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Abstract

Stemming from issue of migration for education, the study explored the language learning experience of Korean university students who come to the Philippines for education. Specifically, it documented the changes in the students’ implicit and explicit knowledge that occurred in the preactional until the actional phase of their learning journey in a study abroad context. Using a free written task and a grammaticality judgment test, the study found that majority of the learners was able to access their implicit knowledge for free production tasks and their explicit knowledge for grammaticality judgment tests. The said findings confirm the effectiveness of Ellis’ (2005) instruments in measuring implicit and explicit knowledge and the existence of the said types of knowledge. It was also found that statistically, the differences were significant but not correlated.


Introduction

In 2012, the London-based news agency British Broadcasting Company (BBC) tagged the Philippines as the World’s budget English teacher (McGeown, 2012) which seconded a Philippine Bureau of Immigration report that more than 24,000 foreigners applied for study permits in 2011. The figure went to show that there were approximately 61,000 foreigners enrolled in Philippine schools. The BBC report adds that the foreigners studying in the Philippines were from Iran, Libya, Brazil, Russia, Japan, Taiwan, Korea as well as those from, North Africa, South America and the Middle East. Although the number is also influenced by learners who have applied for graduate and post-graduate courses, it is claimed that the dramatic increase in the number of foreign learners who have immigrated to the Philippines is attributed to the country’s relatively cheaper cost of education. It is said that a learner may need only $500 (£313) for a 60-hour class which is about a third of the price of
an equivalent course in the United States or Canada. On a more crucial perspective, the Filipinos’ use of English as the medium of instruction in Philippine schools is reported to be the primary reason of the diaspora. Despite adversities such as bureaucracy, corruption and living conditions, the trend in foreign education migrant influx is consistently increasing. A huge percentage of these learners come from South Korea.

With the influx of the Koreans in the Philippines, it is noted that that EFL learners are able to use the target language in and outside the classroom conversations due to the multi-ethnic mix of people around them. On another note, EFL learners are able to receive a more consistent and well-developed instruction and course development since the teachers are natives of the ESL context environment.

One important facet of language learners is their ability to use the appropriate type of grammar knowledge (Gustilo, 2013; Gustilo & Magno, 2015). In the field of second language acquisition, the implicit and explicit knowledge are known to be the type of knowledge that learners possess. Hence, the study focuses on the two types of grammar knowledge used by Koreans in presented situations while on a study abroad context.

In language education, differing assumptions about the nature of language representation and its promotion motivated different teaching traditions. Traditional grammar translation instruction and the cognitive code method popular in the 1960s and 1970s capitalized on the formal operational abilities of older children and adults to think and act in a rule-governed way. These explicit methods were motivated by the belief that perception and awareness of L2 rules necessarily precedes their use. Thus, explicit knowledge is a kind of knowledge that can be acquired consciously by learners, which means learners know the knowledge. Explicit language knowledge consists of knowledge related to language including general language knowledge and specific grammar knowledge.

Implicit knowledge, on the other hand, refers to tacit knowledge. During the process of acquiring mother tongue, children unconsciously master the characteristics and regulation of mother tongue, and knowledge concerning mother tongue implies implicit knowledge. Sun Ju (2006) defines implicit knowledge as occasionally acquired, implicitly stored, automatically used knowledge.

It can be observed that the distinction of implicit and explicit knowledge have been concerned with the development of the two types of knowledge as well as how each can be of aid in the development of the other. There is also an observed disagreement in the conceptualization of both types of knowledge (Ellis & Shintani, 2014); and this reflection is echoed by Sun, Matthews and Lane (2007) in suggesting that both types of knowledge differ on a number of characteristics.

The effectiveness of explicit instruction in developing explicit and implicit knowledge of a second language has been intensively studied during the past decades. However, the extent to which explicit instruction can lead to implicit knowledge is still a matter of debate. Ellis (2005, 2009) argues that this debate is partly due to the difficulty of operationalizing implicit knowledge on the one hand, and as its direct consequence, not having appropriate tests to measure it on the other. An important matter to be discussed in this study is how to operationalize the constructs of L2 implicit and explicit knowledge.
Hence, both the explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge have a role to improve the level of language; the two complement each other and neither of them can be missing. When learning conditions are favorable, these two forms of learning can be transformed into each other, and they can be both rational and intuitive. Pedagogically, only the two kinds of learning mechanisms are organically integrated in the most EFL contexts.

Taking into consideration Ellis' (2009) call for more studies on learners' implicit and explicit knowledge, it may be timely to explore this area among EFL learners such as Koreans in a study abroad context and focus on how it changes over time. Andringa and Rebuschat (2015) add that studies on differences in implicit learning is at its infancy. Also, in response to Ellis' (2008) challenge to validate existing instruments to measure the two types of knowledge, the current study adopts Ellis' (2005) instrumentation. The present study also responds to Ellis’ suggestion that there is a need to apply triangulation method to assess the interrelations of the concerned variables. Finally, implicit knowledge is known to be at the core of automated language processing and that the development of these types of representations is the ultimate goal of L2 acquisition (Doughty, 2003). With the Koreans’ development of the implicit knowledge of English as they take formal education in the Philippines, it is vital to investigate the depth of learning, and so, the following questions were sought: (1) How has the implicit and explicit knowledge of Korean students changed after the EFL to ESL shift? (2) Is there a significant difference between implicit and explicit knowledge in the EFL and ESL contexts?

**Methods**

**Participants**

Croker (2009) mentions that a mixed method study is carried out with a group of learners as the research participants; in the same way, Ellis (2002) recommends that learners with considerable exposure to grammar lessons shall take a grammar test to measure the implicit and explicit knowledge. Given the said parameters and the nature of the study, higher education students from South Korea who migrated to the Philippines were considered to participate in the data collection. For convenience, the students come mostly from Seoul and nearby cities. Around 70-80% of them come from government high schools; however, diversity of the socio-educational backgrounds were also targeted. Most of the student participants originated from major cities such as Suwon, Gimpo and Pyongtaek, but mostly come from Seoul, city capital of South Korea, acting as the center for business and commerce. Prior to the Koreans’ arrival in the Philippines, it was verified that all of the participants were their first time to study in the country.

**Instruments and Data Sets**

One hundred twenty copies of the three questionnaires and a grammar test were distributed to the target participants. Compared to other quantitative studies of the same nature, the number of the sample is relatively smaller. This is due to the probability that the researcher would locate a certain percentage of would-be education migrants in the Philippines.
The interviews of eight participants were conducted after seeking their consent. The interviewees were requested to participate in the interview to share their experiences of learning English in relation to the context of the study. Thirty students were requested to participate in the interview after the 2nd round of questionnaire. Among the initial eight targeted participants, only seven were either agreeable in participating or available for the interview. The interviews were conducted in August 2016 after they have reached the 10 to 12-week period or their actional phase. The procedure of the selection was based on the premise that the results of their quantitative data were salient. Ten students were chosen for each psycholinguistic structure on the basis of the remarkable and lack or absence of changes. The main purpose of the interviews was to find consistency in the quantitative findings. Further, it sought to obtain narratives regarding the learning experience of the students. Two sets of interviews were done in each time frame of the study, i.e. EFL and ESL. This two-fold procedure was done to describe the differences or similarities in the grammar knowledge in both periods.

To let the participants focus on meaning rather than on form, a free written task had to be administered. In the said task, the participants were not required to write fast. Instead, they were instructed to finish their writing within or in at least thirty minutes. According to Hu (2002), this method prevents off-line monitoring. They were instructed to write only one draft and not to revise it after they finished composing. Additionally, they were not allowed to consult any reference materials during their writing so as to make sure that all target uses are generated by the participants themselves. The prompts for the essay were presented before the task. The handwritten compositions are typed, and accuracy is ascertained. The writing prompts for the preactional stage is their language learning experience in Korea and the actional stage is concerned with their language learning experience in the Philippines. The scores were rated on a 10-point basis in order to quantify the outputs. A marking of 9 or 10 is considered ‘excellent’; 7-8 is ‘very good’; 5-6 is ‘good’ 3-4 is ‘fair’; and 1-2 is poor. The same ratings were used for statistical interpretation.

Additionally, a two 20-item grammaticality judgment tests (GJT) were written for the data gathering. The nature of the test is based on Ellis’ (2005) proposed instrument in measuring the explicit knowledge of the participants. The grammatical aspects were based on Bautista’s (2000) and Bauman’s (2010) studies that identified the features of Philippine English and Korean English. Table 1 shows the details of the said features. It should be noted that the questions were also used in Cruz (2013); thus, it can be said that the GJT has been verified for validity and reliability. However, since two phases are involved in the study, it was thought that it would be wise to produce a second set of questionnaire instead of reutilizing the first one. This eliminates possible familiarity with the first set of question which defeats the purpose of testing the respondents’ explicit knowledge. The test made the participants judge the correctness and deviance of the sentence based on grammar. To allow testing of their knowledge of the deviations, only four grammatical sentences were included. The test also asked the participants to indicate whether they used their feeling or knowledge of rule in answering each item. The answers would be verified by the qualitative data. Finally, compared to the instruments for the measurement of the ideal self and ought to self, the GJT was written in English because the grammatical focus is English.
Table 1

Grammatical aspects measured in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Examples of learners’ mistakes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>I want to encounter the different people in different country(ies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>I have a lot of friends whom I can learn on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>Some also says that cheating is part of the “High School Life”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive-Intransitive verbs</td>
<td>I hope you will visit again here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To properly measure the scores, a score of 17-20 is considered ‘excellent; 13-16 is ‘very good’; 9-12 is ‘good’; 5-8 is ‘fair; and 1-4 is ‘poor’. The same ratings were used for statistical interpretation.

Data Analyses

For the statistical treatment of the present study, dependent T-test was used to determine if there would be significant changes in the implicit and explicit knowledge of the Korean learners. The dependent t-test compares the means of two related groups to detect whether there are any statistically significant differences between these means. In the study, the groups are the Koreans in the EFL and ESL contexts. The means of the results of the sample’s FWT and GJT in the preactional and actional phases were compared to determine the significance of the changes. It has been observed that the 30 minute-Free Writing Test generated different written outputs. Apparently, the participants constitute variation in writing fluency and length of the output. Since it was a free writing task, the participants had freedom in choosing what to write and how much to write within the time framework set.

Results and Discussion

Resulting from the FWT results, Table 2 discusses the development of the Korean students’ implicit knowledge of English. As previously discussed in this study, the possession of implicit knowledge is an important benchmark in determining the learner’s mastery of the second language since it elevates grammatical rules and linguistic conventions as innate.
Table 2  
Implicit Knowledge of the Korean Students after the EFL to ESL shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>EFL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT (9-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD (7-8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD (5-6)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR (3-4)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR (1-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The need for the explicit recollection and express mastery of English’s grammatical rules runs contrary to the learners’ very high implicit knowledge scores on both the EFL and ESL stages, pointing at their likely unawareness of their development:

*Whenever I write, I remember grammar lessons I learned in the academy or in school. There are a lot of them so I am always confused that’s why I need to master all of them.*

From responses such as above, and the apparent disparities with the quantitative scores, it could be gleaned that the respondents’ development of implicit knowledge has either eluded explanation in its entirety or has been superseded by anxieties.

On the other hand, when learners allude to their implicit knowledge of English, it is to remark that such knowledge is insufficient and requires a better grasp of the explicit rules of the language:

*I think grammar is important for us Koreans so I need to remember it when I write. But I do not remember everything that is why I have lot and lots of mistakes.*

With a sum of 120 respondents, it is very noticeable how, even at the outset, the learners have high implicit knowledge of English. An overwhelming majority, 99% or 119 respondents, has been accorded a score of 7 or higher signifying a very good or even an excellent implicit knowledge of the language. Responses graded as “above average” constituted many of the responses relative to those who were scored as “above average”. A similar trend in the overall responses is observed during the ESL phase. This reflects that learners still have a high implicit grasp of English. Delving into the processed results, we see a small but still significant increase of “very high” scores, from a 21% during the EFL phase to a 28%.
In turn, Table 3 unveils the explicit knowledge of Korean students. As explored elsewhere in this study, explicit knowledge is knowledge which can be expressed through descriptive language conscious of the linguistic rules and conventions of English. A free written test is applied and the outputs are graded against set criteria.

During the EFL stage, most of the respondents, numbering 77 individuals or 64% of the total sample size, have earned a “fair” score. In addition, 23% of the respondents have a “good” understanding of linguistic norms and grammatical fragments. Finally, a good 10% of learners have exhibited an inadequate understanding of explicit knowledge. ESL learners, however, have a different and overall improved comprehension of explicit knowledge which reflects on their scores indicated below. The improvement is stark, with the majority of respondents, at 60% or 72 individuals, now being granted “good” scores coupled with the absence of “poor” results. To further highlight the improvement, 8% of the learners now have a “very good” rating when their EFL selves failed to reach such a mark.

Table 3
Explicit Knowledge of the Korean Students after the EFL to ESL shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>EFL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>EFL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT (17-20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD (13-16)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD (9-12)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR (5-8)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR (1-4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the matter of the explicit knowledge of English, a student shares how the need to explicitly master the grammatical rules of a language has been imparted during his education in Korean, and even before he began studying English.

Since elementary, our teachers taught us grammar. Everything is all about grammar. As Korean, we need to memorize the rules because that's the character of grammar.

The students also reported that they are aware that they use grammar knowledge and at the same time admit their lack of competence in the said area.

I am not too confident about my grammar skills but that is what I use when answering that kind of test. I am sure I have seen those kinds of questions before, but I am still not good, that is why my score is not good.

My grammar is not really good but it is helpful if I use it in grammar tests. I remember what my teacher tells me because if I forget these rules I fail my course.
The quantitative and qualitative data demonstrated changes in the implicit and explicit knowledge of grammar of the Koreans. In particular, the explicit knowledge of the Koreans slightly improved based on their scores in the grammar test during the actional phase. Additionally, their implicit knowledge also improved with reference to content of the free writing task. A prominent finding of the study is the consistent change in both types of knowledge from the preactional to actional stages, and this finding was backed by the Koreans’ interviews.

To take into account the changes that emerged in the implicit and explicit knowledge of the Koreans, it was necessary to revisit their educational experience. It is possible that the learners’ implicit knowledge in the actional stage was statistically higher than that of the preactional due to the repeated tasks they had undergone in the class and in certain instances, informal education. A huge amount of learning tasks in Philippine education are focused on writing, and Koreans in mixed ability classes are undoubtedly obliged to take part in doing the same task. Another possible reason for this occurrence is the internalization of knowledge by the learners. Ellis (2009) mentioned about full internalization of implicit knowledge such as in SLA; however, constraints such as age may come as a hindrance in achieving it.

On the other hand, the difference in the explicit knowledge of the learners in a span of approximately three months may be caused by the explicit instructions given by teachers in their classes. Typical syllabi of English courses in the pre-K12 curriculum in colleges and universities contain lessons that focus on grammar. It is then possible that explicit learning segued to the development of the students’ explicit knowledge. Based on their interview, however, it was noticed that not all of what they explained to be wrong in the sentences were accurate. Sorace (1985 as cited in Ellis, 2009) postulates that a learner may have an idea about the ungrammaticality of a sentence but may not be very precise about it, but notes that as proficiency improves, the accurate notion on rules follows.

Meanwhile, based on the item analysis, it appears that the errors were mostly focused on prepositions, articles and transitive verbs which are in contrast to previous findings (e.g. Bautista, 2000) that subject-verb agreement and tenses are problematic for English L2 learners. This development could be due to the fact that because of the prevalence of errors on subject-verb agreement and their existence in almost all sentences, it has become imperative for language curricula to include the said lessons. As a result, the Koreans in the current study have perhaps been oriented with the said grammatical rules.

To answer RQ2, Table 4 establishes the significance of the difference of the learners’ implicit and explicit knowledge of the learners in both the EFL and ESL stages. The data presented below does not only reiterate the previously recorded occurrence of differences in the Korean learners’ knowledge of English but affirms that these differences are also valid and acceptable for this research.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Mean/SD</th>
<th>Computed</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Knowledge</td>
<td>4.86/.75</td>
<td>7.04/.73</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Knowledge</td>
<td>8.03/2.40</td>
<td>9.48/2.05</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Reject Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 0.05

Differences in the FWT

The outputs of the students in the FWT demonstrated the changes and the non-changes of their use of implicit knowledge. The output of Student 20 and Student 116 were randomly picked for the purpose of discussion on how changes occurred in their use of implicit knowledge. Student 20’s score in the FWT in the preactional period was marked as “poor” both by the researcher and the inter-rater. In the actional stage, the output was rated as “good” by the researcher and “moderate” by the inter-rater. It was agreed that it was to be marked as “good” based on few considerations. Evidently, the implicit knowledge of Student 20 has improved on the basis of the markings. It has to be noted that the basis of implicit knowledge is dependent mostly on the overall meaning of the essay. As the scores suggest, the student has developed written skills with focus on meaning over form, thus improving his implicit knowledge.

Comparing the output of S20 in the preactional and actional stage, several changes can be noticed in terms of the criteria initially set in the study. In the preactional stage, it can be seen that there was development of idea since it focused on a central theme. The essay’s theme was on the learner’s English language learning experience in high school and the prompt was evidently addressed. In terms of the organization, there were sudden shifts in almost all sentences that made the essay quite jumpy. For instance, although the second sentence elaborates the learner’s classmates and how he assesses their English speaking skills, it is proceeded by a sentence that talks about the student’s teacher’s residency in the United States. The essay also proved to be flawed in terms of its providing support to its main idea. Each sentence appeared to have independent thoughts that no further elaboration was provided. The overall communicability of the essay was somewhat shown as one can obtain a grasp of the learner’s undertaking in learning English in his hometown. This assessment is still justifiable despite the erroneous arrangement of words and phrases in the sentences. In terms of grammar and mechanics, it may be safe to say that errors may be expected. The background of the students may be the primary reason for the said deviations. A common error would be the incorrect verb tenses. There were also errors on punctuation and capitalization as seen in the second and fourth sentences. One evident error is the incorrect word choice which can be seen in the second sentence as the student describes his age, and these errors may result in confusion for the readers.

When interviewed about their outputs, S20 and S116 validated the outcome of their free writing tasks. S20 acknowledges that he thought that his writing skills have remained almost the
same as he finds it a daunting task.

S20: Writing essays is really very hard. I cannot write long essays because I do not know what to put there sometimes. So I just write what I think is about the topic so that I can submit something to my teacher when I need to pass it.

Meanwhile, S116 admits his assumption that he might have improved his writing skills. He owes his supposed progress to overwhelming load of schoolwork given to him in school.

When I started going to school here in Philippines, I wrote a lot of essays. Almost everyday or every week, we have to write something in different classes. I consider that as practice so I think I have improved even if I am here for only a short time.

Based on the perspectives of Students 20 and 116, explicit knowledge was used by the students in the free writing task. With this finding, the learners were also asked on possible causes or sources of their use of implicit knowledge.

The changes in the explicit knowledge shows that there was a general increase in scores of the grammar test in the ESL shift which can be an indication that their grammar knowledge has improved with reference to their initial scores in the EFL phase. It should be noted that there was a different set of questions in both questionnaires; hence, the analysis does not focus on a per item basis but on a general perspective. All of the items in the EFL questionnaire were somewhat challenging for the learners, as there was no item in which at least 50% of the participants answered it correctly. Meanwhile, when the learners answered the ESL questionnaire, 12 of the 20 items incurred at least 50% correct responses.

According to the results of the GJT in the EFL context, more students got sentence number 10 correctly, and the grammatical aspect in the said sentence is subject-verb agreement. Several participants also found ease in identifying grammatical sentences as evident in sentences 7 and 12. Meanwhile, it appears that the learners had difficulty judging grammaticality of sentences with error in preposition and transitivity of verbs based on the turnout in sentences 19 and 20. The ESL context GJT appears to be a similar story. The easiest item for the participants was the item number 5 which is an indicative sentence with an error in tense. Also, more students were able to answer items 7 and 12, with a higher percentage compared to the EFL context, which were about subject-verb agreement and an error-free sentence. The most challenging part appears to be item number 20 which has an error in the use of article.

To determine their use of explicit knowledge, the participants were asked to declare if they used their feeling or grammar rule in analyzing the correctness of the sentences presented in the GJT. The Koreans indicated that in the EFL phase, they used their explicit knowledge 60-70% of the time. It was an entirely different story as they claimed to use their explicit knowledge 70-80% of the time that they answered the test. Based on the frequency count, the Koreans used their knowledge of grammar more than their use of feeling in both instances. The difference is that the number pertinent to the use of explicit knowledge is greater in the ESL stage compared to the EFL stage. It can be therefore theorized that the access of grammar knowledge is greater after exposure to formal education.

To verify the claims that they used their explicit knowledge, some of the students
were asked questions. Those with most number of utilization of explicit knowledge in the GJT were chosen. They were asked about what could have been the cause of errors in the sentences. In their responses, it could be deduced that the learners made an overall attempt to recall their knowledge of grammar. In both the EFL and ESL contexts, there were learners who showed ability to verbalize grammar awareness to a certain extent. It would be noticed that their rationalization is not comprehensive more especially during the EFL context.

When asked about the GJT for the ESL context, elicitation of grammar rules from the Koreans was easier compared to the EFL context interviews. The knowledge of grammar for some students, in some grammatical areas was more overt. There were also instances when it was noticeable that they could not fully verbalize the said rules, and all they did was give hints on the perceived errors. Some of the answers were directly targeted to the real error, and some do not perfectly describe the error.

Some of the responses also proved how the students seem to have no explicit knowledge of grammar. In the interview, there were instances that no acceptable rationalization was provided regarding their answers. This is particularly true when the learners were asked about the use of articles and transitive and intransitive verbs.

While the significant differences in the changes concerning the three variables have been acknowledged due to its preponderant nature, it may be wise to also explore possible explanation on the disestablished relationship of the said psycholinguistic structures. The statistical differences are not too challenging to rationalize due to the change in learning conditions experienced by the learners. Additionally, previous studies such as those of Cruz (2013) and Mamhot, Martin and Masangya (2013) have noted the factors in an ESL context that cause positive changes in the learning experience of the EFL learners. Overtly, this particular aspect is what the Philippines can offer. Apart from its English speaking culture, it is equipped with mechanisms that help develop the language skills of foreign students. With these things said, it also has to be mentioned that the psycholinguistic structures are dynamic in nature which means that these cognitive structures change overtime (Dornyei, 2001; Van Dijk, Verspoor, & Lowie, 2011).

**Conclusion**

This study has revealed the changes in the psycholinguistic abilities of Korean university students in the Philippines before and during the shift in the learning context, specifically during the learners’ EFL and ESL environment. Based on the results of the study, it is deduced that the Koreans appeared to have utilized their implicit grammar knowledge more than their explicit grammar knowledge at the onset of their language learning journey. However, they seem to have gained explicit grammar knowledge during the actional stage. This shift may imply that the formal education during the actional period prompted their increased knowledge in grammar. Hence, it may be safe to say that the learners access their explicit knowledge when they are prompted to verbalize their knowledge of linguistic structures and their implicit knowledge in activities like oral production and written tasks.

Additionally, the qualitative data do not entirely reflect the quantitative data as there were claims in the interview that were different from the survey. It may be due to the non-awareness of the learners’ use of their inherent psycholinguistic abilities such as the implicit and explicit knowledge that they do not recall such concepts. This preponderance among the majority of the interviewees may be expected due to the unconscious nature of psycholinguistic abilities (Tartter, 1986).
Overall findings indicate that the Korean learners’ implicit and explicit knowledge changed positively. An implication of these changes is that there are dynamics necessary for learners to develop certain psycholinguistic mechanics perceived to be vital in learning a language. Further, the shifts suggest that the Philippines may serve as an effective venue for foreign students who intend to learn English. This sentiment is shared by Gustilo (2016), who posits that “writing instruction has to consider implementing an integrative teaching model that enriches students’ resources and text production processes” (p. 38). For future studies, further empirical research may be conducted regarding the linguistic achievements of the Koreans in the post-actional stage in relation to their psycholinguistic abilities. Also, it is suggested that learners of English be made aware of their psycholinguistic abilities that they can use to improve their language learning experience. In doing so, an inventory of a learner’s psycholinguistic capability may be advantageous. The same is true with regard to the teachers’ awareness of the learners’ psycholinguistic abilities. Lastly, Similar to previous studies, it is suggested that implicit knowledge is more preferable compared to implicit knowledge; hence, implicit knowledge must be given more emphasis especially in the formative years.
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