University of Babylon

Investigating Knowledge and Use of Iraqi EFL University Learners of Marginal Modals

A Thesis

Submitted to the Council
of the College of Basic Education,
University of Babylon in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Education in Methods of Teaching English
as a Foreign Language

By

Mais Flayih Hasan Al-Jabbawi

Supervised by

Asst. Prof. Adil Abdul Ridha Al-Akkam (M.A.)

Aasim Abood Zbaar Al-Dulaimi (Ph.D.)

September, 2005   **Sha'ban, 1426**

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ(٥٥)وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَإِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْغَالِبُونَ (٥٦)

صدق الله العلي العظيم

سورة المائدة

(الآيتان ٥٥ و ٥٦)

To

The candles of my life; my
Father and my Mother

The light that lightens my
way; my Sisters and my
Brothers

The butterflies that beautify
my day; my Teachers and
my Friends

We certify that this thesis which is entitled (**Investigating Knowledge and Use of Iraqi EFL University Learners of Marginal Modals**) was prepared by (**Mais Flayih Hasan Al-Jabbawi**) under our supervision at the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Adil Abdul Ridha Al-Akkam (M.A.)

Date: /   / 2005

Signature:

Supervisor: Mr. Aasim Abood Zbaar Al-Duliami (Ph.D.)

Date: /   / 2005

In view of the available recommendations, I forward this thesis for debate by the Examining Committee.

Signature:

Name: Asst. Prof. Hamza Abdul Wahid Hammadi (Ph.D.)

**   Head of the Department of Higher Studies**

Date: /   / 2005

We certify that we have read this thesis entitled (**Investigating Knowledge and Use of Iraqi EFL University Learners of Marginal Modals**), and as Examining Committee examined the student (**Mais Flayih Hasan Al-Jabbawi**), in its content and that, in our opinion, it is adequate standing as a thesis for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature: **Signature:**

Name: **Name:**

   Member   **Member**

Signature:

Name:

   Chairman

Approved by the Council of the College of Basic Education.

Signature:

Name: Asst. Prof. Abbas Ubied Hammadi (Ph.D.)

   Dean of the College of Basic Education

   Date: /   / 2005

IV

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep gratitude to *Allmiety Allah* for his kind look and help in completing this work.

Votes of thanks go to my supervisors; Dr. Aasim Abood Zbaar Al-Duliami and Asst. Prof. Adil Abdul Ridha Al-Akkam for their support, endless patience, invaluable comments and generous remarks, and efficient guidance throughout this work.

I am, also, grateful to Asst. Prof. Abbas Deygan Darweesh, Asst. Prof. Riyadh Tariq Al-Ameedi, lecturer Fareed H. Al-Hindawi, lecturer Maysia K. Hussien, and lecturer Firas Abdul Mini'm for their constructive remarks and discussions, especially in the construction of the test. Thanks and gratitude are extended to Asst. Prof. Salih Mahdi Hameed, Asst. Prof. Hameed Hassoon Al-Mas'udi, and lecturer Dr. Chassib F. Al-Jubouri for their support and inspiration along the way.

I would like to thank all the members of the jury for their useful remarks and suggestions to establish the validity of the test.

Finally, most heartfelt thanks, gratitude and love to my family, who supported and encouraged me to walk and continue this hard work.

List of Contents

Chapter Three : The Test

Abstract

Marginal modals are one of the sub-divisions of modal auxiliary verbs that have unique syntactic and semantic characteristics. The uniqueness of the marginal modals' syntax and semantics distinguishes them from the central modals and the other sub-divisions of modal auxiliary verbs. These verbs are marginal because in some cases they behave like modal auxiliary verbs, in other cases, they behave like lexical verbs. Thus, the present study aims at explaining the syntactic and semantic characteristics of marginal modals and investigating empirically the extent to which Iraqi EFL university learners' master these characteristics. Also, it aims at investigating the extent to which they can recognize and use marginal modals correctly; and their ability to differentiate the marginal state from the lexical state. It is hypothesized that:

1. Iraqi EFL university learners face difficulty in distinguishing the constructions functioning as marginal modals from those functioning as lexical verbs, thus, they cannot convert marginal modals to lexical verbs and vice versa.

2. Such learners cannot use the semantics of the marginal modals correctly. Most of them mix the marginal modals' semantics with that of the central modals or the other modal auxiliary verbs.

3. The learners face more difficulty at the production level than that at the recognition level, so their responses at the recognition level are expected to be better than that at the production one.

To investigate these hypotheses, a diagnostic test has been conducted to a sample of 100 Iraqi EFL university learners at their fourth year in the Departments of English at the Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadisiya during the academic year 2004-2005. The test has been exposed to jury of lecturers to measure its face validity.

Statistical means has been applied to the results of the test to stand on errors and their causes. They have yielded certain conclusions that Iraqi EFL university learners at the fourth year face difficulties in recognizing and producing the marginal modals. The rate of their correct responses in the hole test, (1291, 28.205%), is lower than their incorrect ones (3709, 71.795%). At the production level, the subjects' incorrect responses (2434, 79.84%) reveal that they are unable to use marginal modals correctly whether syntactically or semantically. The difference in the rate of the incorrect responses of the recognition (1275, 63.75%) and production levels show that the learners of the fourth year face more difficulty at the production level than that at the recognition one.

The subjects' errors have been found to be attributed to the four factors which are: interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, context of learning and communication strategies

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

Symbol	Description
AmE	*American English*
AuxV$_{(s)}$	*Auxiliary verb(s)*
BF$_{(s)}$	*Blended form(s)*
BrE	*British English*
CM$_{(s)}$	*Central modal(s)*
D	*Discrimination power*
EFL	*English as a foreign language*
FV	*Facility value*
LV$_{(s)}$	*Lexical verb(s)*
MAV$_{(s)}$	*Modal auxiliary verb(s)*
MM$_{(s)}$	*Marginal Modal(s)*
NICE	*Negation, Inversion, Code and Emphatic affirmation*
No.	*Number*
NZE	*New Zealand English*
PAV$_{(s)}$	*Primary Auxiliary verb(s)*
R	*Reliability*
S	*Subject*
SIN	*'S' of third person, Initial position and Non-finite*
*	*Unacceptable*
~̃	*Systematic correspondence in meaning*

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter One
Introduction

1.1 The Problem

    Marginal modals are a sub-category of modal auxiliary verbs with some syntactic and semantic differences between them. **Marginal modals** can be considered either as modal auxiliary verbs or as lexical verbs:

(1) We **ought to** give him another chance.   (**modal auxiliary verb**)

                                                 (Quirk et al., 1985: 140)

(2) He **didn't used/ use to** be a big old mansion here.   (**lexical verb**)

                                                 (Emmott, 2004: 1)

    Dare and ***need*** have different syntactic features from other modal auxiliary verbs that may be difficult for Iraqi EFL college learners. "Dare and need provide some difficulty because: [i] in terms of the NICE properties some of their forms are forms of auxiliaries, others of full verbs; [ii] the distribution of the auxiliary forms is defective." [1] (Palmer, 1987: 23):

(3) a. He **needn't** climb the mountain to prove his courage.   } **marginal**

    b. **Dare she** say the truth?   } **modals**

---

[1] The term '**NICE properties**' refers to negation, inversion, code and emphatic affirmation.

1

(4) a. Jack **didn't need to** travel to New York last week. ⎤ **lexical verbs**

    b. **Did** Michael **dare to** jump over the fence? ⎦

      Iraqi EFL college learners may lack knowledge of these differences which differentiate **marginal modals**' characteristics from other modal auxiliary verbs' characteristics. Thus, they may be unable to change **marginal modals** to the lexical verb state or the blended forms, since **marginal modals** are not dealt with in detail in grammar textbooks. Palmer (1990: 3-5) indicates that central modals; which involve *shall, should, will, would, can, could, may, might,* and *must*, are called central because they exhibit all the peculiar modal characteristics from **marginal modals;** which   involve dare*, need, ought to,* and *used to*, that are **marginal modals** because they can be used with some of the modal characteristics or they can show lexical verb patterning (Palmer, 1990: 3-4):

(5) a. They **ought to/ used to** go to the museum at evening.

    (**marginal modals**)

  b. They **did not ought to/ used/ use to** go to the museum at evening.

    (**lexical verbs**)

      Quirk et al. (1985: 220) indicate that " the use of the modal verbs is one of the more problematic areas of English." Thus, **marginal modals** are rather ambiguous and Iraqi EFL college learners may face some difficulties when trying to recognize their exact status.

The semantic level of **marginal modals** may be of great difficulty for Iraqi EFL college learners. "Every language has its peculiar problems of meaning for the foreign learner; and many people would agree that in the English language, the most troublesome problem are concentrated in the area of … modal auxiliary usage" (Leech, 1971: 1). Every member of the **marginal modals** has more than one semantic feature that is similar to some of the central modals or to other members of the modal auxiliary verbs. One meaning can be expressed in more than one modal therefore they often cause ambiguity:

(6) They **will have to** hand the essay very soon. (**prediction+ obligation**)
(7) They **might need to** come earlier.   (**possibility+ obligation**)

                                                    (Mayhew, 2004: 6)

In fact, the problem arises when marginal modals are used with or instead of their equivalent verbs, whether central modals or other modal auxiliary verbs and vice versa. In this case, the learners may recognize only one meaning of the marginal modals when they have more than one meaning:

(8) a. A computer **ought to be able to** do this.   (**obligation+ ability**)
   b. A computer **must be able to** do this.   (**obligation+ ability**)

                                                    (ibid.)

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, no adequate empirical study of the subject of the **marginal modals** has been carried out. Thus, the researcher hopes that this study fills this gap and be of great help for the EFL teachers and material designers.

1.2 Aims of the Study

According to the preceding explanation of the **marginal modals** and the problems that Iraqi EFL college learners may encounter, this study aims at:

1. Finding out to what extent Iraqi EFL college learners face difficulty in recognizing and producing **marginal modals**.

2. Assessing whether Iraqi EFL college learners can differentiate **marginal modals**' syntax from that of the central modals and other modal auxiliary verbs.

3. Finding out empirically to what extent Iraqi EFL college learners can differentiate the semantics of the **marginal modals** from that of the central modals and other modal auxiliary verbs.

4. Identifying the reasons behind of the learners' errors so that solutions can be put in order to help them overcome the problems they face in using **marginal modals**.

1.3 The Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that:

1. Iraqi EFL university learners face difficulty in distinguishing the constructions functioning as **marginal modals** from that functioning as lexical verbs, thus, they cannot convert **marginal modals** to lexical verbs and vice versa.

4

2. Such learners cannot use the semantics of the **marginal modals** correctly. Most of them mix the **marginal modals**' semantics with that of the central modals or the other modal auxiliary verbs when they are not in their correct place.

3. The learners face more difficulty on the production level than that on the recognition level, so their responses on the recognition level is expected to be better than that on the production one.

1.4 The Procedures

The following procedures will be followed in this study:

1. Presenting a theoretical background about **marginal modals** in detail with an illustration of the syntactic differences of the **marginal verbs** with that of the primary and the central modals. The semantic differences between the **marginal modals** and the central modals are also mentioned in the same framework.

2. Conducting a test applied to Iraqi EFL learners of fourth-year/ Departments of English at Colleges of Education/ Universities of Babylon and Al- Qadisiya. The test contains items that do not require memorization but to the appropriate use of **marginal modals** in grammatical meaningful sentences in order to stand for the causes of the problem fully.

3. Applying a statistical means to the responses of the learners in order to verify or refute the preceding hypotheses.

4. Investigating the problems and their causes, then analyzing them in detail after collecting the results of the applied statistical means.

5. Arriving at certain results, conclusions, recommendations and giving suggestions.

1.5 Limits of the Study

This study is limited to:

1. Giving a theoretical background about **marginal modals** which are: **dare, need, ought to** and **used to**. Discussing the statistic and semantic differences between marginal modals and central modals.

2. Investigating learners' knowledge about **marginal modals** by designing a test that seeks their ability of using **marginal modals**. The test is limited to the performance of 100 of Iraqi EFL fourth-year college learners taken equally from Department of English at Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadisiya during the academic year 2004-2005.

3. Analyzing the collected data by using statistical means in order to identify errors' reasons and find suitable solusions for those reasons.

1.6 Value of the Study

The findings of the present study are hoped to be useful in twofold: theoretical and practical. The theoretical value is hoped to be of great help for the researchers in paving the way for further investigations on this topic to arrive at new results. In practice, the study is expected to be helpful in the following pedagogical contributions:

1. The results may be of great value to the lecturers in helping learners to overcome their problems in this area. The lecturers can explain **marginal modals** in detail with focusing on the different constructions of these verbs.

2. It can be of great value to the syllabus designers in deciding and preparing remedial teaching programms whether in following a new way in their presentation or in dealing with them in more detail for the semantic and syntactic levels.

3. They may help advanced learners to overcome the difficulties they face in using **marginal modals**.

Chapter Two
Theoretical Background

2.1 An Introductory Note

This chapter deals with primary auxiliary verbs (henceforth **PAVs**) in general, as well as modal auxiliary verbs (henceforth **MAVs**). It illustrates the semantics of central modals (henceforth **CMs**) since they are close to marginal modals (henceforth **MMs**) in this aspect. It focuses mainly on **MMs'** syntactic and semantic characteristics. Firstly, it discuses **MMs'** syntax thoroughly, by going deeply into all their regular and irregular forms. It mentions the constructions functioning as **MMs**, lexical verbs (henceforth **LVs**), and blended forms (henceforth **BFs**). Secondly, it illustrates the semantic roles of **MMs** that interference with the semantics of **CMs**; thus, the researcher has mentioned the similarities and differences between **CMs** and **MMs**. At the end of this chapter, there is a summarized illustration of previous studies that have helped the researcher in certain aspects, since, they don't deal with **MMs** particularly.

For the sake of brevity, there are so many view points on the verbs that are considered **MMs** by different grammarians and linguists, but the researcher finds that the most prominent and comprehensive view is postulated by Quirk et al. (1985: 137-140), therefore such a view is adopted in the present study.

2.2 Primary Auxiliary Verbs

'**Auxiliary**' is a term used in grammatical classification of verbs to refer to the set of verbs, subordinate to **LVs**, which help to make distinctions in mood, aspect, voice, etc. In English, some grammarians call **PAVs** 'main auxiliaries', and they are *do*, *be*, and *have* (Crystal, 1997: 35).

The distinction between **PAVs** and **LVs** can be achieved both morphologically and syntactically. The morphology of **PAVs** differs from that of **LVs** in that the **PAVs** have either more or fewer forms than what the **LVs** have.The **PAV** *be*, for example, has eight verb forms: *be*, *am*, *is*, *are*, *was*, *were*, *been*, *being*. *Have* and *do*, on the other hand, have only three verb forms each, *have*, *has*, *had* and *do*, *does*, *did*.

Syntactically, the distinction between **LVs** and **AuxVs** is drawn on the basis of the following grammatical processes, which will be dealt with in the discussion of the **MMs**, **inversion**, **negation**, **pro-form**, **contraction**, **ellipsis**, and **emphatic affirmation** (Quirk et al., 1985: 121-127; and Palmer, 1987: 16-21).

These processes are sometimes called **NICE properties** of **AuxVs**, which are according to Coates(1983: 4):

N- direct **N**egation (do > don't, should > shouldn't)
I- **I**nversion in questions (I have > Have I?, I will > Will I?)
C- **C**ode or reduced forms (I have a bag > So have you, I may go > So may you)

E- **E**mphatic affirmation (Must we run? > Yes, we must)

To these, Coates (ibid.) adds the first two of the following, which are regarded as specific to the **CMs**:

S-{**S**} in third person is missing (***she musts**)

I- **I**nitial position in VP (***have would**); hence, there is no co-occurrence with other modals (***may will do it**).

Then Gramley (2004: 1) adds the third feature, which seems to make a further useful distinction which he calls **SIN** :

N- **N**on-finite forms are missing; there is no '***to may**' or '***maying**'.

Quirk et al. (1985:133) state that the **PAV** *do* is semantically empty, so it is considered as a purely grammatical word used in *negative, interrogative, emphatic* and *inversion functions* [1]:

(1) a- She ***doesn't*** go to school.   (negation)

   b- ***Does*** she go to school?   (interrogative)

   c- She ***does go*** to school.   (emphasis)

   d- She goes to school and ***so does*** her oldest sister.   (inversion)

Do can be used as a **LV** having a semantic orientation:

(2) a- Julia's job is very boring. **She does the same thing** every day.

   b- **What do you do** in your free time.

                              (Murphy and Smalzer, 2002: 116)

On the other hand, the **PAV** *have* is used for the perfective aspect followed by the past participle '-ed' [(2)]:

   (3) a- They ***have played*** football.

      b- She ***has overcome*** the difficulties.

      c- She ***had passed*** the examination.

The **PAV** *have* can be used as a **LV** with a semantic level that means ' *eat / ate food* ' :

(4) a- **She had her breakfast** at 6 o'clock in the morning.

   b- **The workers usually have their dinner** at the factory.

Finally, the **PAV** *be* has three uses [(3)]:

(**a**) It is used with the past participle to express the passive voice:

   (5) The student **was rewarded** at the school.

(**b**) It is used with the present participle to express the progressive aspect:

   (6) I **am studying** English with my friend.

(**c**) It is used alone as a main verb:

   (7) She **is** a clever girl.

2.3 Modal Auxiliary Verbs

Modality refers to the "manner in which the meaning of a clause is qualified so as to reflect the speaker's judgment of the likelihood of the preposition it expresses being true" (Quirk et al., 1985: 219).

MAVs are a sub-class of **AuxVs** (ibid: 138). They are a set of helping verbs used to express modality in English. The following verbs are normally listed as the **MAVs** in English: *may/might*, *can/could*, *shall/should*, *will/would*, *must*, *dare*, *need*, *ought to*, *used to*.

(Ibid: 137) define *may/ might*, *can/ could*, *shall/ should*, *will/ would*, and *must* as **CMs**; while *dare*, *need*, *ought to*, and *used to* as **MMs**.

MAVs are different from other **PAVs**; *do*, *have*, *be*, in that the former have no -s form, -ing form, and participles. Furthermore, the so-called past forms or modals sometimes denote the same meaning as the present forms. They also occur in constructions which denote future time. Thus, it should be noticed that the form of a **MAV** doesn't necessarily denote the time reference of the sentence in which it is used. Moreover, verb phrases containing negated **MAVs** do not always express the opposite of affirmative ones; questions made with one **MAV** sometimes require answers containing another. In fact, the meanings of **MAVs** are very complex and ambiguous.

Quirk et al. (1972: 82) summarize the morphological and syntactic characteristics of **MAVs** in the following points:

1. **MAVs** are usually followed by a bare infinitive , except *ought* and *used* which are followed by a to-infinitive (Zandvoort, 1962: 8):

    (8) a- He **ought to** read hard.

      b- The strange man **used to** walk at the night.

2. **MAVs** are not inflected for the third person singular in the present tense, where **LVs** have the -s form:

    (9) **He** / **She will** stay at home because it is raining.

3. Both the present and the past forms of **MAVs** can be used to denote the present tense:

    (10) He **may** / **might** lose his money now because of the economic crash.

4. It is significant to note that **MAVs** can only occur as the first finite element of the complex verb phrase with non-finite functions, i.e. as infinitives or participle:

    (11) He **can run** as quickly as a tiger.

      *to can   *is canning   *is canned

5. Negation is made by adding the negative participle **not** after the **MAV** [4]:

    (12) They **will not** attend the meeting.

6. Questions are made by moving the **CMs** before the subject as with other MAVs. The **PV** *do* is not used with **CMs**:

(13) **Can John** open the door?

<div align="right">(Allerton, 1979: 250)</div>

The semantics of the **CMs** have a close relation with the semantics of **MMs**, therefore, the researcher will deal with this subject in detail in the next section.

2.3.1 Semantics of Central Modals

Quirk et al. (1972: 97-102), Al- Hamash and Jamal (1979: 318-330), and Bosewitz (1987: 112-121) deal with the main meaning of **CMs** which are clarified in the following sub-sections.

2.3.1.1 Can/Could

These **CMs** have the following meanings or uses:

a. They are used to express *present* or *past habits*:

(14) a- **Now she can speak** three languages.   (*present habit*)
b- **Last year she could speak** only one.   (*past habit*)

<div align="right">(Krohn, 1971: 110)</div>

b. They are used to ask for a *permission*:

   (15) a- **Can I eat** this piece of cake?

       b- **Could I walk** with you?

     Can is less formal and more common than *may*, which is also used in this sense (Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanic, 2001: 77) :

    (16) **May I** eat this piece of cake?

c. They are used to express *possibility*:

   (17) a- These days, **goods can be sent** all over the world by air.

                                   (ibid: 76)

      b- That **could be** my pen.

2.3.1.2 May/Might

     These **CMs** have the following meanings:

a. They are used to denote *permission*:

   (18) a- **You may speak** now.

      b- **Might I ask** whether you are using the typewriter?

                            (Quirk et al., 1985:223)

     May is more formal than *can* in this sense. Instead of *may not*, *must not* is often used in negation to express *prohibition*:

(19) You **must not** open the door.

<div align="right">(Azar, 1999: 199)</div>

The use of *might* is rare in this sense.

b. They are used to express *hypothetical possibility*:

(20) **He may leave** tomorrow.

<div align="right">(Leech, 1971: 68)</div>

(21) **I might go** to the movies tonight.

    ~ *It is possible that I will go*.

<div align="right">(Murphy and Smalzer, 2002: 60)</div>

In this sense *may* is different from *can* in expressing *possibility*, i.e. in paraphrasing utterances containing *may* indicating *possibility*, it is expressed as *it is possible* followed by **that clause** rather than the **infinitive clause**.

c. They are used to express *benediction* and *malediction*:

(22) a- **May his evil designs perish**.   (*benediction*)

    b- **May God grant you happiness**.   (*malediction*)

<div align="right">(ibid.)</div>

This third exclamatory use of *may* is very formal, and is rarely found in modern English. It is marked by inversion of the subject and the **CM may**. There are no interrogative, negative, or past tense forms.

May is an epistemic modal [5]; that is, it gives the impression that a given proposition is being or becoming true. It also gives our judgment regarding the *possibility* of occurrence of an action or a state of being:

(23) He **may be** at the library.

    ~ **Possibly he is at the library**.

<div align="right">(Azar, 1999: 199)</div>

2.3.1.3 Shall/Should

Shall has the following meanings:

a. It is used to express *willingness* on the speaker's part in the 2nd and 3rd person (*weak volition*):

(24) a- **You shall have** exactly as you wish.   (2nd person)

    b- **She shall get** her respect.   (3rd person)

b. It can be used to express the *speaker's intention* , which is restricted to the 1st person (*intermediate volition*):

(25) According to the opinion polls, **I shall win** quite easily.

<div align="right">(Quirk et al., 1985: 230)</div>

c. i. It can be used in a restricted way to express *insistence* (*strong volition*):

(26) **You shall do** exactly **as I say**.

<div align="center">17</div>

ii. It can be used to express a *legal* or a *quasi-legal discourse*:

(27) The vendor **shall maintain** the equipment in a good repair.

<div align="right">(ibid: 230)</div>

d. It can be used as a *polite question* to make a *suggestion*:

(28) **Shall we leave** at two? Is that Ok?

<div align="right">(Azar, 1999: 169)</div>

Of these meanings, it is only the one that denotes *intention*, which is widely used today. This **CM** is an infrequent verb, especially outside British English (henceforth BrE), when compared with ***should***, ***will*** and ***would***. However, ***should*** may have the following meanings:

a. It can be used to express *obligation* and *logical necessity* that is equivalent to ***ought to***:

(29) a- They **should be** at home now.   (*obligation*)
   b- You **should have** seen his face! (*logical necessity*)

<div align="right">(Swan, 1996: 517)</div>

b. It can be used to express a common repute after certain expressions, such as *'it is a pity that'*, *'I am surprised that'*:

(30) **I am surprised that** you **should** speak nervously with me.

c. It can be used *hypothetically* in the 1ˢᵗ person only in the main clause with a conditional subclass. In this sense it is equivalent to ***would***:

(31) **If** there were an accident, **we should** have to report it.

$$\text{(Quirk et al., 1985: 234)}$$

d. It can be used in a *tentative condition* within conditional clauses:

(32) **If you should hear news** of them, please, let me know.

$$\text{(Leech, 1971: 111)}$$

2.3.1.4 Will/Would

The meaning of ***will*** is rarely purely temporal (Wilkins and Suffolk, 1980: 76). It has the following meanings:

a. It is used to express *willingness* (*weak volition*). It is connected with the 2ⁿᵈ person and this sense is considered as a *polite request*:

(33) **Will you help** the injured people?

$$\text{(Osner, 2004: 2)}$$

b. It can be used to express *intention* (*intermediate volition*). It is usually contracted, especially with the 1ˢᵗ person:

(34) **I'll post** it now.

$$\text{(ibid.)}$$

c. It is used to express *prediction*, which involves the following:

i. *Specific prediction*:

19

(35) **I won't be able to come**, I'm afraid.

<div align="right">(Mayhew, 2004: 4)</div>

ii. *Timeless prediction*:

(36) **He will win the race,** I know it.

<div align="right">(Broukal, 2001: 36)</div>

iii. *Habitual action*:

(37) **If litmus paper is dipped in acid, it will turn red**.

<div align="right">(Quirk et al., 1985: 228)</div>

On the other hand, ***would*** has the following meanings:

a. It can be used to express *willingness* (*weak volition*):

(38) **Would you please** unlock the door?

<div align="right">(Leech; Cruickshank and Ivanic, 2001: 603)</div>

b. It can be used to express *insistence* (*strong volition*):

(39) **He would leave** the house in a muddle.

c. It is used to express *characteristic activities* in the past:

(40) **Every evening he would write a chapter** in his new book.

d. It can be used to denote a *hypothetical meaning* in the main clause:

(41) **If I were rich, I would take a long vocation**.

<div align="right">(Pollock, 1982: 201)</div>

e. It is used to express *probability*:

(42) **That beggar would be her father**.

2.3.1.5 Must

Must has the following meanings:

a. It can be used to express *obligation* in the present tense:

(43) **You must** brush your teeth every night.

<div align="right">(Shepherd; Rossner and Taylor, 1984: 109)</div>

Must, here, indicates that the speaker advocates a certain behaviour. He is the person who gives order.

Only *had to,* not *must,* is used to denote the past tense:

(44) Where have you been? I've been to the post office. **I had to post a letter**.

<div align="right">(Leech; Cruickshank and Ivanic, 201: 299)</div>

In negation, *needn't* and *do not have to* are used:

(45) You **needn't/ don't have to** be shy of your thoughts.

b. It is used to express *logical necessity* (*inference*):

(46) This **must be** one of the finest views of the whole processional rout.

(Palmer, 1990: 32)

Must, here, is used as **epistemic** use and **intrinsic** (see Section **2.3.2.1.2**). It indicates that the speaker has made a conclusion through inference or reasoning rather than direct experience.

c. It can be used to express *prohibition*:

(47) You **mustn't open** this parcel until Christmas day.

(Swan, 1996: 344)

Here, the speaker is using his authority to prevent the occurrence of something.

It should be noted that *can* is used instead of *must* in interrogative sentences:

(48) **Can** there be a mistake?

It should be mentioned that *must* also occurs in superficially interrogative sentences that their answers are assumed within them:

(49) **Mustn't there be another reason** for his behavior?

2.3.2 Marginal Modals

The **MMs** are: *dare, need, ought to* and *used to*. They are verbs which closely resemble the **CMs** (Quirk et al., 1985: 138). Most grammarians such as Thomson and Martinet (1980: 93), Quirk et al. (1985: 138), Palmer (1987: 19-43), Swan (1996: 333) and Azar (1999: 151) agree that the **MMs** are called marginal because they behave in slightly different ways from the **CMs**. The most important point is that they can be used either as **MAVs**:

(50)　　a- **Need we** go?　　　　　　　　　　**MAVs**

　　　　　b- **Dare she** stay?

　　　　　c- **I ought to be** there by now.

Or as **LVs** (allowing **PVs** and **CMs** to precede them):

(51)　　a- I **shall need** to go.　　　　　　**LVs**

　　　　　b- He **doesn't dare to** go there.

　　　　　c- You **didn't ought (to)** wait.

The above example,(50), is often criticized as non standard (Gramley,2004:1).

It can be argued that *dare* and *need* are proper modals, but that for each there is also a homomorphic verb (*DARE, NEED*) constructed as **LVs**. *Ought to*, too, may be treated as a **CM** if speakers construct it with the bare infinitive (Dury, 2004: 7; Osner, 2004: 2).

2.3.2.1 Characteristics of Marginal Modals

While having the previous properties (**2.3.3**) in common with all **CMs**, the **MMs** have peculiarities of their own; they are syntactically characterized by being followed by the bare-infinitive in *dare* and *need* ; and to-infinitive in *ought to* and *used to*, where the **to** can be taken as a marker of the infinitive, having both the present and the past forms used in present tense sequence, constantly occurring as the first finite element of the simple verb phrases and never occurring in the imperative.

MMs have idiosyncratic semantic, formal and informal features, affecting particularly their use in the past tense and in negation (Shammas, 1998: 48-49; Osner, 2004: 2) which differentiates them from **CMs**. These features will be discussed in the next sections.

2.3.2.1.1 Syntactic Characteristics

Dare, need, ought to and *used to* have different functions, some functions are regular; others are irregular. All the **MMs** can be constructed either as **LVs** or under restricted conditions, as **MAVs**.

2.3.2.1.1.1 Dare

All grammarians and linguists who deal with **MMs** agree that *dare* can be used either as a **MAV** (with bare infinitive and without the inflected form-s) or as a **LV** (with to-infinitive and with inflected-s, -ing and past forms) both in their inflection and their syntax with little or no difference in meaning.

When *dare* is used as a **MAV**, third person singular inflection for the simple present is absent. There are no imperative, infinite or participial forms. It takes direct **not** negation and it is used as an operator in question and takes bare infinitive complement. The modal construction of *dare* is restricted to nonassertive contexts; i.e., mainly negative and interrogative sentences:

(52) a- **Dare** she tell him?　　⎫　Question and negation without *do*;

　　b- I **daren't** say what I think.　⎬　third person without –s ; followed by

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　⎭　infinitive without **to**.

(Swan, 1996: 140)

Moreover, this verb is not used here only (i.e. in negation and inversion), but it also has the characteristic of **MAVs** in not having **-s form**. There is no form '**daresn't*' nor do we say '**dares he…*?'.

Whereas the **LV** construction *DARE* can always be used, and in fact (it is) more common (Quirk et al., 1985: 138-139):

(53) a- She **didn't dare to** tell him what had happened.

(ibid.)

　　b- **He dares to ask me that!**

(Aarts and Aarts, 1988: 37)

DARE here, (53/a and b), is a **LV** and no auxiliary state is clear from the presence of one of the forms of *do* in the negative and inverted forms.

Another difference between the **MM** *dare* and the **LV** *DARE* is the structure with which it is associated. The **MM** is associated with the structure of being followed by the bare infinitive, while the **LV** is associated with the structure of to-infinitive.

With inversion and negation, then, both the **MM** and the **LV** may be used (the latter, of course, with **do**). In all other cases only the **LV** occurs. This is especially to be noted for the positive non-inverted forms:

(54) a- **He dares to** ask me that !   (positive non-inverted forms)
     b- You **dare to** come now!

The reasons for thinking that this is a **LV**, not a **MAV** are:

[**i**] the form has a final –s for the third person singular;

[**ii**] the structure to-infinitive, is associated with the **LV**, while, bare- infinitive is associated with the **MAV**.

These reasons would, in themselves, be sufficient criteria for excluding these forms from the **MAVs** since the **PVs** have –s forms and the **MM** *ought to* is associated with the structure to-infinitive, but since a distinction between **LVs** and **MAVs** is relevant here, they are sufficient to link the forms to the **LV** *DARE*, rather than the **MMs** whose characteristics (no –s and the structure of bare infinitive) are shown in the negative and inverted forms.

With code and emphatic affirmation the **MAV** forms do not occur unless there is also negation, implied negation or inversion (***dare*** is anomalous in these forms):

(55) a- Dare I ask him?   No, you **daren't** ask him.   (negation)

b- I **hardly dare** tell him what happened.   (implied negation)

(Alexander, 1988: 236)

c- I needn't come and **neither need** you.   (inversion)

Also, it can occur in the affirmative expression '***daresay***' or '***dare say***', which is found with a weakened meaning in the fixed phrase '*I dare say*'. The verbs ***dare*** and ***say*** can combine into a single verb, '***daresay***', (sometimes spelt as two separate words, '***dare say***') which can be used in the first person singular and plural (present tense only) to mean '*I suppose*' or '*it is possible*':

(56) **I daresay** you will phone me if you are going to be late tonight.

(ibid: 137)

Or in the sense of '*accept what you say*':

(57) This is supposed to be a cheap restaurant. It says so in this guidebook **I daresay it does**, but look at these chairs !

(ibid.)

There appears to be a mixture of the characteristics of the **LV** and the **MM** ***dare*** in negation and inversion when ***do*** is used but the bare infinitive also occurs (Drummond, 1972: 209 ; Quirk et al., 1985: 138 ; Alexander,

1988: 236 ; Palmer, 1988: 25; Greenbaum and Quirk, 1990: 40; Swan, 1996: 141; Shammas, 1998: 49; and Collins, 2005: 8):

(58) a- {
  I **don't dare** ask.
  I **don't dare** to ask.
} (negation)

b- {
  Does he **dare** ask?
  Does he **dare to** ask?
} (inversion)

As a **MM**, *dare* exhibits abnormal time reference in that it can be used, without inflection but with negation or implied negation, for past as well as present time:

(59) The king was so hot-tempered that **no one dare tell** him the bad
     news.

(Quirk et al., 1985: 138)

The past tense form ***dared*** without **do-**support may be regarded as another example of a blended form (henceforth **BF**), since the '–ed' past inflection is not characteristic of **MAVs**:

(60) They **dared not** carry out their threat.

Also, ***dare not*** can be used to refer to the past:

(61) Mother **dared not** tell father she'd given away his old jacket.

(Alexander, 1988: 236)

The old preterit form ***durst*** can still be encountered in English literature acting as a subjunctive:

(62) **If only I durst speak to her!**

<div align="right">(Schibsbye, 1965: 84)</div>

Dare occurs (with unclear stress) in the following idiomatic constructions expressing a *threating rebuke*:

(63) a- **How dare you** do such a thing?

  b- **How dared you** treat her like that?

<div align="right">(ibid: 23)</div>

 c- **Don't you dare speak to me like that.**

<div align="right">(Quirk et al., 1985: 139)</div>

The latter example, with do-support and a bare infinitive ***speak***, is another example of a **BF**.

Children use the expression '***I dare you* + *infinitive***' to challenge each other to do frightening things:

(64) **I dare you to** run across the road with your eyes shut.

<div align="right">(Swan, 1996: 141)</div>

When looking at BrE corpus data, one will notice immediately that bare figures contradict Quirk et al.'s (1985: 138- 139), claim both for ***dare*** and

need; that: "[…] the main verb construction can almost always be used, and is in fact more common." Taeymans (2004: 2) points out, depending on many sources, that in questions and negative sentences *dare* prefer **MAV** constructions over **LV** constructions.

    Dare is ancient, its shift from the archaic to the modern meaning-structure has made hardly any noticeable difference in its employment. It may seem to be in competition with the **LV**-base *DARE*, again with no conspicuous difference in meaning but only the familiar grammatical differences (Joos, 1968: 192).

    In modern English, *dare* is not a very common verb as **MMs** *need* and *used to*. In an informal style, people generally use other expressions to express the same meaning:

   (65) He's **not afraid to say what he thinks**.
<div align="right">(Swan, 1996: 141)</div>

    Swan (ibid.) agrees with Schibsbye (1965: 23) who indicates that "*Dare* is much like *need*: as a full verb. It is regular: I am sure be dares/ be dared me to do it."

    Dare and *need* share some similar syntactic features; therefore, *need* will not be illustrated in detail like *dare* in the coming section.

2.3.2.1.1.2 Need

Anomalous *need* is similar in form to *dare*. When *need* is followed by another verb, it can have the forms either of a **LV** or (in BrE) of a **MM**.

Need most often has the same forms as **LVs**: the third person singular has '–s', usually followed by to-infinitive, and question and negation are made with *do*-support:

(66) a- This **boy needs to** work harder. (third person –s and to-support)

b- **Do** you **need to** finish the story? (question with *do*)

c-You **didn't need to** bring all those books to Helen. (negation with *do*)

The verb *NEED* as a **LV** may take a noun as a direct object:

(67) a- Tom **needs a new coat**.

(Nuttal and Gaist, 1968: 4)

b- I **didn't need anything**.

(Johnson and Thornley, 1966: 8)

In BrE, *need* can also have the same present tense forms as a **MAV**: the third person singular has no '–s', and question and negation are made without *do* . In this case , *need* is normally followed by an infinitive without **to**:

(68) We **needn't reserve** seats, there will be plenty of rooms.

(Swan, 1996: 141)

These modal forms are used mainly in negative sentences, but they are also possible in questions, after **if**, and in other non-assertive structures:

(69) a-   You **needn't** fill in a form.   (negation)

   Need I fill in a form?   (question)

b-   I wonder **if I need** fill in a form?   (after if clause)

   This is **the only form you need fill in** .

   (**But** '***** You need fill in a form').

c- **No one need** know.   (non-assertive structure)

In yes/no questions, a negative answer is often expected (Alexander, 1988: 229):

(70) **Need you** leave so soon?

   ~ **Surely not**/ **I hope not**.

Yes/no questions with *need* can be answered with *must* or *needn't*:

(71) **Need I** type this letter again?

   Yes, you **must** / No, you **needn't**.

'*Need+ have+ past participle*' behaves in the same way:

(72) a- **Need** you **have told** him about my plans?

   b- You **needn't have told** him about my plans.

Yes/no questions with '***need… have…?***' can be answered '**Yes, I had to** (*no choice*)' / '**No, I needn't have** (*I had a choice*)'.

    Need as a **MM** also occurs in combination with negative type of adverbs like ***never, hardly, seldom, rarely,*** and ***scarcely*** to make what are effectively negative statements:

(73) a- She **need never** know what you have just told Tom.

     b- I **need hardly** tell you how badly I feel about her sickness.

     c-   { **All you need** do is to take a taxi from the park.

           ~*You need to do nothing except take a taxi*

.

    NEED can also occur in clauses with a negative main clause:

(74) **I don't think you need** leave yet.

    With code and emphatic affirmation the auxiliary forms do not occur unless there is also negation or inversion:

(75) **I needn't** come and **neither need you**.

    As a **MM**, ***need*** has no tense contrast. To express past tense, however, we can place ***need*** before the perfective aspect:

(76) You **need not have done** it.

This is then approximately equivalent to the past tense of *NEED* as a **LV**:

(77) You **didn't need to have lied** at me.

But the '***need to***' construction does not have the counterfactual implication of the '***need have…***' construction. For instance, in the following sentence the counterfactual meaning is inappropriate, and we could not therefore replace '***did not need to say***' by '***need not have said***':

(78) Anne was too nervous to reply , but fortunately she **did not need to say** anything.

<div align="right">(Quirk et al., 1985: 139)</div>

There appears to be a mixture of the characteristics of the **LVs** and **MM** ***need***, but much less commonly, in negation and inversion when ***do*** is used and the bare infinitive also occurs:

(79) a- I **don't need ask**.   (More commonly '… **to ask**').
     b- **Does** he **need ask**?   (Almost always '… **to ask**').

After *NEED* an '–ing' form can be used in BrE, as a **LV**, with the same meaning as a **passive infinitive**:

(80) That sofa **needs cleaning** again.
      ~ *… needs to be cleaned… .*

A structure with ' *object + … ing* ' is also possible in some cases:

(81) You **need your head examining**.   (Or '… *examined*').

The following table has been designed by Quirk et al. (1985: 138) explaining the general use of *need* and *dare* as **MMs** and **LVs**:

Table (1)
The Syntax of Dare and Need

	Modal Auxiliary Construction	Main Verb Construction
Positive		He needed / dared to escape.
Negative	He needn't/ daren't escape.	He doesn't need / dare to escape.
Interrogative	Need /dare we escape?	Do we need / dare to escape?
Negative Interrogative	⌠Needn't he escape after all? ⌡Dare he not escape?	⌠Does he need to escape after all? ⌡Does he dare to escape?

Taeymans (2004: 1) indicates that *need* is coming to be used more and more as a **MM** and is thus grammaticalizing[6], while *dare* seems to be doing exactly the opposite; it is said to be degrammaticalized[7].

Finally, the modal variants of both verbs seem to be restricted to non-assertive contexts which are mainly, but not exclusively, interrogative and

negative (ibid: 2). This is perfectly in line with the grammaticalization theory: the more grammatical form is limited to non-assertive contexts, while the less grammatical form can always be used.

It can be concluded that *dare* in present-day BrE generally prefers modal syntax, while *NEED* still is a **LV** in the vast majority of cases. If *need* is grammaticalizing and *dare* is degrammaticalizing, they still have a long way to go.

2.3.2.1.1.3 Ought to

Ought to is one of the **MMs** which differs from *dare* and *need* in having to-infinitive construction. *Ought to* has no inflexions (i.e. the same form is used for all persons):

(82) **She ought to** understand the lesson. (***** 'She oughts…').

Ought to has subcontracted negative *ought not to* and the contracted negative *oughtn't to*. Questions and negations are made without **do**:

(83) a- **Ought we to** go now?   ('***Do** we ought …?').
    b- It **oughtn't to** rain today.

 Negative (*oughtn't*/ *ought not to*) and interrogative forms are rarer than their counterparts with *should* (Dury, 2004: 6 and Fuchs, 1988: 259). Collins (2005: 5) notes a widespread tendency for *ought to* to be avoided in questions and negation from in the elicitation studies which suggest strongly that this

avoidance occurs in favour of *should*, for BrE, American English (henceforth AmE), Australian English (henceforth AusE) and New Zealand English (henceforth NZE):

(84) He **ought to** be here soon, **shouldn't he**?

It normally has the to-infinitive when we miss out repetition of the main verb (although occasionally in familiar style the bare infinitive occur in non-assertive contexts):

(85) a- My view point on this is that we **ought to make** concessions.
(Marckwardt and Fred, 1938: 118)

b- **Oughtn't we (to) send** for the police?
(Quirk et al., 1985: 139)

In assertive contexts, however, the to-less form is unacceptable:

(86) **We** { **ought to** } **give** George another chance.
{ ***ought** }

This makes *ought to* different from other **MAVs**.

The '**to**' is also optional following *ought* in ellipsis (in conversation):

(87) Anna : You ought to paint your hall door.
Bill : Yes, I know I **ought (to)**.

But it is not used in question tags:

(88) We ought to wake Helen, **oughtn't we**? (***** '… oughtn't we to?')

<div align="right">(Swan, 1996: 397)</div>

Like ***must***, ***ought to*** has only one form (Johnson and Thornley, 1966: 12). It usually means present time, but in indirect speech it may describe past time:

(89) a- **He ought to work harder than he does**.   (Present time)

     b- **I told him what ought to be done**. ⎤ (Past time)

     c- **I asked him what I ought to do**. ⎦

We can use '***ought to have+ past participle***' to express certain ideas about the past. This structure can be used to talk about things which were supposed to happen but did not, or to make guesses or draw conclusions about things which are not certain to have happened:

(90) a- You ought to have helped your grandfather with the heavy work around the house. (*it were supposed to happen but it didn't*)

<div align="right">(Pollock, 1982: 202)</div>

     b- The Simons **ought to have got back from holiday   yesterday**. Has anybody seen them?   (*uncertainty*)

It is also possible to talk about things that ***ought to*** have happened by now, or by a future time:

(91) a- It is nine o'clock . She **ought to have arrived** at her class **by now**. (present)

b- We **ought to have finished** building the school **by the end of next week**. (future)

Treating ***ought to*** as a **LV** with ***do***-support, which is usually described as a dialectal usage, proved to be the least popular alternative with some people, especially with British teenage informants (Quirk et al., 1985: 140):

(92) a- They **didn't ought to** lie at the teacher.

b- **Did** they **ought to** be at this situation?

However, the existence of this construction, even if it is not part of standard English, is an indicator of the marginal status of ***ought to*** which, like the other **MMs**, shows some tendency to pattern as a **LV**.

In informal style, it is common to avoid them by using a structure with '**think…** ***ought to***' or by using ***should***:

(93) a- **Do** you **think** we **ought to** run now? (Less formal than '**ought we to…?**')

b- I **don't think** Lucy **ought to** shout like that.

c- **Should** we run now?

Quirk et al. (1985: 140) say   "more generally, such results reflect change and uncertainty in the use of certain modals which, from a historical view-point, are in decline."

2.3.2.1.1.4 Used to

When **used to** means '*make use of*' it is perfectly regular and has the voiced sound always **/ ju:z, ju:ziz, ju:zd /**, but when it means '*be in the habit of* ' it enters into the class of **MAVs** (Jespersen, 1965: 13).

'*Used + infinitive*' is used to talk about past habits and status which are now finished:

   (94) a- Peter **used to speak French**, but **he doesn't any more**.

(Drummond, 1972: 210)

   b- Mary's grandparents **used to live here**.

(Spankie, 1987: 92)

Used to combines with *be* and *have* (possession) to describe past status [8]:

   (95) a- I **used to be a waiter**, but now **I'm** a taxi-driver.   (past status)

   b- I **used to have a beard**, but **I've** shaved it off.   (past possession)

The simple past tense can refer to activities and happenings during a period of past time. They are matters of customs and habits during a past time or they are constant or often repeated activities.

Generally *used to* does not go with **since** and **for phrases** that measure the length of the past time period and others such as '*all his life*' etc. [9]:

(96) a- He **always used to ask** for tea. ⟹ He always asked for tea.

b- I **often used to meet** Bob in the park. ⟹ I often met Bob in the park.

c- We **never used to talk** about politics. ⟹ We never talked about politics.

'*Used to do something*' has no present form (and no progressive perfect, infinitive or -ing forms). The speaker cannot say '*I use to do*'. To talk about present habits and status, we usually just use the simple present tense '*I do*':

(97) a-
$$\begin{cases} \text{He **used to smoke**.} & \text{(past tense)} \\ \text{He **smokes**.} & \text{(present tense)} \end{cases}$$

b-
$$\begin{cases} \text{We **used to live in London**.} & \text{(Past tense)} \\ \text{We live in London.} & \text{(Present tense)} \end{cases}$$

Used to is a very marginal member of the **PVs**. In terms of the **NICE** properties (Section 2.2) its status is very dubious since some forms are much more acceptable than others:

(98) He **used to** act like that. ⟹ **Used he to** act like that?

(Palmer, 1987: 170)

Some speakers of English might feel uncomfortable with some of these expressions, that they are slightly substandard.

41

In a formal style, *used to* can have the forms of a **MAV** (question and negative sentences without *do*), especially in BrE. The modal question forms are rare:

(99) a- I **used not to** like opera, but now I do.

(Or 'I **used to not** like opera …')

b- **Used you to** play basketball at school?

These forms are not used in tags:

(100) You **used not to** like Richard, did you? (***** '…used you?')

These forms are relatively rare. *Usedn't* **/ju:s*nt/** is probably avoided because it is difficult to say and spell. *Did* and *didn't* are more commonly used to form questions and negative sentences in such instances.

In an informal style, it is more common to use ordinary question and negative forms with **PV** *do*:

(101) a- **Did you use to** play basketball at school?
b- I **didn't use to** like opera but now I do.

In negation, the operator construction, which avoids the dilemma, is preferred by many in BrE:

(102) a- { He **usen't to** smoke. } BrE
{ He **used not to** smoke. }

b- { He **didn't use to** smoke. } BrE and AmE
{ He **didn't used to** smoke. }

(Quirk et al., 1985: 140)

Some speakers tend to avoid the problem of negating *used to* by employing the negative adverb **never**:

(103) I **never used to** watch television.

In spoken English, we cannot tell whether a speaker is saying '***Did he use to***' or '***Did he used to***' , since what we hear is **/juːst/** not **/juːzd/** as in ***used*** (~ *made use of*) (Alexander, 1988: 134).These forms are not often written, they are sometimes spelt '***did … used to***' and '***didn't …used to***'; many people consider these spellings incorrect (Chalker, 1984: 94).

'***Used + infinitive***' has a quite different meaning from '***be used to …ing***':

(104) a- I **didn't use to** drive a big car.
  ~ *Once I didn't drive a big car, but now I do*.

(Swan, 1996: 601)

  b- I **am used to living** alone.
  ~ *I live alone and I don't find it strange or new because I've been living alone for some time*.

(Murphy, 1994: 36)

43

If a person '*is used*' to something (familiar with it) that he has experienced it so much (i.e. it is no longer strange or new), then, it is an adjective which means '*accustomed*'. It is pronounced **/u:st/**:

(105) I've lived in New York for six years now, **so I'm used to the noise**.

'***Be used to …ing***' as an adjective is out of the limits of the subject of the present study so it will not be discussed any more.

2.3.2.1.2 Semantic Characteristics

Modality, as already has been defined in Section (2.3), is expressed in English mainly by means of the **MAVs**. Yet it is not impossible to realize a modal concept by using a lexical item, but that would seem unusual or even strange in conversational English.

In theoretical discussions of modality in English, periphrastic expressions are often cited as equivalent of modal statements. Both "**He can do it**" and "**He is able to do it**" may be theoretically introduced as equivalent realization of the same modal concept, namely *ability*. However, this could turn out to be a little different in the practical use of language. To express a certain modality periphrastically in a practical situation is likely to be rare in comparison with its syntactic expression by the **MAVs**.

It is worth noting how closely **MMs**, **modal idioms**, **semi-auxiliaries** and **catenative verbs** tend to follow the pattern of the **AuxVs** in the kinds of

44

meaning they convey. On the one hand, there are aspectual or time-indicating verbs such as *used to*, *be going to* and *be about to*. On the other hand, the largest group of these verbs are modal in their semantic function, e.g. *had better* and *be able to*.

In the **MAVs**, the constraining factors of meaning mentioned above may be divided into two types (Quirk et al.,1985: 219):

[i] Those, such as *permission*, *obligation* and *volition* which involve some kind of intrinsic human control over events; and

[ii] Those such as *possibility*, *necessity* and *prediction*, which do not primarily involve some kind of intrinsic human control over events, and typically involve human judgment of what is or is not likely to happen (Shepherd; Rossner and Taylor, 1984: 198; and Swan, 1996: 334- 335).

These two kinds, between which there is a gradient, may be termed **INTRINSIC**, which refers to actions and events that humans (or other agents) directly control: meanings relating to *permission*, *obligation*, or *volition* (or *intention*), and **EXTRINSIC** modality [10], which refer to the logical status of events or states, usually relating to assessments of likelihood: *possibility*, *necessity*, or *prediction* (Dury, 2004: 4- 5; Osner, 2004: 1). One important observation about the modals is that each one of them has both *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* uses: for example, *may* has the meaning of *permission* (*intrinsic*) and the meaning of *possibility* (*extrinsic*). *Will* has the meaning of *volition* (*intrinsic*) and the meaning of *prediction* (*extrinsic*). However, there are areas

of overlap and neutrality between the *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* sense of a modal: *will* in the sentence such as ' **I'll see you tomorrow then**' can be said to combine the meanings of *volition* and *prediction*. Another point of significance is that the modals themselves tend to have overlapping meanings, such that in some circumstances (but not in others), they can be more or less interchangeable. ***Should*** and ***ought to***, for example, are more or less interchangeable with the meaning of *obligation* and *tentative inference* (**Figure 1: 47**). ***Can*** and ***may*** overlap to a small extent in the areas of *permission* and *possibility*, but this overlap is almost entirely confined to written or formal English, and these **MAVs** are very far from being generally in free variation (Dury, 2004: 4-5; and Palmer, 1987: 69-98).

With Palmer (1987: 10-14) , **MAVs** are classified into two types : (**i**) **subject oriented** and (**ii**) **discourse oriented**. These two types of **MAVs** are noticed by those who have studied **MAVs** semantically. It is noticed that **MAVs** are paired; (***will, shall***), (***can, may***), (***must, ought to***), (***dare, need***) and singled (***used to***). This pairing is related to what is called subject orientation and discourse orientation. "Strictly, this classification is a classification not of modals themselves but of their uses." (ibid: 100)

The following figure gathers the **MAVs** in groups with similar or overlapping meanings.

Figure (1)

Meanings of the Modals

GROUP I

can/could **(2.3.1.1)** — permission / possibility, ability [11] — *may/might* **(2.3.1.2)**

INTRINSIC

EXTRINSIC

GROUP II

must **(2.3.1.5)**
have (got) to
need (nonassertive)
(2.3.2.1.2.2)

obligation / necessity

INTRINSIC

should
ought to
(2.3.2.1.2.3)

EXTRINSIC

__COMMITTED__ [12]   __NONCOMMITTED__

GROUP III

will/ would (2.3.1.4) — volition / prediction (future) — **shall < rare and restricted> (2.3.1.3)**

INTRINSIC

EXTRINSIC

This figure is taken from *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985: 221) by Quirk et al., gives a summary of the meanings of the **CMs** and some of the **MMs**. The arrows separate intrinsic from extrinsic meanings, and are reminder that the distinctions between these two forms are gradual rather than absolute. This figure does not, however, make a clear-cut of the epistemic uses of *may*, *must* and *have (got) to*; these verbs are a subcategory of the *possibility* and *necessity* meanings.

2.3.2.1.2.1 Dare

Dare is regarded as a **MM** because of its restricted usage; either as negative polarity or in the idiomatic '***I dare say...*** ' form. However, both structurally and semantically it does function within the system of modality, although in a limited way.

Dare does not fit easily into the semantic framework of the modals (Palmer, 1987: 135). It has roughly the meaning ' *have the courage to ...* ' in a rather weak sense, since it often relates to actions that do not need much courage:

(106) a- I **daren't ask** him to come.

b- **Dare I ask** him to come?

(ibid)

When *dare* is used as a **MM**, it indicates *possibility* (*tentative*) and *unwillingness* where the 3rd person singular is *dare* and the 'to' is omitted before the following infinitive (Rahtz, 1945: 67):

(107) a- I **daren't tell** my wife.   (Intrinsic/ *unwillingness*)

   b- I **dare say** that's true.   (Extrinsic/ *possibility*)

There are many words that combine *dare* to form expressions different syntactically and semantically from the **LV *DARE***. '***I dare say …***' is one of these expressions which has two idiomatic meanings which do not make any difference; '*I suppose*' and '*I accept what you say*'.

'***How dare you?***' is sometimes used as an indignant exclamation:

(108) **How dare you?** Take your hands off me at once!

(Swan, 1996: 141)

The expressions '***You dare!***' and '***Don't you dare!***' are sometimes used to discourage people from doing unwanted things (Thomson and Martinet, 1980: 137; and Alexander, 1988: 237) :

(109) a- Mummy, **can I** draw a picture on the wall?

   You dare!

(ibid.)

   b- **Don't you dare** speak to me like that.

As a LV, ***dare*** means '*to challenge*':

(110) I **dared** him to do it.

(Rahtz, 1945: 67)

But the **MMs** (as opposed to the **LV** *DARE* with to) have some characteristics of the **MAVs**, so that *daren't* in example (106) has a semi-conditional or tentative meaning with a sense of *would(n't) dare to* than to *doesn't dare*.

Similarly, the past tense form '*daren't have*' differs from *didn't DARE* in being closer to *wouldn't have dared*:

(111) I **daren't have gone**, although I wanted to.

<div align="right">(ibid.)</div>

This is similar to the function of *need* and the conditional uses of *should* and *ought to*:

(112) a- I didn't go. I **needn't have**.

      b- I **should have started** on the first of October.

      c- We **ought to have done** so much this year and we haven't done it.

<div align="right">(Palmer, 1990: 124)</div>

These sentences indicate that the action did not take place and would not happen. Here there is an indication of the modal nature of the **MAVs** as compared with the **LV**.

Also, **MM** *dare* can be used with past time reference though it cannot have any past tense marking:

(113) **I wanted to speak, but I daren't**.

Here there is no suggestion of conditionality, *daren't* more like *didn't DARE* than *daren't have*.

(Ibid: 112) indicates that according to the sentence level, *dare* is obliviously subject oriented. It would not , therefore, be expected that it can be voice-neutral:

(114) a- These two aspects of death cannot be successfully separated ,

but they **dare not be confused or identified**.

b- Inflation is a problem which **dare not be neglected**.

(ibid.)

In both cases, there is no agent and there are similar examples with another **CMs**:

(115) It **can easily be rubbed out**.

(ibid.)

2.3.2.1.2.2 Need

As explained in (**2.3.2.1.2.2**), *need* is both a **MM** (especially in BrE) and a **LV**. The basic meaning of *need* is *necessity* now and in the future.

Deontic **MM** *need* occurs mainly in negation (*needn't*); the opposite of *must*, to express the absence of *necessity*, and in questions, where it hopes for the answer '**No**', (i.e. it is seeking a denial of necessity) (Allen, 1959: 37; Drummond, 1972: 216; Shepherd, Rossner and Taylor, 1984: 109; Palmer,

1987: 104; Spankie, 1987: 113; Alexander, 1988: 229; Palmer, 1990: 128; and Swan, 1996: 351):

(116) a- **You must go now**.

      No, **you needn't go just yet**, you can stay a little longer.

<div align="right">(Allen, 1959: 37)</div>

  b- **Need I type** the whole page again for one error?

      No, **you needn't**.

<div align="right">(Spankie, 1987: 113)</div>

In the former example, the speaker asks whether *obligation*, *compulsion* or *necessity* is the reason for an activity or not. ***Need not*** or ***needn't*** means that there is '*no obligation*', '*no compulsion*' and '*no necessity*'; '*do this or don't do this, as you wish*'. As a result, whoever the subject is, he will probably decide not to do what isn't necessary. The answer to a '***Need…?***' Question can be affirmative: '***Yes, she must***. ***I'm sorry, but you'll have to…***'; which will be discussed latter on.

Need only occurs positively if qualified in some semi-negative way:

(117) I **need hardly say** that situation was horrible.

Or if subordinate to a non-assertive main clause:

(118) **I'm not sure whether we need go**.

MM *need* is not used to talk about *habitual, general necessity*:

(119) It's ok: - You **needn't pay** for that phone call.

(OR … You **don't need to pay** for that phone call.)

(120) You **don't need to pay** for emergency calls in most countries.

(***** 'You **needn't pay** … in most countries.')

The two forms above **needn't** and **don't need to**, are considered the negative forms of the **MM** *need* and the **LV** *NEED* with a typical difference. Both forms are used to explain *obligation* but the former form expresses *internal obligation* while the latter form explains *external obligation* though people use them interchangeably.

MM *need* can express absence of *theoretical necessity* (i.e. not necessarily true). This is a rarer meaning of **needn't** than absence of *moral necessity* to act:

(121) Why need there be life on other planets?

I agree. **There needn't be**.

Well **there needn't be**, but there could be.

(Chalker, 1984: 130)

Need as a **MM** may be considered the negative and interrogative counterpart of **must** in both the sense of *compulsion* and that of *logical necessity*.

With negation the situation is quite simply that deontic *necessity* ***mustn't*** negates the proposition, and is used to say that there is an obligation not to do something, but ***needn't*** negates the modality and is used to say that there is no obligation:

(122) a- You **mustn't paint now**.   (negation of proposition)

     b- You **needn't paint now**.   (negation of modality)

The first says that '*you must not-go*' (i.e. that you must stay), the second that '*there is no obligation to go*'.

It would be unwise, however, to see ***need*** and ***must*** as semantically equivalent. This becomes clear in the interrogative forms where there are two possibilities:

(123) a- **Must I eat**?

     b- **Need I eat**?

It is not enough to say that ***need*** supplies the non-assertive form for ***must***. Moreover, that ***must*** expresses *obligation*, usually (though not always) associated with the speaker (i.e. an *obligation* not to do something), but ***need*** expresses a *need* or *requirement* (i.e. there is no *obligation*). ***Needn't*** becomes available as the negative because the absence of requirement excludes *obligation*, including *obligation* imposed by the speaker:

(124) a- **You mustn't tell Margaret. I don't want her to know**. (*obligation*)

     b- **You needn't tell Jennifer, she already knows**.   (*requirement*)

<div align="right">(Swan, 1996: 352)</div>

But in the interrogative there is a potential contrast between '*Do you oblige me to go?*' and '*Is there any need for me to go?*' and this is essentially the contrast made by '***Must I ?***' and '***Need I ?***'.

There are also negative-interrogative forms:

(125) a- **Mustn't I type** the letter?
     b- **Needn't I type** the letter?

The most obviously interpretation of ***mustn't*** is in terms of a positive assertion of the *obligation 'Isn't it the case that I must go?*'. Although native speaker's intuition is uncertain here, it seems that '*Mustn't I type …?*' **could** also mean '*Is it the case that I mustn't type …?*' and that '*Needn't I type …?*' is to be interpreted as a positive question about negated modality '*Is it the case that I needn't type …?*' (Palmer, 1987: 127).

Although there is no past tense form for ***must***, there are two forms for ***need***; ***needn't have***, that refer to something which took place but was unnecessary, and ***didn't have (need) to***, that refers to something which was unnecessary and so didn't take place:

(126) a- He **needn't have** bought a car.
     ~ He **had two already**. Then they were three!

(Spankie, 1987: 115)

This means simply that there was no '*need* or *necessity for the subject to buy a car*'. This strongly suggests that ***need***, unlike ***must***, is never strictly deontic. It just indicates *necessity* (or *need*) without in any way suggesting

that it implies *obligation* imposed by the speaker. For strictly deontic modals have by definition, no past tense forms.

   b- I **didn't need to** go into work and so I spent the morning catching
      up at home.

<div align="right">(Parrot, 2000: 126)</div>

Needn't have functions very like the forms **shouldn't have** and **oughtn't to have** in being essentially *conditional* and *unreal*; but negating the *necessity*, instead of the preposition; the *unreality* relates to the proposition, with the implication that the event would not have taken space (but probably did). The contrasting paraphrases are then:

Shouldn't have/ oughtn't have   ' *was "necessary not" and would not have* happened'

Needn't have   '*was "not-necessary" and would have happened'*.

<div align="right">(Palmer, 1990: 128)</div>

It would be unusual, therefore, to say:

   (127) **I didn't go. I needn't have**.

<div align="right">(ibid: 129)</div>

But it would be perfectly natural to say:

   (128) **I went, but I needn't have**.

<div align="right">(ibid.)</div>

It is possible, and indeed, more common even in BrE, to replace the **MM** *need* by the intrinsic **need to** or **have to** accompanied by *do*-support (Allen, 1959: 36-44):

(129) a- **Need they** make all that noise?

~ **Do they need / have to** make all that noise? (Especially in BrE).

b- **You needn't** worry about the test.

~ **You don't need / have to** worry about that test. (Especially in BrE).

(Quirk et al., 1985: 226)

The **LV** *NEED* occurs positively, but the meaning is different from *must*. With *must*, the feeling of *speaker-obligation* is stronger. With *need* (though ultimately the words reflect the speaker's opinion) there can be an implication *internal necessity* in the person/thing spoken about (Chalker, 1984: 130):

(130) a- [**Mother to child**] : **You must eat your dinner**. (*speaker-obligation*)

~*I'm your mother and I say so*.

b- [**Friend to friend**]: **You need to eat more**. You are so thin. (*internal necessity*).

(ibid.)

Must is possible in the second example, but would make the *advice* sound more speaker-related.

Both ***needn't*** and ***don't need to*** negate ***need*** and not the **LV** that follows: '*There is no necessity to...*'. This contrasts with ***mustn't*** which negates the following **LV**: '**You must not do it**'. This explains why answers to both ***must*** and ***need*** questions can be the same:

(131) **Need / must I** really do this again?

   Yes, you must./ **Well, no, you needn't**.

With questions, **MM** '*Need I ?*' is often more intensely listener-related than **LV** '*Do I need to?*', '*Need I …?*' is hoping for the answer '**No**'. '*Do I need to …?*' is more concerned with the external facts of the situation (Joos, 1968: 192; Leech, 1971: 81):

(132) a- **Need you see the doctor again**? (**Surely not!**)

   b- **Do you need to see the doctor**? (Open question. **Perhaps you need to**).

Will/ shall can combine with ***have to*** and ***NEED to*** (**LV**) for explicit future reference:

(133) I'll { **need to** { be at the bank before 9 tomorrow.

   have to leave Paris before 9 tomorrow.

   be leaving Paris before 9 tomorrow.

   (Alexander, 1988: 230)

At the same time, the **LV** *NEED* can indicate past reference:

(134) a- They **needed to** learn it.

    b- You **didn't need to** ask her.

In present positive interrogation there seems to be no difference in meaning between the **MM** and the **LV** *NEED*, both merely questioning the *necessity* (Palmer, 1990: 128). This is clear enough in the comparison of:

(135) a- **Need I say more**? ⎫ (*necessity*)

    b- **Do I need to say more**? ⎭

There is no difference in meaning between the above two sentences and the answer will be expected to be '***No, you needn't / don't need to***'.

2.3.2.1.2.3 Ought to

Here, the researcher turn to another **MM**, ***ought to*** which is used basically to express *obligation* (or *duty*) and *probability*:

(136) a- **People ought to let one know** before failing to keep an appointment. (*obligation*)

                                          (Gethin, 1983: 128)

    b- Your father is recovering well . **He ought to be home soon**. (*Probability*)

Deontic ***ought to*** [13] is a synonymous verb to ***should***, ***must*** and ***have to*** in use which express the same basic modalities of *tentative expectation*, *logical necessity* and *obligation* with some differences (**section 2.3.1.3** and **2.3.1.5**).

Ought to is usually interchangeable with ***should*** for meaning of *obligation*, *logical necessity* and *tentative expectation* (*assumption*), but ***shall*** is more common in colloquial speech than ***ought to***. In fact even question-tags can be mixed up (Rahtz, 1945: 66; Drummond, 1972: 219; Thomson and Martinet, 1980: 135; Chalker, 1984: 128; Shepherd, Rossner and Taylor, 1984: 109; Quirk et al., 1985: 227; Palmer, 1987: 131, and 1990: 122; Alexander, 1988: 227):

(137) a- **People oughtn't to** ill-treat animals, **should they**?

(Chalker, 1984: 128)

b-**We ought to think** about what we are doing tomorrow,

shouldn't we?

(Parrott, 2000: 122)

Ought to doesn't share the other uses of ***should***. That is, ***ought to*** cannot replace ***should*** for *hypothesis* (**section 2.3.1.3**). Also ***ought to*** can be used in conditional sentences, like ***should***, but it carries the same meaning of *obligation* or *assumption* that it does elsewhere:

(138) If that be (not) the case. **I ought to leave**.

We can use ***ought to*** to tell people that they have a *duty* to do things (i.e. *obligation*); and to ask about our *duty*. The meaning is very similar to that of ***should***; but it is not so strong as ***must***:

(139) a- **You** { **should** / **ought to** } jump the fence.　　　(*obligation*)

　　b- You really **must go** to church next Sunday.　(*strong obligation*)

Another difference between ***must*** and ***should***/***ought to*** is that ***must*** does not allow that the event will not take place:

　(140) a- **He ought to come**, **but he won't**.

　　　b- *** He must come, but he won't**.

Must seems to represent an *obsolete obligation*, not envisaging non-compliance. ***Ought to*** and ***should*** express less *obsolete obligation* and do not exclude non-compliance. Often they imply that the event will not take place:

(141) a- **He ought to be at school**, **but he is not**.　}(less *obsolete-*
　　b- **You should dig more, you don't dig enough**. }*obligation* than ***must***)

Another meaning of ***ought to*** and ***should*** is the *tentative expectation*. We can use ***ought to*** to say that we guess or conclude that something is probable; because it is logical or normal:

(142) **George** { **ought to** / **should** } **be here soon, he left home at eight**.

61

However, **ought to** and **should** are quite neutral in their *implication of actuality* (especially where there is reference to future events):

(143) That **won't happen again**, so I $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\textbf{ought to}\\\textbf{should}\end{array}\right\}$ **enjoy** it.

There is no necessary implication that the event does not or will not happen. The speaker does not fully commit himself to that *implication*, as he would have done with **has to**. In the following example what is *necessary*, is also *true*:

(144) **It** $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\textbf{ought to}\\\textbf{should}\end{array}\right\}$ **be a good shoe, at that price**.

Like **must**, in the *logical necessity* use, **ought to** and **should** generally reflex the *speakers' authority*; but unlike **must**, they do not reflex that the speaker has confidence that the recommendation will be done really. In fact, with the perfect aspect, **ought to** and **should** basically have the *stronger implication* that the recommendation has not been done (Leech, 1971: 94):

(145) **They** $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\textbf{ought to}\\\textbf{should}\end{array}\right\}$**have place in the government.**

(The likely implication is ' *… but they didn't* ').

The implication is, of course, that the subject failed to reach the standards suggested.

This is in striking contrast with ***had to*** which generally stronger and implies that the event did, in fact, take place:

(146) The doctor **had to be patient** with his patience.

While ***had better*** is considered closer in meaning to ***ought to*** and ***should*** and implies a *warning* or a *threat* of possible bad consequences (Azar, 1999: 160):

 (147) **You had better take care of the cat in your hand**.

Another difference between ***ought to***, ***should*** (in the sense of *tentative expectation*) and ***must*** is that the former **MM** tend to carry over from their *obligatory* sense the suggestion that the proposition within their scope is desirable:

(148) a-There ⎰ **ought to** ⎱ **be another change in government shortly**.
 ⎱ **should** ⎰

 b- There ⎰**ought to** ⎱**be another disaster shortly**.
 ⎱**should** ⎰

The second sentence is decidedly odd, suggesting that the speaker takes a favorable view of disaster.

One might imagine, from the form itself ***ought to have/should have***, in parallel with similar forms for the epistemic modals, that have indicated the pastiness of the proposition. This would make little semantic sense; there can

63

be no *obligation, duty, necessity* in the present to perform acts in the past because it is modality that is referred to as being past (Palmer, 1990: 124).

In this sense, the behaviour of ***should/ought to*** and ***should have/ought to have*** exactly parallel that of ***could*** and ***could have***. The latter forms have the following essential characteristics:

[**i**] These forms are considered the *unreal conditional* forms of ***can***, present and past respectively.

[**ii**] *Unreality* often relates not to the modality, but to the proposition, from the semantic point of view. Thus, ***could*** doesn't mean ***would be able*** but ***is able*** and ***would***, while ***could have*** often means ***was able and would have*** (**section 2.3.1.1**).

These, then, are the *unreal* forms of the *possibility* modal. It is not implausible to argue that ***ought to / should*** and ***ought to have / should have*** are the parallel forms of the *necessity* modal. It explains why ***should*** and ***ought to*** usually hold the meaning that the event does not or did not happen (for that is a characteristic of *unreality*), and why the past tense form is formed with ***have*** (ibid.).

The negative forms ***shouldn't*** and ***oughtn't to***, like ***mustn't***, negate the proposition, not the modality. This form hold the meaning of a *tentative obligation* not to act:

(149) a- **You oughtn't(to)/shouldn't smoke** too much. ⎫ (*undone tentative*
     b-**You oughtn't(to)/shouldn't have left** your home. ⎭ *obligation*)

In negation of *ought to*, there is a tendency to delete the infinitive **to**. Also it is preferable to use *should* in the negative form instead of *oughtn't to*.

By contrast with negation (but also like *must*), the interrogative forms of *should* and *ought to* question the modality by asking whether there is a *tentative obligation*:

(150) a- **Ought the manager to shout loudly**?

b- **Should Adam paint the fence**?

Tentative obligatory modality cannot be negated by using *should* and *ought to*. But there is no need to negate *tentative obligation* because the absence of *tentative obligation* is covered by the absence of *obligation* in general, therefore, *needn't* is available:

(151) a- **The officer needn't present a report** to his manager.

b- The Samson's **needn't have gone early**.

Thus, the following rough paraphrases can summarize the negative state of *should* and *ought to* (Palmer, 1990: 126) :

"Shouldn't/oughtn't to	' is " necessary-not " and would not happen'
Shouldn't have/oughtn't to have	' was "necessary-not" and would not happen"

2.3.2.1.2.4 Used to

      Used to can be used to talk about *past habits* and *states* which are now finished[(14)]:

(152) a- He **didn't use/ usen't to** worry about his health or his pocket.
      (*Past habit*)

                                    (Gethin, 1983: 117)

      b- That bingo hall **used to be** a cinema. (*Past state*)

                                    (Swan, 1996: 599)

      Used to can refer to activities and happenings during a period of past time. They were contrast of often repeated activities or they were matters of custom and habit during a past time. Happenings and activities began and ended in the past. *Past habit* can be referred to in the following ways:

(153) When I worked on a farm, I   { always used to   } get up at 6 a.m.
                                would always
                                always   + got up at 6 a.m.

      Used to is largely synonymous with **would**, but like the past tense, in having the meaning of *habitual action*. **Would** can be used to express an action that was repeated regularly in the past:

(154) a- **When I was a child , my father would read me a story** at night before bedtime.   (*repeated action in the past*)

      b- **When I was a child , my father used to read me a story** at night before bedtime.   (*habitual action*)

                                    (Azar, 1999: 195)

Would is often used to talk about regular activities, particularly in narrative, or when we are reminiscing. *Would* is never used at the beginning of a story; the scene must first be set with the simple past or *used to*. In familiar narrative, *would* can be reduced to '*'d*' :

 (155) " When I was a boy we always spent (or used to spend) our
          holidays on a farm. We'd get up at 5 and we'd help milk the cows.
          Then we'd return to the farm kitchen, where we would eat a huge
          breakfast." (Alexander, 1988: 235)

Although there is some connection between *would* and *used to*, there are two differences. First, *would* is *subject oriented* in a way that *used to* is not:

(156) Day after day, **I would see my sister's son getting sick**.

The above example describes an unpleasant characteristic of the subject, and this would not have been indicated by *used to*. Secondly, *would* normally suggests that the action is *alternative*, whereas *used to* does not:

(157) a- **Sara would live in that apartment**.   (the action is *alternative*)
          ~ *Whenever she come / in those days*.
      b- Sara **used to** live in that apartment.   (the action is *not alternative*)
          ~ *In those days*.

Used to, not *would*, combines with *be*, *have* (possession) and other stative verbs to describe *past states*:

(158) a- **I used to be a teacher**, but now I'm a writer.   (*past state*)

b- **Brown used to have a beard** , but he has shaved it off .

(*past possession*)

If we use past tenses instead of **used to**, we need a time reference:

(159) **I was a teacher years ago**, but now I'm a writer.

Although **used to** refers to things that happened at an earlier stage of one's life and are now finished, it is not used simply to say what happened at a past time, or how long it looks, or how many times it happened:

(160) a- I **worked** very hard last month.

(*** I used to work …**).

b- I **lived** in France for two years.

(*** I used to live …**).

The term '**be used to**' is different from **used to** syntactically (**section 2.3.2.1.1.4**) and semantically. '**Be used to**' means '*be accustomed to*':

(161) **Sally is used to cold weather**.

~ *Sally is accustomed to cold weather*.

The latter sentences have the same meaning ' *living in a cold climate is usual and normal to Sally*.' Cold weather, snow and ice do not seem strange to her.

'**Be used to**' and '**be accustomed to**' are followed by an –ing verb form (a gerund):

(162) a- Sally **is used to living** in a cold weather.

b- Sally **is accustomed to living** in a cold weather.

2.3.2.2 Ambiguity of Marginal Modals

MMs have many ambiguous forms within the syntactic and semantic characteristics which are related to different reasons. Some of these reasons are historical or dialectal ones which are related to the changeability of the spoken language through time, other are related to the different view points of linguists and grammarians, which are also related to the changeability of the spoken language.

Foster (2005: 1) indicates that with **MMs** there is a little dialect variation because not every modalizing thing happens at once. He adds that *ought to* and *need* are fully **MMs** while *dare* is a transitional verb time. His view point can put a spot of light into the variation of view points of linguists and grammarians in dealing with **MMs**.

The **BFs** of *dare* and *need* are good examples of the dialectal variation:

(163) a- **Does Bath dare leave** her youngest brother alone?

b- **I don't need speak** with Nigel.

Speakers of BrE and AmE have mixed **MMs**' syntax with that of the **LVs** for more easier pronunciation and use in order to serve their needs (this subject has been explained in detail in section **2.3.2.1.1.1** and **2.3.2.1.1.2**).

Ought to has also been influenced by the dialect variation. It can be used with *did* which is dialectal use especially in BrE teenage informant, as with example (91) (**section 2.3.2.1.1.3**) " They **didn't ought to lie** at the teacher".

The same behaviour can be seen with *used to* which has many forms to confuse the speaker due to dialectal variation and special needs of English native speakers. These forms are *usedn't to, didn't used to* and *didn't use to* in negation; and '*Used+ S.+ to*', '*Did+ S.+ used to*' and '*Did+ S.+ use to*' in interrogation (**section 2.3.2.1.1.4**).

The historical change also has its role in adding ambiguity to **MMs**. For example, *dare* which has an old form *durst* that can be seen in English literary works acting as a subjunctive, as in example (61) (**section 2.3.2.1.1**) " **If only I durst speak to her!**" (Schibsbye, 1962: 84).

Quirk et al. (1985: 140) say " more generally, such results reflect change and uncertainty in the use of certain modals which, from a historical view-point, are in decline". Thus, the forms of **MMs** are not fully interchangeable. On the other hand, there are differences with regard to meaning, positive and non-positive contexts and British and American use.

MMs' semantics are interchangeable with that of the **MAVs** which cause a great gap of ambiguity. **MMs** and equivalents can be used to express more than one modal meaning in the same clause:

(164) a- They **will have to** hand in the essay very soon. (*prediction + obligation*)

b- They **might need to** come earlier.   (*possibility+ obligation*)

c- I **wouldn't dare** to go to Kosovo.   (*hypothesis+ willingness*)

d- A computer **ought to be able** to do this.   (*obligation+ ability*)

e- Exporters **won't be willing** to support goods on credit. (*prediction + willingness*)

(Mayhew, 2004: 6)

Ought to is interchangeable with *should* and *must* but with some differences in use. It is replaced by *should* for the meaning of *obligation* and *necessity*. Palmer (1990: 122) states that "It is not at all clear that,…, English makes any distinction between should and ought to." There are sentences in which *ought to* cannot be replaced by *should*. Dury (2004: 1) indicates that the interpretation of *ought to* in **"At that price, it ought to be good"** is inevitably indeterminate between epistemic ('*I infer that …*') and deontic ('*the producer has a moral obligation to offer a good product*'). These two forms of interpretation are possible. Thus, this sentence can be considered ambiguous.

The distinction between the use of *ought to* and *should* is very obvious that leads to an ambiguous use; this distinction has been explained in (**section 2.3.2.1.2.3**). While, *need* is similar to *must* in the sense of *compulsion* and

logical necessity when it is used in negation and interrogative sentences. It is possible that the use of **need to** or **have to** accompanied by **do**-support is more common even in BrE than using **need** alone. This interference may make speakers of English language feel confuse with which verb they shall use with the different levels of obligation.

On the other hand, **dare** has many expressions like '**I dare say**', '**you dare**', '**don't you dare**'. These expressions hold different meanings which are used in different situations. Also, **used to** and **be going** can be used to indicate different time reference, though they may be possible if the time is not already marked in a relative clause (Palmr, 1987: 44):

(165) a- The man next to me **used to be** the mayor.

b- The man next to me **is going to be** the mayor.

(ibid)

These are ambiguous sentences. The interpretation of these two sentences that "*the man who is or was next to me used to be or is going to be the mayor*, but they could also mean that it used to be or is going to be the case that *the man next to me is the mayor*." (ibid.). The time reference in **used to** and **is going to** may relate either to the man being the mayor, or to my sitting next to him.

Used to is synonymous with **would** in having the meaning of *habitual action*. There are certain places that **would** cannot be used in while **used to** can be. Some of these places are; the use of **would** at the beginning of a story or to talk about regular activities particularly in narrative. Also, there are

certain differences between them; first, *would* is *subject oriented* in a way that *used to* is not; as with example (155) in section (**2.3.2.1.2.4**) "**Day after day, I would see my sister's son getting sick**"; secondly, *would* normally suggests that the action is alternative, whereas *used to* does not, as with example (156/a) " **Sara would live in that apartment**"; and (b) "**Sara used to live in that apartment**" in the same section. All these rules may cause ambiguity to the speakers of English.

Another cause of ambiguity is the variation of the view points of linguists and grammarians about the term and the number of **MMs**. Joos (1968: 22-30) calls **MMs**, **quasi-auxiliaries** which are: *be to, be going to, be about to, be able to, be supposed to, have to* and *used to*; for him *ought to* is a modal proper. Chalker (1984: 92) names them **semi-modals** which are: *dare, need* and *used to*. Quirk et al. (1985: 136) names them **MMs** which are: *dare, need, ought to* and *used to*. This counter is the adopted one as mentioned previously. Palmer (1988: 94) calls them **semi-auxiliaries**, as Chalker does but he differs in the verbs that are considered **MMs**, which are: *be bound to, be able to, have (got) to, be going to, be willing to* and *used to*.

Thus, **MMs** are ambiguous since they can be used as **MAVs**, **LVs** or in **BFs**. These different uses of **MMs** may cause syntactic and semantic confusion to the user of English language.

2.4 Previous Studies

Through reviewing previous studies concerning investigating the difficulties faced by Iraqi EFL university students in using **MMs**, the researcher has found some studies of Iraqi and non-Iraqi researchers. These studies are not adequate empirical studies on **MMs** but there are previous studies on **MAVs** that shed light on **MMs** in general without going deeply with their syntactic and semantic rules. These studies have encountered the **MMs** with their general syntactic and semantic rules only, without dealing with these rules in detail.

2.4.1 Abdul-Wahid (1982)

The purpose of this study was to make a full illustration of the term '**modality**' and its types with pedagogical orientation. It went deeply with types of modality in detail with a general reference to **CMs**. Although, the researcher used a diagnostic test that focused mainly on types of modality, it didn't cover **MMs**' semantics.

2.4.2 Sa'ad (1996)

This study was conducted to measure the effect of teaching **MAVs** through the Structural and the Communicative Approaches. It is limited to first-year college students in the Department of English at University of Baghdad. A test had been applied on two groups of learners using the two approaches in order to find the differences of teaching **MAVs** with these approaches. It went

deeply with the syntax and semantics of the **CMs** with a little comment on the **MMs**' semantics only.

2.4.3 Mohammad (2002)

Mohammad's study sated out to investigate complex verb phrase in English depending on two different views expressed by R. Quirk and F. Palmer. It was restricted to the following points:

1. The concept of complexity in the English verb phrase concentrating on those constructions or structures which contain complex verb phrase.

2. It didn't concentrate on the classes of verbs, such as stative and dynamic, etc.

3. It considered a combination of the Quirkian and Palmerian models.

It aimed at:

1. Locating various structures which express complex verb phrase.

2. Distinguishing between tense and time, on one hind, and between tense and aspect, on the other hand.

3. Identifying the various types of **AuxVs** used within the structure of complex verb phrase.

4. Making a distinction between **AuxVs** and **LVs** on the basis of certain criteria.

Mohammad found out that complex verb phrase containing full verbs can be divided into those containing catenatives and those containing phrasal verbs. Catenatives combine with other verbs by means of strict rules of co-occurrence. Phrasal verbs involve two types of particles: adverbial and prepositional.

2.4.4 Taeymans (2004)[15]

This study offered an account of the alternative uses of *dare* and *need* through time and the percentages of the three constructions' uses of them in BrE. This study focused mostly on the development of the uses of *dare* and *need* through time (**1960$_s$- 1990$_s$**) by using a Corpus-based Approach. It didn't account the syntactic and semantic states of these two **MMs**, since, it was a historical study of the variation of these two verbs.

2.4.5 Collins (2005)[16]

Collins's study surveyed the features of the **MAVs** in AusE grammar as compared with AmE, BrE, and NZE. Also, he used certain statistical means to arrive at certain percentages of their uses among these languages. This study was limited to the uses of the **MAVs** in AusE and the statistical results particularly. It didn't deal with the **MMs**' syntax and semantics.

2.5 A Comparison between Previous Studies and the Present Study

The present study deals with **MMs**' syntax and semantics in detail with a focus on their irregular rules that have not been mentioned in the previous studies. Also, it focuses on the semantic interference between the **MMs**, the **CMs**, and the other types of the **MAVs**. These studies are presented in a chronological order.

Abdul-Wahid's (1982) study doesn't deal with the **MMs**' syntax at all, while it deals with their semantics in general without illustrating the semantic case of every member of the **MMs**. Since, this study is considered different from the present study; it couldn't provide the researcher with the expected help to fill the gap of knowledge of the **MMs**' syntax and semantics.

Sa'ad's (1996) doesn't mention the syntactic differences between the **MMs** and the **CMs**; also, it doesn't come across the semantic similarities between these two sub-categories of the **MAVs**. While, the present study shows the similarities and the differences between them with a detail discussion of the **MMs**' syntax and semantics. It is limited to Iraqi EFL college students in the Department of English at Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadisiya.

It is clear that Mohammad's (2002) study is a pure linguistic study that differs from the present methodological study in depending on the empirical investigation to arrive at certain results.

The present study is restricted to certain boundaries that are different from Mohammad's study boundaries. Firstly, it is restricted to the **MMs**' syntax and semantics mainly. Secondly, it is an empirical study with certain statistical means that have been applied on fourth-year class on College of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadisiya. Also, the present study has different findings from Mohammad's study in that; it aims at investigating the difficulties faced by Iraqi EFL university learners, particularly. Thus, Mohammad's study has helped the researcher in the theoretical background only, in particular, with the discussion of the **CMs**' semantics.

Taeymans' (2004) study is a historical study, that looks after the development of *dare* and *need* only through time. Thus, it can be of a little help to the researcher. While, Collins' (2005) study presents the use of the **MAVs** in three languages with the percentages of their use in these three languages. The present study is looking after the Iraqi EFL university learners of English language only.

Notes to Chapter Two

(1) The **PAV** *do* has the following forms (Quirk et al. 1985: 133):

  Non-negative: *do*, *does*, *did*

  Uncontracted negative: *do not*, *does not*, *did not*

  Contracted negative: *don't*, *doesn't*, *didn't*.

(2) The **PAV** *have* has the following forms (ibid.: 131):

  Non-negative: *have*, *has*, *had*

  Uncontracted negative: *have not*, *has not*, *had not*

  Contracted negative: *haven't*, *hasn't*, *hadn't*.

(3) It should be noted that *be* is unique among English verbs in having eight
  forms (Sledd, 1959: 74, 106-108; Quirk et al., 1972: 81):

  Non- negative: *be*, *am*, *is*, *are*, *was*, *were*, *being*, *been*

  Uncontracted negative: *am not*, *is not*, *are not*, *was not*, *were not*, *not being*

  Contracted negative: *aren't*, *isn't*, *aren't*, *wasn't*, *weren't*.

Aren't is widely used in BrE, but there is no generally acceptable contracted
form for *am not* in declarative sentences. *Ain't* is used in AmE and it is
considered by many to be substandard.

(4) The forms of **MAVs** can be classified as follows:

  Non-negative forms: *can*/*could*, *may*/ *might*, *shall*/ *should*, *will*/ *would*,
              must, *dare*, *need*, *ought to*, *used to*

  Uncontracted negative forms: *cannot*/ *could not*, *may not*/ *might not*,
              shall not/ *should not*, *will not*/ *would not*, *must*

not, *dare not*, *need not*, *ought not to*, *used not to*

Contracted negative form : *can't*/ *couldn't*, *mayn't* / *mightn't* , *shan't* / *shouldn't* , *won't* / *wouldn't* , *mustn't*, *daren't*, *needn't*, *oughtn't to*, *usedn't to*.

(5) *Mayn't* is restricted to BrE, where it is rare.

(6) When a semantic contrast is expressed using grammatical forms, it is said to be grammaticalized. (Crystal, 1997: 175). Thus, **need** is going to be used more and more in grammar and spoken language.

(7) When a word is getting to be declined more and more through time because of a synonymous word in use and function. Thus **dare** is getting to be declined.

(8) **Used to** is always past in modern English; there is no longer any **uses to**; and **had used to** is rare (Joos, 1968: 29).

(9) Sometimes, in familiar conversational style, we can use a frequency adverb (**How often …?**) but more formally, the simple past.

(10) Instead of intrinsic and extrinsic modality, other terminologies, such as modulation and modality,or root and epistemic modality, are widespread. An alternative practice is to regard the root/ epistemic distinction as a subcategorization of extrinsic modality. Another term widely used for the modality of obligation and permission is deontic.

(11) When ***can*** means *ability*, it is considered extrinsic , even though *ability* typically involve human control over an action. *Ability* is considered a special case of possibility.

(12) The meaning of the label **committed** with reference to ***must***, ***have (got) to*** and ***need*** is that, the speaker is confident in the occurrence of the event or state described. While, the meaning of the label **noncommitted** with reference to ***should*** and ***ought to*** is *tentative inference*. That is, the speaker does not know if his statement is true, but tentatively concludes that it is true, on the basis of whatever he knows.

(13) Palmer(1990: 59) indicates that there are no examples of epistemic ***ought to*** were noted, but it is theoretically possible to imagine it used epistemically which seems very rarely to occur. One of the rare examples is shown by Coats (1983: 17) which is indeterminate between an epistemic and a dynamic interpretation.

(14) **Used to** is not normally stressed , but it can be stressed if the speaker wishes to emphasize the contrast between past and present (Thomson and Martinet, 1980: 137).

(15) It is unpublished Ph.D. dissertation that has been taken from internet sources by the researcher. It consists of; introduction, aims, conclusions, and references only.

(16) It is a published Ph.D. dissertation that has been taken from internet sources by the researcher.

Chapter Three
Data Collection

3.1 An Introductory Note

A variety of different types of decisions are made in almost any language programme, and language tests of various kinds can help in making those decisions. In order to test appropriately, the researcher must be very clear about his purpose for making a given decision and then match the correct type of test to that purpose.

Brown (1996: 8) points out that four kinds of decisions are primary in administering language programms, which are proficiency, placement, achievement, and diagnosis.

Throughout this chapter, a discussion of the test is presented including test objectives, material selection, test design, and the sample to which the test has been applied. Validity and reliability of the test are defined and discussed as well. Also the description of the pilot and the final tests and their scoring schemes have been mentioned.

3.2 Test Objectives

The present test has been constructed primarily to investigate the extent to which Iraqi EFL university learners master **MMs**' syntax and semantics. It is a diagnostic test which is used in assessing the strengths and weaknesses encountered by Iraqi EFL university learners in using

those verbs vice versa the instructional objectives for the purposes of correcting an individual's deficiencies.

A diagnostic test is designed to determine the degree to which the specific instructional objectives of the course have been accomplished.

The test is designed to measure the recognition and production levels. The first and second questions measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level, whereas the third, fourth and fifth questions measure their responses at the production level. The reason behind constructing three questions measuring the production level is that much more errors are committed on this level than at the recognition level as Lado (1962:20 and 1963:197;) indicates that "testing structure at a recognition basis is a relatively simple matter which can be solved under the condition that usually prevails". Accordingly, the hypotheses proposed in section (**1.3**) will be either valid or refuted.

3.3 Material Selection

Most of the items of the test have been selected from the grammar books and internet articles mentioned in Chapter Two as well as from *A University Grammar of English (Workbook)* (1974). Other sentences have been constructed by the researcher. The items cover the syntactic and semantic functions of **MMs** as far as possible.

However, the selection of the items of the test and its questions has been submitted to a jury [1] of seventeen experienced university teaching staff members whose recommendations have been taken into consideration.

---

(1)The experts to whom the test has been submitted:

Prof. Al-Jumaily Abdul Latif (Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics), College of Arts/ University of Baghdad.

Prof. Al-Rawi Sabah (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation) , College of Languages / University of Baghdad.

Prof. Hameed Salih M. (Ph.D. in Literature), College of Education/ University of Babylon.

Prof. Muslit Abdul Wahid M. (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation) , College of Languages / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Al- Ameedi Riyadh Tariq Kadhim (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Al- Annie Lamia (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Languages / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Al-Masaodi Hameed H. (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation) , College of Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Darweesh Abbas Deygan (Ph.D. in Linguistics),College of Education / University of Babylon

Asst. Prof. Hussein Hashim A. (Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language) , College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya.

Asst. Prof. Ma'aruf Firass Awad (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education (Ibn Rushed) / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Mahood Omran Moosa (Ph.D. in Linguistics),College of Education/ University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Manhal Munthir (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation),College of Language / University of Baghdad.

Instructor Al- Assadi Sámi A. (MA. in Linguistics), College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya.

Instructor Al- Hindawi Fareed H. (Ph.D. in Linguistics),College of Education / University of Babylon.

Instructor Al-Jubouri Chassib F. (Ph.D. in Methods of teaching English as a Foreign Language) , Open Educational College / University of Babylon.

Instructor Faisal Wafa'a M. (Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Instructor Hussein Maysia K. (Ph.D. in English Language and Linguistics) , College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya.

3.4 Test Design

The test consists of five questions (**Appendix**). The first two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level. The first question includes ten items intended to measure the subjects' ability to choose the right option for the right item. This question depends on the subjects' knowledge of the semantics of the **MM .** The subjects' responses to such a question will reflect the extent to which they can join the meaning of the sentence with their correct response. The subjects are provided with seven options: obligation, necessity, habitual action, advisability, expectation, hypothesis, and probability. This question contains not only the **MM** verbs but also the **AuxVs**: *would, should,* and *must*. The reason behind that is the close relation between some **CMs** or **MAVs** and the **MMs** at the semantic level. This leads to the conclusion that some items hold only one option.

In the second question, the subjects are provided with three choices: **marginal, lexical (main),** and **blended forms (marginal + lexical).** This question measures the subjects' knowledge of the **MMs**' syntax in ten items. The choice of the right option depends on the rule that charges every sentence that differs from **LVs**' rules in which its place differs from the **BFs**.

The last three questions, on the other hand, are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the production level. The third question contains ten items distributed equally over two sub-questions: **A** and **B**, each consisting of five items.

Sub-question **A** examines the semantic rule of the **MM**. The subjects are asked to produce the difference in meaning in each item which contains two sub-divisions 'A' and 'B', if there is any difference in meaning. For example, there is no difference in meaning in item number (2). The other four items consist of different meanings, one of which is the difference between '*order*' and '*advice*' that is reflected in the difference between **must** and **ought to** in item (1). Item (3) shows a slight difference between being '*brave*' and being '*impudent*'. The meaning of **probability** and **order** is shown in the difference between **must** and **ought to** in item (4). Item (5) consists of **used to** and **use(s)** that have different meaning and syntax and are related to two different states.

Sub-question **B** is a mixture of the syntactic and semantic levels applied to five items. The subjects are asked to give a response to each stimuli using the **MMs** in brackets. The response must be semantically correct by having the same meaning of the stimuli and matching the first word in the response, while syntactically correct by applying the **MMs'** rules.

One of the main differences between the **MMs** and the auxiliaries is the form of the past tense, which is intended to be examined in Question Four. The subjects are requested to produce the past tense of the **MMs** and the **MAVs** in ten items.

One of the ten sentences consists of the **MM** *used to*, item (9), which doesn't accept any change because it is past in its form, but it may take the do-support in which **didn't use/ used to** occurs. The subjects are supposed to write *'zero'* which indicates the impossibility of changing this verb. Some of the verbs accept the **did** form in its past tense, especially with **MAVs**, which can be examined in items (2), (3), (5) and (7). The other

verbs don't accept the ***did*** form because they are **MMs** as shown in items (1), (4), (6), (8) and (10).

Question Five is divided into two sub-questions: **A** and **B,** each of which contains five items. In both sub-questions, the subjects are requested to change sentences to interrogative forms in sub-question **A** and to negative forms in sub-question **B**. The sentences in the two sub-questions have the **MM** and the **MAVs** which have different syntactic rules. The subjects are asked to produce all interrogative and the negative forms because some of the sentences accept more than one form of change, as in, item (2) and (4) in sub-question **A**, and item (1) in sub-question **B**. Thus, their ability to do so can be measured.

Validity, reliability, economy, scorabilitty, and administrability are the features of a good test, therefore, they will be dealt with in some detail in the following sections.

3.5 The Sample

The sample of the study comprises of ***100*** subjects of the fourth academic year (2004-2005) of the Departments of English at the Colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Al-Qadisiya. Fifty students (17 males and 33 females) of the sample have been taken from University of Babylon while the other half (14 males and 36 females) has been taken from University of Al-Qadisiya. The first half of the sample represents (***70***%) of the total student population while the second half of the sample represents (***73***%) of the total student population. They are native speakers

of Arabic who have been studying EFL for eight years in general and four years at the Department of English. Students whose native language is other than Arabic or who have had a language contact with native speakers of English are excluded from the sample, because students from other countries other than Iraq may have English language background different from that background of Iraqi students. Also, repeaters have been excluded. Their average age is twenty-two years old.

The topic under study has been taught in their third year of study at the university while the test has been applied at the fourth year students because they are more proficient and the most advanced learners of English at the university level before graduation. The textbook adopted, which they have studied, is *A University Grammar of English* by Quirk and Greebaum (1973).

3.6 Pilot Administration

One method of estimating reliability and validity of a test is by administering parallel forms of the test to the same group called pilot administration.

The pilot test has been conducted before the actual administration of the final test on the twentieth of January, 2005 at University of Babylon, and on the eighteenth of February the same year another pilot test has been conducted at University of Al-Qadisia. This test has been administrated to twenty subjects in both of the universities, ten from every university, who have been excluded from the final administration.

The pilot administration has informed the researcher with the time allotted to answer the test and with feedback on the clarity of items and procedures, which of these items and procedures have needed modification or change by analyzing them in terms of item difficulty and discrimination.

After conducting the pilot test, the results have revealed that the time required for answering the whole items is about fifty minutes, and that some instructions needed modification because the subjects have not understood them.

3.7 Item Analysis

Item analysis is "a means of estimating how much information each single item in a test contributes to the information provided by the test as a whole'' (Davies, 1986: 192). The researcher focuses on the degree to which each item is properly written so that it can measure the desired content. Such analysis often involves making judgments about the adequacy of item formats.

This analysis is labeled according to two levels: **item facility value** and **item discrimination power**.

3.7.1 Item Facility Value

Item facility value (also called item difficulty or item easiness) refers to the proportion of correct responses to a test item (Murcia, 1991: 498). It is a statistical index used to examine the percentage of students who correctly answer a given item by using the following formula which helps to measure the levels of difficulty and easiness of each item:

$$FV = \frac{R}{N}$$

(Heaton, 1988: 178)

Where

FV= item facility value.

R= the number of correct answers.

N= the number of the students taking the test.

The application of this formula has yielded that the item difficulty and easiness range between (*0.20-0.80*). Some of the items show low facility value yet they have been involved in the final version of test because they measure certain aspects of the learners' production awareness.

Madson (1983, 181-2) states that " a test is considered too easy if more than 90 percent get it right. An item is considered too difficult if fewer than 30 percent get it right." This indicates that the present test is satisfactory. Table (3) shows the item facility value and the item discrimination power; which will be explained after the table:

Table (3)
The Facility Value and the Discrimination Power
of the Test Items

NO. OF QUESTION	NO. OF ITEM	FV	D	NO. OF QUESTION	NO. OF ITEM	FV	D
1	1	0.2	0.2	3/B	1	0.2	0.4
	2	0.4	0.4		2	0.2	0.2
	3	0.4	0.6		3	0.4	0.2
	4	0.6	0.2		4	0.6	0.4
	5	0.4	0.4		5	0	0
	6	0.8	0.6	4	1	0.4	0.2
	7	0.4	0.2		2	0.2	0.4
	8	0.4	0.4		3	0.6	0.2
	9	0.6	0.8		4	0.2	0.2
	10	0.2	0.2		5	0.4	0.2
2	1	0.4	0.4		6	0.2	0.2
	2	0.6	0.2		7	0.4	0.6
	3	0.6	0.4		8	0.4	0.4
	4	0.4	0.8		9	0.6	0.2
	5	0.4	0.4		10	0.2	0.2
	6	0.6	0.2	5/A	1	0.2	0.4
	7	0.4	0.2		2	0.2	0.6
	8	0.2	0.2		3	0.2	0.4
	9	0.8	0.6		4	0.6	0.4
	10	0.6	0.4		5	0.4	0.4
3/A	1	0.2	0.2	5/B	1	0.2	0.4
	2	0.4	0.2		2	0.6	0.2
	3	0	0		3	0.4	0.6
	4	0.6	0.2		4	0.6	0.4
	5	0.4	0.4		5	0.4	0.4

3.7.2 Item Discrimination Power

The second concept '**item discrimination power**' indicates the degree to which an item separates the students who performed well from those who performed poorly. These two groups are sometimes referred to as the high and low scores or upper and lower-proficiency students, which can be explained in the following formula:

$$D = \frac{\textbf{Correct U - Correct L}}{\textbf{N}}$$

(ibid: 180)

Where

D= discrimination power.

U= upper half.

L= lower half.

N= the number of the students taking the test in one group.

The computation of this formula has yielded that the discrimination power ranges between *0.20-0.80* (**see Table 3**). In this respect, Ahman and Glock (1975: 139) point out that good results can be obtained if the items vary in discrimination power (20% and above). Items (**3** and **5** in Question **3/A** and **B** respectively) show low discrimination power yet they have been involved in the final version of the test because they measure certain aspects of the students' recognition and production levels.

In this respect, Ebel (1972: 395) assures that if the low discrimination is not due to technical weakness in the items or to inappropriate difficulty, the test constructor can include them regardless of their low discrimination

if s/he is convinced that they do belong and are clearly relevant to some aspects of the learners' achievement to be measured by the test.

3.8 Test Virtues

The most important features of a good test are validity, reliability, and practicality (Harrison, 1993: 10). Practicality is achieved by conducting a test with economy (i.e. saving time and effort) and ease (i.e. showing smoothness of administration, responding to its items, and scoring). Validity and reliability are illustrated in the following sub-categories of the test virtues.

3.8.1 Validity

Since the researcher's main concern in this study is to measure the pupils' ability in using **MMs** both at the production and recognition levels, the techniques and items are carefully constructed so as not to give space to other grammatical aspects of language to be tested other than **MMs**. Hence validity is ensured as Brown (1996: 231) indicates that validity is "the degree to which a test measures what it claims, or purports, to be measuring." Face validity and content validity are very important types of validity which are considered standards to measure test validity.

In the words of Harris (1969: 7), face validity is "the way the test looks to the examinees, test administrations, educators, and the like." Therefore, the test has been exposed to the jury mentioned previously . For more valid and reliable test items, it has been approved by a jury of seventeen experienced university teaching staff members (**Section 3.3**).

Even a superficial inspection of the items will be sufficient to reveal that the test has face validity. If a test item looks right to other testers, teachers, moderators, and testees, it can be described as having at least face validity. Therefore the present test has been exposed to some administrators and non-expert users who have shown their approval of the test as a whole.

The adequacy of sampling of content or objectives in a test is called content validity (Murcia, 1991:497). In order to investigate content validity, " the tester must decide whether the test is a representative sample of the content of whatever the test was designed to measure" (Brown, 1996: 233).Content validation depends on the analysis of the language being tested and the objectives of a particular course (Heaton, 1988: 160). Gardner and Gliksman (1982: 193) state that for ensuring content validity, two major standards must be conducted " (1) a representative collection of items and (2) 'sensible' methods of construction." Therefore, statistical treatment of the students' scores in the pilot study has been made to ensure what is called above "sensible method of test construction." Thus, the items of the present test are assumed to be valid as they are constructed to meet the aims of the test (**Section 3.2**).

Content and face validity are most often determined on the basis of expert judgment (Burns, 2000: 352), therefore, the test has been submitted to a jury of experts (**Section 3.3**). The jury has shown its approval of the test as being valid to measure the purposes for which it is designed. The jury has given some suggestions which have been taken into consideration by replacing some sentences and modifying some instructions.

3.8.2 Reliability

One of the characteristics of a good test is reliability. It is defined by Brown (1996: 192) as "the extent to which the results can be considered consistent or stable." To ensure that, a definite scoring scheme has been used (**section 3.10**). Furthermore, the instructions of the test have been clearly explained to the subjects.

There are different methods for estimating the reliability of a test, as Burns (2000:340-344) says, such as: **test-retest, two equivalent forms, split-half, and Kurder-Richardson method.**

Kurder-Richardson is the method adopted to estimate the reliability of the present test which the following formula stands for:

$$R= \frac{N}{N-1} \left(1- \frac{m(N-m)}{NX^2} \right)$$

Where

R= reliability.

N= the number of items in the test.

M= the mean of the test scores.

X= the standard deviation of the test scores.

The computation of this formula has yielded that the reliability coefficient of the present test is (**0.96**) which is a highly positive correlation (ibid:235).

3.9 Final Administration

On the twelfth of February during the academic year (2004-2005), the final version of the test was conducted on fifty of the learners of the English Department at University of Babylon, then on the third of March during the same academic year the same test was applied on fifty of the learners of the Department of English at University of Al-Qadisia. The subjects have taken one hour for responding to the items, which is the time allotted for the test. In the words of Carroll (1980: 16), a good test is expected to "provide as much information as is required with the minimum expenditure of time, effort and resources."

The researcher explained the **MMs** in general then she distributed the test papers. Any question, the subjects have asked, the researcher answered. The subjects have been assured that the test was purely for research purposes and did nothing with their marks by informing them not to write their names on the test sheets.

Moreover, the subjects were asked to give their responses on the test papers so as not to waste time and effort. Al-Hammash and Younis (1980: 205) remark that " a good test should be economic both in time and stationary."

After collecting the test sheets, the researcher has marked those papers using a scoring scheme, which is presented in the following section.

3.10 The Scoring Scheme

The test has been scored out of **100**. The scores have been divided in an equal way so as to give two scores for each correct answer in all questions and '*zero*' for the incorrect one. The item which is left without

96

answer by the subjects has been considered incorrect and given zero since the subject hasn't recognized or produced any answer.

Regarding Question Three, Four, and Five which demand the subjects to produce the answer according to the given requirements, the following are considered wrong responses: (1) use of wrong verb formation; (2) use of wrong tenses with correct formation and (3) giving no response. Thus, the researcher has ignored the spelling mistakes.

The scoring scheme is represented in the following table:

Table (4)
Distribution of the Scores of the Test

NO. OF QUESTION	NO. OF ITEMS	SCORES	PERCENTAGE
1	10	20	20
2	10	20	20
3.A	5	10	10
3.B	5	10	10
4	10	20	20
5.A	5	10	10
5.B	5	10	10
Total	50	100	100

Chapter Four
Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

It is an undeniable fact that all learners make errors and that these errors can be spotted, analyzed, classified and interpreted in order to find the solutions. These errors have been spotted by the test in Chapter Three. Analysis, classification and interpretation will be discussed in this chapter. All these processes will give some insights into the nature of the difficulties that Iraqi EFL university learners encounter in mastering **MMs**.

4.2 Discussion of the Results

This section presents the statistical results of the subjects' responses on each question of the test with regard to the comments on each table. The statistical analysis shows the range of the correct answers which determines the subjects' mastery of **MMs** constructions. These results are necessary to verify or refute the hypotheses clarified in the outline of the present study.

4.2.1 Subjects' Responses of the First Question

Question One, as mentioned in Section (**3.4**), measures the subjects' responses at the recognition level, where the subjects are required to chose the correct option for every item. The following table represents the number of the correct and incorrect responses with their rate of each item:

Table (4)
Subjects' Responses at
the Recognition Level in Question (1)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	38	38	62	62		
2	36	36	64	64		
3	40	40	60	60		
4	34	34	66	66		
5	30	30	70	70		
6	31	31	67	67	2	2
7	39	39	61	61		
8	27	27	71	71	2	2
9	35	35	65	65		
10	33	33	67	67		
Total	343	34.3	653	65.3	4	0.4

This table reveals the number of the correct responses (**343, 34.3 %**) and that of the incorrect ones (**including avoided items**) (**657, 65.7 %**). The rate of the incorrect responses is higher than that of the correct responses which reveals the subjects' inability of mastering the semantics of **MMs**.

99

Subjects cannot combine the sentences that contain these verbs, whether they are in their marginal state or in their lexical state, with their correct meaning. This result explians the difference between the present study and Sa'ad's study (see Section 2.4.2) concerning the semantic level of **MMs**.

4.2.2 Subjects' Responses of the Second Question

Question Two is also related to the recognition level that measures the subjects' ability of recognizing the rules of **MMs** from those of **LVs** or **BFs**. The Subjects are required to distinguish the types of the verbs according to their syntactic rules. Table (5) displays the subjects' responses for each item in this question:

Table (5)
Subjects' Responses
at the Recognition Level in Question (2)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	33	33	67	67		
2	34	34	66	66		
3	34	34	66	66		
4	30	30	70	70		
5	45	45	55	55		
6	48	48	52	52		
7	34	34	66	66		
8	32	32	68	68		
9	40	40	60	60		
10	52	52	48	48		
Total	382	38.2	618	61.8	0	0

Table (5) presents the total number of the incorrect responses (**618, 61.8%**) and the correct ones (**382, 38.2 %**). The number of the incorrect responses reveals that the subjects have faced difficulty in recognizing the constructions functioning as **MMs** from those functioning as **LVs** or **BFs**. The total number of the correct responses to **MMs**' items, (**124, 24.8 %**), is lower than that of **LVs** (**146, 48.6 %**) and **BFs** (**112, 56%**) phrases' items, thus, the subjects have encountered more difficulty in recognizing **MMs** from the other two types, as shown in the following table:

Table (6)
Subjects' Responses of the Three Types of Classification:
MMs, LVs and BFs in Question (2)

Type of Classification	Total No. of Responses	No. of Correct Responses	%
MMs	500	124	24.8
LVs	300	146	48.6
BFs	200	112	56

The previous two questions represent the recognition level of the test, thus, the following table represents the total number of the subjects' responses at the First and Second Questions:

Table (7)
Subjects' Total Responses at
the Recognition Level in Questions (1 and 2)

No. of Question	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	343	34.3	653	65.3	4	4
2	382	38.2	618	61.8	0	0
Total	725	36.25	1271	63.55	4	0.2

The highest rate of the incorrect responses is related to **MMs** (**1275, 63.75%**) which indicates that the subjects have faced more difficulties in distinguishing **MMs**.

These results verify the first hypothesis which states that Iraqi EFL university learners may face difficulty in distinguishing the constructions functioning as **MMs** from those functioning as **LVs** or **BFs**. No one of the previous studies has dealt with this problem, since they deal with **MAVs** or complex verb phrase not with **MMs** in particuliar.

4.2.3 Subjects' Responses of the Third Question

Question Three is divided into two sub-questions constructed primarily to measure the subjects' responses at the production level. They are constructed to measure the subjects' mastery of the semantic level of **MMs** (see section 3.4). Table (8) represents subjects' responses of each item in Question (**3/A**):

Table (8)
Subjects' Responses at
the Production Level in Question (3/A)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	8	8	92	92		
2	15	15	85	85		
3	20	20	80	80		
4	34	34	66	66		
5	38	38	62	62		
Total	115	23	385	77	0	0

These results explain the subjects' inability of estimating the difference in meaning between the two sentences in every item. The total number of their incorrect responses, (**385, 77 %**), is higher than that of their correct ones (**115, 23 %**). The subjects are unable to produce the semantic differences between **MMs** and **LVs**.

Moreover, the subjects are unable to change the sentences that contain lexical verbs to sentences containing **MMs** in sub-question (**B**). They have failed to produce the syntax of **MMs** since the number of their incorrect responses is (**413, 82.6 %)** while the number of the correct ones is (**87, 17. 4 %**). The results are explained in the following table:

Table (9)
Subjects' Responses at
the Production Level in Question (3/B)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	0	0	100	100		
2	16	16	84	84		
3	38	38	62	62		
4	33	33	67	67		
5	0	0	100	100		
Total	87	17.4	413	82.6	0	0

4.2.4 Subjects' Responses of the Fourth Question

Question Four is constructed to measure the subjects' productive knowledge of the past tense syntax of **MMs**. It measures their mastery of the different constructions of **MMs**. The results of their responses are shown in the following table:

Table (10)
Subjects' Responses at
the Production Level in Question (4)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	0	0	100	100		
2	20	20	80	80		
3	36	36	64	64		
4	4	4	94	94	2	2
5	6	6	94	94		
6	2	2	94	94	4	4
7	32	42	66	66	2	2
8	0	0	100	100		
9	18	18	82	82		
10	6	6	94	94		
Total	124	12.4	868	86.8	8	0.8

Table (10) reveals that the subjects have encountered difficulties in producing the past tense of **MMs** since the total number of their incorrect responses, (**876, 87.6 %**), is higher than their correct ones (**124, 12.4 %**). Mohammad's study (see Section 2.4.3) has mentioned **MMs**' syntax, yet, it is different from the present study in this subject particuliarly. Mohammad's study has focused on the complex verb phrase, while, the present study focuses on the past tense of **MMs**, as one of its limtations. Thus, the results of the present study are different from Mohammad's results.

4.2.5 Subjects' Responses of the Fifth Question

Question Five is divided into two sub-questions (**A**) and (**B**) that measure subjects' responses at the production level, where the subjects are required to change the given items into a form of question, in sub-question (**A**), and to the negative form, in sub-question (**B**). The subjects' responses to the first sub-question's items are presented in the following table:

Table (11)
Subjects' Performance at
the Production Level in Question (5/A)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	2	2	98	98		
2	24	24	76	76		
3	22	22	76	76	2	2
4	8	8	92	92		
5	30	30	68	68	2	2
Total	86	17.2	410	82	4	0.8

The low rate of the correct responses (**86, 17.2%**) reveals that the subjects have faced difficulties in producing the interrogative forms of **MMs** since the total number of the incorrect responses, (**414, 82.8 %**), is higher than their correct ones.

The subjects' responses on sub-question **B**, reflect their failure in producing the negative forms of **MMs**. The rate of their incorrect responses (**346, 69.2 %**) is considered very high if compared to their correct ones (**154, 30.8 %**), as presented in table (12):

Table (12)
Subjects' Responses at
the Production Level in Question (5/B)

No. of Item	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
1	38	38	62	62		
2	20	20	80	80		
3	38	48	62	52		
4	26	26	72	72	2	2
5	32	32	66	66	2	2
Total	154	30.8	342	68.4	4	0.8

The subjects' total responses at the production level are presented in the following table:

Table (13)
Subjects' Total Responses at
the Production Level in Questions (3, 4 and 5)

No. of Question	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
3/A	115	23	385	77	0	0
3/B	87	17.4	413	82.6	0	0
4	124	12.2	868	86.8	8	0.8
5/A	86	17.2	410	82	4	0.8
5/B	154	30.8	342	68.4	4	0.8
Total	566	20.16	2418	79.36	16	0.48

Table (13) shows that the subjects are facing difficulty in producing the syntax and semantics of **MMs** and that the subjects have failed in distinguishing **MMs**' functions from that of **LVs**. Thus, the subjects have low productive knowledge since their incorrect responses (**2434, 79.84%**) are high when they are compared with their correct ones (**566, 20.16%**). Such results verify the third hypothesis which states that Iraqi EFL university learners face difficulty in mastering and distinguishing the semantics of **MMs** from that of the **LVs**.

4.2.6 Subjects' Responses of Marginal Modals in the Whole Test

The total number of the subjects' responses at both levels, the recognition and production levels, is presented in the following table:

Table (14)
Subjects' Responses at
the Recognition and Production Levels

Level	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%	No. of Avoided Items	%
Recognition	725	36.25	1271	63.55	4	0.2
Production	566	20.16	2418	79.36	16	0.48
Total	1291	28.205	3689	71.455	20	0.34

The table above reveals that the subjects' incorrect responses (**3709, 71.795 %**), are higher than their correct ones (**1291, 28.205 %**). These results indicate that the subjects face difficulty in mastering **MMs** at both

the recognition and production levels since their incorrect responses at the recognition level (**1275 , 63.75%**) are more than their correct responses (**725, 36.25 %**) at the same level, while their incorrect responses on the production level (**2434, 79.84 %**) are also more than their correct responses (**566, 20.16 %**) at the same level. All these results indicate that the subjects face more difficulty at the production level than that at the production level.

These results can be confirmed by using two statistical instruments, which are the mean and the coefficient variation at the two levels. The mean for the production level, (**11.32**), is lower than that for the recognition level, (**14.5**), and the coefficient variation for the production level, (**75.27**), is higher than that for the recognition one, (**62.77**).These results support the previous discussion that the subjects face more difficulty at the production level than at the recognition level.

4.3 Error Analysis

Error analysis is a technique used for identifying, classifying and systematically interpreting the unacceptable forms produced by learners of a foreign language, using any of the principles and procedures provided by linguists. Errors are assumed to reflect the level of competence achieved by a learner (Crystal, 1997: 139). The results of error analysis studies are important because they provide empirical support for the theoretically derived claims (Ellis, 1990: 46).

4.3.1 Sources of Errors

It can be said that identification of the exact source of errors made by foreign learners cannot be completely accurate. Furthermore, an error may be attributed to more than one source. Corder (1973: 290) argues that " in accounting for particular errors made by a learner, there is a large area of uncertainty … . In many cases there appear to be several simultaneous processes going on: transfer, overgeneralization … ." Mukattash (1980: 144) concludes that " it is not always possible to identify the source of error that a learner of a foreign language makes."

According to Brown (1987: 171), errors are attributed to four factors: i) *interlingual transfer*; ii) *intralingual transfer*; iii) *context of learning*; and iv) *communication strategies*.

4.3.1.1 Interlingual Transfer

Iraqi EFL university learners face difficulty of interference between their native language and the target language. Their native language may have characteristics similar to those of the target language which lead Iraqi EFL university learners to overgeneralize the rules between the two languages (Lightbown and Spada, 1999: 176).

Iraqi EFL university learners fall in this type of error when they face difficulty in producing correct foreign sentences; they try to apply the rules of their native language on the target language, which are actually different from each other causing interlingual transfer.

Most of these errors are widespread at the production level. They are clear in items (**1**) and (**4**) in Question (**3/A**):

Item (1): **a.** The doctor said you must give up smoking.   order

       b. The doctor said you really give up smoking.   *order

Item (4): **a.** He must pay for the broken window.

    * Order which will be done

      b. He ought to pay for the broken window.

      *Order which will be done.

Some of the subjects have committed these errors relying on translating the semantic features of those items into their native language (i.e. **Arabic**). This process has caused wrong responses since the two verbs: **MM** *ought to* and **MAV** *must*, may hold two different meanings in some sentences. Here, *must*, in item (**1**), gives the meaning of *order* while *ought to*, in the same item, gives the meaning of an *advice*. *Must* and *ought to* have the same meaning in item (**4**) which is **order** but *must*, here, refers to an *order which will be done* while *ought to* refers to an *order which may not be done*. The subjects may translate the meaning of the four sentences in items (**1**) and (**4**) to an **order** since *must* and *ought to* in their native language can be translated to ' يجب ' without any difference between them, so they may translate the two sentences in item (**1**) as follows: 'قـال يجبالطبيب أن تقلـع عن التـدخين ' and to: 'يجب أن يدفع سعر الزجاج المحطم ' in item (**4**).

111

Moreover, the errors committed by the subjects in item (**5**) in Question (**3/B**) can be attributed to the interlingual factor also:

Item (5): He was smoking.

    *He ought not to smoke.

The subjects may translate the sentence in item (**5**) into 'يجب أن لا يدخن' using their native language. The subjects may use the easier construction '***he ought not to smoke***', instead of the right one (**see the Appendix**), which is closer to the meaning in their native language.

The analysis of errors' sources has yielded that about (**290**) errors may be committed in this area, i.e. (**8 %**) of the total number of the subjects' errors. This means that the process of learning a foreign language results in an interlanguage during which a learner may bring his native language into contact with the foreign language. This case can be used significantly only in the first stages of learning a foreign language when the learners rely on their previous linguistic system of their native language. The reliance on the native language decreases through the progress of the foreign language learning. This transfer is called positive **transfer** according to Ellis (1963: 3).

4.3.1.2 Intralingual Transfer

This type of errors takes place within the structure of the foreign language itself. Intralingual transfer has four factors which works at both levels, the recognition and production ones; they are:

i) *overgeneralization*; ii) *subjects' ignorance of rule restrictions*; iii) *incomplete application of rules*; iiii) *false concepts hypothesis* (Brown, 1987: 81-83). **Overgeneralization** is one of these factors which refers to the negative transfer that involves the incorrect application of the previously learned foreign language material to a present foreign language context (Ellis, 1986: 171). Due to the learners' obvious lack of knowledge with regard to both the syntactic and semantic uses of **MMs**, EFL Iraqi learners tend to make various generalizations which are unacceptable. This explains the high rate of incorrect responses of the **second** (**64, 64%**) and **seventh** (**61, 61%**) items in Question (**1**):

Item (2): The instructor ought to be in her office now.

    *Obligation

Item (7): That police officer should know where down area is.

    *Obligation

Most of the subjects have recognized the functions of the sentences above as obligation since *ought to* and *should* are largely used to denote obligatory meaning. The semantic characteristics of *ought to* and *should* are very close to each other, thus, when the subjects have recognized the function of *ought to*, in the second item, as obligation, they have immediately linked it to *should* giving it the same function.

Similarly, the **sixth**, (**98, 98%**), and the **tenth,** (**94, 94%**), items in Question (**4**) have a high rate of the incorrect responses which may be due to *overgeneralization*:

Item (6): Need the teacher be taught with the learners?

   * Did the teacher need to be taught with the learners?

Item (10): Dare the boy shout in her face?

   *Did the boy dare to shout in her face?

It is clear that the subjects have applied the rules of the **LVs** in deriving the past tense on the **MMs** *need* and *dare* by adding the **PV** *did*, thus, the subjects may have overgeneralized the **LVs**' rules of the past tense on that of **MMs**.

Most of the subjects have given incorrect responses in item (**2**) (**80, 80%**) in Question (**5/B**) which may be attributed to the feature of overgeneralization. The subjects have overgeneralized the **MMs**' rules in negating the **LV** *NEED* by adding *not* to the **LV** without using the **PV** *do*.

Another factor of intralingual transfer is the **subjects' ignorance of rule restriction**, that the learners apply a rule on a category which is in incorrect place that leads to error committing. Item (**2**) in Question (**2**) illustrates this aspect:

Item (2): Everybody <u>needs to</u> recall his previous behaviour.

   * <u>Lexical</u>

The subjects may ignore the to-infinitive and notice the 's' of the third person only in responding to this item. Instead of recognizing this construction as a **BF**, the subjects recognize it as a **LV** depending on the

third person-s. Items (**2**) and (**5**) in Question (**4**), item (**3**) and (**5**) in sub-question (**5/B**) can be attributed to this factor:

Item (2): Susan needs to go with her friend.

       *Susan needed to go with her friend.

Item (5): Jack dares to lie.

       *Jack dared to lie.

Item (3): Need we attend the lecture?

       *Don't we need attend the lecture?

Item (5): Dare David cheat in the test?

       *Doesn't David dare cheat in the test?

The verbs in items (**2**) and (**5**) are **BFs** where the **PV** *did* is added to form the past tense construction. With items (**3**) and (**5**), the subjects have added the primary verb *do* and *does* to the **MMs** *need* and dare to change these two sentences into the negative form. Thus, the subjects have ignored the rules that restrict the **MMs** and used wrong formations which are not in their place.

      The third factor of intralingual transfer is **incomplete applications of rules** that the learners fail to apply complex complete rules since they are complex and hard in learning and use, the learners tend to use simple

constructions to achieve effective communication. This type of intralingual transfer is found in items (**3**) and (**4**) in Question (**2**), as shown below:

Item (3): The bank <u>dares not</u> try to call in its debts.   * lexical

Item (4): Sally <u>doesn't need</u> to read this handbook.   *lexical

The subjects have considered the 's' of the third person and not, in item (**3**), as a reference of the **LVs**' rules ignoring the to-infinitive that follows the **MM** *dare* changing it to a **BF**. The same explanation has been applied on the verb construction in item (**4**). The subjects have considered the negated **PV** *do* as a reference of the **LV** construction since it is easier for them to think of it in this way than to consider the to-infinitive as a part of the **BF** constructions.

The errors in item (**1**) in question (**3/B**), and item (**1**), (**4**), and (**8**) in question (**4**) can also be ascribed to this factor:

Item (1): A: I haven't finished the story.   (ought to)

          B: <u>But, * you ought to finish it.</u>

Item (1): She ought to do well in the test.

          <u>* She did ought to do well on the test.</u>

Item (4): The parents daren't stay longer at the party.

          <u>* The parents didn't dare stay longer at the party.</u>

Item (8): The mother needn't ask her daughter for a help.

          <u>* The mother didn't need ask her daughter for a help.</u>

116

The wrong responses to item (**1**) in Question (**3/B**) show the incomplete application of the rule by the subjects since it is easier for them to use this rule than the right complex one (**see the Appendix**). The same idea has been applied by the subjects on the later three items.

The last factor of intralingual transfer is **the false concepts hypothesis** that refers to the target language learners' attempts to control the range of hypotheses that they attempt to build at any single stage in his development by restricting hypothesis-formation to those which are relatively easy to form and then facilitate communication. What results from this process is faulty comprehension of any distinction in the target language (Ellis, 1986: 171). This concept is illustrated in items (**6**) and (**9**) in Question (**1**):

Item (6): My last roommate would play the stereo until 3 in the morning.
　　　　　*expectation

Item (9): I wouldn't dare to go to a party at night.
　　　　　*expectation

The high rate of the incorrect responses in these two items may be due to faulty comprehension of a distinction between the two different meanings of **_would_** in the above two sentences. **_Would_** in the former item is equivalent to **_used to_** indicating _habitual action_, while **_would_** in the latter item is used with **_dare_** forming a concept indicating a hypothetical meaning.

117

False concepts hypothesis might also be the reason behind some of the subjects' incorrect responses to item (**7**) in Question (**2**), and item (**5**) in Question (**5/A**):

Item (7): She <u>ought to</u> act this scene.
　　　<u>*lexical</u>

Item (5): Liza dared to reply loudly.
　　　<u>*Dared Liza to reply loudly.</u>

In item (**7**), the subjects seem to form a faulty hypothesis by considering the to-infinitive after ***ought*** as a reference of the lexical state of **MMs**. Most of the subjects have used the **LV *dared*** in item (**5**) as a **MM** by using it in the place of the **PV *did***.

From all the previous illustration of intralingual transfer, it seems that most of the subjects' incorrect responses can be ascribed to this factor. Thus, the total number of errors, that are classified under this factor, is (**2155, 59.38%**). This rate is considered the highest rate of errors related to any factor.

4.3.1.3 Context of Learning

Errors can be ascribed to context of learning that refers to the text-books materials. The errors committed under this factor can result from two reasons: i) the misleading explanation by the teacher; and ii) the unauthentic textbooks. Some teachers mislead some rules of some

grammatical categories; others ignore some instructions of teaching approaches, while these instructions help learners get more useful grammatical information (Brown, 1987: 179).

Most grammar textbooks illustrate their observation about language using examples that have been made up by the grammarians themselves and which they assume will be recognized as representative of how language works in general (Emmott, 2004: 1). Thus, these two factors are the major reasons for a negative effect of motivating the learners to form effective wrong hypotheses (Yalden, 1987: 78).

The researcher has noticed that few textbooks have dealt with **MMs**; whether as a sub-category of **MAVs** or as **LVs**. Most grammar books have dealt with the **MMs** within the category of **MAVs** without mentioning the differences in syntax and semantics between them. Other grammar books have mentioned some of the syntactic and semantic differences between them but not all. Thus, the researcher has faced difficulty in finding sources as well as the learners who face difficulty in getting more knowledge about **MMs**. All these difficulties have led the subjects to commit errors that can be ascribed to this factor. These errors are represented mostly in item (**5**) in Question (**3/A**), item (**2**) in Question (**5/A**), and item (**1**) in Question (**5/B**):

Item (5): a. He used to live in the boat.

*There is no difference.

b. He uses the boat for living.

*There is no difference.

119

Item (2): Sandy used to be careless.

       *Giving one answer only.

Item (1): The painter used to spend the day in the museum.

       *Giving one answer only.

It is clear that the subjects have not recognized any difference in meaning and state between *used to* and *uses* in item (**5**) since their textbooks have focused on the difference between these two verbs; that the former is a **MM** and the later is a **LV**. The other two items, (**2**) and (**1**), share the one problem, that *used to* has another form that is the lexical form *did used/use to* which can be used in the interrogative and negative forms. In item (**2**), most of the subjects have given one correct possibility of the interrogative form of *used to* thinking that the **PV** *did* cannot be used here. The subjects have also given one possibility in item (**5**) mostly ' **Used the painter to spend the day in the museum?**' ignoring the other form of using the **PV** *did*. However it is somehow difficult to trace errors to this source since this would require investigating the proficiency of all the teachers who have taught each testee, all the books the testee has studied and all the teaching methods.

The total number of such errors committed by the subjects is (**465, 12.81%**).

4.3.1.4 Communication Strategies

Strategic competence is the ability to organize a message effectively and to compensate for any difficulties. It actually includes processes of *interlingual* and *intralingual transfer* and *the context of learning* as a learner tries to get a message across to a hearer or a reader (Brown, 1987: 180). Second language learners will inevitably experience moments where there is a gap between communicative intent and their ability to express that intent. Some learners may just stop talking; others will try to express themselves using *communication strategies* (Yule, 1996: 197). Some of these strategies are *avoidance* which is a common communication strategy that can be broken down into several subcategories; the most common strategy of which is syntactic or lexical avoidance within a semantic category, *appeal for repair and confirmation* that the learner asks for a help from other people in order to say what he wants. Among these lie *self-achievements points* such as *paraphrasing* (i.e. using different words similar in meaning to the original ones), *guessing* (i.e. using words, clauses or sentences that are based on the target language or not, from context, world or text structure in order to guess the meaning when there is absence of knowledge of the target language elements), *coinage* (i.e. the learners make up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept), and *approximation* (i.e. using a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker) (Brown, 1987: 183).

Approximation strategy can be illustrated in item (**3**) in question (**3/A**):

Item (3): **a**. Dare he say such rude things about Lucy?

*It expresses challenge.

      b. How dare he say such rude things about Lucy?

*It expresses exclamation.

The subjects have approximated the right answer **be brave enough to** in (**a**) to **challenge**, and **be impudent enough** to **exclamation** in (**b**) which are both wrong answers. While **paraphrasing strategy** can be illustrated in items (**2** and 4) in question (**3/ B**):

Item (2): **A**: It is not compulsory for us to attend the meeting. (need)

      B: Then, *you don't attend because you don't need to.

Item (4): **A**: she doesn't read long stories. (used to)

      B: But, *she read long stories previously and she used to.

Although the subjects have given paraphrased sentences which are supposed to be similar to the right answers, these sentences are wrong when they are compared with the right ones.

Guessing strategy has also been used by the subjects mainly in items (**3**) in Question (**3/ B**), item (**9**) in Question (**4**), and item (**1**) in Question (**5/ A**):

122

Item (3): **A**: He cannot challenge him.   (dare)

      B: Yes, *you will not fight him because you daren't.

Item (9): I used to visit my grandmother every weekend.

      *I did used to visit my grandmother every weekend.

Item (1): He ought to be more careful.

      *Does he ought to become more careful?

Finally, ***avoidance strategy*** has also been used by the subjects which have been illustrated in the previous tables under '**No. of Avoided Items**' columns. When learners are unable to give responses, they use this strategy.

The total number of errors that might be committed using this strategy is (**719, 19.81 %**) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

Chapter five
Conclusions, Recommendations, and Suggestions

5.1 An Introductory Note

This chapter represents the main findings of the theoretical and practical work of this study; it reveals the results of the test, the recommendations for textbook designers and teachers of English, and further suggestions for other researchers who want to deal with a topic similar to the present one.

5.2 Conclusions

In the light of the results and the foregoing discussions of **MMs**, the researcher draws conclusions for the theoretical and practical levels.

5.2.1 Theoretical Conclusions

The theoretical investigation of the present study has yielded the following conclusions:

1. **MMs** are a sub-category of **MAVs** which display some but not all of the properties of the **AuxVs** class. These verbs are workable in two

major directions; either as **MMs** or as **LVs**, they can also occur in the **BFs**. Thus, **MMs** are different from **CMs** in being workable as **LVs** and vice versa.

2. **MMs** can be followed by the bare infinitive, in the case of *dare* and *need*, and to-infinitive, in the case of *ought to* and *used to*; while **CMs** cannot be followed by a to-infinitive. **MMs** are also different from **CMs** in their semantic features although there are some similarities between them at the same level.

3. The **MMs** *dare* and *need* have different rules in being **MMs** from the other two **MMs**, i.e. *ought to* and *used to*. *Dare* and *need* can be considered **MMs** when they are used in the negative and interrogative sentences; while *ought to* and *used to* are **MMs** in their positive forms and they are not **MMs** when they are used with the **PV** *do*.

4. Linguists and grammarians depend on the spoken language in their interpretation. Some of them say that *need* is coming to be used more and more as a **MAV**, while *dare* seems to be doing the opposite, i.e.(is going to be used more and more as a **LV**); others declare the opposite, depending on their collected data. With *ought to* and *used to* there are no disagreements between linguists and grammarians with their common use; both are mostly used as **MMs**.

5. With the semantic level, there are equivalent **CMs** to the **MMs**. *Would* and *have* can be considered the equivalent **CMs** to *dare* in some semantic functions; *must* is the equivalent verb of *need* with some restricted semantic rules that *need* has a less obligatory meaning; *should*, *have to*, and *must* are the most probable equivalents to *ought to*

but at different levels of *obligation*; finally, ***would*** can also be considered the equivalent **CM** of ***used to*** in expressing habitual actions with some semantic differences.

6. Some of the **MMs** can express a private meaning that is not widely used. For example; the expression ***needn't have*** can be used in conditional and unreal sentences (**section 2.3.2.1.2.2**).

7. **MMs** have confusing forms within the syntactic and semantic characteristics due to historical reasons and different view points of linguists and grammarians. Both these two reasons are related to the changeability of the spoken language through time.

5.2.2 Practical Conclusions

The results of the practical work have yielded the following conclusions:

1. Iraqi EFL university learners at the fourth year face difficulties in recognizing and producing the **MMs**. The low rate of their responses in the main test at both levels can support this finding. The rate of their correct responses in the hole test, (**1291, 28.205%**), is lower than their incorrect ones, (**3709, 71.795%**).This validates the first hypothesis of the present study.

2. The rate of the subjects' incorrect responses in Questions (1 and 2), (**1275, 63.75%**), indicates that Iraqi EFL university learners cannot

distinguish the constructions functioning as **MMs** from those functioning as **LVs** or **BFs**.These results support the second hypothesis of this study.

3. At the production level, the subjects' incorrect responses in Questions (3, 4, and 5) (**2434, 79.84%**) reveal that they are unable to use **MMs** correctly whether syntactically or semantically. The high rate of their incorrect responses in Question (3/ A and B) (**798, 79.8%**) shows that they face difficulty in mastering the semantics of **MMs**. This verifies the third hypothesis of this study.

4. The difference in the rate of the incorrect responses of the recognition and production levels verifies the fourth hypothesis that Iraqi EFL university learners of the fourth year face more difficulty at the production level than that at the recognition one since the rate of the incorrect responses of the production level (**2434, 79.84%**) is higher than that at the recognition level (**1275, 63.75%**).

5. The reasons behind the high rate of the incorrect responses at both performance levels can be attributed to the following factors:

a. Intralingual transfer which is exemplified through *overgeneralization , subjects' ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete applications of rules,* and *false concepts hypothesized* whereby the subjects employ the already mastered foreign language rules concerning the **MAVs** in general and the **MMs** in particular regardless of their specific rule restrictions. This source of errors contributes to the majority of the subjects' incorrect responses as it accounts for (**2155, 59.38%**) of their total errors.

b. Communication strategies such as ***guessing***, ***paraphrasing***, ***avoidance***, and ***coinage*** which the subjects tend to use to fill the gap between their linguistic competence and the test's requirements. The rate of the errors ascribed to this factor is (**719, 19.81%**).

c. Context of learning deals with the syntactic and semantic rules of **MMs** which have not been dealt with in detail due to the little attention given to them in grammar textbooks. The rate of the errors committed within this factor is (**465, 12.81%**).

d. Interlingual transfer whereby the subjects depend on their native language in producing **MMs**' syntax and semantics. The rate of interlingual errors is considered the lower rate which is (290, 8%) of all the subjects' errors.

5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the study and its conclusions, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Due to the importance of **MMs**, as a sub-category of **MAVs**, to language production proficiency and to the programmes of the Department of English, syllabus designers and language teachers must explain and deal with **MMs** in detail. **MMs** are dealt with only once during the third stage and only in one grammar textbook (section 5.3). The results of this study can provide English teachers and syllabus designers with certain clues about the problematic areas in using **MMs** that need change or special emphasis, especially the irregular forms of **MMs** and the neglected semantics in their textbooks.

2. Due to the importance of **MMs** and their wide use, they must be introduced from the first year of the university study. If this presentation takes place,Iraqi EFL university learners of the fourth year will not face difficulty in mastering **MMs**. The **MMs** areas can be covered through the four year of their study and the learners can have a full mastery at them and their errors can be reduced to the minimum range.

3. Textbooks' designers and teachers must draw and illustrate the distinction between the **MMs** and the **CMs** on one hand and the distinction between the **MMs** in their marginal state and their lexical state or **BFs** on the other hand. These two levels of distinction will help the learners to get more knowledge about **MMs** gradually.

4. More time must be specialized in teaching and testing **MMs** particularly. If **MMs** are taught during the four year of study in Department of English, time will be available, thus, **MMs** can always be tested through time.

5. In addition to the recommendations above, the results of this study can provide textbooks designers and lecturers of English with the necessary effective information for the influential remedial teaching programmes aiming at helping those learners to overcome the difficulties they face in mastering **MMs**.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

The researcher suggests the following topics for further research to be carried out in this area:

1. Replicating the study techniques other than those used in the present study, whether the techniques that have been used in collecting data or analyzing data

2. Studying the techniques used in teaching **MMs** for Iraqi EFL university learners in Department of English.

3. The role of **MMs** in helping Iraqi EFL university learners developing their communicative skills as compared with the role of **CMs** at the same area.

4. Due to the fact that **MMs** have many irregular forms and functions at the syntactic and semantic levels, a study can be conducted measuring the awareness of Iraqi EFL university learners of those irregular forms and functions in a pedagogical study.

5. A linguistic study can be made at other stages of learning, i.e., at the university level or at the secondary level dealing with those irregular forms and functions of **MMs** in the syntactic and semantic levels.

Appendix
The Test

Q1. **Identify the function of the following sentences using the words between brackets. (** *obligation, necessity, habitual action, advice, expectation, hypothesis, probability*)**. Examine the following example:**

(20 marks)

    Example: You really should read more**.**   <u>**advice**</u>

1. You ought to leave that job. It's making you nervous.   _____

2. The instructor ought to be in her office now.   _____

3. I used to eat a lot of candy.   _____

4. Sam ought to work harder.   _____

5. You don't need to worry about the test.   _____

6. My roommate would play the stereo until the morning.   _____

7. That police officer should know where down area is.   _____

8. The letter of confirmation ought to be ready now.   _____

9. I wouldn't dare to go to the party.   _____

10. There must be some mistakes.   _____

Q2/ Read the following sentences then classify the underlined verbs as *marginal , lexical (main)* or *blended form (marginal + lexical)*. Examine the following example: (20 marks)

Example: They don't <u>need</u> to worry too much.   <u>Lexical</u>

Better doesn't <u>dare</u> ask Nick.   <u>blended form</u>

He <u>needn't </u>run fast.   <u>marginal</u>

1. He is a man who <u>dares to</u> say what he thinks.   _____

2. Everybody <u>needs to</u> recall his previous behaviors.   _____

3. The bank <u>dares not</u> try to call in its debts.   _____

4. Sally doesn't <u>need to</u> read this handbook.   _____

6. I <u>daren't</u> say it will rain soon because it is sunny.   _____

7. She <u>ought to</u> act this scene.   _____

8. The girl doesn't <u>need</u> the new car.   _____

9. Jim <u>needn't</u> behave like that.   _____

10. I wonder if I <u>daren't</u> fill in form, what should I do?   _____

Q3/A/ Discuss the *difference in meaning*, if any, in each group of

   sentences.   **(10 marks)**

1. a. The doctor said you must give up smoking.   _____

   b. The doctor said you really ought to give up smoking._____

2. a. I always used to be afraid of dogs.   _____

   b. I used always to be afraid of dogs.   _____

3. a. Dare he say such rude things about Lucy!   _____.

   b. How dare he say such rude things about Lucy? _____

4. a. He must pay for the broken window.   _____

   b. He ought to pay for the broken window.   _____

5. a. He used to live in the boat.   _____.

   b. He uses the boat for living.   _____

B/ Give a response to each of the stimuli given below, using the *marginal modal verb* in brackets. Examine the following example:

(10 marks)

Example: A: I'm not obliged to send the letter after all.   (need)

B: Yes, <u>you don't need to send the letter after all.</u>

1. A: I haven't finished the story.   (ought to)

   B: But, _____ .

2. A: It is not compulsory for us to attend the meeting.   (need)

   B: Then _____ .

3. A: He can't challenge him.   (dare)

   B: Yes, _____ .

4. A: She doesn't read long stories.   (used to)

   B: But, _____ .

5. A: He was smoking.   (ought not to)

   B: But, _____ .

Q4/ Change the verbs in the following sentences into their *past tense*. If the verb doesn't accept a past tense, write *'zero'*. Examine the following examples: **(20 marks)**

Example: They don't dare to ask for more.
<u>They didn't dare to ask for more</u>.

He used to be a typist.
<u>Zero</u>.

1. She ought to do well o the test.   _____

2. Susan needs to go with her friends.   _____

3. Does Sámi need to study with Marry?   _____

4. The parents daren't longer at the party.   _____

5. Jack dares to lie.   _____

6. Need the teachers be taught with the learners?   _____

7. Do the students dare to call tom an idiot?   _____

8. The mother needn't ask her daughter for a help. _____

9. I used to visit my grandmother every weekend. _____

10. Dare Donny shout in her face?   _____

Q5/A/ Change the following sentences into the *interrogative form*.
Notice that some sentences accept more than one form of
interrogation. Examine the following example: **(10 marks)**

Example: The boy needs to eat now.

Does the boy need to eat now?

1. He ought to e more careful. _____

2. Sandy used to be a good worker. _____

3. They didn't ought to have done it. _____

4. You needn't escape. _____

5. Liza dared to reply loudly. _____

B/ Change the following sentences into the *negative form*. Notice that
some sentences accept more than one form of negation. Examine
the following example: **(10 marks)**

Example: They ought to do their homework.

They ought not to do their homework.

1. The painter used to spend the day in the museum. _____

2. You need a haircut. _____

3. Need we attend the lecture? _____

4. The parents to give their sons another chance. _____

5. Dare David cheat in the test? _____

136

The Test's Possible Answers

Q1/

1. advisability.
2. expectation.
3. habitual action.
4. obligation.
5. necessity.
6. habitual action.
7. expectation.
8. probability.
9. hypothesis.
10. necessity.

Q2/

1. lexical verb.
2. lexical verb.
3. blended form.
4. blended form.
5. marginal modal.
6. marginal modal.
7. marginal modal.
8. lexical verb.
9. marginal modal.
10. marginal modal.

Q3/ A/

1. a. an order which is likely to be obeyed.

   b. a piece of advice which may not be obeyed.

2. a. there is no difference.

   b. there is no difference.

3. a. he is brave enough to speak.

   b. he is impudent enough to speak.

4. a. an order. He will do so, because I say so.

   b. he probably not.

5. a. habitual action in the past which refers to the speaker.

   b. present action which refers to the object.

B/

1. You ought to have finished the story.
2. You do not need attend the meeting.
3. He does not dare to/ dare not challenge him.
4. She used to read long stories.
5. He ought not to have been smoking.

Q4/

1. She ought to have done well on the test.
2. Susan needs to go with her friends.
3. Did Sámi need to study with Marry?
4. The parents dared not stay longer.
5. Jack did dare to lie.
6. Needed the teachers be taught with the learners?
7. Did they dare to call him an idiot?
8. The mother needed not ask her daughter for a help.
9. Zero.
10. Dared Donny shout in her face?

Q5/ A/

1. Ought he to go?
2. Used Sandy to be a good worker? **OR:** Did Sandy use/ used to be a good worker?
3. Did they ought to have done it?
4. Need Peter escape?
5. Did Liza dare to reply loudly?

B/

1. The painter did not use/ used to spend the day in the museum.
   OR: The painter used not to spend the day in the museum.
2. You do not need a haircut.
3. Needn't we attend the lecture?

4. The parents ought to give their sons another chance.

5. Daren't David cheat in the test?

Bibliography

Aarts, Flor and Jan Aarts. 1988. *English Syntactic Structure*. Wiltshire: Prentice-Hall Europe.

Abdul-Wahid, A. Abdul-Daem. 1982. *Modality in English: A Semantic Study with Pedagogical Orientation*. Unpublished Thesis. Basrah: College of Arts.

Ahman, J. S. and M. D., Glock. 1975. *Measuring and Evaluating Educational Achievement*, 5th ed. Boston: Allen and Bocon.

Alexander, L. G. 1988. *Longman English Grammar*. London: Longman.

Al-Hamash, Khalil I. and Jamal J. Abdulla. 1979. *A Course in Modern English Grammar*. Baghdad: IDELTI.

_____ and Hamdi Younis. 1980. *Principles and Techniques of Teaching English as a Second Language*. Baghdad: IDELTI.

Allen, J. P. B. and Alan Davies. 1978. *Testing and Experimental Method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allen, W. Stannard. 1959. *Living English Structure: Practice Book for Foreign Students:* 4th ed. London: Longman.

Allerton, D. J. 1979. *Essentials of Grammatical Theory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Azar, Betly. 1999. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*, 3rd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Bosewitz, Rene. 1987. *Penguin Student's Grammar*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Broukal, Milada. 2001. *TOFEL Grammar Flash*. Sidney: Peterson's Thomas Learning.

Brown, James Dean. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning*. New York: Macmillan.

_____. 1996. *Testing in Language Programs*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Regents.

Burns, Robert B. 2000. *Introduction to Research Methods*, 4th ed. London: SAGA Publications Ltd.

Carroll, Brendan J. 1980. *Testing Communicative Performance: An Interim Study*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Chalker, Sylvia. 1984. *Current English Grammar*. New York: Macmillan.

Close, R. A. 1981. *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. London: Longman.

_____ 1974. *A University Grammar of English (Workbook)*. London: Longman.

Coats, J. 1983. **The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries**. London: Croom Helm.

Collins, Peter. 2004. "*A Thesis of Marginal Modals: Australian English Grammar: Fact and Fiction?*" Published Dissertation. Internet. http://www. hichumanities.org/AHproceddings/Peter%20Collins.pdf.

Corder, S. Pit. 1973. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Crystal, D. 1997. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Davies, E. 1986. *The English Imperatives*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Drummond, Gordon. 1972. *English Structure Practice*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Dury, Richard. 2004. "*A Briff Glossary of Modality*". Intrnet www.Unibg.it/anglistica/Slin/morlgloss.htm-50K.

Ebel, Robert L. 1972. *Essentials of Educational Measurement*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Ellis, H. C. 1965. *The Transfer of Learning*. New York: Macmillan.

Ellis, Rod. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1990. ***Instructed Second Language Acquisition***. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Emmott, Catherine. 2004. ***Real Grammar in Fictional Context***. Internet. http//www.uky.edu./ArtsSciences/Classics/rhetoric.htm1#7.

Foster, Joseph F. (Personal Contact through e-mail). 2005. ***Marginal Modals***. Internet. Professor of Anthropology (Ph.D. Associate): University of Cincinnati.

Fuchs, Marjorie. 1988. ***Focus on Grammar***. London: Addison - Wesley Publishing Company.

Gardner, R. C. and L. Gliksman. 1982. " ***On " Gardener on Effect": A Discussion of Validity as It Relates to the Attitude / Motivation Test Battery: A Response From Gardener*** " in Language Learning Journal. Vol. 32, No. 1, June.

Gethin, Hugh. 1983. ***Grammar in Context: Proficiency Level English***. London: Collins ELT.

Gramley, W. S. 2004. " ***How to Write a Grammar; Auxiliaries, Operators, and Modality***". Internet. www.cis.upenn.edu/~xtag/ release.8.31.98-html/mode167.html-/ok.

Greenbaum, Sidney and Randolph Quirk. 1990. ***A Student Grammar of the English Language***. London: Longman.

Harris, David P. 1969. ***Testing English as a Second Language***. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Harrison, A. 1993. *A Language Testing Handbook*. London: Macmillan
      Press.

Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.

Jesspersen, Otto. 1954. *A Modern English Grammar*. Part III, Volume 2.
      London: Brandford and Dickens.

_____. 1966. *Essentials of English Grammar*. London: Greoge
      Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Johnson, A. and G. C. Thornley. 1966. *Grammar and Idiom*, 2^d ed. Hong
      Kong: Longmans.

Joos, Martin. 1968. *The English Verb: Form and Meaning*, 2^d ed. London:
      The University of Wisconsin Press.

Krohn, Robert. 1971. *English Sentence Structure*. Ann Arbor: The
      University of Michigan Press.

Lado, Robert. 1962. *Language Testing*. London: Longmans.

_____. 1963. " *Testing Control of the Structure of a Foreign
      Language.*" Selected Articles from Language Learning: A Journal of
      Applied Linguistics. A publication of the Research Club in Language
      Learning.

Lee, Y. D. et al. 1985. *New Directions in Language Testing: Papers
      Presented at the International Symposium on Lange Testing*. Hong
      Kong: Pergaman Press.

Leech, Geoffrey. 1971. *Meaning of the English Verb*. London: Longman Group Limited.

—————————; Benita Cruickshank; and Roz Ivanic. 2001. *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage*. London: Longman.

Lightbown, Patsy M. and Nina Spada. 1999. *How Languages are Learned*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Madeson, Harold S. 1983. *Techniques in Testing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marckwardt, Albert H. and Fred G. Walcott. 1938. *Facts about Current English Usage*. 1938. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Mayhew, Janathan. 2004. " *Aspect (Cont.) Marginal Modal Auxiliaries*." Internet. www.homes.Uni-bielefed.de/sgramley/HowGram-WS-03- . 04Aux-op-Mod.htm-61k-supplementalresult.

Mohammad, Taha Yassin. 2002. *The Concept of Complexity in the English Verb Phrase*. Unpublished Thesis. Mosul: College of Arts.

Mukattash, Lwis. 1980. " Yes / no Questions and the Contrastive Hypothesis." Vol. 4, No.2. *ELT Journal*.

Murcia, Marianne Celce (ed.). 1991. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 2[d] ed. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Murphy, Raymond. 1994. *English Grammar in Use*. 2[d] ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ and William Smalzer. 2002. ***Basic Grammar in Use***. 2^d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuttal, C. E. and J. Gaist. 1968. ***English Language Units, Unit 4: Must and Need***. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Osner, Jerem. 2004. " ***Edict Functional Grammar, Summary of Modal Verb Functions***." Internet. www.hotbot.com.

Palmer, F. R. 1987. ***The English Verb***, 2^d ed. London: Longman.

_____. 1990. ***Modality and the English Verb***. 2^d ed. London: Longman.

Parrott, Martin. 2000. ***Grammar for English Language Teachers***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollock, Carroll Washington. 1982. ***Communicate What You Mean***. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Praninskas, Jean. 1975. ***Rapid Review of English Grammar***. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Quirk, R. ; S. Greenbaum; G. Leech; and J. Svartivk. 1972. ***A Grammar of Contemporary English***. London: Longman.

_____.1985. ***A Comprehensive Grammar of the English language***. London: Longman.

Rahtz, F. J. 1945. *Higher English*, 26th ed. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Sa'ad, Abdul Hameed Nasser. 1996. *A Comparative Study of the Effect of Teaching Modal Auxiliary Verbs through the Structural Approach and the Communicative Approach of First-Year College Students in the Department of English - University of Baghdad*. Unpublished Dissertation. Baghdad: Ibn Rushed.

Schibsbye, Knud. 1965. *A Modern English Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.

Shammas, Nafez A. 1998. *Use in English*. Damascus: Ayd Printing House.

Shepherd, John; Richard Rossner; and James Taylor. 1984. *Ways to Grammar*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Spankie, G. M. 1987. *The Grammar You Need*. London: MacMilan Publishers Ltd.

Swan, Michael. 1996. *Practical Grammar Usage*, 2[d] ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taeymans, Martine. 2004. "*An Investigation into the Marginal Modals 'dare' and 'need' (1960$_s$ -1990$_s$): A Corpus-based Approach*." Unpublished Dissertation. Internet. Cf.hum.Uva.nl /gramma/ abstracts/taymans.htm\.5k.

Thomason, A. J. and A. V. Martinet. 1980. *A Practical English Grammar*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D. A. and G. B. Suffolk. 1980. *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Yalden, Janice. 1987. *The Communicative Syllabus Evolution, Design, and Implementation*. London: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Yule, George. 1996. *The Study of Language*, 2^d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zandvoort, R. W. 1962. *A Handbook of English Grammar*. London: Longmans, Green and Co LTD.

الخلاصة

الافعال الهامشية هي واحدة من تقسيمات الافعال المساعدة و التي تمتلك صفات دلالية ونحوية متفردة. هذه الصفات المتفردة هي التي تميز الافعال الهامشية عن الافعال المركزية و تقسيمات الافعال المساعدة الاخرى. تعتبر هذه الأفعال هامشية لأنها في بعض الحالات تتصرف كأفعال مساعدة، و في حالات اخرى تتصرف كأفعال معجمية. فالدراسة الحالية تهدف الى شرح الصفات الدلالية و النحوية للأفعال الهامشية، و البحث بشكل عملي في مدى إتقان الطلبة الجامعيين العراقيين الدارسين للغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية على هذه الصفات. و يهدف كذلك البحث التعرف على قابلية هؤلاء الطلبة في تمييز و استخدام الافعال الهامشية بصورة صحيحة، و قدرتهم على تمييز حالتي الفعل الهامشية و المعجمية.

جرى وضع أربع فرضيات لتحقيق اهداف هذه الدراسة:

١. يواجه طلبة الكلية العراقيون الدارسون للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية صعوبات في تمييز التراكيب التي تعمل كافعال هامشية من تلك التي   تعمل كافعال المعجمية، و هكذا فانهم لا يستطيعون تحويل الافعال الهامشية الى افعال معجمية وبالعكس.

٢. لا يستطيع هؤلاء المتعلمون استخدام الأفعال الهامشية بصورة صحيحة في المنحى الدلالي. فاغلب هؤلاء المتعلمين يمزجون المعنى الدلالي للافعال الهامشية مع المعنى الدلالي للافعال المركزية و الافعال المساعدة الاخرى.

٣. يتوقع أن يواجه هؤلاء المتعلمون صعوبات أكثر على المستوى الانتاجي منه على المستوى التمييزي، لذلك فان استجابتهم على المستوى ألتمييزي يتوقع أن تكون أفضل من استجابتهم على المستوى الانتاجي.

لاثبات صحة هذه الفرضيات، فقد صمم اختبار تشخيصي و طبق على عينة مؤلفة من مائة طالب و طالبة من طلبة الجامعة العراقيين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في الصف الرابع من قسم اللغة الانجليزية في كلية التربية، جامعتي بابل و القادسية خلال العام الدراسي ٢٠٠٤ ـ ٢٠٠٥ . و قد عُرضَ الاختبار على لجنة مكونة من مجموعة من اساتذة الجامعات للوقوف على الصدق الظاهري للاختبار.

طبقت وسائل احصائية على نتائج الاختبار للوقوف على انواع الاخطاء و اسبابها. هذه الوسائل ادت الى استنتاجات معينة، و هي ان الطلبة الجامعيين العراقيين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في الصف الرابع يواجهون صعوبات في تمييز و اداء الافعال الهامشية. نسبة الاجابات الصحيحة من مجموع الاجابات كلها (١٢٩١، ٢٨,٢٠٥%) اوطا من نسبة الاجابات الخاطئة (٣٧٠٩، ٧١,٧٩٥%) في نفس الاختبار. اما بالنسبة للمستوى الانتاجي فان نسبة اجابات الطلبة الخاطئة (٢٤٣٤، ٧٩,٨٤%) تكشف عن إن هؤلاء الطلبة غير قادرين على استخدام الافعال الهامشية بصورة صحيحة، سواء على المستوى النحوي أو الدلالي. الفرق في نسبة الاجابات الخاطئة على المستوى ألتمييزي (١٢٧٥، ٦٣,٧٥%) و على المستوى الانتاجي، تشير الى ان هؤلاء المتعلمين يواجهون صعوبات اكبر على المستوى الانتاجي منه على المستوى التمييزي.

وجد أن أخطاء الطلبة يمكن ان تعزى إلى أربع عوامل و هي، تأثير اللغة ألام، تطبيق الطلبة للقواعد التي درسوها سابقا في اللغة الإنجليزية، سياق التعليم و براعات الاتصال.

جامعة بابل

العراقيين جامعةالبحث في معرفة و استخدام طلبة أل
الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية
الأفعال الهامشية

رسالة تقدمت بها
إلى

مجلس كلية التربية الأساسية في جامعة بابل
جزءاً من متطلبات نيل درجة ماجستير تربية
في طرائق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية

ميس فليح حسن الجباوي

بإشراف

د. عاصم عبود الدليمي   ا.م. عادل عبد الرضا العكام

أيلول/ ٢٠٠٥ م   شعبان/ ١٤٢٦ ه