

The present perfect in Korean learner English: A corpus-based analysis

Junseon Hong
Seoul National University

Hong, Junseon. 2022. **The present perfect in Korean learner English: A corpus-based analysis**. *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 18, 15-34. This study focuses on the use of the present perfect by Korean learners of English. The results suggest that learners produced less present perfect than the natives, while the frequency of the present perfect differs according to the genre of essays. Moreover, it turns out that not only the high frequency of adverbials but also the low diversity is evidence of low proficiency. Specifically, *ever* was dominantly used by Korean learners, whereas the present perfect of the natives accompanied with other diverse types of adverbials. Regarding the lexical aspect, atelic predicates occurred more often in the form of the present perfect produced by learners, and states were often the source of errors in Korean learner English. (Seoul National University)

Keywords: learner corpus, present perfect, lexical aspect, temporal adverbials

1. Introduction

The English present perfect is one of the most semantically complex verb forms (Kearns, 2011). It is mainly due to the overlap of the temporal domain between the present perfect and other tenses (i.e. the present and the simple past). Therefore, the present perfect has always been a challenge for L2 English learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 1997, 2000; Lim, 2008; Park, 2016; Yi, 2016; Choi, 2018). Especially, learners whose language does not have a distinct form of the present perfect experience a lot of difficulty for learning the English present perfect. Many studies have also demonstrated that the present perfect is difficult to be learned for Korean English learners (Park & Choe, 2013; Han & Hong, 2015).

This article aims to examine the present perfect usage by Korean learners of

English in written essays compared with the utilization of the present perfect by the natives. Even though quite a few studies have been done on the issue, there is not enough study focusing on the lexical aspect and error patterns of learners with diverse genres of essays. In this study, the LOCNESS, the native corpus, and the Gacheon Learner Corpus, the Korean learner corpus, are adopted. With the two corpora, Korean university students' production of the present perfect in written essays is examined.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. The English present perfect

As have mentioned, the present perfect in English has always been a huddle for L2 English learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 1997, 2000; Lim, 2008; Park, 2016; Yi, 2016; Choi, 2018). It is mostly because of the vagueness between the present perfect and the simple past. The subtle difference between the two is that the present perfect can capture 'extended now' meaning (Dowty, 1979; Parsons, 1990). The idea was first proposed by Dowty (1979), later adopted by Parsons (1990) and Kamp and Reyle (1993). Parsons (1990) claimed that the 'target state' of the present perfect should be located at the extended now. Therefore, (1a) requires John has not come back from Hawaii by now and (1b) that the wallet has not turned up as of now.

- (1) a. John has gone to Hawaii.
b. Jim has lost his wallet.

With regard to adverbials, the present perfect cannot be used with 'past' adverbials. Rather, the present perfect can be accompanied by 'at present' adverbials. Therefore, (2a) is infelicitous while (2b) is grammatical.

- (2) a. *Amy has spilled milk last year.
b. He has gone to London recently.

As above, the present perfect can be often accompanied by adverbials. In the study of second language acquisition, it is known that learners with low proficiency rely more on temporal adverbials when using the present perfect (Bardovi-Harlig, 1997; Park, 2016).

2.2. The lexical aspect

In addition to the characteristics of the present perfect discussed above, the classification of aspectual classes is another important influential factor in the learning of the present perfect (Lim, 2008). Vendler (1967) classified aspects of events into four categories: activity, state, accomplishment, and achievement. These four classes are called the lexical aspect or Aktionsarten (from the German *Aktion* ‘action’ and *Art* ‘kind, sort, type’). They can be characterized in terms of three main distinctions: telic/atelic, durative/non-durative, static/dynamic.

Telicity stands for the natural finishing point of verbs. When the event has a natural finishing point, it is telic, and atelic if opposite. For example, *eat a banana* and *run a mile* are telic while *walk* and *dance* are atelic. Durative is whether the events occupy time or are restricted to a point in time. Durative predicates include *chat* and *watch TV*. Non-duratives contain achievements that indicate momentary events such as *realize* and *notice*. Lastly, dynamism or stativity is whether the event is uniform during the time interval (static) or culminates as time goes (dynamic). State predicates as *know* and *be asleep* are static while dynamic includes other aspects such as *dance* and *build a house*. With the three distinctions, Table 1 summarizes four classes of the lexical aspect with examples.

Activities are telic (have finishing point), durative (occupy time), and dynamic (change happens). States are atelic (no finishing point), durative, and static (events do not change). Accomplishments are alike activities except that they are atelic. Lastly, achievements are the onset of a state, which are telic, non-durative (idealized to a point in time), and dynamic.

In the study of language acquisition, the Aspect Hypothesis (Shirai and Anderson, 1995) predicts that past and perfect markers would emerge in achievements and accomplishments first (Choi, 2018; Bardovi-Harlig &

Table 1. The lexical aspect (Anderson, 1991; Kearns, 2011)

Lexical Aspects	Telos	Duration	Dynamism	Examples
Activity	-	+	+	walk, dance, chat
State	-	+	-	know, be asleep, be smaller
Accomplishment	+	+	+	eat a banana, build a house, run a mile
Achievement	+	-	+	realize, find, notice

Comajoan-Colomé, 2020). However, there are papers on Korean learners of English (Lim, 2008; Park, 2016; Choi 2018) whose results contradict the Aspect Hypothesis.

2.3. L2 learning of the English present perfect

Because of its complexity, lots of research has been conducted on the use of the present perfect in Korean learners of English writing. Lim (2008) focused on the lexical aspect of the present perfect. She found out that L2 acquisition follows a similar step to that of L1, at least in the English present perfect. The results also showed that accomplishments were the most frequently used lexical aspect for the present perfect and low-level learners used more adverbials with the present perfect than high-level learners. Park (2016) investigated the tendency in the use of the present perfect by Korean learners of English and English natives. Following the corpus-based analysis on the Yonsei English Learner Corpus (YELC) (Lee & Chung, 2012), Korean learners' use of the present perfect was compared with the results in previous papers on native corpora. She concluded that high-level writers use more present perfect than low-level writers while low-level writers depend more on temporal adverbials. She also found the common errors occurring between different levels of learners but did not find a strong association between the present perfect and the lexical aspect of verbs. Choi (2018) tried to describe how Korean learners of English use the present perfect in their writing by focusing on the error patterns. She concluded that the learners were able to use adverbials according to semantic contexts. For the lexical aspect, Korean students showed a higher frequency of accomplishments and achievements than states and activities in the present perfect form.

The study of the present perfect in learner corpus has been also conducted internationally. Davydova (2011) investigated various usage of the present perfect in world Englishes. The results on semantic context, lexical aspect (Aktionsart), negation, transitivity, time adverbial, and sex of the speaker showed that diverse patterns of the present perfect were raised with different Englishes around the world. Yi (2016) conveyed research on Chinese learners' use of the English present perfect. With a comparison of Chinese learners and native corpora, it turns out that native speakers use the present perfect much more often than learners. However, the ranking order of different usages are similar across the corpora: Resultative > Experiential > Persistent > Result.

Fuchs et al. (2016) focused on German learners. They concluded that the present perfect is a highly difficult feature to be learned even for German learners whose language uses perfect form a lot. Also, it turns out that the pattern of the present perfect utilization differs among natives, whether they are British or American.

However, previous studies have some limitations. The papers on Korean learners of English did not consider various types of essays. Park (2016) was limited to two types of essays, argumentative and narrative and Choi (2018) only counted one topic. It is also true for other language learners as Yi (2016) solely considered argumentative essays. Furthermore, not enough studies focused on the lexical aspect and the pattern of errors have been done except Lim (2008). Therefore, this study considered various essay types and the lexical aspect to investigate the influence of essays genre, lexical aspects, and adverbials on the use of the English present perfect by Korean learners of English.

2.4. Research questions

Based on the discussion above, three research questions are as follows:

1. What is the overall distribution pattern of the present perfect according to the genre of essays?
2. How do Korean learners of English use temporal adverbials with the present perfect?
3. Do the lexical aspects influence the use and error pattern of the present perfect?

3. Data and methodology

3.1. Data

The analysis of Korean learners of English data is based on a corpus extracted from the Gacheon Learner Corpus (Carlstrom and Price, 2012-2014) which is consisted of 25,073 essays produced by 2500 participants collected from 2012 through 2014. The reason for using the Gacheon Learner Corpus is that it has the most diverse prompts (see Appendix A). For the analysis, 40 essays that have more than 100 words from every prompts were selected (Gacheon-KR). The texts that do not have a form of a full paragraph or contain contents

Table 2. The breakdown of learner and native corpora

Korean Learner English	Native (British and American) English	
106,790 words	45,051 words	
Gacheon-KR	LOCNESS-BR	LOCNESS-US
106,790 words	19,019 words	26,032 words

irrelevant to the topic were excluded. To only include the data of Korean learners, the essays which were written by the students (i) who use Korean as their first language (ii) whose parents use Korean as their first language (iii) who used Korean as their primary language in their school years (iv) who studied less than 6 months in English-speaking countries were chosen. Through the process, the corpus of 106,790 words from 800 essays was constructed (see Appendix B).

The analysis of native data is based on the selected components of the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS). LOCNESS is a corpus of native English essays made up of British pupil's A-level essays and British and American university student essays with a total number of 324,304 words. Among various data included in LOCNESS, the essays written by the university students with a maximum of 500 words were used for the study. It is to choose the essays with less than three paragraphs that have a similar structure to the essays in the Gacheon Learner Corpus. As a result, the comparative native corpus contains a total of 45,051 words, 19,019 words from British students (LOCNESS-BR) and 26,032 words from American students (LOCNESS-US). Table 2 gives the breakdown of the corpora used for the study.

3.2. Data extraction and coding

First, all the data in corpora was tagged using the C7 tagset of the CLAWS tagger (Rayson, n.d.).¹ With the tagged data, the frequency of the simple past was counted. Next, the structure of 'have + past participle' was searched manually to find the present perfect. Then, the ratio of the present perfect in the past context were calculated. As a next step, lexical aspects for every token of the present perfect were manually analyzed. The lexical aspect of each verb was decided according to Shirai and Anderson (1995)'s diagnosis and diagnostic

1. The tagger can be accessed through <http://ucrel-api.lancaster.ac.uk/claws/free.html>.

tests introduced in Kearns (2011). For each token, whether the present perfect was used for appropriate usage was also determined. As a final step, temporal adverbials associated with the present perfect were searched.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Overall distribution of the present perfect

In Gacheon-KR, a total of 207 tokens of the present perfect were found. To normalize and to be compared with previous research, the frequency per 1000 words was also counted. The total token of the present perfect per 1000 words is 1.94, which corresponds to the finding in Park (2016): 1.75-2.78 for high-level learners and 0.87-2.02 for low-level learners. Table 3 shows the distribution pattern of the present perfect used by Korean learners of English.

In Table 3, the number of tokens of the present perfect varies considerably according to the prompts. Prompt 12 has the lowest 0.40 tokens per 1000 words while the present perfect was used 4.86 times per 1000 words for prompt 3. According to Park (2016), the use of the present perfect in essays differ according to the type of essays, whether they are narrative or argumentative. Similarly, Shülter (2006) and Fuchs et al. (2016) showed that the distribution ratio of the present perfect can differ according to the type of writing. To see the difference in the use of the present perfect according to the genre of essays, essays were classified for the analysis as well. However, few essays were impossible to be assigned in the dichotomy used in previous studies: argumentative and narrative. To contain every essay, they were classified into three groups: narrative, argumentative and expository. The expository essay is to give an explanation to something while the argumentative essay is to convince the reader. The prompts of expository essays often require writers to define/classify concepts, compare/contrast the topic, or explain the circumstances. Unlike argumentative essays, writers do not have to pick a side. As argumentative and expository are both non-narratives, it is predicted that they may have a similar pattern in the use of the present perfect. Following the three-way classification, tokens of the present perfect per 1000 words with appropriate usage are shown in Table 4 (See Appendix A for the genre).

In narrative essays, Korean learners of English produced 3.18 tokens of the present perfect per 1000 words while 1.33 in argumentative essays and 1.38 in

Table 3. The distribution pattern of the present perfect (PP) in the Gacheon-KR

Prompts	PP	per 1000	Correct PP	Correct %
1	4	0.78	4	100
2	20	3.12	16	80
3	33	4.86	23	69.70
4	10	2.09	10	100
5	5	0.94	4	80
6	4	0.75	2	50
7	6	1.12	2	33.33
8	12	2.24	9	75
9	7	1.43	4	57.14
10	4	0.77	3	75
11	11	2.22	8	72.73
12	2	0.40	0	0
13	10	1.86	7	70
14	2	0.38	1	50
15	14	2.57	8	57.14
16	9	1.67	4	44.44
17	19	3.69	11	57.89
18	10	2.18	6	60
19	12	2.15	7	58.33
20	13	2.37	11	84.62
Total	207	1.94	140	67.63

Table 4. The distribution pattern of the present perfect (PP) across the genre of essays in the Gacheon-KR

Genre	PP	per 1000	Correct PP	Correct %
Narrative	108	3.18	71	64.75
Argumentative	41	1.33	30	73.17
Expository	58	1.38	39	67.24

expository essays. The higher frequency of the present perfect in narrative essays than others corresponds to Park (2016) that showed 2.02 (low-level) to 2.78 (high-level) for narrative and 0.87 (low-level) to 1.75 (high-level) for argumentative. This is another evidence that Korean learners tend to use the present perfect more often in narrative essays. For expository essays, similar patterns with argumentative essays (1.33 tokens per 1000 words) are shown with 1.38 tokens per 1000 words. As predicted, students produce a similar number of tokens in both non-narrative types of essays. For the correct usage, Korean learners used the present perfect correctly in 73.17% of sentences in argumentative essays, 67.24% in expository essays, and 64.75% in narrative essays. Given the low frequency, in argumentative essays, learners seem to use the present perfect only in certain situations.

Fuchs et al. (2016) showed that in the native corpus, the present perfect is used more often in a formal context. LOCNESS-US consists of two sub-corpora, titled MICH and USPRB. MICH is an argumentative essay and USPRB is close to a narrative essay² both written by American students. BRSUR is an argumentative essay on ‘A single Europe: A loss of sovereignty for Britain’. The overall distribution pattern of the present perfect in native corpora is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5 shows that tokens of the present perfect are much higher in the argumentative essay (MICH; 15.2) than in the narrative essays (USPRB; 2.95). British pupils’ essays, which are argumentative, are also higher than narrative essays of US students. From the result, it is shown that Korean learners of

Table 5. The distribution pattern of the present perfect (PP) across the genre of essays in the LOCNESS

Genre		PP	per 1000
US	Narrative	28	2.95
	Argumentative	251	15.2
BR	Argumentative	121	6.33
Total		403	8.95

2. Topic for MICH is ‘Great inventions and discoveries of 20th century and their impact on people’s lives’ and USPRB is on the aspect of social psychology which is not argumentative (Granger, 1998).

English do not have the same pattern in using the present perfect as native speakers as they use the present perfect more frequently in narrative essays. Yi (2016) showed that learners use more present perfect in argumentative as their English proficiency rises. Therefore, the opposite pattern may be due to the low proficiency. Also, it seems that the use of the present perfect in the right way is hard to be achieved even for university students. Pedagogically, encouragement for the learners to produce the present perfect in argumentative essays is required.

As in Ogihara (2007), the domain of present perfect and simple past can often overlap. In order to see the learners' tendency to choose the present perfect over the simple past in the past context, the present perfect ratio was calculated. Table 6 shows the ratio of the present perfect in learner and native corpora according to the genre of essays. For the present perfect ratio, the following formula is used: $\text{Present Perfect \%} = \frac{\text{Present Perfect}}{\text{Present Perfect} + \text{Simple Past}} \times 100$.

The total ratio of the present perfect in the Korean learner corpus is 12.18. With the type of essays, the ratio is highest in expository (19.93) followed by argumentative (14.24) and narrative (9.83). This is a different pattern from tokens per 1000 words in Table 4, which is highest in narrative essays. It means that Korean learners produced past context much more often in narrative writing than other genres of essays. However, in the native corpus, narrative essays have low tokens and ratios at the same time. For argumentative essays, the ratio even exceeds 50%. Compared with the Korean learner corpus, it shows that native speakers produced more tokens of the present perfect in the past context than learners. The underuse of the present perfect in learner English can be also found in Rogatcheva (2014). In Fuchs et al (2016), the frequency of

Table 6. The ratio of the present perfect in the past context

Corpora	Genre		Present Perfect %
Learner Corpus	Narrative		9.83
	Argumentative		14.24
	Expository		19.23
Native Corpus	US	Narrative	18.42
		Argumentative	61.65
	BR	Argumentative	60.50

the present perfect is higher in early starters (10 years or more instruction on English at school) than late starters (less than 10 years of instruction on English at school) and only early starters showed native-like present perfect production. Therefore, it can be said that Korean learners in the corpus may lack enough instructions in English.

To summarize, the production of the present perfect by learners can differ according to type of task. Compared with native English, learners tend to use present perfect less, but the production pattern may become similar to that of natives as they become more proficient.

4.2. The adverb phrases

The adverbials that can be used with the present perfect are restricted to ‘at present’ adverbials (Ogihara, 2007). As the present perfect is often used with such adverbials, temporal adverbials accompanied with the present perfect

Table 7. Adverbials accompanied with the present perfect in the Gacheon-KR

Adv	Narrative		Argumentative		Expository		
	Frequency	Token (%)	Frequency	Token (%)	Frequency	Token (%)	
yet	2	27/71 (38.02)		3/30 (10)	2	9/39 (23.08)	
just							
since	2				1		
already	2						
always	1				1		
recently	2		1				
usually	1						
never	3				1		
ever	10		2				
so far	1				1		
once	1				2		
ago	1						
this day	1						
N times							1

have been noticed by lots of previous studies (Davydova, 2011; Fuchs et al., 2016; Park, 2016). Most importantly, Bardovi-Harlig (1997) and Park (2016) observed that low-level learners rely more on the temporal adverbials when using the present perfect. For the overall tendency of temporal adverbial usage, the frequency of temporal adverbials with the present perfect produced by Korean learners of English is illustrated in Table 7.

In Table 7, temporal adverbials were used 39 times, 27.86% of the whole present perfect phrases. The result corresponds with Park (2016)'s finding (25%~52.6%) and Fuchs et al. (2016)'s observation (27.4% for L1 German learners). Specifically, the frequency of adverbials differs according to the genre of essays. In narrative essays, 38.02% of the present perfect is accompanied by temporal adverbials whereas only 10% of the present perfect appeared with adverbials in argumentative essays, and 23.08% in expository essays. The result also corresponds to Park (2016) with a higher percentage of temporal adverbials co-occurrence in narrative essays than in argumentative essays.

When it comes to the natives, the tendency changes. The LOCNESS shows

Table 8. Adverbials accompanied with the present perfect in the LOCNESS

Adv	Frequency	Token (%)
yet	5	84/403 (20.84%)
just	1	
since	10	
already	12	
always	6	
recently	5	
never	4	
ever	1	
ago	1	
in + years, days...	15	
for + years, days...	12	
Other Adverbs ³	12	

3. *only when, lastly, within the past years, etc.*

lower co-occurrence of temporal adverbials than Korean learners' corpus. Table 8 shows the ratio of temporal adverbials in the native corpus.

Overall, 20.84% of the present perfect tokens, lower than that of Korean learners, were co-occurred with time adverbials. However, the diversity of adverbials differs between the two corpora. Korean learners of English used only 14 types of adverbials, with *ever* as the most frequent adverbials. On the contrary, natives used *ever* only once, and more than 20 different expressions were used. The reason for the high co-occurrence of *ever* in learner corpus might come from the prototypical meaning of the present perfect that learners have in mind. They may feel the prototypical meaning of the present perfect is correlated with the adverb *ever* as the present perfect is often used to describe the past event related to the present. From the awareness, learners rely more on *ever* to make sure that atelic verbs have the temporal domain both in the past and the present. More on prototype theory related to Vendler (1967)'s four-way classification will be dealt with in Section 4.3. Meanwhile, not only the frequency of adverbials (Bardovi-Harlig, 1997; Park, 2016) but also the diversity of temporal adverbials accompanied with the present perfect seems to be another indicator of English proficiency.

4.3. The lexical aspect of the present perfect

The present perfect has been often investigated related to the lexical aspect (Lim, 2008; Davydova, 2011; Uno, 2014; Park, 2016). Following Vendler's four classifications of verbs, operational procedures developed by Shirai and Anderson (1995, p. 749) were used to diagnose the lexical aspect. To be more precise, diagnostic tests introduced in Kearns (2011) were also implemented. Examples of each lexical aspect associated with the present perfect from the corpus are as follows:

- (3) I have been living in Seoul since I was born.
[State]
- (4) And the worst drivers have watched TV.
[Activity]
- (5) I have seen "The Butler" before.
[Accomplishment]
- (6) The goals of the people have changed.
[Achievement]

Table 9. The present perfect across the lexical aspect

	Atelic		Telic	
	Activity (%)	State (%)	Accomplishment (%)	Achievement (%)
All Use (N = 207)	91 (43.96)	64 (30.92)	21 (10.14)	31 (14.98)
Correct Use (N = 140)	65 (46.43)	39 (27.86)	15 (10.71)	21 (15.00)

With the 140 appropriate use out of 207 tokens of the present perfect in the corpus, Table 9 indicates the lexical aspect of the present perfect used by Korean English learners.

The correct use of the present perfect is sequenced as; Activity > State > Achievement > Accomplishment. The finding of the study about the ranking order of the lexical aspect is consistent with Park (2016) and Lim (2008) and part consistent with Choi (2018). Meanwhile, four types of lexical aspects can be classified into two groups according to telicity: activity and state that do not have a finishing point (atelic) and achievement and accomplishment that have a finishing point (telic). The results showed that atelic verbs are dominant for the present perfect in learner English. The reason for atelic verbs taking the most portion of the present perfect is might because of the prototype of the present perfect that learners have. The idea of prototype formation is that the semantic representation of learners evolves from the prototypical meaning in the early stage of language development (Shirai and Anderson, 1995). While the present perfect can encode perfective and imperfective sense (Uno, 2014), learners may feel that the prototype of the present perfect is an ongoing process without a natural endpoint (imperfective sense). As the use of the present perfect for atelic verbs “gives rise to a unitary continuous sense that constitutes a prototypical sense of imperfective” (Anderson and Shirai, 1996; Uno, 2014), learners may feel that it is more natural to use atelic verbs in the form of the present perfect. As a result, atelic verbs were used more often in the present perfect.

However, the result does not correspond with the results from Shirai and Anderson (1995) that learners prefer achievements and accomplishments in the present perfect form. Park (2016) claimed that Aspect Hypothesis (Shirai and Anderson, 1995) is irrelevant in the context of Korean learners, but this

Table 10. Correct verb uses in the present perfect across the lexical aspect

	Activity	State	Accomplishment	Achievement
Correct %	71.43	60.94	71.42	67.74

inconsistency cannot be generalized yet. Park (2016), Choi (2018), and the present study used the corpora from university students which are synchronic data, whereas diachronic data is needed to investigate the process of language acquisition. More work is required to see whether the Aspect Hypothesis can be applied to the L2 acquisition of English in Korean contexts.

To see which area is the biggest challenge for learners to learn the present perfect, the error pattern by lexical aspects was also investigated. Table 10 shows the percentage of correct use in the present perfect across the lexical aspect.

It turns out that states have the lowest correct percentage (60.94%). It seems that learners feel difficulty dealing with events that are uniform across time.

Uno (2014) showed that Japanese learners produce better forms of present perfect with atelic verbs when the sentence is used with a durative adverb. In contrast, she claimed that no clear pattern was found in the context without the durative adverb. Likewise, Lim (2008) found that the percentage that requires adverbials is highest in achievements. The percentage of the present perfect accompanied with time adverbials were calculated to see whether the finding is also true in the data. Table 11 is the ratio of the present perfect used with temporal adverbials according to lexical aspects.

Table 11 shows that about half of the accomplishments (46.67%) were used with adverbials, which is the highest among the four lexical aspects. The result does not correspond with Lim (2008) where achievements were most frequently used with adverbials. As no other clear correspondents can be found on the rest of the lexical aspects, it is concluded that no clear association exists between the

Table 11. Lexical aspects and adverbials

Lexical Aspects	Total	With Adverbials	Ratio (%)
Activity	65	19	29.23
State	39	10	25.64
Accomplishment	15	7	46.67
Achievement	21	3	14.28

lexical aspects and temporal adverbials.

5. Implications and conclusion

The present study is an analysis of the usage of the present perfect by Korean learners of English with lexical aspects and temporal adverbials. Overall, the frequency of the present perfect and the usage of adverbials differs depending on the genres of essays. It turns out that narrative essays have the highest normalized frequency, and argumentative essays have the lowest, while the tendency of the ratio of the present perfect in the past context was the opposite. This suggests the prompts of the essays play an important role in the choice of tense and aspect. The co-occurrence of the present perfect and adverbials also differs according to the genre of essays, mostly used in narrative essays. Compared with native English, learners relied more on adverbials when they produce the present perfect. However, natives used more diverse types of adverbials while Korean learners used *ever* mostly. With lexical aspects, atelic verbs were dominantly used for the present perfect. Also, learners feel hard to make a correct form of the present perfect with state predicates. Lastly, accomplishments were accompanied with adverbials most frequently.

The limitation of the study is that it did not consider the different levels the learners might have. Unlike the YELC, the Gacheon Learner Corpus does not contain the level of the students; therefore, all data were treated as a single level. Further, the correct use of the present perfect was determined by a single researcher, which might be biased. Moreover, even though there is a claim about the fifth type in lexical aspects, semelfactives (Kearns, 2011), the pattern of semelfactives in the present perfect in learner English has not been dealt with in the study. Despite the limitations, the study is significant that the results suggested a meaningful approach to understanding the relation between lexical aspects and the present perfect in learner English and the relation between temporal adverbials and the present perfect. Further research on the relation of lexical aspects and the present perfect with error patterns is expected.

References

Andersen, R. W. (1991). Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect markings

- in second language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Cross Currents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories* (pp.305-324). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1997). Another piece of the puzzle: The emergence of the present perfect. *Language Learning*, 47(3), 375-422.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Comajoan-Colomé, L. (2020). The aspect hypothesis and the acquisition of L2 past morphology in the last 20 years. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42, 1137-1167.
- Carlstrom, B., & Price, N. (2012-2014). *The Gachon Learner Corpus*. <http://koreanlearnercorpusblog.blogspot.kr/p/corpus.html>.
- Choi, J. (2018). Use of the present perfect by Korean learners of English: A descriptive case study. *Foreign Languages Education*, 25(3), 23-51.
- Davydova, J. (2011). *The Present Perfect in Non-Native Englishes: A Corpus-Based Study of Variation*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dowty, D. (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Fuchs, R., Götz, S., Werner, V. (2016) The present perfect in learner Englishes: A corpus-based case study on L1 German intermediate and advanced speech and writing. In W. Valentin., E. Seoane., C. Suárez-Gómez (Eds.), *Re-Assessing the Present Perfect*. (pp.297-338). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Granger, S. (1998). The computer learner corpus: A versatile new source of data for SLA research. In S. Granger (Eds.), *Learner English on Computer* (pp. 3-18). London: Routledge.
- Han, I., & Hong, S. (2015). The acquisition problem of English present perfect to Korean adult learners of English: L1 transfer matters. *English Language and Linguistics*, 21, 141-164.
- Kamp, H., & Reyle, U. (1993). *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kearns, K. (2011). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Lee, S., & Chung, C. (2012). *Yonsei English Learner Corpus*. Seoul: Yonsei University.
- Lim, J. (2008). The lexical aspect of English present perfect in advanced L2 learner's writing. *Modern English Education*, 9(2), 42-57.
- Ogihara, T. (2007). Tense and aspect in truth-conditional semantics. *Lingua*, 117(2), 392-418.
- Park, H. (2016). The present perfect in written L2 English. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 24(2), 1-23.
- Park, M., & Choe, M. (2013). Advanced Korean EFL learners' use of the English simple past and present perfect in controlled contexts. *The Linguistic Association*

- of Korea Journal*, 21, 119-145.
- Parsons, T. (1990) *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Rayson, P. (n.d.). *Free CLAWS web tagger*. <http://ucrel-api.lancaster.ac.uk/claws/free.html>.
- Rogatcheva, S. (2014). *Aspect in Learner Writing: A Corpus-Based Comparison of Advanced Bulgarian and German Learners' Written English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Giessen, Giessen.
- Shirai, Y., & Andersen, R. W. (1995). The acquisition of tense-aspect morphology: A prototype account. *Language*, 71(4), 743-762.
- Schlüter, N. (2006). How reliable are the results? Comparing corpus-based studies of the present perfect. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 54, 135-148.
- Uno, M. (2014). Lexical aspect in the use of the present perfect by Japanese EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(1), 31-57.
- Vendler, Z. (1967). Verbs and times. In Z. Vendler (Eds.), *Linguistics and Philosophy* (pp. 97-121). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Yi, L. (2016). A Corpus-based study on the use of English present perfect by Chinese EFL learners. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 24(2), 41-55.

Appendix A

Table A1. Prompts in the Gacheon Learner Corpus

No.	Prompts	Genre ⁴
1	What topics should people avoid during small talk? Why?	A
2	Have you ever done something that was really thrilling or frightening? What did you do?	N
3	What's the best movie you've ever seen? What was it about?	N
4	Should children be allowed to watch violent movies? Why or why not?	A
5	If you are the manager of a hotel, what services will you have? Why?	E
6	What are the most important factors for you when choosing a hotel? Why?	E
7	What kinds of aggressive driving behaviors bother you the most? Why?	E
8	Do you think most drivers in your city are good or bad drivers? Why?	A
9	Do you regularly use personal care and beauty products? Why or why not?	E
10	What's the best way for someone to improve his or her appearance? Why?	A
11	In your country, do people usually stay slim easily, or do they struggle with watching their weight? Why?	E
12	Do you think people are eating healthier or less healthy foods than they used to? Why?	A
13	What makes some people like some colors and dislike others?	E
14	In what ways do a parent's behaviors affect a child's development?	E
15	What kind of art do you find the most interesting? Why?	N
16	Do you think people are born with artistic talent, or is it developed through years of training, practice, and hard work? Why?	A
17	Have you ever had a problem with a computer? Describe the problem and how you tried to fix it.	N
18	Do you ever worry about using the Internet? Why or why not?	N
19	What would you do if a cashier gave you too much change? Why?	N
20	Are your values different from your parents? If yes, how? If no, why?	E

4. A: Argumentative, N: Narrative, E: Expository.

Appendix B

Table B1. The breakdown of the Gacheon-KR

Prompts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Words	5,154	6,415	6,797	4,792	5,344	5,311	5,335	5,359	4,907	5,191
Prompts	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Words	4,952	4,982	5,366	5,270	5,443	5,375	5,145	4,595	5,579	5,478

Junseon Hong

jshong512@snu.ac.kr