This paper explores the understanding of Korean EFL students with respect to the perceived nature and usage of the overt habitual past markers, namely *used to* and *would*, and the study’s outcome indicates that the students’ awareness falls short of producing and using the markers properly to a greater or lesser extent. More specifically, the paper addresses the perceived criteria for choosing between *used to* and *would* to refer to past states and habits at a sentence level and beyond. In addition, the paper explores the students’ knowledge with regard to the nature of the markers, particularly *used to*. In conjunction with discussion of generally accepted viewpoints on the habitual past in contemporary English, the study’s finding reviews our understanding of the habitual markers, which can in turn help devise more accurate and effective teaching materials and practices for the EFL learners than ever before.

I. INTRODUCTION

The overt habitual past constructions, *used to* and *would*, are widely used, especially in spoken English, by native speakers to describe habits in the past (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999). In addition to the preterit or simple past, these auxiliary verbs are highly valuable in referring to habitual past events, in conversation and narrative, and maintaining the coherence of utterances in their broader discourse context as a part of the tense-aspect-modality device according to Givon (as cited in Suh, 1992). However, it seems that the majority of Korean college and university students neglect to use these forms, when addressing a repeated episode or event in the past, and also appear rather confused in handling *used to* and *would* even when prompted to use these overt forms (hereafter referred to the habitual past markers) to mark the habitual past. In light of the
fact that Korean has both “durative and continuative” as well as “iterative and repetitive” types of implicature (Hinkel, 1992, p. 566), the lack of Korean learners’ understanding of and appreciation for the habitual aspect of English deserves due consideration.

In order to gain insight into the Korean EFL students’ understanding of the nature and usage of *used to* and *would*, this study intends to evaluate their pertinent knowledge in a relatively empirical manner in light of contemporary English use. To that end, this article seeks to accomplish three objectives: first, to offer a clear picture of the current understanding of the habitual past in English by Korean students and possibly English educators as well; secondly, to promote more accurate and better ways of teaching habitual past markers in the classroom; and, finally, to broaden the knowledge basis in this particular aspect for EFL text writers. In particular, the accomplishment of the second and third purposes is strived for by sharing and discussing the most current information available in recent studies and reputable grammar textbooks. It is hoped that this study contributes to replacing misleading information with a greater understanding of the markers.

With a growing realization that accuracy is an important facet of communicative language teaching approach, it is believed that in-depth inquiry—with regard to a particular element of grammar—can add another dimension to the recent movement committed to examine, amend and improve grammar teaching practices. While the topic of this paper is limited to the exploration of the students’ understanding of the markers, the study appears to have wider implications for future research efforts on grammar teaching. Also, possibly being the first kind of study to look into the understanding of the habitual past markers by learners of English, this study add a new dimension to an ongoing effort to explore the use of the habitual past in English.

II. LITERATURE BACKGROUND

1. Markers in Use

As *would* with its habitual past meaning is found in “the earliest documented stages” of English such as *Beowulf* and *Caedmon* as well as in Chaucer (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000, p. 328), i.e., the record of “the Old English of the Anglo-Saxons and the Middle English” (Rawling, 2005, p. 1), *would* as a habitual marker apparently has a deep root in the history of English. In contrast, *used to* is known to have its origin in the French verb *user* and gained its popularity in use only in the fifteenth century according to Tagliamonte and Lawrence. Although *would* has a much earlier pedigree in English, *used to* is frequently singled out in the discussion of the habitual past due to its exclusive application
in conveying habitual past meaning, whereas would has a number of different functions, e.g., conditional and insistency.

In any event, there has been little research on used to, would and other expression of habitual past meaning (Binnick, 2006; Jørgensen, 1988; Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000) even though the auxiliary verbs used to and would have marginally been dealt as a part of verb aspect (e.g., Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994; Comrie, 1976). Consequentially, a paucity of information that could truly reflect and delineate the nature and role of habitual past expressions has resulted in puzzling English language teachers and students alike with respect to this area of grammar (Suh, 1992).

Fortunately, however, a few studies, conducted in the last decade, shed light on the habitual past in English. For example, the remarkable study by Tagliamonte and Lawrence (2000) examines a large corpus of contemporary spoken English, i.e., a variety of British English, consisting of informal conversation with people of all ages residing in northeast England at the time of data collection, and elucidates the contextualized behavior of habitual past expressions. Their data analysis reveals that used to (19 percent) is used more frequently than would (6%) in everyday conversation, which indicates that the combined use of these overt habitual past markers accounts for only “small portions of the real-world situation” that describe the habitual past while other constructions, as shown by Tagliamonte and Lawrence, are sparse too (pp. 329-330).

(1) a. We kept having to stop and rescue vehicles that had fallen by the wayside.
   b. They were pretty blatant about it when they were talking about men.
   c. I did tend to lark about a bit I think.

Given the fact that the preterit (nearly 70%) is quite widely used to achieve the habitual past, Tagliamonte and Lawrence focus their analysis on three forms used to, would and the preterit to address “how, why, and where a speaker uses” these forms (p. 325)—in terms of grammatical person, negation, animacy of subject, type of verb, temporal adverb, duration, and discourse sequencing—and succinctly summarize their study as follows:

[Used to] is used in affirmative sentences, with first-person subjects, and nonstative verbs, while the preterit is used for negative constructions, with indefinite and inanimate subjects, and stative verbs. Would, on the other hand, is concentrated in contexts of short duration, typically within a sequence of habitual past sentences, and tends to occur with third-person subject. (p. 349)

Regarding the summary, it should be noted that used to and the preterit are more sensitive to certain contexts than would, and that seems to be the reason for differentiating
used to and the simple past first and then commenting on would separately in the summary above. While a thorough discussion of the study’s finding is beyond the scope of this paper, a specific aspect, i.e., grammatical person, is elaborated below for illustrative purposes.

With respect to grammatical person, used to is found to accommodate first-person subjects frequently, whereas would is preferred for third person. Since first person is more personal and proximal to the speaker than third person, used to is considered to register personal interest and involvement while would conveys remoteness. Even in habitual past contexts where would is not feasible, the preterit—rather than used to—tends to occur for third person as used to is favored for first-person subject. In terms of the animacy of the subject, the preterit is favored over used to in dealing with inanimate subjects, e.g., (2a) is preferred to (2b).

(2) a. The clock on the top of the tower rang out the hours on bells.
    b. The clock on the top of the tower used to ring out the hours on bells.

Then, there is would which is insensitive to the animacy of the subject at all, and thus the discussion of preference for animate and inanimate subject becomes trivial for would. This example clearly demonstrates that certain conditions—in which one form is preferred to the others in its own particular contexts of use—exist in the strictest sense. The other side of the coin is that used to, would and the preterit are also known to operate “in near complementary distribution to each other” (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000, p. 343). For all intents and purposes, the temptation to overemphasize the preference must be eschewed in the EFL classroom because preference is only preference after all.

2. Application of Markers at a Sentence Level

To describe habits which occurred over a period of time and then ceased, used to and would can undisputedly be used as an alternative to the simple past (e.g., Azar, 2002; Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Murphy & Smalzer, 2000; Parrott, 2000). In fact, it is difficult to distinguish used to and would at the sentence level according to Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, who make the point with the following pair (p. 169):

(3) a. My father used to exercise every morning.
    b. My father would exercise every morning.

Without further context, (3a) and (3b) are indistinguishable as used to and would are readily interchangeable without any consequences. However, provided that a particular context is assigned, the sentence containing would may acquire a different meaning. For
example, (3b) can have a conditional reading given an appropriate context (i.e., “if he had time”) implying that the man did not exercise every morning (e.g., due to busy schedule) as explained by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman. By and large, a conditional reading of would is not unusual with stative verbs, and the use of would for the habitual past is, according to Visser, restricted to nonstative verbs (as cited in Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000). Also, suppose that the context conveys the father’s reluctance to exercise, a reading of insistency may as well be acquired in (3b) as follows: ‘My father would not exercise but continued enjoying his sedentary lifestyle despite the doctor’s warning against lack of exercise.’ Indeed, would, especially in negated utterances, would often take such meaning. While habitual past meaning is inherent with used to, that of would, on the other hand, is more or less “contextually determined” (Suh, 1992, p. 875).

A general consensus exists that used to and would describe past habits, but the use of the habitual past markers to refer to a single, continuous state may be disputable. While arguing that used to is not a true marker of the habitual past, Binnick (2005) reasons, inter alia, that the habitual “concerns a series of recurring events …, or of bounded states” (p. 33) but not a single, extended state. Yet, the expanded concept of time, defined by Comrie (1976), apparently removes cause for such a concern: “A situation which is characteristic of an extended period of time, so extended in fact that the situation referred to is viewed not as an incidental property of the moment but precisely, as a characteristic feature of a whole period” (pp. 27-28).

Accordingly, habitual past situations include “activities or states that are characteristic of the period” whether it is a “protracted” episode or involves an “iteration of an event” (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000, p. 326). In other words, within a specific time frame, even a state can be considered as the habitual in consideration of the expanded concept of time because the situation does represent a distinctive feature of the particular period. As a matter of fact, used to refers to past states, as in (4a), and habits as in (4b).

(4) a. There, on the river bank, used to be a majestic pine tree in which a couple of beautiful cranes would make their nest year after year.

b. We used to go to church every Sunday.

In the case of past states described by used to, a permanent change is typically implied so that the portrayed state inherently contradicts the present condition (Downing & Locke, 1992). The following inferences can be made for the examples (5): (5a) The person now lives elsewhere; (5b) The sister does not believe in Santa Clause any more; (5c) The tree is not there; and (5d) The grandmother does not own the car.
(5) a. I used to live in Ulsan with my parents years ago.
   b. Indeed, my sister used to believe in Santa Clause for the longest time.
   c. The old pine tree used to be right there on the edge of the cliff.
   d. My grandmother used to have a classic convertible.

As a past state refers to the condition that existed for a particular time being but no longer is the case, the change is typically permanent in nature. In that regard, aforementioned inferences are taken for granted because it is extremely unusual to proclaim that the previous condition still exists right after flatly claiming that the condition only existed in the past. Thus, it is conceivable that the reversal of past states is highly unlikely for all practical purposes, and the void of past implicature regarding past states is not viable in general. Nonetheless, it is claimed that the removal of past implicature is feasible by the addition of a clause in the following manner: We used to play soccer in high school, and we still do (Binnick, 2005). Although a clear distinction is not made by Binnick regarding when the reversal of implicature could occur, it appears that the performance of such a maneuver is limited to past habits and serves the purpose of highlighting the influence of a past habit over a present behavior rather than removing past implicature. In any case, it is clear that used to carries past implicature.

As shown with (3b), the meaning of would is usually begotten by context since would has a number of different functions. In particular, the use of would with stative verbs tends to create ambiguity and uncertainty in meaning, and, primarily for this reason, the use of would to describe past states is apparently avoided as a rule. Accordingly, the role of would is excluded from marking past states (e.g., Azar, 2002; Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Hewings, 2005; Yule, 2006). It should be noted that this view is not unanimously embraced as Parrott (2000) claims that would may be used to describe “repeated states which are temporary and related to a particular context” (p. 210).

(6) a. Most flood victims would stay in the school buildings.
   b. My parents would usually be upset with me when I brought the report card from school.

Certainly, (6a) and (6b) impart a sense of repetition, as well as a possibility of reoccurrence. Yet, from another perspective, (6a) and (6b) could be considered barely expressing the conditional mode rather than habitual past meaning because it is not uncommon to express conditional without an explicit protasis, i.e., the if-clause: (6a) if the residences were flooded; and (6b) if a school report card with low grades was usually brought home. Although the absence of context renders this discussion somewhat futile, to all practical intents and purposes, it appears safe to assume that the use of would to describe past states is irrelevant for the sake of EFL teaching; indeed, it is easily
foreseeable that the concept of permanence and temporariness would create needless confusion.

To recap, the habitual past consists of past habits and states, and there are two overt markers available in English. The following words sufficiently summarize the use of the markers at a sentence level: While *used to* and *would* refer to habits in the past, only *used to* can mark past states. This simple distinction well serves the purpose of teaching language learners even if the reality is rather complex as preferences for each of habitual past forms may affect the choice of the marker by native speakers of English. For example, the preterit, rather than *used to*, is normally adopted with stative verbs (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000), but the discussion of such a point, being largely irrelevant in the EFL context, may be postponed until the students are fully ready to manage other habitual past expressions.

3. Application of Markers beyond a Sentence Level

As mentioned above, both markers can describe past habits, at least in principle, at a sentence level. Yet, beyond a sentence level, *would* is customarily used only after a time frame is established “by a previous occurrence of *used to* … or by time adverbial expressions (e.g., years ago, when I was a child)” to refer to past habits (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p. 663). Hewings (2005) goes a step further to argue that *would* must not be used in a sentence without a clear time reference. In this regard, one study is of a particular interest to the distribution pattern of *used to* and *would* in discourse. Suh (1992) examines transcribed data of spoken English which were originally obtained from teenagers, university students and adults prior to the early 1970’s in the United States.

In data analysis, it is found that *used to* appears more frequently than *would* in conversation whereas the opposite holds true in narrative (Suh, 1992). A reason for the pattern of distribution of the markers can be explained by the discourse-pragmatic functions of *used to* and *would*: “The *used to*-utterance thus provides a global frame at the level of topic shift or topic proffering, within which various specific past habitual events relevant to the preceding global one are marked by a succession of occurrences of *would*” (Suh, 1992, p. 864). Since *would* has the role of successively elaborating “on specific points deriving from the topical frame provided by *used to*” (Suh, 1992, p. 860), the narrative’s very nature to describe events in detail necessitates the greater use of *would* than in conversation.

In addition, Suh (1992) goes on to argue that the inherent habitual past meaning of *used to* marks “an episode boundary” and tends to “set up a rhetorical frame for a past habitual episode” whereas *would* provides “the details that follow, expanding on or elaborating the topic” in narrative (p. 861). In other words, although *used to* is not required to proceed *would* in terms of order in discourse, “*used to* tends to be used for framing a past habitual
episode, and *would* is used for elaboration within the frame” (Suh, 1992, p. 874). Suh claims that *used to* “is often found at a place where it initiates a past habitual episode … and provide a contrastive link with the prior talk in such a way that they [*used to* and *would*] highlight the point of a story or support the speaker’s points” in discourse (p. 878). In essence, both markers work together in a complementary manner in which *used to* begets a shift in time frame and *would* or its contracted form (*’d*) fills in the details.

The Frame-Elaboration Hypothesis proposed by Suh (1992) is succinctly summarized by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman as follows: “… the temporally more explicit *used to* tends to mark an episode boundary or set up a frame for a past habitual event, whereas the more contingent form *would* (or *’d*) marks the details or elaborates the topic” (1999, p. 169). This hypothesis is also corroborated to a degree by Tagliamonte and Lawrence (2000) who make a following observation: “*Used to* tended to occur at the beginning of a habitual past sequence, while *would* and the preterit occurred thereafter” (p. 342). Another way of looking at the order of *used to* and *would* is—according to McCarthy (1998) who also claims that *would* and/or the preterit is used to describe habits after *used to*—that “the whole *used to* + *would* sequence may function as ‘orientation’ … for a narrative of a particular, one-off event or set of events” (p. 97).

Even though it is mentioned that the preterit may also be used as an alternative to *would* in referring to the habitual past, Suh (1992) does not pursue the issue further regarding the specific role and overall contribution of the simple past in discourse. As the preterit acquires a habitual meaning in the context of discourse, McCarthy (1998) reports that the simple past occurs “in subordinate clauses introduced by *when*/*as soon as*” and asserts the following: “The pattern *used to* + *past simple* in main clauses is rare in the spoken corpus compared with the much higher frequency of *used to* + *would*” (p. 100). An explanation to account for the observation is however not offered by McCarthy. In fact, the review of the literature on the habitual past does not furnish any definite, compelling criteria to aid teachers and text writers in recognizing and determining the appropriateness of the alternatives, i.e., the preterit and *would*, to *used to*.

Nevertheless, it is possible to extract some general guidelines, with regard to the use of *would* or the preterit, from the finding of Tagliamonte and Lawrence (2000): (a) *would* appears generally within a sequence of habitual past utterances; (b) *would* is preferred in contexts of relatively short duration; (c) the negated utterances favor the preterit; (d) the stative verbs are accompanied by the simple past; and (e) the preterit prefers indefinite and inanimate subjects as well as second person subjects, whereas third person subjects favor *would* (2000). The first two guidelines, being particularly pertinent in teaching EFL students, deserve further consideration as follows: While the preterit covers a longer period “with temporal adverbials such as usually, often, always, from time to time, and so on” (Binnick, 2005, p. 340), *would* tends to deal with past habits within a time frame
established by *used to* (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000), and thus *would* (or ‘d) lends itself to refer to a series of past habits within a relatively short period. Nonetheless, these guidelines, regarding the use of *would* and the simple past in relation to *used to*, need to be substantiated and refined by corpus-based studies in the future.

In summary, the findings of corpus-based studies (McCarthy, 1998; Suh, 1992; Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000) reflect the use of the habitual past markers in contemporary English discourse, which can augment our level of understanding in expressing the habitual past. These findings are highly valuable, albeit inconclusive, in that descriptive accounts of the habitual past in contemporary English are made available. As some of relevant details of these studies will be revisited below, it may suffice to recap a few salient points here with respect to the markers. First of all, both *used to* and *would* can refer to past habits in principle, irrespective of regularity or frequency of occurrence, even though preferences for one form over the other may exist. Secondly, only *used to* typically refers to past states as *would* tend to take a different reading with stative verbs. Thirdly, in discourse, *used to* tends to establish a time reference, and *would* is used to elaborate on details of past habits.

4. Negation of Markers

The negation of a sentence containing *would* is relatively straightforward in that the negative particle *not*, or its contracted form (*n’t*), accompanies the modal, as in ‘I *would not* wait in line,’ and ‘I *wouldn’t* wait in line.’ However, when it comes to the pseudo modal *used to*, it is a bit more complicated as there are four possible ways of negation.

(7) a. I *didn’t use to* wait in line.

b. I *didn’t used to* wait in line.

c. I *used not to* wait in line.

d. I *never used to* wait in line.

The well-known way of negating *used to*, in contemporary English, is shown in (7a) as the verb *used* in *used to* is considered a normally inflected past-tense form, and, thus, the auxiliary verb *did* is added as a place to attach the negative particles *not* or *n’t*. In a similar vein, the verb *used*, in (7b), is construed an intermediate frozen form (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999) or a bound form (Huddleston, 2002) so that verb inflection is bypassed. In spoken English, it would be difficult to distinguish between (7a) and (7b) because pronunciation is identical, i.e., [ju: stu], for *use to* and *used to*. Nevertheless, the negated form (7b) is rarely used nowadays despite its popularity in the old days (Jørgensen, 1988). In consideration of *used to* as an auxiliary modal, primary verb negation could take
place as in (7c), or even in its contracted form *usedn’t to*, according to Huddleston (2002), but the appearance of this form is limited to the British English of formal registers (Yule, 2006), which apparently does not hold a practical value for communicative language teaching. The last form *never used to*, as in (7d), is reported to be the most frequently used from in spoken English (Biber et al., 1999).

In summary, *didn’t use to* as in (7a) and *never used to* as in (7d) are widely used in English and should be given due attention in the EFL classroom notwithstanding “considerable variation and confusion over the ‘proper’ negation” (Binnick, 2005, p. 350). In real life, the frequency of negated *used to* tends to be on the low end because negation of the habitual prefers the preterit to *used to* (Tagliamonte & Lawrence, 2000). In addition, the occasion to contradict one’s own past habits or states is sparse as reasoned by Binnick (2006): “Given that the point of *used to* is precisely to contrast what happened in the past with what no longer is the case, it is easy to see why it might not readily undergo negation” (p. 37). Yet, the ability to negate *used to* appears quite beneficial for language teaching, which will be discussed shortly, and is thus deemed worthy of consideration.

III. METHOD

Being a part of a larger research project that intends to address and improve the coverage of the habitual past prior to the tertiary level of education, this study intends to explore the knowledge basis of those who have not had a significant exposure to English education in higher learning. With that in mind, the scope of the study is confined to the assessment of Korean EFL learners’ understanding of the markers, i.e., *used to* and *would*. As mentioned above, together with relevant information in the literature and grammar texts, the data will be subject to careful scrutiny in order to reflect the students’ understanding and provide some general pedagogical suggestions.

1. Participants

In the fall of 2007, 41 male and 36 female first-year students, in their early twenties, who were in six English Conversation classes at a relatively large university in Seoul, participated in the study. This particular English Conversation course fulfills the general education requirement and is normally offered to students in their first year. Specifically, 23, 26, 14, and 14 students had their major, respectively, in Law, Economics, Public Administration, and Sociology, and received their secondary education in mainstream high schools in a wide geographic region throughout South Korea even though a few students completed their education in foreign language high schools.
These students were chosen partly to satisfy the study’s need to consider the knowledge basis of those who recently completed high school. As it turned out, most students had their proficiency level in the range between high-beginner and pre-intermediate. While allusion to the habitual past was not made prior to the study, all participants received nearly identical instructions covering the following topics: the present, past, and future tense; the sentence and question formation; the use of modal verbs should and must; and some other fundamental grammar points. A diverse assortment of tasks and activities are carried out in the classroom to pique the students’ interest and enhance their communicative competence.

2. Data Collection

To assess the students’ knowledge, a written exam consisted of seven separate parts was prepared from an a priori perspective, and care was taken to ensure that only the pertinent knowledge area with respect to used to and would be focused on in the data collection process. The aim of the assessment was twofold. While the obvious purpose of the exam was to evaluate the learners’ grammar knowledge, the exam was also used as a teaching material to review and reconstruct their understanding of the markers. Although the individual items of the exam were designed to provide sufficient clues, the exam was given, in a sense, without having fully activated background knowledge, which is somewhat justifiable though as such a condition may represent real life situations in which learners may have to produce utterances on demand. To facilitate the students’ comprehension of the exam and to truly reflect their understanding of the said issue, some parts of the exam as well as the questions throughout the exam were worded in Korean (See Appendix for the slightly modified copy of the exam).

Regarding the construction of the exam, the first part includes the task of producing an auxiliary verb to complete the translation of sentences written in Korean into English. This part intends to discover two points: whether students could produce used to and would when prompted; and, if they could, whether they could correctly use used to, not would, in referring to past states. Part Two, as an extension of the latter point, contains questions that evaluate whether the markers can be properly used at a sentence and discourse level while the markers are explicitly provided with italicized key words. The third part asks students to make three syntactic maneuvers—of making Yes/No questions, forming information questions with a given WH-word, and negating sentences—to ascertain the way the markers are manipulated by exam takers. More specifically, this part taps into the students’ perception of the nature of used to, i.e., whether learners consider it as a normally inflected past-tense form of use or a distinct modal verb.

The fourth part consists of two error correction type questions. The first question is to assess the students’ awareness of the difference between used to and be used to. The
second one intends to confirm the use of constructing a negative sentence using *not* lest the use of *not* is evaded in Part Three. Part Five has two multiple-choice type questions, prepared in Korean, that aim to pinpoint the students’ knowledge or belief regarding the correct use of *used* to and *would*, which is expected to illuminate the learners’ understanding in a rather explicit manner. Finally, it is attempted, in Part Six and Seven, to find out whether students can distinguish and appropriately use two expressions, i.e., *used to* and the phrasal verb *be used to*, that have a similar appearance but hold quite different meaning. All that being said about the exam, it is mainly designed to evaluate and reveal the students’ understanding of the markers and their use.

In an effort to enhance the validity of the exam, the segment of the exam, consists of Part Two through Five, was first given to a couple of native speakers of English before the complete exam was administered in the classroom. After the participants were informed of the purpose of the exam and gave their consent, the first five parts of the exam were administered to the participants in a manner in which each part was handed out and collected before the subsequent section was distributed. Although no time limit was posed for the students to respond to the questions, approximately 30 minutes were spent on average for the administration of the first set of the exam. On a separate occasion, Part Six and Seven were distributed and collected in the same manner in the span of 10 minutes. The exam was administered separately primarily to avoid undesirable confusion because of similarity in appearance. The participants made their responses anonymously on the exam. At the end of each exam session, the students were provided a worksheet that resembled the set of the exam, and a reasonably thorough instruction was given on the topic, which was subsequently reinforced with a few in-class activities.

3. Data Analysis

Despite the anonymity of the responses, the employment of numbering on the back side of the exam, as well as the small class size, enabled the linking of different parts together for data analysis, of which the students were also informed prior to the administration of the exam. The students’ responses to the questions in Part Five of the exam were marked, and simple descriptive statistics were performed to describe their perception in relation to the use of *used* to and *would* after removing incomplete responses which were considered invalid for data analysis. These responses for Part Five were used as a benchmark for interpreting the individual responses in other sections, especially Part Two, as the students’ capacity to place *used* to and *would* within an appropriate context is assessed. Benchmarking appears necessary to help circumvent any inevitable interference of random guesses in data analysis. Efforts were made to discover and record conspicuous patterns in the use of the markers in Part One and Two as well. Next, the responses in Part Three were
categorized to provide clues as to the perceived rules of negating and making questions out of sentences. The responses in Part Four were also analyzed in the aforementioned manner. Last but not least, the students’ knowledge of be used to apart from used to in Part Six and Seven was considered. Where possible, the responses in each part of the exam were compared during the analysis for clarification and confirmation.

IV. RESULTS

1. Awareness of Markers

To the matter of whether the students were sufficiently aware of the past habitual markers in English to produce them when prompted by the Korean equivalent of the habitual aspect, 35 student (45%) out of 77 students remembered to use used to while 15 student (19%) wrote would, together with the verb provided in the parenthesis, to fill in the blank at least once to complete the translation. Only 7 students (9%) produced both forms somewhere in Part One.

(8) a. When I was young, my father used to/would tell fairy tales. (tell)
   b. Although I do not believe now, I used to believe in the power of magic then. (believe)
   c. I used to/would look for four-leaved clovers in the garden. (look)
   d. Look, there used to be a garden over there. (be)

An intriguing pattern was observed when 15 students (20%) and 18 students (23%) chose to use the preterit and past perfect form, respectively, as in (9a) and (9b) instead of (8b). This pattern was also present in (8d) when 18 students (23%) and 16 students (21%) employed the preterit and past perfect form, respectively, as in (9c) and (9d).

(9) a. Although I do not believe now, I once believed in the power of magic then.
   b. Although I do not believe now, I had believed in the power of magic then.
   c. Look, there was a garden over there.
   d. Look, there had been a garden over there.

In other words, a significant portion of the students chose to use other forms to describe past states when they were pressured into expressing habitual past aspect.
2. Conceptual Understanding of Markers

The students’ understanding of the proper context is perhaps a more interesting issue than their awareness of the markers, which was revealed in Part Five. For the inquiry into the use of the markers for past habits on the basis of regularity of occurrence, 56 students (74%) out of 76 students with a valid response concurred with the following statement: *Used to* is for the past habitual that occurs on a regular basis, whereas *would* is for the past habitual that occurs on an irregular basis. On the other hand, 17 students (23%) agreed that *would* and *used to* describe past habits that took place, respectively, at regular and irregular intervals. Surprisingly though, only 3 students (4%) chose the most accurate statement that both *used to* and *would* can describe habitual past situations irrespective of the pattern of occurrence. To put it simply, the result shows that most students were inclined to differentiate between *used to* and *would* on grounds of regularity of habitual occurrence when the reality is that both *used to* and *would* mark past habits regardless of the occurrence pattern (See Table 1).

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices for the multiple choice item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Used to</em> describes past habits that occur on a regular basis, whereas <em>would</em> refers to the ones that occur on an irregular basis.</td>
<td>56 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would</em> describes past habits that occur on a regular basis, whereas <em>used to</em> refers to the ones that occur on an irregular basis.</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both <em>used to</em> and <em>would</em> can refer to past habits regardless of whether their occurrence is regular or not.</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither <em>used to</em> nor <em>would</em> can refer to past habits.</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the inquiry into the use of *used to* and *would* regarding past habits and states showed that the majority of students were largely unaware of the fact that *used to* is the only marker that can refer to both past habits and states because merely 31 students (41%) considered this to be the best choice. On the other hand, an equal number of the students mistakenly identified that both markers can describe past states (See Table 2).

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices for the multiple choice item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Used to</em> can refer to past states that no longer exist, whereas <em>would</em> cannot.</td>
<td>31 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would</em> can refer to past states that no longer exist, whereas <em>used to</em> cannot.</td>
<td>13 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both <em>used to</em> and <em>would</em> can refer to past states that no longer exist.</td>
<td>31 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither <em>used to</em> nor <em>would</em> can refer to past states that no longer exist.</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On further inquiry, the students’ responses obtained in Part Five are compared individually to their responses in Part Two, and it is found that not even one student deployed *used to* properly to describe past states, at a sentence-level, with knowledge that *used to* refers to past states while *would* cannot. However, when the use of *used to* and *would* is probed beyond the level of clauses and sentences, it is found that nine students (12%) chose *used to* in the beginning and *would* subsequently thereafter, as shown in the narrative below.

In my childhood, every summer I *used to visit* my uncle who lived and worked on a farm near a well-known beach. My brother and I *would get* up in the morning and help our uncle with his daily chores. Then, we *would go* swimming in the sea for the afternoon. After that, we *would come* home for dinner and campfire stories.

The responses given by the rest of the students did not seem to follow a clear pattern whatsoever. For example, 55 other students (71%) elected to use *used to* in the beginning and other places throughout the paragraph above.

3. Question Formation and Negation

For the matter of question formation using *would*, 58 students (75%) produced a Yes/No question correctly, and it shows that most students were cognizant of and familiar with the usage of modal *would*. Incidentally, 25 students (33%) generated a proper information question using *would*. The result demonstrates that the difficulty experienced in forming WH-questions should be considered in the interpretation of data. Anyway, in sharp contrast to the use of *would*, a greater number of the students appeared unaware of the nature and usage of *used to* for question formation, and, as a result, noticeable errors were evidently rampant. For the given statement (10a), barely 4 students (5%) were able to make a Yes/No question successfully as in (10b), and 2 students (3%) produced (10c). Various but unacceptable formations were also observed, and, for instance, 26 students (34%) used the auxiliary verb *does* to reflect the third-person singular and left *used to* intact as in (10d).

(10) a. She *used to* collect stamps.
   b. *Did* she *use to* collect stamps?
   c. *Did* she *used to* collect stamps?
   d. *Does* she *used to* collect stamps?

When the students were called on to make information questions for the underlined
word(s) in (11a) with an interrogative word in the parenthesis, 3 students (4%) were able to make a question as in (11b), and 3 other students (4%) did so in the fashion of (11c). Again, 13 students (17%) gave the question formation (11d) using *does*. Incidentally, for the statement (11e), 32 students (42%) made a proper question as in (11f) while 2 students (3%) used *does* in front of *used to* to make the question (11g).

(11) a. He *used to* brush his teeth before bedtime. (when)
    b. When *did he use to* brush his teeth?
    c. When *did he used to* brush his teeth?
    d. *When *does he used to* brush his teeth?*
    e. Ms. Lee *used to* be her favorite teacher. (who)
    f. Who *used to* be her favorite teacher?
    g. *Who *does used to* be her favorite teacher?*

Only 2 students (3%) displayed full competency in question formation with *used to* for the given statements (10a), (11a), and (11e). In comparison to the result found with *would*, this outcome signifies that many students had been neither instructed in nor exposed adequately to questions that contain *used to*. At the same time, it is obvious that the students who made the questions (10d), (11d) and (11g) are oblivious to the simple fact that *used to* inherently marks the past tense.

For the negation of *would*, 63 students (82%) demonstrated their ability to handle it properly. However, when it came to the negation of *used to*, the result was dismal in comparison. For the negation of the statement (12a), 18 students (23%) added *not* between *used* and *to* as in (12b), and 2 students (3%) used *did not* or *didn’t*, to reflect tense and negation, and changed *used* to the bare infinitive form *use* like (12c). Here too, 18 students (23%) used *do* as an auxiliary verb as in (12d). Interestingly enough, 4 students (5%) considered *used* to as a modal verb unit and added *not* after *used to* as shown in (12e).

(12) a. I *used to* exercise and play sports.
    b. I *used not to* exercise and play sports.
    c. I *didn’t use to* exercise and play sports.
    d. *I don’t used to* exercise and play sports.
    e. *I used to not* exercise and play sports.

A roughly similar result is obtained with the statement (13a) as 16 students (21%) and 2 students (3%) made a negative sentence, respectively, as in (13b) and (13c). 10 students (13%) used *does* like (13d), and 5 students (6%) added *not* after *used to* as shown in (13e).

(13) a. My aunt *used to* have a very nice car.
Understanding of Habitual Past Markers by Korean EFL Students

b. My aunt used not to have a very nice car.
c. My aunt didn’t use to have a very nice car.
d. *My aunt doesn’t used to have a very nice car.
e. *My aunt used to not have a very nice car.

For the negation of both statement (12a) and (13a), it is found that 16 students (21%) definitely knew how to make a negative sentence by adding not between used and to, as in (12b) and (13b), and that only 2 students (3%) constructed a negative statement by placing did before not as in (12c) and (13c).

None of the students used never to negate any of the sentences given in Part Three, which is surprising in consideration of its popularity in the negation of used to in contemporary English. Although a safety measure was built into the second item of Part Four, in the design stage of the exam, just in case the use of not is completely avoided in Part Three, such a concern was evidently unnecessary. Moreover, this item in Part Four turned out to be not so useful as 16 students (21%) simply rectified the sentence by the unanticipated removal of not while the same number of the students corrected the sentence by placing not between used and to. Therefore, this error correction item shows at best that a portion of the students (over 40%) noticed the misplacement of not.

4. Recognition of ‘be used to’ apart from ‘used to’

To probe whether the students recognized a similar looking expression be used to, they were given a context in which be used to is more or less required as in 14a and asked to make a necessary correction in Part Four. Only 4 students (5%) out of 77 students noticed be used to as a phrasal verb and changed the bare infinitive into gerund by adding –ing as in 14b.

(14) a. *After being in the hospital for six months, my mother is now used to stay in bed all day.
b. After being in the hospital for six months, my mother is now used to staying in bed all day.

The outcome obviously shows that the level of recognition for be used to is not sufficient enough for most students to make a desirable change. However, when a task was assigned to choose the proper verb form to accompany be used to in Part Six as below, 51 students (66%) did choose gerund in preference to infinitive, which presumably means that more students were indeed aware of the phrasal expression be used to + -ing, whereas the rest of the students either did not notice be used to or did not know that a noun, pronoun or
gerund is required following a preposition to.

I used to feel tired all the time until I started running. First, it was 500 meters. Then, before I knew it, I was running six or seven kilometers a day. Now, I run more than ten kilometers every morning, which makes me feel energized throughout the day. Nowadays, I am used to feeling good all day long.

Lastly, when the students’ knowledge was evaluated with respect to the basic meaning of used to and be used to with the following sentences (15) in Part Seven, 53 students (69%) stated the difference correctly as follows: used to refers to the habitual past and be used to carries the meaning of be accustomed to.

(15) a. I am used to memorizing 20 to 30 words a day.
   b. I used to memorize 20 to 30 words a day.

The finding is remarkable in that many more students actually knew the difference in meaning and form than what was suggested by their performance in Part Four, and this discrepancy in the students’ responses indicates that the students were not used to encountering be used to and thus fell short of having a working knowledge to recognize the form.

V. DISCUSSION

The results clearly show that most students have somehow acquired either incomplete or misrepresented information with respect to the habitual past markers, and this was also evident as the students appeared quite confused and uncertain in handling used to and would while taking the exam. The results are reflected and juxtaposed with currently available information on the markers in the hope of building a reasonably comprehensive knowledge body. For practical applications, discussion is accompanied by some general pedagogical suggestions.

1. Knowledge of Markers

Less than half of the students were capable of producing used to, and only a fifth of them came up with would when prompted with Korean equivalents of the habitual past in the first part of the exam. The apparent failure of many students to generate these forms indicates one of, or any combination thereof, three possibilities: (a) the prompts, i.e.,
Korean equivalents, alone could not effectively elicit the students’ knowledge; (b) the students were unaware of the markers; or (c) they were not accustomed to using *used to* and *would*. Perhaps, all three possibilities attribute to the finding and should be contemplated together to bring about an efficacious remedy. Hence, some of these possibilities ought to be considered in detail. To begin with, the students’ use, in Part One, of the preterit as well as the past perfect when prompted, in lieu of the markers, is discussed below.

On the surface, it seems plausible to use the simple past and past perfect to describe the situations given in Part One, and, certainly, the use of the simple past, as in (9a) and (9c), is perfectly acceptable because the preterit is frequently used in place of *used to* or *would*. However, in the strictest sense, the past perfect, i.e., *had* + *past participle*, cannot be used to refer to either past states or habits even in this limited context. Conceptually, the perfect carries no habitual aspect because the tense addresses not “the internal temporal constituency of a situation” but “the continuing relevance of a past situation” (Harrison, 2006, p. 3).

More specifically, the past perfect indicates a connection between a state in the past and an even earlier event that is out of sequence (Swan, 2005), and, in fact, the context is required to impart the meaning of the past perfect as in the following sentence: When I went to see my friend for Christmas, he pointed to the yard and said, ‘Look, there *had been* a garden over there since I was a child.’ In the example related to (9d), it is clear that the garden in question happened to be in existence for a period before the utterance was produced, but the garden’s existence at the present moment cannot be ascertained definitely without an additional context, which is quite different from the habitual past that no longer exist in (8d). Also, the past perfect cannot replace *used to* in (9b), and this is due to the fact that the introduction of the past perfect is syntactically unlikely in the absence of any reference to the past.

To recap, contrary to the prevalent perception held by the students, the past perfect cannot take a habitual past reading which typically contrasts the present with the past with its past implicature. This discussion may be relevant to teaching of the markers for it could give the teachers—who appreciate the difference between *used to* and the past perfect—an advantage. In other words, teachers equipped with such insight could elucidate the meaning of *used to*, which may be necessary as the identical Korean word(s) are frequently used to define *used to*, in context of past states, and the past perfect.

2. Awareness of Markers for Past Habits

Although the data contradict the notion that the students were unaware of the markers, they undoubtedly reveal that a lot of them were grossly misinformed regarding the use of
the markers. Regarding the impact of regularity of occurrence on the use of the markers to refer to past habits, just a few students were cognizant of the fact that the occurrence pattern has no bearing at all, whereas the rest of them appeared to believe otherwise according to the data in Part Five. As pointed out earlier, the prevalent idea is that *used to* and *would* describe past habits that take place, respectively, regularly and irregularly respectively even though their predominant presumption did not affect the actual selection of *used to* or *would* in Part Two. Anyway, it should be made clear for students that whether a past habit took place in a regular or irregular fashion should not be used as a determining factor for choosing *used to* or *would*.

Beyond a clause and sentence level, the use of the markers to refer to past habits is somewhat different though: *Used to* is preferably uttered, usually in the beginning of a series of past habitual utterances, to establish a time frame, and, only then, *would* (or ‘d) is followed to elaborate on episodes and events that repeatedly happened for the period. The data that nine students selected *used to* in the beginning and *would* subsequently thereafter in Part Two appears significant because it is indicative of their awareness of, or possibly feeling for, the role of *used to* in establishing a time frame and *would* in providing the details of past habits in discourses. Even the native speakers of English who were consulted for the validity of the exam were not certain of the reason why they were inclined to use ‘d to describe past habits once *used to* was used, rather than to avoid redundancy and to use the shorter form. Following an instruction on the markers to describe a series of past habits and some simple tasks to reinforce language learning, a storytelling activity described by Jones (2002) or another interesting activity might be useful if the activity could give language learners a chance to use the markers in a meaningful way.

3. Awareness of Markers for Past States

Moving on to the issue of past states, about one third of the students chose, in Part Five, the notion that only *used to* can describe both past habits and states. For all practical purposes, *would* can only mark past habits, as opposed to *used to* which can refer to both past habits and states, but the misunderstanding of this simple concept has apparently caused much confusion and probably resulted in the misconception that regularity of occurrence determines the use of the markers. In this regard, the misinterpretation of the word ‘regularly’ which is frequently found in the definition of *used to* as in ‘used to refers to something that regularly happened’—together with the unavailability of a clear, explicit definition of *would* for the habitual past—has undoubtedly reinforced the flawed concept and exacerbated the problem further. Moreover, the fact that even those who knew the proper marker, i.e., *used to*, for past states chose *would* instead in Part Two may
substantiate the contribution of an additional factor that the students may lack the ability to differentiate between past habits and states.

In this regard, it may be propitious to introduce the topic of stative and nonstative verbs in English. As the name reveals, stative verbs are static and lack a clear endpoint and duration, whereas nonstative verbs, on the other hand, are dynamic involving an action of the subject. To give a few examples, be-verb, believe, like, and have are considered stative verbs, even though some stative verbs could be dynamic depends on context. For instance, the verb have, in the sentence ‘I have a dog and a cat,’ is static while that, in ‘Let’s have lunch,’ is dynamic because the former and the latter refers, respectively, to the condition of possession and the act of consuming food. In general, stative verbs are often used to describe the condition of a subject while the action of a subject is portrayed with nonstative verbs. For simplicity, it could be said that stative and nonstative verbs are used for states and actions respectively. Thus, if the element of action is missing in a verb, then it is likely that a past condition is being described, and used to is the marker to be chosen to refer to the past state. A brief discussion on stative and dynamic verbs followed by examples can be useful in setting apart past states from habits. This approach well served the purpose of differentiating between past habits and states for the study participants and is expected to help enhance the EFL learners’ comprehension.

Many commercial textbooks prepared for EFL learners (e.g., Richards, Hull, & Proctor, 2005) contain used to and expand on it, without alluding to would, possibly because it exclusively marks the habitual past (Parrott, 2000). This fact should be considered in the introduction of the markers for Korean EFL learners as well. In the first stage of teaching the markers, e.g., in the first term, used to could be presented and explained, followed by some tasks on which learners can use the marker to describe their past habits and states. In the second stage, e.g., in the following term, the use of would to describe past habits could be discussed in comparison with used to and put into practice, at a sentence-level, solidifying the concept that used to can mark both past habits and states.

In the last stage, how used to establishes a time frame and would subsequently elaborates past habits in discourse could be discussed and highlighted with some exciting examples from a variety of teaching resources, followed by a communicative activity that encourages learners to use both markers in narrative. Of course, the suggestions made here should be adjusted and adapted to accommodate and satisfy the students’ need. It is recommended that widely-accepted, accurate information be disseminated at the earliest opportunity. In addition, where applicable, students should be prompted and encouraged to use the markers, as Parrott (2000) argues, to overcome the natural tendency to avoid using the markers.
4. Perceived Nature of ‘used to’

For the task which involves the negation of *would* in Part Three, further discussion may be unnecessary as the familiarity with the modals resulted in the relatively satisfactory performance. However, the outcome regarding the negation of *used to* suggests that many students were not sure of how to deal with the pseudo modal. For example, some students relied on the aid of the auxiliary *do* or *does*, rather than *did*, to negate *used to*, which demonstrates the lack of understanding of its primary role in referring to the past. Certainly, there is a chance that the output observed is merely the regurgitation of their previous learning, which represents the kind of information that the students were exposed to as well.

The data apparently indicate the followings: (a) the negation of *used to* is not extensively taught at the primary and secondary level of education; (b) *used not to*, as in (12b) and (13b), may be widely adopted in the curriculum that happens to cover the negation of *used to*; and (c) the use of *never* is not adequately addressed. It is suggested here that at least the negated forms *didn’t use to* and *never used to* should be made available for learners to be familiar with as these forms could be helpful in building up confidence in using *used to* for a communicative purpose. Only when the risk of causing confusion by introducing multiple forms is considered low, then the less frequently used form *used not to* may be introduced as well with a remark on its limited use.

On the same token, the students’ responses to the task of making questions using the form *used to* are disheartening for it is rather clear that many students have not been exposed to questions containing it when exposure can be of great value in enhancing the internalization of the marker. Moreover, as questioning plays a crucial role in effective interactive lessons (Brown, 2001), meaningful questions can draw out students and help them get involved in using the markers actively. By addressing their intrinsic need to communicate, the enhancement of the students’ language acquisition can be facilitated (Willis & Willis, 2001).

In this regard, it appears advantageous to increase the students’ exposure to questions in a meaningful way. It should be mentioned, however, that questions containing the habitual past markers, e.g., (16a), are apparently rare in everyday English. Indeed, diverse forms, e.g., the preterit or present perfect, are typically used to inquire about past experiences and elicit the habitual past as in (16b) unless interlocutors are in the discussion of a specific matter that presumably ceases to exist in the present as in (16c).

(16) a. What *did* you *use to* do in your spare time in high school?  
   b. What was your favorite pastime in high school?  
   c. *Did* you *use to* get an allowance for toys?
The implication is that context should be chosen very carefully if questions containing *used to* were to be adopted. Also, a lesson on the question formation of *used to* should be given in consideration of the students’ competence because, according to Mackey (1999), question formation belongs to the category of complex structures. Before leaving the topic of question, a comment should be made on the fact that the use of *would to* obtain habitual past information is virtually nonexistent as the form is predominantly used to make polite requests or offers.

5. Understanding of ‘*be used to*’

The results of this study show that no more than a handful of the students recognized the phrasal verb *be used to* in context, in Part Four, while many more students were evidently aware, to a varying degree, of its meaning and structure as shown in Part Six and Seven. The finding suggests that the concept of *be used to*, in relation to *used to*, is not firmly internalized in spite of their previous learning of these two forms. The fact that both forms *used to* and *be used to* bear a strong resemblance in appearance is believed to account, among other factors, for the students’ confusion. Despite the similarity in appearance, the meaning of *used to* and *be used to* is quite different. *Used to* describes past habits and states—by bringing a shift in time and allowing speakers to reminisce about the past—with implicature that the described habit or state no longer exists.

On the other hand, *be used to* describes current habits and states that have been developed over time and, thus, even the unpleasantness, strangeness or difficulty of the current circumstance exerts little influence on the subject having undergone a gradual change for a relatively long period of time. As an aside, *get used to* also describes present habits and states even though emphasis is placed on the process of change (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

(17) a. My sister *used to* work 60 hours a week.
   b. My sister *is used to* working 60 hours a week.
   c. My sister *got used to* working 60 hours a week.

In other words, (17b) and (17c) imply that the sister has worked 60 hours or more a week for a while and that the long work hours do not bother her at the moment of utterance. To be exact, however, (17c) draws attention to the fact that some kind of adjustment, at the emotional, mental and/or physical level, took place while (17b) merely reports the current status. The emphasis on change is readily noticeable in the following sentence: ‘You’d better *get used to* long work hours.’ Basically, *used to* describe past habits and states, and *be used to* refer to present habits and states. This distinction may be helpful if two forms were to be compared and contrasted for EFL students.
VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the students’ knowledge of the overt habitual past markers, *used to* and *would*, is evaluated to gain an in-depth understanding of the perceived nature and use of the markers, especially *used to*. The study finding shows that many students are apt to choose between *used to* and *would*, on the basis of an erroneous premise which seems to have permeated the English teaching community in Korea. Perhaps, more importantly, the finding also indicates that most students are not capable of producing and using the forms adequately on demand, and it calls for a greater allocation of class time and teaching resources in pursuit of developing the learners’ communicative competence in this regard.

The finding presented herein, in conjunction with the findings of other notable studies recently conducted, helps dispel a widespread myth and clarify the puzzling aspect with regard to the use of the markers. English teachers and text developers can reflect on and disseminate the accurate, up-to-date information which will be percolated eventually through the English teaching community. Ultimately, more students will be inclined to use the markers to describe habitual past episodes with confidence, which can enrich their communicative experience.

In terms of the limitations of the study, the finding may not be subject to generalization due to the sample size and the preliminary nature of the data presented. Further corroboration—including, but not limited to, the discourse analysis of students conversing within the proper context, the text analysis of teaching materials available, and the assessment of English teachers’ understanding—may be required to confirm the finding. With regard to future implications, studies on the effectiveness of the lesson on the markers can be carried out by engaging students in conversation and narrative.

Furthermore, it can be propitious to assess the effect of enhanced competence in the habitual past on the confidence and performance of learners who are engaged in interaction with speakers of English. All things considered, the study’s finding lays a reasonably strong foundation on which the potential of intriguing studies could be realized in the future, and the study is thus an important step toward reaching a comprehensive coverage of the markers used by EFL learners. For obvious reasons, the exploration of individual grammar elements deserves serious consideration in an effort to rectify any misrepresented grammar issues, ensure quality teaching with regard to accuracy, and foster a conducive and productive learning environment.
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Appendix

Student Assessment Form*

PART 1

1. Use an auxiliary verb to accompany the verb in the parenthesis in order to complete the sentence.
   a. 내가 어렸을 때, 아빠는 동화를 들려 주곤 했다. (tell)
      When I was young, my father ____________________ fairy tales.
   b. 비록 이제는 안 믿지만, 한때 나는 마법의 힘을 믿었다. (believe)
      Although I do not believe it now, I ____________________ in the power of magic then.
   c. 나는 네잎클로버를 정원에서 찾곤 했다. (look)
      I ____________________ for four-leaved clovers in the garden.
   d. 저기, (지금은 없어졌지만) 저 자리에 그 정원이 있었다. (be)
      Look, there ____________________ a garden over there.

PART 2

2. Choose either used to or would in consideration of context. Where possible, you may circle both used to and would.
   a. My parents used to / would climb the mountain every weekend before my father took a second job.
   b. My grandparents used to / would live with us in Seoul.
   c. Until the last year or so, our cat used to / would go night hunting once in a while, but she seldom goes out now.
   d. My younger sister used to / would have breakfast every morning if she had time.
3. Choose either *used to* or *would* in consideration of context. Where possible, you may circle both *used to* and *would*.

   In my childhood, every summer I *used to / would*¹ visit my uncle who lived and worked on a farm near a well-known beach. My brother and I *used to / would*² get up in the morning and help our uncle with his daily chores. Then, we *used to / would*³ go swimming in the sea for the afternoon. After that, we *used to / would*⁴ come home for dinner and campfire stories.

PART 3

4. Make Yes/No questions. Ignore the words in the parentheses in your response.
   a. He would play piano for his mother (whenever she appeared unhappy).
   b. She used to collect stamps.

5. Make information questions to ask for the underlined word(s) using the WH-word provided in the parenthesis.
   a. They would bring food to the old. *(what)*
   b. He used to brush his teeth before bedtime. *(when)*
   c. Ms. Lee used to be her favorite teacher. *(who)*

6. Negate the following sentences. Ignore the words in the parentheses in your response.
   a. He would eat ice cream and pizza (if he were to have a hangover).
   b. I used to exercise and play sports.
   c. My aunt used to have a very nice car.

PART 4

7. Identify and correct the error in the sentence in consideration of context.
   a. After being in the hospital for six months, my mother is now used to stay in bed all day.
   b. My father and I not used to buy chocolates and flowers for my mother in hospital.

PART 5

8. Choose the most accurate statement.
   a. *Used to* describes past habits that occur on a regular basis, whereas *would* refers to the ones that occur on an irregular basis.
   b. *Would* describes past habits that occur on a regular basis, whereas *used to* refers to the ones that occur on an irregular basis.
   c. Both *used to* and *would* can refer to past habits regardless of whether their occurrence is regular or not.
   d. Neither *used to* nor *would* can refer to past habits.

9. Choose the most accurate statement.
   a. *Used to* can refer to past states that no longer exist, whereas *would* cannot.
   b. *Would* can refer to past states that no longer exist, whereas *used to* cannot.
   c. Both *used to* and *would* can refer to past states that no longer exist.
   d. Neither *used to* nor *would* can refer to past states that no longer exist.

PART 6

10. Choose the correct pair of verb forms to complete the paragraph.
    I *used to* _______ tired all the time until I started running. First, it was 500 meters. Then, before I knew it, I was running six or seven kilometers a day. Now, I run more than ten kilometers every morning, which makes me feel energized throughout the day. Nowadays, I *am used to* _______ good all day long.
    a. feel – feel b. feel – feeling
    c. feel – have felt d. feel – felt
11. Compare and contrast the sentence “a” and “b” below in terms of meaning.
   a. I am used to memorizing 20 to 30 words a day.
   b. I used to memorize 20 to 30 words a day.

Note: The assessment form provided here is slightly modified in format and wording.