Therefore, this study aims to investigate teacher and student beliefs about grammar instructions as well as grammar learning and error correction in Korean EFL contexts.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Many L2 studies reported that learner beliefs played a key role in language learning and its development while the views about grammar learning might differ from context to context (Inceceay & Dollar, 2011; Jean & Simard, 2011; Kang, 2016; Loewen et al., 2009; Schultz, 1996, 2001). For example, Schultz (1996) compared student and teacher attitudes toward the role of explicit grammar study and error correction in foreign language learning. The results showed that students generally had more favorable attitudes toward a focus on form in L2 learning than teachers. In other words, they held the generally stronger and

more favorable attitudes toward grammar and corrective feedback than teachers. Schultz (2001) further examined the cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback between USA and Columbia. The findings showed both similarities and differences between the two cultures. For example, the students of both cultures were positive about the role of explicit grammar study and corrective feedback in FL learning while the Columbian students and teachers preferred traditional language teaching to the USA counterparts.

Nurusus et al. (2015) examined L2 teachers' beliefs involving the process of decision-making in teaching grammar, especially teacher beliefs according to their teaching experiences. The researchers used a survey based on the four stages of a computational model of L2 acquisition proposed by Ellis (1998): input, explicit instruction of grammar, production practice, and negative feedback. The study showed that teacher belief in the importance of providing feedback increased while the production practice decreased with teaching experiences. In addition, the less experienced teachers valued explicit L2 knowledge of grammatical rules the least important while the more experienced teachers believed that providing feedback was more important than language production practice in their beliefs.

On the other hand, Loewen et al. (2009) examined L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction at an American university. Six underlying factors were elicited from a factor analysis: efficacy of grammar, negative attitude toward error correction, priority of communication, importance of grammar, importance of grammatical accuracy, and negative attitude toward grammar instruction. They found that learners viewed error correction and grammar instruction as distinct categories rather than perceiving error correction as a type of focus on form, reflecting a difference between learners' and researchers' views. The learners highly valued grammar instruction, but they had negative attitudes towards grammar learning and error correction. In addition, ESL learners had more preference to improving communicative skills while foreign language learners were more positive about grammar instruction and error correction.

Jean and Simard (2011) investigated both L2 high school students' and teachers' beliefs about different types of grammar instructions as well as grammar in general and corrective feedback in Quebec, Canada. The main findings suggest that both students and teachers valued grammar instruction but they perceived it as boring, as shown in Loewen et al. (2009). Even though both students and teachers generally agreed about the benefits of grammar instruction, students valued error correction and mechanical-type exercises more highly than teachers. In addition, accuracy in speech was more important to older learners than to younger ones. Peacock (1998) also found similar differences between teacher and student views about useful language learning activities in a Hong Kong university context, where L2 learners rated error correction and grammar exercises much higher, and pair

work and group work much lower, than did the teachers. It seemed that teachers rated communicative activities more highly than L2 learners from these studies.

However, compared to the attention given to L2 learner beliefs about grammar learning and error correction, there has been less research into teacher and learner beliefs about types of grammar instructions. In addition, the beliefs about grammar learning and error correction have never been investigated with the different samples such as students and teachers from high schools and college in Korea. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate teacher and learner beliefs about grammar instructions as well as grammar learning and error correction in Korean EFL contexts.

### 3. RESEARCH METHOD

The present study replicated and extended Jean and Simard's (2011) study. Four hundred eighty-seven participants (teachers and students) from schools at Seoul and Gyeonggi province took part in this study. Teachers consisted of three sub-groups: non-native Korean high school teachers ( $N = 28$ ), Korean college teachers ( $N = 25$ ), and native teachers of English at college ( $N = 32$ ). The student samples were divided into two groups: high school ( $N = 205$ ) and college students ( $N = 196$ ). The age of non-native Korean college teachers ranged from 35 to 60 ( $M = 50$ ), college native teachers from 30 to 64 ( $M = 38$ ), and high school Korean teachers from 30 to 55 ( $M = 52$ ). Teachers' teaching experiences ranged from 1 month to about 11 years ( $M =$  about 38 months).

The researcher investigated the participants' beliefs about grammar learning by using two questionnaires for teacher and student samples respectively (See Appendix for the student version). The only difference between the teacher and student questionnaires was one change in the instructions: students were asked to assess their beliefs for learning English grammar while teachers rated their beliefs for teaching. The questionnaire was adapted from Jean and Simard (2011). For the purpose of this study, the researcher added three more questions to the original questionnaire: input-based instruction, output-based instruction, and peer review (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1998; Incebay & Dollar, 2011; Nurusus et al., 2015).

The questionnaire included (1) beliefs about grammar learning (Items 1-2), (2) views about grammar instructions (Items 3-8), and (3) views about error correction (Items 9-11). The participants were asked to indicate their item response on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "not important at all" to "very important," depending on types of the questions. The data were collected from high schools and colleges from 2015 to 2016 in Korea, where the researcher directly asked teachers to complete the teacher questionnaire and to get student questionnaires from their students during class hours. The descriptive

statistics of frequency analysis was conducted to examine their views. To investigate the differences of subgroups on the participants' beliefs, ANOVA statistics was performed.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1. Beliefs about Grammar and Accuracy

Question 1 inquired about how much they liked learning or teaching grammar. About 40% of the participants in total rated their preferences as “not at all” or “not much,” as shown in Table 1. But there were some differences among the subsamples. High school teachers reported more negative view about their preferences than high school students (e.g., about 60% and 35% of them rated preferences as “not at all” or “not much” respectively). At college, native English teachers were the most negative about grammar teaching (about 56%), followed by college students (about 42%) and college teachers (about 36%) while high school students were most positive about grammar learning (23%).

**TABLE 1**  
**Preference of Grammar Learning**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	13.8	10.7	17.9	18.4	9.4	4
Not much	27.5	24.9	42.9	24.5	46.9	32
So-so	39.0	41.5	25.0	39.8	31.3	36
Much	17.9	22.0	14.3	15.3	9.4	20
Very Much	1.6	1.0	0	2.0	3.1	4

**TABLE 2**  
**Importance of Accuracy**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	7.6	8.8	0	9.7	0	0
Not very	11.3	10.7	14.3	12.8	3.1	12.0
Somewhat	30.0	27.3	42.9	26.0	62.5	24.0
Important	40.7	39.5	42.9	40.8	31.3	60
Very Important	10.5	13.7	0	10.7	3.1	4

Questions 2a, 2b, and 2c addressed the issue of the importance of accuracy, as shown in Tables 2-4. Table 2 showed that the participants reported accuracy important in general. About 51% of the participants in total reported accuracy as “important” or “very important.” Native English teachers at college gave less importance to accuracy than Korean students and teachers. Both students and teachers at high school shared similar

views about accuracy (53% vs. 43% as “important” or “very important” respectively) while Korean teachers at college gave more importance to accuracy than the college students (64% vs. 41%), indicating opinion gaps between students and teachers at college.

Table 3 and Table 4 below showed the participants’ opinions about the importance of accuracy in speaking and writing respectively. In general, the participants believed that accuracy was important in both speaking and writing while they, in total, rated accuracy in writing more important than in speaking. While most of the participants shared the same opinions about the importance of accuracy in speaking and writing skills, the accuracy in speaking tended to be more important for high school students than for high school teachers.

**TABLE 3**  
**Importance of Accuracy in Speaking**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	3.7	4.4	0	4.6	0	0
Not very	15.4	17.6	21.4	15.3	9.4	0
Somewhat	33.5	30.2	53.6	34.7	46.9	48
Important	36.1	35.6	25	36.7	40.6	44
Very Important	9.2	12.2	0	8.7	3.1	8

**TABLE 4**  
**Importance of Accuracy in Writing**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not very	2.7	12.9	3.6	3.1	0	0
Somewhat	10.7	14.1	0	10.7	6.3	0
Important	48.0	42.0	57.1	52.6	53.1	44
Very Important	38.4	41.0	35.7	33.7	40.6	56

## 4.2. Views about Grammar Instructions

This section investigated the participants’ views about different types of grammar instructions. Question 3 inquired about how important it was for you (or for your students) to practice English grammar through specific grammar exercises rather than simply through speaking or writing, as shown in Table 5. The participants in total were moderately positive about the grammar practice (about 38% reported it as “important” or “very important”). Most of the subsamples shared the same opinion, while Korean college teachers reported the most positive view (72%).

Questions 4a and 4b inquired the importance and difficulty of learning grammar rules respectively. About 51% of the participants in total reported it as “important” or “very

important” and almost half of the participants found it “somewhat difficult,” as shown in Table 6 and Table 7. Both teachers and students agreed that learning grammar rules was important, but Korean college teachers were most convinced about this opinion (72% reported it as “important” or “very important”).

**TABLE 5**  
**Grammar Practice**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	4.9	4.4	3.6	7.1	3.1	0
Not very	19.3	20.5	14.3	18.9	9.4	8
Somewhat	37.2	36.1	42.9	38.3	50.0	20
Important	32.0	31.2	35.7	29.6	34.4	64
Very Important	6.4	7.3	3.6	6.1	3.1	8

**TABLE 6**  
**Learning of Grammar Rule**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	2.1	2.0	0	2.6	3.1	0
Not very	11.3	10.7	7.1	14.3	9.4	0
Somewhat	35.1	31.2	32.1	37.8	50.0	28
Important	43.3	44.4	46.4	41.3	34.4	60
Very Important	7.8	11.7	10.7	3.6	3.1	12

**TABLE 7**  
**Difficulty of Learning Grammar Rule**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	0.6	1.0	0	0.5	0	0
Not very	24.6	24.9	7.1	24.0	37.5	28
Somewhat	51.5	53.2	75	48.5	40.6	52
Difficult	17.7	16.6	7.1	20.4	18.8	16
Very Difficult	5.1	4.4	7.1	6.6	3.1	0

Questions 5a and 5b inquired their previous experience of discovery or inductive learning of grammar and its usefulness respectively. The majority of the participants (71.9%) in total reported that discovery learning was used in class before. All subsamples shared similar experiences about discovery learning. Overall, 82.5% of the total participants reporting Question 5a answered Question 5b, the usefulness of the discovery learning. Also, 34.7% out of 82.5% in total reported discovery learning of grammar as “useful” or “very useful,” as shown in Table 9. It seems that teachers had more positive beliefs about discovery instruction than students in general. Especially, Korean college teachers were much more positive about discovery learning than college students (68% vs.

24.5% for “useful” and “very useful” responses).

**TABLE 8**  
**Experience of Discovery Learning**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Yes	71.9	78.0	85.7	60.7	78.1	84
No	27.9	22.0	14.3	38.8	21.9	16

**TABLE 9**  
**Usefulness of Discovery Learning**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	3.5	3.4	0	5.1	0	0
Not very	11.3	12.7	3.6	11.7	9.4	8.0
Somewhat	32.9	25.6	35.7	34.2	25.0	8.0
Useful	29.2	30.2	42.9	21.9	34.4	52.0
Very Useful	5.5	5.9	7.1	2.6	12.5	16.0
Total	82.5	88.3	89.3	75.5	81.3	84.0

Questions 6a and 6b inquired about the participants’ opinions about usefulness and interest of mechanical practice respectively. The participants in total were negative about mechanical practices. It seemed that Korean students found it less useful than Korean teachers, as shown in Table 10 (e.g., high school (19.5%) and college students (13.3%) and high school (32.2%) and college (36%) teachers reported it as “useful” or “very useful” respectively). As for the interest of mechanical practice, all participants seemed to agree that it was not interesting, as shown in Table 11.

**TABLE 10**  
**Usefulness of Mechanical (Form-only) Practice**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	14.6	19.0	3.6	15.3	0	4.0
Not very	30.4	22.4	21.4	39.3	43.8	20.0
Somewhat	34.7	38.0	39.3	31.6	25.0	36.0
Useful	18.1	18.5	28.6	12.8	25.0	36.0
Very Useful	18.3	1.0	3.6	0.5	3.1	0

Questions 7a and 7b revealed the participants’ opinions about their previous experience of input-based instruction and its usefulness respectively, as shown in Table 12 and Table 13. The participants were asked the question, *Have you ever asked your students to notice target forms in the input (e.g., a sentence or a paragraph) when you read or they listen to it?* A majority of them (84.6%) in total reported that they have experienced this kind of



instruction before. While most of the subsamples seemed to agree that the input-based instruction was useful, there was a big opinion gap between Korean college students and teachers. That is, Korean college teachers were the most positive about the usefulness of input-based instruction (e.g., 72% reported it as “useful” or “very useful”), while its usefulness was the most negative for Korean college students (22.9% for the same response).

**TABLE 11**  
**Interest of Mechanical (Form-only) Practice**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	18.7	17.6	10.7	23.0	18.8	4.0
Not very	40.2	33.2	57.1	43.4	37.5	56.0
Somewhat	34.5	40.5	32.1	30.1	28.1	32.0
Interesting	5.3	6.8	0	3.1	12.5	8.0
Very Interesting	0.4	1.0	0	0	0	9.0

**TABLE 12**  
**Experience of Input-based Instruction**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Yes	84.6	88.3	89.3	79.6	84.4	88.0
No	15.0	11.7	10.7	19.9	15.6	8.0

**TABLE 13**  
**Usefulness of Input-based Instruction**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	5.5	5.9	3.6	6.6	3.1	0
Not very	15.4	11.2	14.3	21.4	12.5	4.0
Somewhat	34.3	37.6	25	34.7	34.4	16.0
Useful	30.0	30.7	42.9	21.9	34.4	68.0
Very Useful	3.3	5.9	0	1.0	3.1	4.0
Total	88.5	91.2	85.7	85.7	87.5	92.0

Questions 8a and 8b inquired about the participants’ opinions about their previous experience of the output-based instruction and its usefulness respectively through the question, *Have you ever asked your students to compare their production with the original script or writing after they speak or write?*. Unlike findings of the input-based instruction, only 34.1% of the participants in total reported that the output-based one was used in class before. This finding also revealed opinion differences between teachers and students. About half of the teacher subsamples reported they have used the output-based instruction in class and the figure was higher than those of student subsamples (36.6% and 26%

respectively), as shown in Table 14. As for the usefulness of output-based instruction, 42.7% of the total participants reporting Question 8a answered Question 8b. The participants in total reported some positive views about its usefulness (17.1% out of 42.7% reported it as “useful” or “very useful”) while teacher subsamples perceived the usefulness of the output-based instruction higher than the student subsamples.

**TABLE 14**  
**Experience of Output-based Instruction**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Yes	34.1	36.6	42.9	26.0	46.9	52.0
No	64.7	62.9	57.1	71.4	53.1	48.0

**TABLE 15**  
**Usefulness of Output-based Instruction**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
Not at all	3.9	4.4	0	5.1	0	0
Not very	7.4	8.3	7.1	7.1	6.3	4.0
Somewhat	13.6	17.1	3.6	11.2	18.8	8.0
Useful	14.2	10.2	28.6	12.8	25	28.0
Very Useful	2.9	3.4	3.6	0.5	6.3	12.0
Total	42.7	43.9	42.9	36.8	56.3	52.0

#### 4.3. Views about Error Correction

The findings in this section showed the participants’ opinions about error correction and peer review. First of all, Questions 9 and 10 asked the participants their views about error correction in speaking and writing respectively, as shown in Table 16 and Table 17. Their views about oral error correction in total spread out from “instructional focus,” and “meaning ambiguity,” to “all errors” even though the majority of the participants (35.7%) answered that students’ oral errors should be corrected when they were the focus of the instruction. Their answers to written error correction were similar, but more participants

**TABLE 16**  
**Error Correction in Speaking**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
No correction	0.4	1.0	0	0	0	0
Instruction	35.7	34.1	46.4	30.1	40.9	64.0
Meaning	27.7	25.9	32.1	28.6	37.5	20.0
All Correction	20.3	25.4	0	22.4	3.1	8.0
Instruction & meaning	15.2	12.2	21.4	18.9	12.5	8.0

(31.8%) reported that all errors should be corrected in the written production, compared to the oral error correction.

**TABLE 17**  
**Error Correction in Writing**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
No correction	0.2	0.5	0	0	0	0
Instruction	25.9	23.4	42.9	23.5	31.3	36.0
Meaning	25.3	23.9	25	28.1	31.3	8.0
All Correction	31.8	36.6	17.9	29.1	34.4	28.0
Instruction & meaning	16.2	14.6	14.3	18.9	3.1	28.0

**TABLE 18**

**Peer Review**

Scale	Total (%)	High Ss (%)	High T (%)	College Ss (%)	Native T (%)	College T (%)
S Disagree	5.3	4.4	0	8.2	3.1	0
Disagree	15.0	18.5	3.6	14.3	12.5	8.0
So-so	41.9	39.5	28.6	46.9	43.8	32.0
Agree	28.5	26.8	60.7	23.5	25	52.0
S Agree	8.8	9.8	7.1	7.1	15.6	8.0

Finally, the participants' opinions about peer review on the errors showed that they were more likely to favor peer review (37.3% in total reported it as "agree" or "strongly agree"), as shown in Table 18. There were also contrasting views about peer review between teachers and students. Korean teachers perceived peer review more positively than Korean students.

#### 4.4. ANOVA Analysis of Subgroups

ANOVA statistics in Table 19 showed that there existed statistically significant differences in grammar instructions and peer review among the subgroups. First of all, there were different opinions between Korean college students and teachers in grammar practice. Korean teachers at college valued grammar practice more highly than Korean college students ( $p < .05$ ). This indicates that existed opinion conflicts existed in the learning of grammar between students and teachers, as shown in Schultz (1996), revealing opposite findings to previous studies (Jean & Simard, 2011; Peacock, 1998; Schultz, 1996), where students favored grammar learning rather than teachers. In addition, there appeared opinion gaps in the learning of grammar rules among the subgroups at college. Non-native Korean teachers of English at college strongly believed that the rule of grammar in English should be taught explicitly while both native teachers of English and Korean college

students valued less the explicit learning of grammar rules.

While student subgroups were less positive about the discovery instruction than teacher subgroups ( $p < .05$ ), there appeared statistically significant differences between college students and teachers at college ( $p < .01$ ). Both native and non-native teachers of English at college valued the discovery instruction of grammar rule more highly than college students, who were most negative about the discovery instruction among the subgroups.

The discovery learning or inductive approach was favored in communicative language teaching since it could enhance more interaction than deductive approach or explicit learning of grammar rule (Larsen-Freeman, 2009). However, DeKeyser (2009) cautioned that there was little evidence in the psychological literature concerning its superiority. Larsen-Freeman (2014) pointed out that if our goal as L2 teachers was not to develop grammar rule itself, but to perform communicative performances through grammar rule, there was no reason to avoid giving explicit rules through deductive approach. Moreover, instructing a grammar rule explicitly can often bring about linguistic insights in a more efficacious manner in foreign language learning contexts (Robinson, 1996).

As far as the mechanical instruction was concerned, it was neither valued nor interested by most of the subgroups, which was opposite to the study by Jean and Simard (2011). However, the ANOVA result showed that both Korean high school and college teachers valued the mechanical instruction more highly than college students. The difference could explain why students feel bored about the grammar lesson, where teacher might frequently use the traditional mechanical practice in class. There was also a significant difference between high school and college students in the preference of the mechanical practice ( $p < .05$ ). This indicates that older learners were more negative about the mechanical instruction than younger ones even though both groups were negative about mechanical practice (Mean scores less than 2.5).

On the other hand, Korean non-native teachers of English at college valued the input-based instruction most among the subgroups while Korean college students did the least. In addition, the high school students' view was more positive than the college students ( $p < .01$ ). Teachers also highly valued the usefulness of the output-based instruction compared to the students. This difference in the opinions might be due to the previous experience of the output-based instruction. From the previous analysis in Table 14, most of the students (62% to 71%) have never experienced this type of instruction before, leading to negative views about the instruction. According to Ellis's (1999) review, the less proficient L2 learners performed better in most of the input-based instructions (VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993), while more advanced learners in Canadian immersion studies performed better in output-oriented instructions (DeKeyser & Sokalski, 1996). This study indicates that the input-based instruction might be useful for high school students, and the output-based one for old college students.

TABLE 19

## ANOVA Results of Views about Grammar Instructions &amp; Peer Review

Scale	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Sequence
Grammar Practice	High Students	3.17	.98	2.54	.039	CS < CT*
	High Teachers	3.21	.88			
	College Students	3.09	1.01			
	College Natives	3.03	.82			
	College Teachers	3.72	.74			
Learning of Grammar Rule	High Students	3.53	.90	4.11	.003	CN < CT* CS < CT**
	High Teachers	3.63	.79			
	College Students	3.29	.85			
	College Natives	3.25	.80			
	College Teachers	3.84	.62			
Usefulness of Discovery Learning	High Students	3.24	.95	6.07	.000	HS < CT* CS < CT** CS < CN*
	High Teachers	3.60	.71			
	College Students	3.07	.92			
	College Natives	3.62	.90			
	College Teachers	3.90	.83			
Usefulness of Mechanical Practice	High Students	2.60	1.03	5.14	.000	CS < HT* CS < CT*
	High Teachers	3.07	.92			
	College Students	2.44	.92			
	College Natives	2.87	.92			
	College Teachers	3.08	.88			
Interest in Mechanical Practice	High Students	2.40	.89	2.85	.024	CS < HS*
	High Teachers	2.21	.63			
	College Students	2.13	.80			
	College Natives	2.35	.95			
	College Teachers	2.44	.71			
Usefulness of Input Instruction	High Students	3.21	.32	6.64	.000	HS < CT* CS < HS** CS < CT**
	High Teachers	3.25	.31			
	College Students	2.88	.40			
	College Natives	3.25	.37			
	College Teachers	3.78	.47			
Usefulness of Output Instruction	High Students	2.97	1.12	4.66	.001	HS < CT* CS < CT*
	High Teachers	3.67	.89			
	College Students	2.90	1.08			
	College Natives	3.56	.86			
	College Teachers	3.92	.86			
Peer Review	High Students	3.19	.10	4.14	.003	CS < HT*
	High Teachers	3.71	.66			
	College Students	3.07	.99			
	College Natives	3.38	1.01			
	College Teachers	3.60	.76			

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ 

Finally, most of the participants seemed to share the similar beliefs about peer review. In other words, they believed that the peer review was useful in the error correction and grammar learning. However, Korean high school teachers valued peer review the most while Korean college students did the least according to the mean scores (3.71 vs. 3.07) leading to the statistical difference ( $p < .05$ ).

## 5. CONCLUSION

The results of the beliefs about accuracy and preferences of grammar learning or teaching showed that the majority of the participants believed that accuracy was important in L2 learning, but most of them had negative attitudes towards grammar learning, supporting the findings of previous studies (Incecay & Dollar, 2011; Jean & Simard, 2011; Loewen et al., 2009). There appeared individual differences among the subgroups, especially opinion gaps between Korean students and teachers and between natives and non-natives. For example, Korean teachers were more negative about teaching grammar than Korean students, while they valued accuracy more highly than Korean students. Their beliefs did not always match their teaching behaviors. In other words, Korean teacher perceived accuracy was important, but they disliked teaching grammar. There also existed cultural differences revealing that native teachers of English at college were most negative about teaching grammar and accuracy, confirming Schultz's (2001) study. In addition, it seemed that accuracy was more important in writing skills than in speaking for most of the participants.

As for the opinions of grammar instructions, there were also opinion gaps among the subgroups. The participants were in general positive about grammar practice and learning grammar rules. This might reflect the cultural aspect of Korean traditional grammar instruction, compared with ESL tradition emphasizing the implicit learning of grammar through authentic communication, as shown in Schultz (2001), where Columbian EFL students had more positive attitudes towards traditional explicit grammar learning and error correction than the counterpart ESL students in the United States.

One special finding was that Korean college teachers were most convinced about the usefulness of traditional grammar practice and rule learning leading to the statistically significant differences with Korean college students and native English teachers unlike previous findings (Jean & Simard, 2011; Peacock, 1998; Schultz, 1996). These previous studies found that students valued error correction and mechanical-type exercises more highly than teachers. Considering that these studies were conducted in Canada and America (Jean & Simard, 2011; Peacock, 1998; Schultz, 1996), the contextual differences between ESL and EFL seemed to lead to this difference. Another interpretation was the age factor as well as the cultural one. Korean teacher groups aged from 50 to 52 on average, which means that they could be more conservative. Nurusus et al. (2015) supported the current finding, where the less experienced teachers felt that they were the most negative about the explicit L2 knowledge of grammatical rules among the four age groups and vice versa. To reduce the gaps between students and teachers, Korean teachers need to change their beliefs into more communicatively oriented ones (Peacock, 1998).

This study also investigated the participants' views about different types of instructions

in teaching grammar: discovery learning, mechanical practice, input-based, and output-based instructions. Most of the participants reported that they have experienced either discovery learning or input-based instruction while they seldom had opportunities for output-based instruction. This indicated that L2 teachers need to provide a variety of focus-on-form instructions for L2 learners in class so that L2 grammar instruction can appropriately match the students' individual learning styles and preferences (Doughty & Williams, 1998). While the majority of the participants believed that these instructions could be useful in grammar learning, Korean teachers reported more positive views about these instructions than Korean students. However, the opinion conflicts appeared most salient between Korean teachers and students at college.

There also appeared opinion gaps between Korean high school and college students, especially for the input-based instruction. This indicates that this type of instruction could be useful for beginners or younger students, but might not be the best option for older or advanced ones. In addition, most of the participants perceived the traditional mechanical practice as "boring" while teacher subgroups had more positive views about the mechanical (form-only) practice than student subgroups, which could result in the conflicts in class. In other words, the teachers' preference to the traditional instruction in teaching grammar could lead to the students' negative perception of the grammar instruction at school. This finding contrasted with previous studies, where most of them reported that learners preferred 'traditional' activities (e.g., grammar exercises, translation, etc.) and teachers, 'communicative' activities (e.g., pair or group work) (Peacock, 1998). Oxford et al. (1992) pointed out that teachers' teaching styles often differed substantially from L2 learners' learning styles, which resulted in "style wars" (p. 439), negatively in turn affecting students' performances in the classroom (Wallace & Oxford, 1992). Korean teachers should take into account the individual differences when designing the types of grammar instructions. In addition, L2 teachers need to consider giving learners more autonomy in choosing activities, and provide learners with the rationale behind unpopular activities in grammar instructions, as Peacock (1998) mentioned.

Finally, the majority of the participants agreed that the students' oral errors should be corrected when they were instructional focus while more participants wanted all the errors to be corrected in the written production. However, student subgroups were more likely to get their oral errors corrected all the time than the teachers in the spoken production. For this matter, Korean English teachers need to inform the students that fluency was much more important than accuracy in L2 communication, but they still should keep a balance between fluency and accuracy in providing feedback on the errors depending on the types of activities such as fluency-oriented and accuracy-oriented ones. As for the peer review, while the majority of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed the use of peer review in error correction, Korean teachers reported much more positive views than

Korean students. Cotterall (1995) suggested that L2 teachers need to transfer responsibility from teachers to students so that they can gradually be ready for autonomy. Korean English teachers need to provide a valid and reliable checklist for peer reviews so that the students can work more independently in peer review sessions without depending on the teachers.

## REFERENCES

- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23(2), 195-205.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2009). Cognitive-psychological processes in second language learning. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 119-138). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- DeKeyser, R. M., & Sokalski, K. (1996). The differential role of comprehension and production practice. *Language Learning*, 46(4), 613-642.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 39-60.
- Ellis, R. (1999). Input-based approaches to teaching grammar: A review of classroom-oriented research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 64-80.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294.
- Incecay, V., & Dollar, Y. K. (2011). Foreign language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 15, 3394-3398.
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: Necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 467-494.
- Kang, D. (2016). Native and non-native English teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction in Korean college contexts. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 16(2), 265-284.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2009). Teaching and testing grammar. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 518-542). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & M. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 256-270). Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91-104.
- Nurusus, E., Samad, A., Rahman, S., Noordin, N., Rashid, J. (2015). Exploring teachers' beliefs in teaching grammar. *The English Teacher*, XLIV(1), 23-32.
- Oxford, R., Hollaway, M., & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System*, 20(4), 439-456.
- Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about 'useful' activities for EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 233-250.
- Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(1), 27-67.
- Schultz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 343-364.
- Schultz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-258.
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(1), 45-57.
- Wallace, W., & Oxford, R. (1992). Disparity in learning styles and teaching styles in the ESL classroom: Does it mean war? *AMTESOL Journal*, 1, 45-68.

## APPENDIX

### Questionnaire (Student Version)

This questionnaire aims to assess your general opinions to grammar and error correction in class. Please read each statement and circle your response for each item.

Q1: How much do you like learning grammar in English (understanding rules, finding explanations, doing grammar exercises orally or in writing)?

Q2a: According to you, how important is it to express oneself accurately (i.e., without grammatical errors) in English?

Q2b: How important is it to learn grammar in order to speak better in English?

Q2c: How important is it to learn grammar in order to write better in English?

Q3: How important is it for you to practice English grammar through specific grammar exercises rather than simply through speaking or writing in real-life situations?

Q4a: According to you, how important is it to learn grammar rules in English?

Q4b: How difficult do you find understanding grammar rules in English?

Q5a: Have you ever been asked to discover an English grammar rule from examples provided to you? Yes or No

Q5b: How useful was it for your comprehension?

Q6a: How useful, in general, do you find the mechanical-type exercises used in English class (for example, providing verbs in the correct tenses, transforming affirmations into questions, etc.)?

Q6b: How interesting do you find these exercises?

Q7a: Have you ever been asked to notice target forms (relative pronouns, articles, etc.) in the input (e.g., a sentence or a paragraph) when you read or they listen to it? Yes or No

Q7b: How useful was it for you to learn the forms?

Q8a: Have you ever been asked to compare your production with the original script or writing after your teachers speak or write? Yes or No

Q8b: How useful was it for you to learn the forms?

Q9: When do you feel you should correct the grammar errors that you make while speaking? (More than one answer is possible here.)

Never	When the grammar point is the focus of the lesson	Only when they cannot make themselves understood	All the time
1	2	3	4

Q10: When do you feel your teacher should correct your grammatical errors in your written work (compositions, tests, etc.)? (More than one answer is possible here.)

Never	When the grammar point is the focus of the lesson	Only when they cannot make themselves understood	All the time
1	2	3	4

Q11: I prefer to be corrected by my fellow students in small work rather than by my teacher in front of the entire class.

Applicable levels: Tertiary

Dept. of English Language & Literature,  
College of Humanities and Social Science,  
Seoul National University of Science & Technology  
172 Gongneung-2dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139-743, Korea.  
Phone: 02-970-6250  
Email: dh14kang@seoultech.ac.kr

Received on March 1, 2017

Reviewed on April 15, 2017

Revised version received on May 15, 2017