

영어어문교육 10권 1호 2004년 봄

What Do Our Students and Teachers Believe about Grammar in EFL Context?

Jae-Suk Suh
(Inha University)

Suh, Jae-Suk(2004). What do our students and teachers believe about grammar in EFL context? *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 10(1), 23-52

This paper investigated students' and teachers' attitudes toward L2 grammar in EFL learning context. In a study in which attitude was viewed as consisting of three different components such as cognitive, affective, and behavioral, questionnaire developed on the basis of such a view of attitude was used as a data collection method. The results of the study indicated that in general, both students and teachers were similar to each other in their attitude toward L2 grammar. Among the findings, most important, two groups were shown to fully understand the important role of grammar in L2 learning. Another finding was that despite the 6th national curriculum for English education, our English class was still dominated by grammar-centered instruction. Also it was shown that the way teachers had been taught L2 grammar had a considerable effect on the way they would instruct it in their future classes. Based on these findings, some suggestions were offered for effective grammar pedagogy in EFL context.

[attitude/grammar-centered instruction, 태도/문법중심교육]

I. INTRODUCTION

From a historical point of view in L2 teaching profession the role of grammar has been a major impetus of the rise and fall of language teaching methods (Brown, 2001). For instance, the overemphasis of the Grammar-Translation Method on conscious learning of grammar gave way to the Direct Method while excessive mechanical practice with little attention to grammar in Audiolingualism resulted in the Cognitive Code Method. Since the Cognitive Code Method informed by Chomskyan linguistics saw conscious metalinguistic knowledge as the key to successful language learning, it advocated grammar-oriented learning which later brought dissatisfaction, and led to the advent of the Communicative Approach (Hymes, 1979; Ellis, 1990).

As compared to the language teaching methods which take various stances toward grammar, many L2 researchers have also expressed their concern over grammar learning, and showed the overall consensus on its crucial role in the development of target language proficiency (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Bachman (1990), Chen (1990), and Scarcella and Oxford (1992) posited a distinctive status of grammatical competence independent from *communicative competence*, and noted the importance of grammar rules in language use. Politzer and McGroarty (1983), Savignon (1972), and Walters (1980) were among those to provide empirical evidence for the separateness of grammatical knowledge from communicative knowledge and for the critical role of grammar in attaining fluency. For example, Politzer and McGroarty (1983) in a study of ESL learners' communication ability proposed a minimum level of grammatical competence as a prerequisite for the development of adequate communication ability since low grammatical competence was shown to be incompatible with high communicative competence whereas different levels of communicative competence were found to be possible at the same level of grammatical competence. Meanwhile, Ellis (1985), Higgs (1984), and VanPatten (1988) considered the issue of grammar in terms of the notion of fossilization. They espoused grammar learning particularly in the beginning stages of L2 development since fossilized learners result mainly from the negligence or even ignorance of grammar during the early period of learning. From this it follows that too much attention to meaning in the early days of L2 learning would be

dangerous, and the adequate support of grammar is necessary to prevent inaccurately oversimplified forms from being reinforced or, fossilized.

On the other hand, Celce-Murcia (1991), Dickins and Woods (1988), Larsen-Freeman (1991), Mitchell and Redmond (1993), Nunan (1998), Terrell (1991), and VanPatten (1993) all raised their voice in arguing for grammar teaching, and provided specific, practical suggestions for the L2 classroom. In their view of grammar, grammar assumes a crucial part in getting message across by becoming a framework mapping meaning onto language forms, which implies that grammar would be best learned if treated in context for communication. It is Fotos (1994) who was interested in looking into how grammar instruction could be integrated into communication-oriented classroom through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. Based on a study involving three groups of EFL Japanese learners each of which received three differing treatments of grammar (i.e., the first group received teacher-fronted grammar lessons while the second group performed grammar tasks. The third group engaged in communication-oriented tasks involving grammar.), it was shown that grammar consciousness-raising tasks can be a useful tool to develop grammar knowledge within a communicative framework.

To summarize, despite some differences among L2 teaching methods in their focus on grammar, it can be safely said that there is an overall agreement both on the important role of grammar for the effective, successful development of interlanguage, and on grammar teaching in context for communication (Brown, 2001). This obviously indicates that grammatical competence is an indispensable part of language proficiency, and should be given appropriate attention in L2 learning.

Speaking of EFL situations in this country, grammar-based instruction with a heavy focus on grammar has been dominating the classrooms during the last several decades. Moreover, it seems that in most classrooms grammar has been treated in unsystematic and inconsistent manners. However, given the introduction of the 6th national curriculum for English education which for the first time, began to stress the importance of developing fluency (Ministry of Education, 1995) on the one hand, and a recent trend in L2 teaching profession of moving away from a mere mastery of grammatical knowledge toward an attainment of communication ability on the other, it is clear that grammar

learning and teaching in our EFL classes should take place more effectively and more systematically than ever before along with much efforts to deal with grammar in context, not in isolation.

In doing so, one of the major things to be considered prior to grammar instruction in *EFL classroom would be to find out both learners' and teachers' attitudes toward grammar in L2 learning*. In other words, on the basis of information on both groups' beliefs and thoughts about grammar and grammar learning, it can be ensured that a better-designed plan for instruction can be established, and executed which is conducive to the efficient and systematic learning of grammar for our students (Schulz, 2001). The present paper started along such a line of inquiry, and thus its goal was to determine learners' and teachers' attitudes toward grammar in EFL learning context. As stated before, the 6th national curriculum for education was believed to become a crucial turning point of L2 learning which addressed the importance of developing communication skills in our EFL classes. And students who are in college now are thought to have been taught English under such a curriculum. So it would be interesting to examine what those students' beliefs and thoughts about grammar and grammar learning are, and in what ways they had been instructed grammar in their EFL classes. More specifically, this paper attempted to find out answers to the following questions:

1. What do students and teachers think or believe about L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching in EFL context?
2. What are teachers' teaching beliefs and ways of instructing grammar in EFL classes?

II. METHOD

1. Subjects

Two different groups of subjects participated in the study. The first group was made up of 135 college students (39 males and 96 females) who were enrolled in one of the universities in the southern part of Korea. They were

taking either the introductory course of second language acquisition, or English phonetics at the time of study. Nearly all of them had been majoring in English language and literature, and more than two thirds of them were sophomores or juniors. According to the background information gathered at the beginning of study, two thirds of the students self-rated their English proficiency as intermediate-mid or intermediate-high. Also more than a half of the students were shown to spend an average of one hour a day studying English grammar.

The second group of subjects consisted of 41 graduate students (7 males and 34 females) who were enrolled in school of education at the same university as the students in the first group. They were majoring in English education, and were taking a course entitled "seminar on second language acquisition" at the time of study. Ten out of the forty one subjects had been working as full-time, in-service teachers in middle and high schools while the rest had been engaged in part-time English teaching in private institutions. The English proficiency level self-rated by both pre- and in-service teachers in the group ranged from intermediate-mid to advanced.

2. Instrument and Procedures

In order to find answers to research questions, data were collected by means of questionnaire. Questionnaire was designed on the basis of suggestions made by Teale & Lewis (1981) according to which attitude toward L2 grammar can be divided into three differing components such as *cognitive, affective, and behavioral*. Based on such a view of attitude, questionnaire was created to contain twenty items which were assumed to elicit data on beliefs, feelings, and actual behaviors involving L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching. Also ten more items were added to the questionnaire for the group of teachers in order to find out their teaching beliefs and ways of dealing with grammar in EFL class. In addition, for each group of subjects four open questions were included in the questionnaire to further examine attitudes of both students and teachers toward L2 grammar. Questionnaires for both students and teachers were attached in Appendix A.

Given the questionnaire, for thirty items each subject in the two groups was asked to read the statement of each item, and rate their preferences over a

given item in terms of a five-point scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. As for open questions, subjects were instructed to write down whatever they believe, think, or do in relation to a given item. It was assumed that written responses from open questions would complement the findings from thirty items, and as a result, two differing means of collecting data (i.e., retrospection and Likert scale) were felt to be likely to improve an overall quality of data in the study, and to contribute to a better understanding of subjects' attitude toward L2 grammar.

3. Data analysis

In an effort to find out answers to research questions, descriptive statistics were computed. Frequencies with which each one of the five-point scales from 1 through 5 was chosen by each group of subjects in an individual item were counted. Then the total frequencies in each one of the five-point scales in a given item were converted into percentages. Meanwhile, concerning the analysis of data from open questions, written responses were analyzed qualitatively with a focus on content, which led to the emergence of categories representing what students and teachers were thinking and believing about L2 grammar.

III. RESULTS

1. What do Students and Teachers Think or Believe about L2 Grammar, and L2 Grammar Learning and Teaching?

1) Cognitive Aspect of Attitude Toward L2 Grammar

Since the questionnaire was developed on the basis of the assumption that attitude can be divided into three components such as cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspect, a comparison of students with teachers was made in relation to their attitudes toward L2 grammar in terms of those three components. Table 1 showed the cognitive aspect of attitude of each group toward English grammar in EFL context. For the sake of simplicity, a five-point scale was

reduced to a three-point scale with 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' coalesced into 'disagree', and 'strongly agree' and 'agree' into 'agree'. Between the two, 'not decided' was used.

TABLE 1
Frequency of Cognitive Attitude toward L2 Grammar (%)

	Students			Teachers		
	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree
Item 1	7	13	80	10	5	85
Item 2	41	27	32	54	22	24
Item 3	52	25	3	61	24	15
Item 4	7	12	81	17	22	61
Item 5	15	24	61	12	25	63
Item 6	7	30	63	0	10	90
Item 7	37	32	31	49	22	29
Item 8	32	42	26	31	40	29

Item 1: I think in general, knowing about grammar helps me to learn English.

Item 2: I think grammar is the most important part in learning English.

Item 3: I think correct use of English is more important than fluent use of E.

Item 4: I think I need to learn more about grammar of English.

Item 5: I think grammar should be learned as a way of developing communication skills.

Item 6: I think grammar should be learned within various context, not in isolation.

Item 7: I find it necessary to learn grammar from the beginning of learning E.

Item 8: I think grammar should be taught as little as possible during class.

As seen in Table 1, there was an overall agreement between students and teachers on the cognitive side of attitude toward L2 grammar in items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. In item 1, most subjects in each group (students: 80% and teachers: 85%) believed that grammatical knowledge would be helpful and useful in their learning of English. Such a strong belief seems to lead many subjects (students:

81% and teachers: 61%) in two groups to think that in item 4 they would feel the need for learning more about grammar in L2 development. However, in item 3 which involves the relationship between fluency and accuracy in L2 learning and use, more than a half of the subjects in each group (students: 52% and teachers: 61%) saw correct use of L2 less important than fluent use of it. This indicates that subjects in both groups valued the ability to fluently use the L2 for communication more than the ability to just correctly use it. Likewise, in item 2, 'I think grammar is the most important part in learning English', less than a half of the subjects in each group (students: 32% and teachers: 24%) agreed with the statement. This finding can be understood if one assumes that though both groups of subjects acknowledged the positive, active role of grammar in L2 learning in general, they considered grammar as just one of the many important components of target language proficiency. Regarding the way in which grammar should be learned, in item 5 about the same percentage of students (61%) and teachers (63%) agreed that grammar needs to be learned as a means to develop communication skills. Particularly, in item 6 nearly all teachers (90%) advocated the learning of grammar within context, not in isolation far more strongly than students (63%).

Meanwhile, there were some differences between the two groups in their responses to item 7. In item 7, 'I find it necessary to learn grammar from the beginning of learning English', teachers (49%) were more active than students (37%) in disagreeing on the focus of learners' attention on grammar in the early stages of L2 development. Finally, in item 8, 'I think grammar should be taught as little as possible during class', subjects in both groups remained undecided. That is, almost a half of the subjects (students: 42% and teachers: 40%) were not sure about whether grammar should be treated as little as possible during class.

2) Affective Aspect of Attitude toward L2 Grammar

The affective aspect of attitude toward L2 grammar was assumed to contain such affective factors as interest, motivation, anxiety, and comfort influencing L2 learning and use. The findings on subjects' affective attitude toward English grammar were given in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Frequency of Affective Attitude toward L2 Grammar (%)

	Students			Teachers		
	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree
Item 9	24	31	57	15	24	61
Item 10	34	18	50	32	20	49
Item 11	47	28	25	41	30	29
Item 12	30	31	39	34	34	32
Item 13	43	31	26	40	38	22

Item 9: I feel uncomfortable and worried when I use ungrammatical expressions during conversation.

Item 10: I feel more comfortable and better in a grammar class than a conversation class.

Item 11: I do not worry about incorrect forms if my message is understood.

Item 12: Grammar learning motivates me to learn English a lot.

Item 13: Grammar learning reduces my interest and enthusiasm in learning E.

Overall, students and teachers showed a great deal of similarities to each other in this category. In item 9, more than a half of the subjects in each group (students: 57% and teachers: 61%) felt uncomfortable, or worried using ungrammatical expressions in interaction, revealing that they were concerned about accuracy during the actual use of language. In the same vein, in item 11, 'I do not worry about incorrect forms if my message is understood', the number of students and teachers who disagreed on the statement was much larger than that of those who agreed on it. That is, 47% of students and 41% of teachers were shown to care about the grammaticality of language forms in spite of interlocutor's comprehension. This finding demonstrates that language learners have a tendency to be more sensitive to grammatical aspects of language than do target language speakers (Tanaka & Kawade, 1982).

As for item 10, about the same percentage of students and teachers (50% and 49%, respectively) thought that they would feel more comfortable and easier in a grammar class than in a conversation class. In responding to items 12 and 13,

both students and teachers remained undecided. Some students and teachers felt that grammar learning would promote interest, and thus motivate them to further study English whereas other did not. In light of the earlier findings that both groups of subjects showed an overall agreement on the importance of grammar and grammar learning in L2 development, subjects' indecisiveness here seems to lead one to keep in mind that grammar learning can increase interest and motivation only if proceeding with meaning-based approaches, rather than excessive, tedious grammatical explanations.

3) Behavioral Aspect of Attitude toward L2 Grammar Learning

The behavioral aspect of attitude toward L2 grammar learning was assumed to include actual learning behaviors or actions taken by learners in their learning of English grammar. Table 3 showed behavioral attitudes of both students and teachers while they responded to items from 14 to 20 in terms of a three-point scale.

TABLE 3
Frequency of Behavioral Attitude toward L2 Grammar Learning (%)

	Students			Teachers		
	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree
Item 14	57	19	24	51	20	29
Item 15	48	22	30	88	5	7
Item 16	24	29	47	22	23	55
Item 17	11	19	70	17	7	76
Item 18	5	10	85	5	5	90
Item 19	16	21	63	7	12	81
Item 20	16	17	67	61	24	25

Item 14: I study grammar hard because it would help me develop my communication ability.

Item 15: I usually spend more time on learning grammar than four language skills (speaking, listening, reading or writing).

Item 16: I usually focus on grammar(rules) during speaking or writing.

Item 17: I have studied grammar because it helps me to develop reading skill.

Item 18: I have studied *grammar* because it helps me to develop writing skill.

Item 19: I've studied grammar because English teachers emphasized and tested it during school days.

Item 20: I usually ask others to correct my incorrect forms whenever possible.

A close look at Table 3 indicates that two groups of subjects showed a rather strong agreement on items 14, 16, 17, 18, and 19 whereas they failed to reach an agreement on items 15, and 20. Concerning the similarities between students and teachers in the behavioral aspect of attitude toward L2 grammar learning, in items 17 and 18, both groups of subjects were able to reach a consensus as to the role of grammar in developing reading and writing skills. More than 70% of subjects in each group were found to invest time on studying grammar since they believed such an investment to be conducive to the promotion of reading and writing proficiency. In item 16, about a half of the subjects in both groups agreed that they tended to pay attention to the grammaticality of a particular sentence or utterance during speaking or writing. This finding appears to be supportive to item 11 in which subjects (students: 47% and teachers: 41%) in two groups expressed their concern over accurate use of L2 even when message is transmitted successfully. However, such a subjects' concern over accuracy seems to be contradictory to the finding on item 3 to which 52% of the students and 61% of the teachers responded with more emphasis on fluency than accuracy. One possible explanation for this contradiction is that though both students and teachers would aim at attaining fluency, and be eager to become fluent L2 users, most of the time they would find themselves giving constant heed to accurate use of language consciously or unconsciously in production. This, as mentioned earlier, may be due in part to non-native speakers' tendency of oversensitivity to grammatical aspects of language as compared to target language speakers.

Meanwhile, in item 14, only 24% of the students and 29% of the teachers gave a positive response, which indicates that they saw the relationship between grammar learning and communication ability in L2 learning unimportant. In view of an overall consensus about the nature of communicative competence in the L2 literature which is posited to include grammatical knowledge as one

indispensable dimension constituting communication ability, the above attitude of both students and teachers is not desirable, and it is necessary for them to have a better understanding of the importance of achieving a harmonious, balanced development between the ability to use an L2 correctly and the ability to use it fluently for getting message across in the development of target language proficiency. In item 19, most students and teachers were found to have studied grammar since it had been emphasized and tested most of the time during their school days. This finding implies that grammar-centered instruction had been still popular in spite of the recommendation by the 6th national curriculum stressing more on communication than grammar in the classroom. In particular, there were more teachers (81%) than students (63%) who responded affirmatively in this item, which clearly indicates that teachers had been taught English with a heavy focus on grammar in their school days as compared to students.

Despite the similarities between students and teachers in their behavioral attitude in relation to the items presented above, there were some notable differences between them. In item 15, teachers (88%) were far more active than students (48%) in disagreeing on the statement 'I usually spend more time on learning grammar than on developing four language skills.' One main reason for the difference may lie in the fact that since for getting a job or studying further, students need to obtain a high score on a variety of standardized tests such as TOEIC, TOEFL, or TEPS whose parts considerably deal with grammatical aspects of an L2, they have to devote a considerable amount of time to the studying of grammar as compared to teachers. Finally, in item 20, more than a half of the students (67%) agreed that they would like to be corrected whenever errors would occur whereas 61% of the teachers did not. Among many plausible explanations for the difference, one is that teachers seemed to be careful in giving feedback by thinking that correcting all errors does not necessarily have a positive, constructive effect on the development of communication ability since there are a number of factors (e.g., learner age, proficiency level, reason for learning, type of error, etc) to be considered in error correction. On the other hand, students' preference for corrective feedback gives support to previous findings on error correction that L2 learners are willing to be corrected more than teachers feel they should be (Cathcart & Olsen, 1976, cited in Hendrickson, 1987).

2. Teachers' Teaching Beliefs and Ways of Instructing Grammar

As stated earlier, in order to find out teachers' teaching beliefs and ways of dealing with grammar in the class, ten items were added into the questionnaire administered to the group of teachers. Table 4 summarized the results of the analysis of those items.

TABLE 4
Frequency of Teachers' Teaching Beliefs and Ways of Dealing with Grammar in Class (%)

	Disagree	Not Decided	Agree		Disagree	Not Decided	Agree
Item 21	74	17	9	Item 22	49	29	22
Item 23	52	27	21	Item 24	12	12	76
Item 25	10	7	83	Item 26	75	13	12
Item 27	20	19	61	Item 28	15	8	77
Item 29	14	15	71	Item 30	15	18	67

As shown in Table 4, in item 24 ('I think grammar teaching should be viewed as a way of promoting communication skills'), most teachers (76%) saw grammar teaching as a means of promoting communication skills while about 50% of the teachers wanted communication ability to be developed prior to grammatical ability in item 22 ('I think grammatical ability should be developed before communication ability'). Concerning the way of dealing with grammar in item 21 ('I think grammar should always be explained and taught in an explicit, analytical way'), many teachers (74%) were opposed to instruction based on explicit, metalinguistic explanations of grammar. Similarly, a half of the teachers (52%) disagreed on the statement of item 23 that learners should know about grammar consciously and explicitly in L2 learning and use. On the basis of these findings so far, it can be said that teachers tended to put more emphasis on fluent use of an L2 than accurate use of L2 forms by giving priority to communication skills in their classroom. This may conflict with the earlier findings that teachers like students were quite active in agreeing on the critical role played by grammar in L2 learning. Such a conflict, however, can be

accounted for when one notes that the role of grammar in L2 learning can be understood and represented in a variety of differing ways, and teachers in this study took their way of showing grammar role in L2 learning through seeing grammar as one important dimension of language competence, and activating it as a *means of promoting* language competence, not through teaching grammar in an explicit, analytical manner to gain conscious, metalinguistic knowledge.

In item 25 ('I think grammar teaching should be done along with a focus on communication'), more than two thirds of the teachers (83%) believed that grammar instruction should proceed along with a major focus on communicating meaning with others. To this end, teachers were shown to be willing to use communication-centered activities as frequently as possible in item 28 ('I would use communication-oriented activities for grammar teaching whenever possible'). These findings appear to show a teachers' strong belief in the Communicative Approach (henceforth, CA). In item 29 ('I think the CA pays attention to not only communication skills, but grammatical ability'), 71% of the teachers gave a positive response, which indicates their full, right understanding of the CA. It is likely that such a teaching belief would be conducive to the attainment of a balanced development between accuracy and fluency in L2 learning, which should be the goal of our EFL class.

The teachers' tendency of giving priority to communication in the teaching of grammar can also be shown in their response to items 26 and 27. In item 26 ('I think the most effective method of grammar teaching is the Grammar-Translation Method'), few teachers (12%) thought that grammar can be taught most effectively through the Grammar-Translation Method (henceforth, GT) while most teachers (75%) did not. However, more than a half of the teachers (61%) responded positively in item 27 ('I would teach grammar in the way I had been taught it in my school days, which makes me comfortable, and confident, as compared to trying other ways'), which indicates possibility of a transfer of an old way of teachers' being taught into their new teaching situation. This finding is somewhat interesting, and provides one important implication for our classrooms. It is not difficult to see that the way of teachers' having been taught grammar was mainly through conscious, explicit learning and memorization of it since the GT had been quite popular in our EFL classes until recently. The above finding shows that the success of L2

class may depend not on teaching method itself, but on teachers. In other words, even though there are teaching methods leading to effective, successful language learning, they may not be used, or applied into the classroom actively by teachers for some reason. For example, teachers would feel more comfortable conducting teaching in the way they had been instructed than using a method which is new and unfamiliar to them. Finally, with regard to the goal of grammar teaching in EFL context in item 30 ('I think one of the goals of grammar instruction would be to learn about grammar for entering college, passing various exams for getting jobs, or studying further'), a majority of teachers (67%) showed an agreement on the positive role of grammar teaching in gaining high score for entering college, getting a job, or studying further in standardized tests which considerably deal with conscious grammatical knowledge.

3. Findings on Written Data from Open Questions

This section presented the results of four open questions included in the questionnaire in order to find out how both students and teachers described, or explained what they were thinking, or believing about L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching in EFL context. The four questions involved the definition of grammar, the way of being taught grammar, the most effective way of learning grammar, and problems with grammar learning and teaching in our current EFL class.

1) What is Grammar?

A variety of different definitions of grammar are available in the literature on linguistics and language learning. Such a variation in the view of grammar usually results from differing schools of linguistics each of which sees language from a different perspective. For instance, Gleason (1955), an influential structural linguist, viewed language as an expression system consisting of phonemes and morphemes, and saw grammar as dealing with morphemes and their combinations. Meanwhile, Chomskyan linguistics, which considered language as one important aspect of human mind, thought of grammar as

subconscious, mental knowledge possessed by every language user (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998). Still, from a functional view of language, Scarcella and Oxford (1992) credited grammar with a cornerstone of communication and an essential component of language competence.

The analysis of written data gathered from an open question asking about what grammar is showed much similarities between subjects and the forementioned scholars in their views of grammar. For most students, grammar was understood as a basis or a foundation of language which is indispensable for language use. That is, grammar was thought to play a pivotal role in communication by letting language users use four language skills at their disposal. Other students also saw grammar as a set of language rules functioning as a skeleton or a framework to allow what is uttered to be systematic, and to sound natural and comprehensible.

From these views of grammar, it follows that many students seemed to fully understand the importance of grammar in L2 learning and use. According to one student, "To L2 learners, the learning of grammar is essential since the lack of grammatical knowledge would be a serious barrier to the achievement of full language competence". Similarly, another student added that "the knowledge of grammar is necessary to a considerable extent in the learning of English since it is required in the development of reading and writing skills, not to mention the obtaining of high score in TOEIC or TOEFL".

Meanwhile, some students expressed negative attitude toward grammar by seeing grammar as something boring, tedious, difficult or uninteresting. Here are some examples:

"I think grammar is definitely needed in learning English, but is the thing that I hate most."

"Grammar is the most difficult and the hardest part of English to learn. Nonetheless, I have to learn."

"In fact, the word 'grammar' gives me a headache because it is so difficult and complex that sometime it makes me feel distressful and even frustrated."

Teachers showed similar views of grammar to those of students. Most teachers remarked in one voice that grammar is a fundamental dimension for language use. To cite some examples:

“Grammar is like a mathematical formula for language use.”

“I guess grammar is a necessary evil, and serves as a basis of language as well as language use.”

“It [Grammar] is like bones of human body indispensable for both creating sentences and transmitting them for communication.”

Like students, though many teachers acknowledged the fundamental role of grammar in language use, they had negative attitude toward grammar, and offered some comments on grammar instruction. Most teachers mentioned that grammar was difficult and boring to learn, and they had hard time seeking ways of learning and teaching grammar in an efficient, attractive way. At the same time, they did not forget to warn that grammar should neither be a main point of instruction, nor be it an end in itself for our English class.

2) The Way Grammar Had Been Taught

The second open question given to students and teachers involved the way they had been taught English grammar in their school days. The reason for asking this question was that a specific way an individual had been instructed L2 grammar may have a considerable effect on his/her attitude toward grammar. Nearly all the students remarked in one voice that they had been instructed English grammar mechanically with little attention to communication. Here are some examples:

“Teachers always pushed us to remember the rules of grammar even though I didn’t know why and how native speakers spoke and used such rules. I tried not to forget words and rules in reading texts.”

"It was very stupid. It was not important at all whether or not, we understood. The only thing that we did in a class was to memorize everything like a song."

"When I was in high school, teachers usually asked us to underline phrases or sentences, and explained grammar points in them on a blackboard. After that, we wrote down what was explained on our notebook, and memorized it. It could be on the test, so we had to keep memorizing it strictly and accurately."

The above finding was somewhat surprising in light of the fact that students during their school days had been taught English under the guidance of the 6th national curriculum which emphasized the importance of communication skill in L2 learning. Many students must have received grammar-oriented instruction focusing mainly on memorization and rote learning of grammar, and reading.

Teachers did not differ much from students in the way in which they had been instructed English. The following examples obviously indicated that they had been taught grammar for the sake of grammar learning itself, not as a tool leading to communication in their school days:

"I imagine it was through the Grammar-Translation Method that we were taught English. Grammar rules were given in such a deductive manner that after understanding and memorizing a given rule, we had an opportunity to interpret sentences containing it and to apply it into other sentences."

"It [the way I was taught grammar] was definitely useless for speaking skill. Rules were explained, and then memorized. Though such a way helped me to develop reading and writing skills, it was nothing when I started to be in a conversation class in college."

"During reading, sentences were analyzed with a focus on new grammar rules and vocabulary which had to be memorized later. There was no connection to communication."

The above teachers' retrospection gives support to the earlier finding that though teachers fully understood that the CA was appropriate for the development of both fluency and accuracy, they were not active in using the CA in the teaching of grammar, and rather, relied on the way of their having been taught grammar in their school days. As stated before, one reason for such a contradiction may be that teachers were hesitant in employing an L2 teaching method which was unfamiliar to them, and thus made them feel uncomfortable and uneasy using it in their class. Consequently, they would be highly likely to stick to the old way in their class in which they had been received grammar instruction during their school days.

3) The Most Effective Way of Learning and Teaching L2 Grammar

The third open question involved the most effective way of learning grammar in EFL context. As can be expected from the earlier findings, many students objected to the memorized, rote learning of grammar, and instead, they preferred the meaningful, natural learning of grammar through communication. According to one student, "rather than relying on memorization, it would be a lot better to learn grammar within everyday communication, which I'm sure is effective and unborring". Another student gave the similar opinion that grammar should be learned at the same time when we work on conversation, and should be applied and practiced in everyday conversation. The following are some examples showing students' preference for grammar learning through communication:

"I think grammar is best learned together with conversation in which we are offered an opportunity to practice a given grammar item for communicative purposes. We should know how and where that grammar point is used for everyday speech, not just for the purpose of test or storage in memory."

"To me, the most effective way of learning grammar is to get together with English native speakers, and to let them correct what I say during communication."

"I don't think we have to learn all grammar items in English. Rather, we need to focus on some of them frequently used in everyday conversation. Also those grammar items can be learned most effectively during communication."

Other students believed that the most effective way of learning grammar was through reading or writing. One student mentioned that since the knowledge of grammar influences the comprehension of text in reading to a considerable extent, grammar should be learned through reading. Another student added that grammar can be learned and practiced in writing most effectively since writing requires the mapping of meaning created by a writer onto certain grammatical structures with the help of grammatical rules.

Like students, most teachers believed that the most useful way of learning grammar was through communication. In particular, teachers stressed an integration of grammar into communication tasks which learners work on. Here are some examples:

"Learners should be ensured to have an opportunity to practice a grammar point in communication-oriented activities once a grammar point is presented and explained."

"It would be a good idea that learners should use grammar rules for practice not only in conversation, but in reading and writing tasks which encourage learners to repeat and reinforce what they learn about grammar."

"Grammar can be learned quite easily and effectively in context in which learners are required to get their message across by using grammar items necessary for communication to take place. This is important in fully understanding how grammar works."

Other teachers addressed conditions under which grammar learning can occur most effectively. One of the frequently mentioned condition involved whether sentences or dialogues containing grammar points could draw attention or

attraction from learners. As long as learners are interested in what they are doing, they would be likely to be motivated to learn grammar actively and enthusiastically.

4) Problems with Current Grammar Learning

In the last question, both students and teachers were asked to identify problems, if any, with current *grammar learning in our EFL classes*. Many students saw rote learning of grammar, or mere memorization of grammar as the most serious problem. Such classes seemed to make learners feel bored and helpless as one student wrote, "We are forced to do so much memorization. My head 'hard drive' is going to break down, and I feel terrible." Others addressed *problems as follows*:

"The big problem with our grammar learning lies in overreliance on rote memorization. One way of avoiding such a problem is through engaging in meaningful, natural communication with the minimum reference to a textbook."

"One thing that I hate most with regard to grammar learning is that though most of the class time is spent on rule explanation and application, I am not sure whether I will be able to use a learned grammar rule for real communication correctly and appropriately. There is a definite need for a practice of grammar rules in context."

On the other hand, some students expressed their concern over conversation-centered classes with little attention to grammar learning. One student criticized that communication-oriented classes are likely to result in incorrect use of English, and hoped that more class time should be devoted to grammar learning. Furthermore, a few students warned against the increasing of fossilization, and emphasized the correction of ungrammatical use of language. It seemed that what these students stressed here is to be careful not to let all the errors go unnoticed with a heavy focus on meaning even when a full understanding of message may not have occurred.

Most teachers noted that one major problem with our grammar instruction had to do with grammar learning as an end in itself. According to them, such a class spends most of the time on presenting and explaining rules with translation exercises, forces students to memorize them, and leads students to have trouble using them for communication. As a result, students are likely to become bored, and lose interest in overall L2 learning. As one way of avoiding such a grammar class, many teachers offered the following suggestions:

“It is urgent that we should avoid tests assessing grammatical knowledge or reading comprehension. Rather, we need to place grammar in the middle of communication with a focus on speaking and listening.”

“Grammar should be treated in the course of learning how to send message in context, which leads us to naturally and effortlessly learn how a specific grammar rule can be used in a particular situation.”

“Rather than relying on passive learning in teacher-fronted class, I would ask students to engage in a variety of learning activities, for instance, an assignment of searching and collecting utterances illustrating the use of a given grammar point in natural setting.”

Meanwhile, like students, some teachers lamented the recent tendency of ignoring grammar in the class, and argued for the learning of basic grammar rules necessary for conversation in a systematic way.

IV. DISCUSSION

Based on the findings of the study so far, it can be said that both students and teachers showed an overall similarity in their attitude toward L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching in spite of some differences. First, concerning the cognitive aspect of attitude, two groups of subjects fully acknowledged the important role of grammar in L2 development, seeing

grammatical knowledge as indispensable in learning English. Also they agreed that grammar learning should be done within context as a means of developing communication ability, and objected to the learning of grammar as an end in itself. On the other hand, students and teachers differed from each other in the early learning of grammar. Students were more active than teachers in learning grammar in the beginning stage of learning.

Second, as for the affective aspect of attitude, overall, students and teachers showed much similarities in this category. Both groups were concerned about the correct use of language forms in interaction, and showed sensitivity to grammaticality of their language even in the case of success in getting message across. Such an attitude was accounted for by L2 learners' tendency of being more sensitive to grammatical aspects of language than native speakers of target language. That is, though learners have an ultimate aim of becoming fluent L2 users, they usually find themselves ended up with struggling with grammaticality of their language in production. In addition, two groups were found to feel easier and more comfortable in a grammar class than in a conversation class. As one possible explanation, we Koreans have been accustomed to teacher-fronted classes characterized by independent, analytical learning fitting a grammar class better than a conversation class, so subjects in this study were assumed to like being in a grammar class more than in a conversation class requiring collaborative, interactive learning with which they were not familiar.

Third, regarding the behavioral aspect of attitude, most important, not only teachers, but students who had been taught English under the guidance of the 6th national curriculum were shown to study grammar since grammar was given a major focus during instruction and testing, which indicates that grammar-centered instruction had been still popular in our EFL classes despite an emphasis of communication skills by the 6th national curriculum. Meanwhile, one notable difference between the two groups involves corrective feedback. Students were ready to get ungrammatical forms of language to be corrected whenever possible, which was explained by L2 learners' general preference for corrective feedback. However, teachers were careful in providing error correction, which indicates their considerate approaches to error treatment.

As for teachers' teaching beliefs and ways of dealing with grammar, one

important finding is that even though nearly all the teachers believed that grammar instruction should be done with a focus on communication, and did not see the Grammar-Translation Method as an effective way of teaching grammar, to one's surprise, many of them had an intention to instruct grammar in the way in which they had been taught L2 grammar in their school days. Given that the way they had been taught English was mainly through rote memorization and translation as in the GT, there is some discrepancy between teachers' belief and actual teaching behavior, which means that the way in which teachers was taught L2 grammar is highly likely to influence the way they would instruct it to their students. Such a discrepancy can be reduced through teachers' active participation in workshops or seminars during vacation and their frequent discussion with fellow teachers and colleagues. By doing so, teachers can stay away from an old, ineffective method by themselves, stick to what they think or believe about L2 grammar teaching, and try it with confidence.

Finally, the analysis of written data from open questions indicated that in general, students and teachers were similar to each other in various issues relevant to L2 grammar learning and teaching. First, both groups took a similar view of L2 grammar, and considered it as a basis of language use for communication. Second, the two groups of subjects remarked in one voice that they had been taught L2 grammar with a heavy focus on conscious rule-learning and memorization mostly to the exclusion of context. Such a finding seems to address one serious problem with our EFL classrooms since as mentioned before, despite the strong recommendation of the 6th national curriculum to promote communication ability, grammar-based instruction might have been popular with little attention to communication. In a similar vein, according to most students and teachers, one of the serious problems in our EFL classes involves rote, conscious learning of grammar which is not sufficient for communication. For grammar to be learned or taught effectively and successfully, both students and teachers wanted it to be treated within context during communication.

V. CONCLUSION

The present paper had an aim to examine both students' and teachers' attitude toward L2 grammar on the one hand, and teachers' teaching beliefs and ways of dealing with L2 grammar on the other. To this end, a questionnaire which divided attitude into three differing parts (i.e., cognitive, affective, and behavioral) was administered to two groups of subjects. The results of the study indicated that in general, students and teachers showed an overall similarity in their attitude toward L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching (Schulz, 2001). Among many findings, most important, rather than giving priority to the promotion of communication ability suggested by the 6th national curriculum, our EFL classes had placed a heavy focus on grammar. It was also found that the way teachers had been taught English had a considerable effect on the way they would instruct it in their class.

As one of the effective ways of dealing with grammar, both students and teachers strongly recommended that the learning and teaching of grammar should be done while engaged in using and practicing a given grammar point within context for communicative purposes. This is what many L2 researchers (e.g., Celce-Murcia, 1991; Richards, 2002; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992) have suggested for effective grammar pedagogy. In light of the findings of the study, one of the problems in our English classroom to be solved as soon as possible is that grammar should be handled not as an end itself, but as a tool leading to communication under various situations. By making efforts to communicating meaning with right grammar rules during interaction, students are likely to get to better know how and in which context they can be used, and in doing so, to build confidence to use them for real communicative situations.

Concerning weaknesses of the study, the number of female subjects was much larger than that of male subjects, so the generalizability of the findings of the study was limited. Also since only ten out of forty one teachers who participated in the study were full-time, in-service teachers, it is not clear whether the overall findings of the study fully represent the attitudes of other in-service teachers toward L2 grammar and L2 grammar learning and teaching. In spite of these weaknesses, as stated earlier, the use of differing modes to gather data (i.e., Likert scale and retrospection) in the study is believed to have

a positive effect on improving the quality of data in such a way that data from written, retrospection can complement data from the Likert scale, or vice-versa. Hence, it is likely that a better picture can be obtained of both students' and teachers' attitudes toward L2 grammar, and L2 grammar learning and teaching in EFL learning context. This in turn would contribute to the development and execution of a well-planned curriculum leading to effective, successful learning and teaching of grammar in our EFL classroom.

REFERENCES

- Bachman, F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed)*. Longman.
- Cathcart, L., & Olsen, J. (1976). Teachers' students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76*, Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 459-480.
- Chen, S. Q. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning*, 40, 155-187.
- Dickins, P. M. R., & Woods, E. G. (1988). Some criteria for the development of communicative grammar tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 623-646.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.
- Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 323-351.
- Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1998). *An introduction to language. (6th ed)*. Harcourt Brace.
- Gleason, H. A. (1955). *An introduction to descriptive linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Hendrickson, J. (1987). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practices. In M. Long & L. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 355-369). Newbury House.
- Higgs, T. (1984). Language teaching and the quest for the Holy Grail. In T. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency: The organizing principle* (pp. 1-9). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Hymes, D. (1979). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 1-26). Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 279-296). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Ministry of Education. (1995). *Accounts for curriculum of foreign languages in high school*. Seoul: Ministry of Education.
- Mitchell, J. T., & Redmond, M. L. (1993). Rethinking grammar and communication. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 13-19.
- Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, 52, 101-109.
- Politzer, R. L., & McGroarty, M. (1983). A discrete point test of communicative competence. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 180-190.
- Richards, J. (2002, Fall). *Cambridge day 2002: 30 years of language teaching-what have we learned?* Paper presented at the 2002 Cambridge Day Conference. Pusan, Korea.
- Savignon, S. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Tanaka, S., & Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 18-33.
- Teale, W., & Lewis, R. (1981). The nature and measurement of secondary school students' attitudes toward reading. *Reading Horizons*, 221, 94-102.
- Terrell, T. D. (1991). The role of grammar instruction in a communicative

- approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 52-63.
- VanPatten, B. (1988). How juries get hung: problems with the evidence for a focus on form in teaching. *Language Learning*, 38, 243-260.
- _____. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition-rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 435-450.
- Walters, J. (1980). Grammar, meaning and sociocultural appropriateness in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 34, 337-345.

Appendix A
Questionnaire

- Male () Female () - Major:
- Year in College: Freshman () Sophomore () Junior () Senior ()
- Your level of English proficiency
- Intermediate-low () Intermediate-mid () Intermediate-high () Advanced ()
- How many hours do you usually spend on studying English grammar a day?
_____ hours a day or _____ hours a week
-

I) Please read the following statements and respond to them by 'Strongly disagree (1)', 'Disagree (2)', 'Neither Agree or Disagree (3)', 'Agree (4)', 'Strongly agree (5)'.

1. I think in general, knowing about grammar helps me to learn English. __
2. I think grammar is the most important part in learning English. __
3. I think correct use of English is more important than fluent use of it. __
4. I think I need to learn more about grammar of English. __
5. I think grammar should be learned as a way of developing communication skills. __
6. I think grammar should be learned within various context, not in isolation. __
7. I find it necessary to learn grammar from the beginning of learning English. __
8. I think grammar should be taught as little as possible during class. __
9. I feel uncomfortable and worried when I use ungrammatical expression during conversation. __
10. I feel more comfortable and better in a grammar class than a conversation

class. ___

11. I do not worry about incorrect forms if my message is understood. ___
12. Grammar learning motivates me to learn English a lot. ___
13. Grammar learning reduces my interest and enthusiasm in learning English. ___
14. I study grammar hard because it would help me develop my communication ability. ___
15. I usually spend more time on learning grammar than four language skills (speaking, listening, reading or writing). ___
16. I usually focus on grammar(rules) during speaking or writing.
17. I have studied grammar because it helps me to develop reading skill. ___
18. I have studied grammar because it helps me to develop writing skill. ___
19. I've studied grammar because English teachers emphasized and tested it during school days. ___
20. I usually ask others to correct my incorrect forms whenever possible. ___

II) Please briefly write down your answer to each question.

1. What do you think is grammar?
2. Describe the way that you were taught English grammar in the middle & high school?
3. What do you think is the most effective way of learning grammar?
4. Do our current English classrooms have any problems with grammar learning? Please write down your opinions (Comments or suggestions for grammar learning & teaching will be fine!)

The following ten items were included only for teachers.

21. I think grammar should always be explained and taught students in an explicit, analytical way. ___
22. I think grammatical ability should be developed before communication ability.
23. I think students should know grammar rules consciously and clearly. ___
24. I think grammar teaching should be viewed as a way of promoting communication skills. ___
25. I think grammar teaching should be done along with a focus on communication. ___
26. I think the most effective method of grammar teaching is the Grammar - Translation Method. ___
27. I would teach grammar in the way I had been taught in my school days,

which makes me comfortable, and confident, as compared to trying other ways. __

28. I would use communication -oriented activities for grammar teaching whenever possible. __
29. I think the CA pays attention to not only communication skills, but grammatical ability. __
30. I think one of the goals of grammar instruction would be to learn about grammar for entering college, passing various exams for getting jobs, or studying further. __

예시언어(Examples in): English

적용가능 언어(Applicable Languages): English

적용가능 수준(Applicable Levels): Secondary/College

Jae-Suk Suh

Inha University

Yonghyun-dong Nam-gu, Incheon

Tel: (032) 860-7853

E-mail: jssuh@inha.ac.kr

Revised in Feb., 2004

Reviewed in March, 2004

Revised version received in April, 2004