The Effect of Instructional Order on the L2 Acquisition of the Korean Imperfective Aspect

Ju-Yeon Ryu and Yasuhiro Shirai
Tohoku University and University of Pittsburgh

1. Introduction

It has been widely observed that in the L2 acquisition of aspect, progressive/imperfective marking is acquired earlier with activity verbs than with achievement verbs (the Aspect Hypothesis; Andersen & Shirai, 1994). This pattern has been seen repeatedly in Japanese *-te i-* (e.g., Shirai & Kurono, 1998), and in *-ko iss-* and *-a iss-* in L2 Korean (e.g., Lee & Kim, 2007). However, Ishida (2004) found her L2 Japanese learners used *-te i-* more accurately as a resultative marker than as a progressive marker, contradicting the general trend. Ishida's learners were exposed to the resultative state *-te i-* long before the progressive *-te i-* was introduced, which suggests that instructional variables have a strong effect on acquisition.

This study tests whether or not the instructional order influences the acquisition of the Korean imperfective aspect. In L2 Korean acquisition, Lee and Kim (2007) and Ryu et al.(2008), found that the progressive *-ko iss-* was acquired earlier than the resultative *-ko iss-/-a iss-*. We examined the pedagogical conditions of Japanese learners in Ryu et al. (2008) and those of English learners reported in Lee and Kim (2007) by analyzing the textbooks used and found that both groups of learners were introduced to the progressive *-ko iss-* first (first-year Korean), with the resultative *-a iss-* being introduced later (second-year Korean). Since this instructional order was used in both situations, it is not improbable that the progressive was acquired earlier than the resultative simply because the progressive was introduced earlier than the resultative. Thus, further study on the relationship between acquisition order and instruction order was required.

2. The Imperfective Aspect System in Korean

Imperfective aspect markers in Korean can express two meanings: the progressive and the resultant state (Lee, 1993; Martin, 1992). The progressive is a type of imperfective aspect which imposes an internal view (Comrie, 1976), whereas the perfective imposes an external view. An external view (i.e. perfective) disregards the internal structure and presents a given situation as a whole, while an internal view (i.e., imperfective) presents a situation by focusing on the temporal structure from within. The progressive has an action-in-progress meaning, like *be -ing* in English, whereas the resultant state focuses on the duration of the resultant state that is obtained as a result of the punctual change.

When expressing an action-in-progress meaning, Korean uses *-ko iss-* as the progressive marker, as shown in (1a), while using *-ko iss-* or *-a iss-* when expressing a resultant state meaning, as shown in (2) and (3). Syntactically, when expressing a resultative state, *-ko iss-* and *-a iss-* show a complementary distribution depending on the transitivity of the main verbs, as shown in Table 1. As we can see, *-ko iss-* co-occurs with transitive verbs as in (2), whereas *-a iss-* co-occurs with intransitive verbs as in (3) (Lee, 1991).

(1) a. Ku-ka   talli-<u>ko iss</u>-ta
      he-Nom   run-Prog-Dec
    "He is running"
   b. Ku-ka   talli-<u>n</u>-ta
      he-Nom   run-Prs-Dec
    "He is running"

(2) Ku-ka   moca-lul   ssu-<u>ko iss</u>-ta
    he-Nom   hat-Acc wear-Resl-Dec
    "He is wearing a hat."

(3) Ku-ka   chimtay-ey   nwu-<u>e iss</u>-ta
    he-Nom   bed-Loc   lie-Resl-Dec
    "He is lying in bed."

Table 1 *Imperfective markers -ko iss- and -a iss-*

	Intransitive verbs	Transitive verbs
The progressive marker		*-ko iss-*
The resultant marker	*-a iss-*	*-ko iss-*

   -ko iss- is generally treated as a progressive marker similar to the English progressive marker *be -ing*, as shown in (1a). However, it is not obligatory to employ the Korean *-ko iss-* to describe an ongoing event, unlike with the English *be -ing* and the Japanese *-te i-*. The simple present form in Korean can in fact encode an ongoing event like in the Romance languages and others, as shown in (1a) and (1b).

   Since the participants in this study were Japanese learners of Korean, it is necessary to describe the aspectual system of Japanese as compared with Korean here. Japanese has an aspectual system quite similar to Korean. The Japanese imperfective marker *-te i-* can denote both progressive and resultant state meanings. Generally speaking, the meaning of *-te i-* is dependent on the inherent aspectual value of the verbs to which *-te i-* is attached. Dynamic durative verbs — i.e., Vendler's (1967) activity and accomplishment verbs — combine with *-te i-* to express progressive meaning, whereas punctual change of state verbs — Vendler's achievement verbs — express resulting state meanings. The Korean imperfective marker *-a iss-*, which covers the resultative state meaning denoted by *-te i-* with achievement verbs in Japanese, is attached almost exclusively to intransitive change-of-state verbs.[1] On the other hand, the Korean imperfective marker *-ko iss-*, which denotes progressive meaning with activity and accomplishment verbs as in Japanese, can have a resultative meaning with transitive achievement verbs, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 *Comparison of Japanese and Korean imperfective aspect markers*

	Progressive	Resultative	
Japanese	*-te i-*	*-te i-*	
	Activity, Accomplishment	Achievement	
Korean	*-ko iss-*	*-ko iss-*	*-a iss-*
	Activity, Accomplishment	transitive	intransitive
		Achievement	Achievement

3.   Previous studies on the acquisition of aspect

   Previous studies on the acquisition of tense/aspect have claimed that the development of

---

[1]   Korean *-a iss-* is often treated as perfective (e.g. K-D. Lee 1981; Sohn 1995; McClure 1993). This is in a sense understandable because there is a close affinity between resultative, perfect, and perfective. However, in this paper, resultative markers are treated as imperfective markers that focus on the duration after the punctual point of change-of-state, following Shirai (1998).

tense/aspect morphology in L2 acquisition is strongly influenced by the inherent semantic aspect of the verbs to which the inflections are attached. This hypothesis, generally referred to as the Aspect Hypothesis (Andersen & Shirai, 1994, 1996; Shirai, 1991; Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, 2000; Li & Shirai, 2000; Salaberry & Shirai, 2002), has the following as its central claims:

1. Learners use (perfective) past making on achievement/accomplishment verbs first, eventually extending use to activity and stative verbs.
2. In languages that encode the perfective/imperfective distinction morphologically, the imperfective past appears later than the perfective past. The imperfect past marking begins with stative and activity (i.e., atelic) verbs, and then extends to accomplishment and achievement (i.e., telic) verbs.
3. In languages that have a progressive aspect, progressive marking begins with activity verbs, and then extends to accomplishment/achievement verbs.
4. Progressive marking is rarely incorrectly overextended to stative verbs (in L1 acquisition).

Although there appear to be some disagreements (e.g., Klein, Dietrich, & Noyau, 1995), recent studies have generally reached consensus that the developmental sequence (i.e., past tense form starts with achievement verbs, and progressive starts with activity verbs) has attained the status of a universal in SLA (Shirai & Kurono 1998: 249).

Several studies have addressed the questions concerning the acquisition of imperfective aspects (see Li & Shirai, 2000 for the L1 acquisition of Chinese *zai* and *zhe*; Shirai & Kurono, 1998 for the L2 acquisition of Japanese *-te i-*; Lee & Kim, 2007 for the L2 acquisition of Korean *-ko iss-* and *-a iss-*). Shirai and Kurono (1998), in their Study 1, tested the Aspect Hypothesis analyzing the L2 Japanese interview data from 3 native speakers of Chinese. It was observed that the Japanese imperfective aspect marker *-te i-* was more strongly associated with activities in the progressive than with achievements for resultant states. Their Study 2, an acceptability judgment test, also indicated that the 17 learners of JSL in their experimentation had much difficulty acquiring the resultative meaning of *-te i-*.

Meanwhile, Sugaya and Shirai (2007) examined the influence of inherent aspect and learners' L1 on the acquisition of Japanese imperfective aspect. They collected data from two groups of learners: 26 native speakers of English, which has obligatory progressive marking, and 35 native speakers of languages that have no obligatory progressive marking (German and Slavic languages). The results from the acceptability judgment test support the aspect hypothesis in that, regardless of a learner's L1, the imperfective marker *-te i-* was strongly associated with activity verbs for lower proficiency learners. However, the results from the oral task did not support the prediction in that lower proficiency L1 non-progressive learners did not show any such preference. Sugaya and Shirai suggested that L1 transfer cannot be the sole reason for the predicted association in the acquisition of Japanese *-te i-(ru)*.

In L2 Korean acquisition, there have been two previous studies that focused on the development of imperfective aspect morphology — Lee and Kim (2007) and Ryu et al. (2008). Lee and Kim (2007) focused on the imperfective aspect system and compared the developments of the imperfective periphrastic constructions: the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-ko iss-*, and the resultative *-a iss-*. They collected cross-sectional data from 120 L1 English learners of L2 Korean using a sentence interpretation task and a guided picture description task. They found that the progressive *-ko iss-* was acquired earlier than the resultative *-ko iss-/-a iss-*. This shows the same developmental pattern as was found in Shirai and Kurono (1998); resultative marking is more difficult to acquire than progressive marking, although in the case of Japanese, a single aspect marker functions as both, depending on the semantics of verbs.

Ryu et al. (2008) looked at the development of the Korean imperfective aspect markers, *-ko iss-* (progressive and resultative) and *-a iss-* (resultative) in L1 Japanese learners. They examined 55 L1 Japanese learners (KFL) and 20 Korean native speakers using a sentence interpretation task and a guided picture description task, which were originally used by Lee and Kim (2007). They found that the progressive meaning (*-ko iss-*) is acquired prior to the resultative meaning (*-ko iss-/-a iss-*), following the same pattern as earlier studies. They also noted that Japanese learners expand the use of *-ko iss-* to the resultant state before acquiring the resultative *-a iss-*, due to the influence of L1.

In contrast, a study by Ishida (2004) reported results contrary to most of the previous studies. Ishida, who analyzed conversational data from four L2 learners of Japanese (L1 English and Chinese), found higher accuracy for the resultative use of *-te i-* over its progressive use, which indicates, as Ishida suggested, that this could be attributed to instructional factors—more specifically, to the order of

presentation. Whereas the progressive meaning is usually introduced earlier than the resultative state meaning in Japanese language textbooks, Ishida's learners of Japanese were taught the resultative meaning in the second semester, 4 months earlier than the progressive meaning, which was introduced in the third semester. It appears that initial exposure exclusively to the resultative meaning, and deprivation of the progressive meaning for 4 months can result in more accurate production of the resultative meaning, even long after the progressive meaning is introduced.

Although most of the earlier studies on the L2 acquisition of the Korean imperfective aspect so far reach consensus that the progressive meaning is easier to acquire than the resultative meaning, we need to pay attention to the strong effect of instructional variables. In prior research, both L1 Japanese learners and L1 English learners were taught the progressive *-ko iss-* first, and the resultative *-a iss-* later. One might wonder about the influence of this on the order of acquisition. Perhaps the progressive was acquired earlier than the resultative simply because the progressive was introduced earlier than the resultative.

We surveyed the pedagogical conditions of L1 Japanese learners in Ryu et al. (2008) and L1 English learners in Lee and Kim (2007), as shown in Table 3. We analyzed the textbooks "The Korean" (National Institute for the International Education Press) designed for native speakers of Japanese and "Integrated Korean" (University of Hawaii Press) designed for native speakers of English. Both groups of learners were introduced to the progressive *-ko iss-* first (first-year Korean), with the resultative *-a iss-* being introduced later (second-year Korean). Neither group learned the resultative *-ko iss-* with explicit explanation as a particular function of grammar. The learners were only exposed to it through lexical expressions that described clothes with wearing verbs. Furthermore, no explanation on how to use the two resultatives (*-ko iss-*/*-a iss-*) was given.

Table 3 *Pedagogical conditions of Korean imperfective aspect markers in Lee and Kim and Ryu et al.*

	Progressive	Resultative	
Marker	*-ko iss-*	*-ko iss-*	*-a iss-*
Explicit Teaching	✓	✗	✓
Start to learn	first year		second year
Problem		no explanation for how to use two resultatives	

Since this instructional order (the progressive before the resultative) was used in both studies, it is not improbable that the progressive was acquired earlier than the resultative simply because the progressive was introduced earlier than the resultative. In addition, research done by Ishida (2004) found that L1 English speaking learners of Japanese initially used *-te i-* as a resultative aspect marker more accurately than as a progressive, which contrasts with the idea of a universal developmental pattern. Ishida's learners were exposed to the resultative state *-te i-* long before the progressive *-te i-* was introduced, unlike in conventional curriculums. This study investigates whether or not the instructional order influences the order of the L2 Korean imperfective aspect acquisition by native speakers of Japanese. Meanwhile, conflicting claims about whether or not instruction can override acquisition sequences have been made in other literature. Krashen (1982) argued that instruction which provided learners with metalinguistic information or pedagogical rules and corrective feedback was not an effective way to acquire a second language and could actually interfere with the natural developmental process. Similarly, Pienemann (1989) formulated a 'teachability hypothesis' based on the psycholinguistic research in L2 acquisition. His hypothesis is that instruction which targets a learner's next developmental level will be more effective than that which targets features too far beyond the learner's current level. Thus, even though classroom instruction could help learners move from one stage to the next faster, it can not change the order of acquisition, according to this hypothesis (Pienemann, 1989). These researchers are skeptical of the effect of formal instruction to override natural sequence of acquisition.

In contrast, other research has indicated that instruction is effective when it targets items which may be developmentally more complex. For example, in studies which have explored the acquisition of relative clauses with reference to Keenan and Comrie's (1977) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (NPAH), learners who had just begun to use relative clauses and were taught more advanced relative clauses were able to progress to the more advanced levels in the hierarchy (e.g., Doughty, 1991; Eckman, Bell & Nelson, 1988). Similarly, studies on the acquisition of possessive determiners have reported

benefits from instruction when learners are exposed to more advanced features in an implicational relationship (see J. White, 1996 and Zobl, 1985). While this suggests that there may be a bonus that comes with teaching features that are more than one or two stages beyond the learner's development, relative clauses and possessive determiners may not be developmental in the same way as the features that are covered by Pienemann's teachability hypothesis.

In summary, regardless of conflicting ideas about the effect of instruction on acquisition patterns, the trend for progressive markers to be acquired earlier than resultative markers has been widely observed in learners' acquisition of L2 aspect morphology. In Japanese, which is known to be very similar to Korean in morphology, syntactic structures, and other typological criteria, this developmental pattern has been observed repeatedly (Sheu, 1997; Shirai, 1995; Kurono, 1995, Koyama, 2003). An earlier study of L2 Korean (Lee & Kim, 2007; Ryu et al. 2008) found that Korean learners also follow the same pattern. However, there were a few cases that reported an opposite difficulty order (e.g., Ishida, 2004; Shibata, 1999). Ishida (2004), for example, suggested that the disagreement in a seemingly universal cognitive predisposition for the progressive meaning with activities could possibly be accounted for by the role of input in classroom instruction. The present study with Korean learners of opposite instruction order, from the resultative to the progressive, will help us to understand the mechanisms of the L2 acquisition of the imperfective aspect.

In order to claim universal status for the aspectual developmental pattern given above, research must be done that covers the relationship between the acquisition order and the instruction order, and be able to verify the effects of instruction order on acquisition order. This study aims to examine whether or not the instructional order influences the order of L2 Korean imperfective aspect acquisition, and will discuss the universal status of the L2 developmental pattern of the imperfective aspect, wherein we will test the universal acquisition pattern by comparing the data of a group taught the resultative first and a group taught the progressive first.

4. Research Questions

Based on the literature reviewed above, the following question has emerged:

Q   Does the instructional order influence the acquisition order of the Korean imperfective aspect?

We hypothesize that:

   H1   There will be no significant difference between the group who are taught Resultative first (Resultative Group) and the group who were taught Progressive first (Progressive Group).
   H2   In each group, the progressive -ko iss- will show higher accuracy than the resultative -ko iss-/ -a iss-.

Our first hypothesis is based on the idea that instruction can change the rate, but not the route, of acquisition (e.g., Ellis, 1994). According to this position, even though classroom instruction could help learners move from one stage to the next faster, it cannot change the order of acquisition. Thus, we predicted that even though the instructional order was different, the order of acquisition would not change.

The second hypothesis concerns the Aspect Hypothesis (Andersen & Shirai, 1994), which states that in languages that have a progressive aspect, progressive marking begins with activity verbs, and then extends to accomplishment/achievement verbs. We predicted that the acquisition pattern (acquiring of progressive markers earlier than resultative imperfective markers) observed in earlier studies would be observed in our study as well.

5. The Study
5.1. Participants

We tested two groups that were taught in different instructional orders. We divided the same level of participants into two groups. The Resultative Group (n = 18) was taught the resultative aspectual

markers (*-ko iss-/-a iss-*) before the progressive, unlike in conventional curriculums, and the Progressive Group (n = 15) was taught the progressive marker *-ko iss-* first, in the opposite order.

The learners of the two groups were taught one aspectual meaning (the progressive or the resultative) first. The other meaning was introduced four months later in the same manner as in Ishida (2004). The two tasks were employed four months, after the second meaning was taught. Thus, the test was employed for both groups at the end of the eight-month classroom study. Except for the imperfective aspectual markers, the rest of the curriculum was the same. The same instructor taught both groups.

The 33 students who participated in the study were learning Korean at the Korean Education Center in the Korean Consulate General in Sendai, Japan (age range = 27-59, mean age = 45.7). The participants of this study all reported Japanese as their L1, and were learning Korean as a foreign Language in Japan. The length of their studying Korean was about 2 years at the time of their testing. They were taking the second-year Korean language course at the Korean Education Center after taking their first year in the same school. They were all complete beginners when they started taking Korean at this school except for two students, who had studied Korean before. The Korean class in which the students were enrolled met 30 times per year, with each class lasting for 100 minutes.

5.2. Materials and procedure

We used two different tasks, originally used by Lee and Kim (2007). One of the tasks was an interpretation task focusing on comprehension, and the other a sentence completion task which focused on production. The interpretation task included 30 target items (10 items for each of the categories: the progressive *-ko iss-*, the resultative *-ko iss-*, and the resultative *-a iss-*) and 17 distractor items. The participants were asked to select the best matching picture for the sentence from three choices that were supplied. The sentence completion task included 15 target items (5 items from each category). Two pictures, a picture of a family at home and a picture of a train station, were presented with sentences describing the actions, postures, or outfits of the people in the pictures. The participants were asked to fill in the blanks with the appropriate inflected forms of the given infinitive verbs.

The data was collected at the Korean Education Center in the Korean Consulate General in Sendai, Japan at the end of their second-year Korean class.[2] The participants first had background questionnaires with a short introduction, and then completed the interpretation task and the sentence completion task. The data was collected during regular class sessions, and it took about 40 minutes on average. One of the researchers (the first author) was present throughout the administration. During the two tasks, the researcher told the participants to feel free to ask about unfamiliar words in the test items in order to properly elicit their tense-aspect knowledge and avoid misunderstanding of the test sentences. When asked, the researcher told the participant the meaning of the unfamiliar word in Japanese.

Responses to the interpretation task, a multiple-choice task, were interpreted as either correct or incorrect. The grammatical tense and aspect forms the participants used were analyzed for the responses to the guided production task. Spelling errors and other irrelevant inflection errors were ignored.

6. Results
6.1. Comprehension task

The results of the comprehension task appear in Table 4, which presents the accuracy with which the two groups were able to differentiate the three aspect types. A two-way repeated-measures ANOVA revealed that the interaction between the aspect markers and the groups was not significant ($F_{(2, 62)}$ = 1.227, $p > .05$), and that the two learner groups also had no significant main effect between them ($F_{(1, 31)}$ = 1.965, $p > .05$), but that the aspect markers had a significant main effect on the comprehension score ($F_{(2, 62)}$ = 11.753, $p < .01$).

---

[2]   In addition, they answered a language learning background questionnaire at the beginning of their second-year of instruction.

Table 4 *Comprehension task: Accuracy scores (%)*

	Resultative Group (n = 18)		Progressive Group (n = 15)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Progressive *-ko iss-*	78	10	77	16
Resultative *-ko iss-*	86	15	82	14
Resultative *-a iss-*	74	13	64	14

To examine the significant differences of the three aspect markers within each group, we performed a one-way repeated-measure ANOVA on each group. In the Resultative Group, there were no significant differences between the mean scores of the three aspect markers (F (2, 34) = 3.241, *p* = .051). Meanwhile, in the Progressive Group, there were significant differences between the mean scores (F (2, 28) = 12.570, *p* < .01). For post hoc analysis, we performed a pair-wise comparison, using the Bonferroni method, as shown in Table 5. There were significant differences between the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-a iss-* (*p* = .033), and between the resultative *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-a iss-* (*p* = .000) in the Progressive Group. Although there was no significant difference within the Resultative Group, we ran a pair-wise comparison on this group as well, but found no significant differences, as expected. This means that in the Progressive Group, the interpretation of the resultative *-a iss-* was significantly more difficult than that for the progressive and resultative *-ko iss-*, whereas the learners in the Resultative Group were able to process the three aspect markers equally well.

Table 5 *Comprehension task: Significance within-group with the Bonferroni correction*

	Progressive Group (n = 15)		
	PRG-*ko iss-*	RSL-*ko iss-*	RSL-*a iss-*
PRG-*ko iss-*	-	*p* = .560 (n.s.)	*p* = .033*
RSL-*ko iss-*		-	*p* = .000*
RSL-*a iss-*			-

Note. Abbreviations for major categories: PRG: progressive; RSL: resultative.
  *indicates significance level of .05 .

To examine the differences between the two groups, we performed *t*-tests for three aspect types, as shown in Table 6. Although there was no significant difference between the Resultative Group and the Progressive Group in the accuracy of the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-ko iss-*, the difference between the two groups was significant (*p* = .043) in the accuracy of the resultative *-a iss-*. Thus, in the comprehension task, the Resultative Group, which was taught the resultative *-ko iss-*/*-a iss-* first, outperformed the Progressive Group (*p* < .05) in the comprehension of the resultative marker *-a iss-*.

Table 6 *Comprehension task: significance between groups (%)*

	Resultative Group (n = 18)	Progressive Group (n = 15)	*t*-test
Progressive *-ko iss-*	78	77	*p* = 0.924
Resultative *-ko iss-*	86	82	*p* = 0.500
Resultative *-a iss-*	74	64	*p* = 0.043*

Note. *indicates significance level of .05.

6.2. Production task

The results of the production task appear in Table 7, which presents the usage of the three aspect types in the target context. We excluded the data of the participants who did not use any aspect markers in the target context. A two-way repeated-measures ANOVA revealed that the interaction between the aspect markers and the groups was not significant (F (2, 28) = 1.617 *p* > .05), and that the learner

groups also had no significant main effect between them ($F_{(1, 14)} = 0.277$, $p > .05$), but that the aspect markers had a significant main effect on the production score ($F_{(2, 28)} = 6.352$, $p < .01$).

Table 7 *Production task: usage of the aspect markers in the target context (%)*

	Resultative Group (n = 10)		Progressive Group (n = 6)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Progressive *-ko iss-*	30	27	53	45
Resultative *-ko iss-*	48	34	50	49
Resultative *-a iss-*	24	30	23	23

To examine the significant differences of the three aspect markers within each group, we performed a one-way repeated-measure ANOVA on each group. In the Resultative Group, there were significant differences between the usage scores of three aspect markers ($F_{(2, 18)} = 4.162$, $p < .05$) while in the Progressive Group, there were no significant differences between the usage scores ($F_{(2, 10)} = 3.614$, $p = .066$). For post hoc analysis, we performed a pair-wise comparison, using the Bonferroni method, and found no significant differences among the three aspect markers in the Resultative Group.

To examine the difference between the two groups, we performed *t*-tests, as shown in Table 8. There were no significant differences between the Resultative Group and the Progressive Group in the usage of the three aspect types.

Table 8 *Production task: significance between groups (%)*

	Resultative Group (n = 10)	Progressive Group (n = 6)	*t*-test
Progressive *-ko iss-*	30	53	$p = 0.212$
Resultative *-ko iss-*	48	50	$p = 0.924$
Resultative *-a iss-*	24	23	$p = 0.963$

In summary, the results of the production task show that there was no significant difference for most cross-group and within-group comparisons, suggesting that the instructional order does not influence the acquisition order of the Korean imperfective aspect. However, in the comprehension task, the Resultative Group outperformed the Progressive Group ($p < .05$) in the accuracy of the resultative marker *-a iss-*. Meanwhile, the Progressive Group showed significantly lower accuracy with the resultative *-a iss-* ($p < .05$) than the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-ko iss-*. Both findings suggest instruction order to have a positive effect on the acquisition of the resultative marker *-a iss-* in the comprehension task. Even though the results of our two tasks do not seem to be compatible with assessments about the influence of the instructional order, we need to pay attention to the fact that this is restricted to the case of the resultative *-a iss-*. In the case of the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-ko iss-*, results show that there were no significant differences between the Resultative Group and the Progressive Group in either task. Thus, our first hypothesis, that there would be no significant differences between the Resultative Group and the Progressive Group, was generally supported, with the exception of the resultative marker *-a iss-* in the comprehension task.

In comparing the results of the comprehension accuracy and the usage scores of three aspect types, we found that, interestingly, the resultative *-ko iss-* was higher than the progressive *-ko iss-*, except in the production data for the Progressive Group (see Tables 4 and 7). These results contradict the supposed universal acquisition order of the progressive and the resultative aspect, and thus our second hypothesis was not supported. Though not statistically significant, the fact that both groups performed better with the resultative *-ko iss-* than the progressive *-ko iss-* warrants further inquiry into the form-meaning mapping of aspectual markers between Korean and Japanese (Table 2) and the focus-on-form teaching of the resultative *-ko iss-*.

7. Discussion
7.1. The effect of instructional order

Overall, there was no significant difference observed as a result of instruction order. However, in the accuracy of the resultative marker *-a iss-* in the comprehension task, the instructional order had a significant positive effect on the Korean imperfective aspect by Japanese learners. That is to say, the group that was taught the resultative first and the progressive later performed well on the comprehension of the resultative marker *-a iss-*. This could be explained by the "Projection Model" (Zobl 1983, 1985), which states that the teaching of marked items facilitates the learning of unmarked items, but not vice versa (Eckman et al. 1988). Thus, it may be more effective to train learners on marked items first with regards to the progressive/resultative aspects. We could suggest that teaching the resultative aspect first may facilitate the comprehension of the resultative *-a iss-*. This is a hypothesis that needs further testing and could be an important contribution to the field of Korean SLA.

7.2. The effect of explicit teaching on the resultative -ko iss-

In this study, the learners' comprehension and usage scores of the resultative *-ko iss-* were found to be higher than the scores for the progressive *-ko iss-*. There are some possible reasons for this finding, including the role of classroom instruction. First, we should consider the effect of explicit teaching. As mentioned in Table 3, the learners of Korean in previous studies were not taught the resultative *-ko iss-* with explicit explanation as a particular function of grammar, and were only exposed to it through lexical expressions that described clothes with wearing verbs. Furthermore, no explanation as to how to use the two resultatives (*-ko iss-/-a iss-*) was given. However, the learners in this study were taught the resultative *-ko iss-* with explicit explanation. They were told that it is the resultative marker with transitive verbs, and were provided explanation on how to use the two resultatives (*-ko iss-/-a iss-*). Thus, we can suggest that explicit teaching of the resultative *-ko iss-* has a positive effect on Korean aspect acquisition.

We must also consider the influence of L1. The Japanese tense-aspect system is very similar to that of Korean (see Table 2). The Japanese imperfective marker *-te i-* can denote both progressive and resultative meanings. The Korean imperfective marker *-ko iss-* can also denote both progressive meaning with activity and accomplishment verbs and resultative meaning with transitive achievement verbs. Even though the Korean imperfective marker *-a iss-* has a resultative state meaning when combined with intransitive achievement verbs, the Korean imperfective marker *-ko iss-* is more similar to the Japanese *-te i-* than the imperfective marker *-a iss-*. It can thus be thought that Japanese learners of Korean are more likely to expand the use of *-ko iss-* from progressive to resultative, or from resultative to progressive, than to expand the resultative *-a iss-* to progressive use. Therefore, it may be possible that Japanese learners analogize from their L1 *-te i-* and make the form-meaning mapping of aspectual markers, acquiring the two aspectual meaning of *-ko iss-* first and then the resultative meaning of *-a iss-* later. Moreover, explicit teaching of the resultative *-ko iss-* could accelerate the acquisition of its form-meaning mapping.

7.3. The Aspect Hypothesis

The question to be addressed here is whether the results of the present study support the Aspect Hypothesis (Andersen & Shirai, 1994, 1996). According to the Aspect Hypothesis and the results found in earlier studies, learners' acquisition of L2 aspect morphology follows a similar pattern; progressive markers (attached to activity and accomplishment verbs) are acquired earlier than resultative markers (attached to achievement verbs). In the present study, even though the scores of the resultative *-ko iss-* are higher than those of the progressive *-ko iss-*, these differences are not statistically significant (see Section 6.1 and Section 6.2). We further performed paired sample *t*-test in each group and each task, which revealed that there were no significant differences between the progressive *-ko iss-* and the resultative *-ko iss-*. Therefore, we cannot conclude that the resultative *-ko iss-* was acquired earlier than the progressive *-ko iss-*. Thus, the results of our study cannot be thought to support the Aspect

Hypothesis. This is probably due toL1 transfer from Japanese, since *-te i-* can refer to both progressive and resultative meanings, on which learners can easily map a new Korean form, *-ko iss-*, which also has two meanings.

8. Conclusion

This study investigated the effect of instructional order on the acquisition of the Korean imperfective aspect by native speakers of Japanese. Several important contributions to the field of SLA research and teaching of Korean as a second/foreign language can be made from our results. First, the results from this study reveal that overall, changing the instructional order for Japanese learners of Korean does not have strong effects on the acquisition of the Korean aspectual system. Our results showed that the resultative meaning was not acquired earlier than the progressive meaning, despite our teaching the resultative first, although such a trend was observed in Ishida (2004).

At the same time, some effect of the instruction order was also found, which may have pedagogical implications. The results may suggest that teaching the resultative *-ko iss-/-a iss-* first may help learners to comprehend the resultative *-a iss-*, and that explicit teaching of the resultative *-ko iss-* may have a positive effect on acquisition. Though not yet fully tested in controlled experiments, these findings could greatly help learners of Korean as hints for practical changes to instructional techniques. However, further research is still needed to understand the learner's interlanguage tense and aspect system and to test the influence of L1 transfer and the distribution of input and other factors. Hopefully such research would make use of the results found in this study and be converted to actual instructional improvements in the future.

Abbreviations
Acc = Accusative
Dec = Declarative
Loc = Locative particle
Nom = Nominative
Prog = Progressive
Prs = Present
Resl = Resultant state

References

Andersen, Roger W., & Shirai, Yasuhiro (1994). Discourse motivations for some cognitive acquisition principles. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16,* 133–156.

Andersen, Roger W., & Shirai, Yasuhiro (1996). The primacy of aspect in first and second language acquisition: The pidgin-creole connection. In William C. Ritchie and Tej K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 527–570). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen (1999). From morpheme studies to temporal semantics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 341–382.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen (2000). *Tense and aspect in second language acquisition: Form, meaning, and use.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Comrie, Bernard (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, Catherine (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 431–69.

Eckman, Fred R., Bell, Lawrence, & Nelson, Diane (1988). On the generalization of relative clause instruction in the acquisition of English as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 9,* 1–20.

Ellis, Rod (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ishida, M. (2004). The effect of recasts on acquisition of aspect in Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning, 54,* 311–394.

Keenan, Edward L., & Comrie, Bernard (1977). Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry, 8,* 63–100.

Kellerman, Eric (1978). Giving learners a break: Native language intuitions as a source of predictions about transferablilty. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 15,* 59–92.

Kim, Yookyung (1993). The resultative progressive in Korean. *CLS29: Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 251–265). Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Klein, Wolfgang, Dietrich, Rainer, & Noyau, Colette. (1995). Conclusions. In Rainer Dietrich, Wolfgang Klein, & Colette Noyau (Eds.), *The acquisition of temporality in a second language* (pp. 261–280). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koyama, Satoru (2003). Nihongo no tensu-asupekuto no syuutoku ni okeru huhensei to kobetusei: Bogono yakuwari to eikyoo o tyuusin ni [Universality and variability in the acquisition of Japanese tense-aspect: Focusing on the role and effect of L1]. In S. Koyama, K. Otomo, & M. Nohara (Eds.), *Gengo to kyooiku: Nihongo o taisyoo ni* [Language and education: The case of Japanese] (pp. 415–436). Tokyo: Kurosio.

Kurono, Atsuko (1995). Syokyuu nihongo gakusyuusya ni okeru *-te i-ru* no syuutoku ni tuite [On the acquisition of *-te i-ru* by novice learners of Japanese]. *Nihongo Kyoiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], *87,* 153–164.

Krashen, Stephen D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Lee, Eun-Hee, & Kim, Hae-Young (2007). On cross-linguistic variations in imperfective aspect: The case of L2 Korean. *Language Learning, 57,* 651–685.

Lee, Hyo-Sang (1991). *Tense, aspect and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal suffixes in Korean from a typological perspective.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lee, Kee-Dong (1981). A tense-aspect-modality system in Korean. *Aysanhanpo, 1,* 71–117.

Li, Ping, & Shirai, Yasuhiro. (2000). *The acquisition of lexical and grammatical aspect*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McClure, William (1993). A semantic parameter: The progressive in Japanese and English. In Soonja Choi (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics, 3* (pp. 254–270). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Pienemann, Manfred (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6,* 186–214.

Pienemann, Manfred (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics, 10,* 52–79.

Ryu, Ju-Yeon, Horie, Kaoru, & Shirai, Yasuhiro (2008, August) The L2 acquisition of Korean aspect markers *-ko iss-* and *-a iss-* by Japanese learners. Paper presented at ICEAL2, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver.

Salaberry, Rafael M. & Shirai, Yasuhiro (2002). *The L2 acquisition of tense-aspect morphology (pp. 1-20).* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sheu, Shiah-pei (1997). Tyuu-zyookyuu taiwanzin nihongo gakusyuusya ni yoru te i-ru no syuutoku ni kansuru oodan kenkyuu [A cross-sectional study of the acquisition of te i-ru by intermediate and advanced Taiwanese learners of Japanese]. *Nihongo Kyooiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], *95,* 37–48.

Shibata, Miki (1999). The use of Japanese tense-aspect morphology in L2 discourse narratives. *Acquisition of Japanese as a Second Language, 2,* 68–102.

Shirai, Yasuhiro (1991). *Primacy of aspect in language acquisition: Simplified input and prototype.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Shirai, Yasuhiro (1995). Tense-aspect marking by L2 learners of Japanese. In D. MacLauglin & S. McEwan (Eds.), *Processings of the 19th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development: Vol. 2* (pp. 575–586). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Shirai, Yasuhiro & Andersen, Roger W. (1995). The acquisition of tense/aspect morphology: A prototype account. *Language, 71,* 743–62.

Shirai, Yasuhiro & Kurono, Atsuko (1998). The acquisition of tense-aspect marking in Japanese as a second language. *Language Learning, 48,* 245–279.

Sohn, Sung-Ock. (1995). *Tense and aspect in Korean.* Honolulu. HI: Center for Korean Studies.

Sugaya, Natsue & Shirai, Yasuhiro (2007). The acquisition of progressive and resultative meanings of the imperfective aspect marker by L2 learners of Japanese. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29,* 1–38.

Vendler, Zeno (1967). *Linguistics in Philosophy.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

White, Joanna (1996). *An input enhancement study with ESL children: Effects on the acquisition of possessive determiners.* Unpublished PhD thesis, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Zobl, Helmut (1983). Markedness and the projection problem. *Language Learning, 33,* 293–313.

Zobl, Helmut (1985). Grammars in search of input and intake. In Susan M. Gass & Carolyn G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 329–344). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Selected Proceedings of the 2010 Second Language Research Forum: Reconsidering SLA Research, Dimensions, and Directions

edited by Gisela Granena, Joel Koeth, Sunyoung Lee-Ellis, Anna Lukyanchenko, Goretti Prieto Botana, and Elizabeth Rhoades

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2011

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Ryu, Ju-Yeon and Yasuhiro Shirai. 2011. The Effect of Instructional Order on the L2 Acquisition of the Korean Imperfective Aspect. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2010 Second Language Research Forum*, ed. Gisela Granena et al., 158-168. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2623.