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1. INTRODUCTION

“The English modal verbs are often challenging for learners of English. This happens for many reasons, including both grammar and meaning.” (Oliver, 2007) Therefore, it is important to learn and understand the meaning and uses of all the individual modal verbs in order to apply them correctly. Learners of English as a second language (ESL) often put great emphasis on what is written and explained in textbooks for learners. However, not all textbooks give a clear and understandable definition of the uses of all modal verbs. Hence, a lot of students have difficulties in applying the auxiliaries. The wrong usages of modal verbs often cause confusions and misunderstandings. This paper is going to take a look at how the
modals *shall* and *should* are introduced in German school books of English and how they are used in 'real' English in order to see if the usages of the modals correspond.

Teaching English in Germany should be as realistic as possible. The English used in school books, therefore, should correspond to the English found in computerized data-collections (corpora). The topic of English modal auxiliaries is particularly interesting because their meanings and usages have changed in the 20th century. The aim of this research is to find out whether the usages of the two modal verbs *shall* and *should* explained in school books are still the same as that in recently compiled corpora. This study uses a Canadian component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-CAN henceforth) to test this. The American component of ICE was the first choice, but as there is no version that contains both written and spoken English files available yet, an alternative had to be found. The British component (ICE-GB) did not come into consideration, since the British English (BrE) with all its different dialects is not a good representation of Standard English (StE). Canadian English has roots of BrE as well as American English (AmE) and is hence a good representation of StE. Further, not all components of ICE are freely available. “This means in practice […] that the only native-speaker corpora available at the moment are ICE-Ireland and ICE-Canada.” (Schmied 2011: 2) That is why it was eventually decided to take the ICE-CAN for this analysis. Considering that I am a German citizen and native speaker of German, who started learning ESL with school books by the publishing company Cornelson, I decided to take the same for this study on modal auxiliaries. The corpus analysis will be conducted with the computer program AntConc.

The best way to express probability, possibility, belief, necessity and confidence is by using modal verbs. These particular verbs are also called auxiliary verbs. The terms modality and modal verb are much discussed and analyzed, but there is still not one fixed definition. In association with the research for this paper, I came across a lot of different explanations of modality by different authors like Palmer, Bybee and Diewald to name but a few. The definition by Portner (2009), which will be given later on, is the one that I mostly agree with.

After firstly taking a look at how modal verbs are portrayed in German school books of English, I will secondly give some background information on mood, modality and modal verbs and their classification as well as their deontic and epistemic uses to raise the reader's awareness of the complexity of the topic. Thirdly, I am going to introduce the methodology. Therefore, I am going to say a few words about corpus linguistics in general, before I will then come to the corpus I am going to use, namely ICE-CAN. Finally,
limitations of corpus linguistics will be pointed out. Fourthly, I am going to come to my main part, the analysis of the uses of the modals *shall* and *should*. Thereby, some information on the selection of texts will be given and the methods of investigation introduced. Following, the semantic uses and the frequency in ICE-CAN of the modal auxiliary *shall* are going to be demonstrated and analyzed. The same will be done for the modal *should*. Hereafter, a conclusion will be drawn from the findings. Questions like 'Is *should* really the past tense of *shall*?' and 'Is *shall* really used in few selected contexts only today?' will be answered. Fifthly, improvements for German school books are suggested.

English modals “are members of a larger set of auxiliary verbs” (Palmer, 2001: 100) that, what the name already indicates, help other verbs. (cf. Soars & Soars, 1996: 146) Modals behave differently from normal English verbs. A modal verb expresses the speaker’s attitude about the main verb, but does not directly influence it. The following lexemes are the most important and common modal verbs: *Can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, would*. (McArthur 2005) Those are the ones that are definitely defined as modals. There are also verbs that have characteristics of an auxiliary verb, but are not defined as one such as the verb *have to*. It was decided to concentrate on the two modal verbs *shall* and *should* in this study. They are both well-known modals, whereby one is used rather infrequently today and the other one is often used in everyday speech.

While spending almost three years abroad, I had language contact with many people from all over the world who are learning ESL. As I am not the only one who has problems with the different usages of modal verbs, I hope this study will be helpful for other students as well.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1. English Modal Auxiliaries in German School Books

A problem in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is that the teachers usually teach only a limited number of expressions of a certain topic. Certainly, in a few school years, not all the entire vocabulary can be imparted. This is one of the reasons why it is really hard for learners of a foreign language to express themselves as wished. Students only use the words and meaning of words they have learned at school. When it comes to modal verbs, this definitely applies since each modal has more than one meaning and not all of them are
taught at school.

Most school books for learners do not give a clear definition of all the different usages of modal verbs. Hence, the students tend to overuse the modals they have learned, which is definitely the case with the modal should. We should do our homework is a proposition often used by German learners of English. However, this sentence is logically incorrect. Doing their homework is not an act in which students can express their own opinion, they are either asked to do it, or not. Teachers should at least broach the topic and tell them about the variety of expressions of the modal verbs. This would make it much easier for the learners - in writing as well as in speaking English. Before the different usages of shall and should will be analyzed in detail, we will take a look at how modal auxiliaries are introduced and explained in German textbooks for learners of English.

The school books chosen for this research are English G 2000: D3- D6 by the publishing company Cornelson (1998-2002). The books were compiled according to the curriculum for gymnasiums (an academic high school) of Saxony. Some of the editions were compared with the ones of Saxony- Anhalt, but since the differences were not immense, it was decided to only take the textbooks from Saxony into consideration. However, there is no guarantee that the textbooks of English are the same across all states in Germany. Depending on the school and grade, the teachers have a certain freedom and are quite flexible in teaching. Each topic listed in the curriculum has to be included in the class sessions, but can be varied in order to adjust the pace of instructions to the needs and capabilities of the learners. Hence, a big differences in teaching can occur across Saxony and the states. One teacher might spend several sessions on modal verbs, whereas another teacher might put more emphasis on a different topic. The following analysis, therefore, only serves as a general overview.

After modal verbs are first introduced in 5th grade, they are discussed again in grades six, seven, eight, nine and ten. However, modal auxiliaries are not yet addressed as such in 5th grade. Furthermore, not all the modal verbs are taught in 5th grade and there is no complete section on verbs of such kind. According to the curriculum Saxony, six to eight of the modal verbs are supposed to be introduced in 5th or 6th grade. (cf. Sächsisches Staatsministerium für Kultus und Sport 2011: 24) The text books, however, include significantly less. Since teachers mostly follow the structure of the textbooks and build their sessions around the chapters of the book, only a few modals are addressed in grades five and six. Can is the modal verb that is first introduced, but only in the sense of ability and allowance. Examples like Can I open the window?, Please, can I have your pen? and He
can speak French, Jeff can go to the school disco, but he has to be home at 9. (Schwarz 1998:129) are used to explain the concept. As can is often used in questions and exercises in the books as in Can you say these things in English, it is important that students learn this lexeme and the concept in the very beginning. However, its function as a modal verb with its different usages is not explained in the first stadium. Instead of saying I can stay up late, the students first learn to say I am allowed to stay up late and later replace the verb by the modal verb can.

The next modal the students learn is should. It is compared to the auxiliary have to and the meaning of should first introduced is deontic. Apart from obligation, teachers do not present any other expressions of should at this point. In 7th grade, those special auxiliaries are already called modal verbs. The modals would and could are introduced in connection with conditional sentences types II and later type III; but separately. (cf. Sächsisches Staatsministerium für Kultus und Sport 2011: 31) Students are, for example, asked to say what they would do or be if they discovered a planet. One example is If I discovered a planet, I would be famous. (Schwarz 1999: 144) Another sample sentences given in book is I would like my parents to buy me new shoes. (Schwarz, 1998: 185) Everyday situations are usually the basis for creating examples, which is often catchy and easily remembered. In the same grade, another expression of should is introduced, namely possibility. What makes it difficult for learners to differentiate between, but also connect, those meanings of one verb, is the fact that they are taught in separate sections and not in one. In 8th grade, the students talk about the auxiliaries could and should again when dealing with the past participle and perfect participle. The principle is, for example, demonstrated by stories about Friday the 13th. You should have been more careful- the bears could have attacked you is one example that is given in the book. (Schwarz 1999: 143) The books all have an exercise part and a grammar part as well as a vocabulary section. In the case of should and could, the grammar part of the book states that with the help of these auxiliaries you can express what could or should have happened under certain circumstances. (Schwarz 1999: 60) Furthermore, it is pointed out that the German sollen can have a different meaning than the English should, which is very important for learners to know.

Advantages of the books are that the modal verbs are repeatedly dealt with throughout grades five until ten. With examples like Information about the first World War can be found in any history book, the students are introduced to the passive voice. With various examples, they are asked to create their own passive constructions.

Another topic that every student of English learns about at school is direct and
indirect speech. With this topic, another aspect of should is explained. According to the textbook English G 2000 D4, should is also used when making commands, suggestions, requests and giving advice. (Schwarz 1999: 143 f.) Students are asked to formulate sentences with My mom told me... I should come home or I should stop laughing. (cf. Schwarz, 2000: 135) Numerous exercises are given to make the students confident in the uses of the passive voice and (in-)direct speech. Nevertheless, the emphasis is not on the modal verbs and their uses but on the concepts of passive voice, direct and indirect speech, conditional sentences as well as past participle and perfect participle.

In 7th grade, shall is introduced as a new vocabulary. In the vocabulary section, it says that shall can be used in, for example, connection with we- Shall we have lunch now?- as an offer or suggestion or I, as in Shall I make dinner? (Schwarz, 2000: 141). However, there are not a lot of exercises on this modal verb. Depending on the teacher, there might not even be further examples as the ones explained in the textbook. The amount of exercises of shall and should in the German school books corresponds to the frequency in ICE-CAN.

The usages of the modals shall and should will be analyzed and compared by means of the Canadian component of ICE in the main part (see 4.) in order to see if the uses correspond to the explanations in the school books. Before, however, the concept of modality, mood and modal verbs are explained in order to make the analysis more understandable.
2.2 Modal Verbs

2.2.1. Mood, Modality and Modals

Since modal verbs are a constituent part of modality, it is necessary to explain the whole concept before going into detail with the modal verbs themselves. “The idea of modality is an old one, going back to classical Greek philosophy.” (Davidsen-Nielsen 1990: 43) Several linguists “are of the opinion that there are three basic modalities” (Davidsen-Nielsen 1990: 43), namely dynamic, deontic and epistemic modality. However, because there are several different opinions by various linguists on how to define modality and categorize modal verbs, some of them will now be introduced and discussed.

As can be found in the books and reports by several authors¹, modality is a linguistic phenomenon which is concerned with a speakers attitude, volition and opinion as well as kindness, possibility, certainty, permission and necessity of a situation or an utterance. (cf. Bybee, Fleischman 1995: 74) Because the speaker is expressing his opinion, the situation does not necessarily have to be true. To express your attitude, modal adjectives, nouns, hedges and adverbs like maybe, extremely or excessively can be used. This paper, however, will concentrate on modal verbs. According to Portner, who sees modality as a semantic theory, “modality is the linguistic phenomenon whereby grammar allows one to say things about, or on the basis of, situations which need not to be real.” (2009: 1) To illustrate this concept, Portner gives the following example: “You should see a doctor” (2009: 1) Someone gives a statement about a situation and suggests that seeing a doctor would be good and necessary for you. However, this situation does not need to be real. Hence, the concept of modality does apply. Further, he states that the “traditional way of classifying varieties of modality is into the categories of epistemic and deontic” (Portner, 2009: 2), which will be explained in more detail in 2.2.3. Lyon gives a more general definition of modality by saying it is something that has “to do with possibility, or probability, necessity or contingency, rather than merely with truth or falsity.” (1997: 322) Slightly different to this point of view, is the interpretation by Frank Palmer. In his book 'Mood and Modality', he defines modality as a grammatical category “that is closely associated with tense and aspect.” (2001: 1) In addition to that, modality refers “to the status of the proposition.”

¹ Like Palmer (2001), Saeed (2003), Portner (2009) and Bybee (1985)
(Palmer 2001: 1) He sees modality as an overall category that has two distinctions, namely the modal system and mood whereas he differentiates between the indicative, subjunctive and imperative mood. (cf. Palmer 2001: 4) Most linguists, however, go with the notion that mood is a morphosyntactic category and part of modality. (cf. Harris, Ramat 1987: 339) Another point of view will be introduced in the next paragraph.

According to Huddleston, mood belongs to the category of grammar and modality to the category of meaning. (1984: 166) The Professor of Dutch and General Linguistics, Jan Nuyts, agrees with this definition. (2006: 1) In contrast to the definition by, for example, Palmer, Huddleston defines modality as a semantic category that is not only expressed by modal verbs, but also by verbs like dare, have and need as well as modal adverbs like surely and perhaps and modal adjectives like possible and able. Deontic, epistemic and dynamic interpretations are the three ways of reading modality introduced by Huddleston. However, he more or less excludes the latter one and only concentrates on the first two and therewith on the notion of possibility and necessity. This study also uses the classification into deontic and epistemic modality.

Bybee et al. (1994) state that modality ranges far beyond than what Palmer (1986) defines as such. According to them, it “may be impossible to come up with a succinct characterization of the notional domain of modality and the part of it that is expressed grammatically.” (Bybee et al. 1994: 176) Furthermore, Bybee et al. argue that mood is “a set of diachronically related functions.” (1994: 176) The three semantic dimensions deontic, epistemic and dynamic are also viewed as versions, that modality comprises, by Bybee et al. (cf. Nuyts 2006: 1) These linguists take a comparable position to Palmer (2001) when it comes to defining mood. In short, it can be noted that generally, modality is seen as a semantic notion whereas mood is viewed as a grammatical one. (cf. Frawley 2006: 8) “Languages such as French or Spanish are more readily associated with subjunctives and a synthetic mood system.” (Seidel 2004: 10) However, since modality is usually expressed through modal verbs in English, its mood system is described as an analytic one. (cf. Huddleston 1984: 164)

For the rest of this paper, the focus will only be on one dimension of modality- the modal auxiliaries. In the following, the classification of modal verbs will be examined.
2.2.2. Classification of Modals

“An auxiliary is a verb used to form the tenses, moods, voices etc. of the other verbs” (Warner 1993: 1) in a sentence or statement. However, the classification of this group of verbs has “been a major area for discussions and disagreement in recent years.” (Warner 1993: 1) Modal auxiliaries are categorical related to full verbs in the English language. According to Palmer, modal verbs “are a clearly defined set.” (Palmer 2001: 102) Nevertheless, not all scholars agree on the characteristics and the number of verbs that count as modal verbs. Some linguists name seven modals (Huddleston 1984), others eight (Palmer 1987) and yet other scholars include nine verbs in the category of modal auxiliaries (Warner 1993, Biber et al. 1999). Can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will and would (Warner 1993: 3) are commonly defined as modal verbs. Furthermore, the non-modal auxiliaries be, do and have are listed as auxiliaries. (cf. Warner 1993: 3) In the following, the most important formal characteristics of the word group of modal auxiliaries according to Palmer (2001) are pointed out

i. **Third person -s:**

Modal verbs do not go with the “-s” – ending in third person.

*She plays soccer* is perfectly correct, while *She cans play soccer* is incorrect.

ii. **Negation:**

To negate a modal verb, “not” instead of “do not” is used. For example: *Eric should not drink too much soda.* This rule applies for both Simple Present and Simple Past. Therefore, auxiliaries do not need the support of the verb *do*.

iii. **No future tense:**

Modal verbs cannot be applied in future and only partly in past tense, i.e. *Martin musted go swimming* is not correct as well as *Katja will should study for her math test* is wrong. Past tense forms like *could, would* and *should* are also used in reported speech and conditional sentences. “Apart from that, it is worth noting that it is not possible to express past time with the past tense forms of *might* and *should.* (Seidel 2004: 12)

*You should fix the car yesterday.*
iv. **No non-finite form:**

Compared to normal full verbs, **modals cannot be used in the non-finite form**

* I like canning singing very well.

v. **No co-occurrence:**

Moreover, **auxiliaries cannot be chained in a sentence**, as for example in

Johnny must can come to the party tomorrow.

vi. **“They have no imperatives:**

*Can be here! *” is incorrect. (Palmer 2001: 100)

“The asterisk (*) is conventionally prefixed to some construction which is considered to be ungrammatical.” (Bauer 2007: 95)

According to Huddleston, “the auxiliaries are marker of tense, aspect, mood and voice” (Huddleston 2002: 103) in their core uses. Furthermore, Huddleston introduces the so-called NICE properties to characterize auxiliaries defining this subclass. “NICE is an acronym of Negation (1), Inversion (2), Code (3), and Emphasis (4).” (Huddleston 2002: 93) Those characteristics are briefly illustrated with the following four examples.

(1a) Dave should swim today.  
(1b) Dave should not swim today.
(1c) Dave swam today.  
(1d) * Dave swam not today.

→ Unlike full verbs, auxiliaries usually have a form with the contracted -n’t. (cf. Warner 1993: 3)

(2a) Sue should be able to hear it.  
(2b) Should she be able to hear it?
(2c) Sue hears it.  
(2d) * Hears Sue it?

→ The modal auxiliary “can occurs before the subject in statements, questions” (Seidel 2004: 11), “in and neither and and so tags and restricted in conditionals and comparatives.” (Warner 1993: 4)
(3a) Lucas has left, has he?  (3b) *Lucas left, left he?
(3c) May I take a seat? - Yes, you may.

→ Auxiliaries are used as full verbs in questions and answers and can hence avoid repetitions. The speaker uses “a kind of code […] that can’t be understood without a key.” (Huddleston 2002: 93)

(4a) We shall do it!  (4b) *We do it!
(4c) We cán do this!

→ Emphatic Affirmation involves the stressing of a particular word of the sentence in order to deny a negative statement or to affirm a doubtful one. In this case, the emphasis is on the auxiliary verb. (Huddleston 2002: 93)

Next to the above mentioned central modals, there are other verbs that share some of the same characteristics, but are not considered as central modals. According to Quirk et al., there are three more distinctions, namely marginal modals (dare, need, ought to, used to), modal idioms (had better, would rather/sooner, be to, have to) and semi-auxiliaries (be able to, be bound to, be willing to). (1985: 137) For the remainder of this paper, only two of the central modal verbs, namely shall and should, will be of importance. It is now time to have a look at their exact meaning.

2.2.3. Deontic vs. Epistemic Uses of Modals

After it has been shown that there are different ways of defining modality and classifying modal verbs, the different uses and meanings of modal verbs will now be explained. The following sample sentences give a better understanding in how modal verbs can convey at least two different meanings.

1. Kevin should be home by now.
2. Kevin should be working harder in order not to fail the next exam.
3. Can I go to the party on Friday?
4. Lucas is a very talented boy, he can play the organ and speak perfectly
Chinese.

5. The fact that Josh can become the new head of department, gives Henry sleepless nights.

6. Its main thrust, as we shall see, was to turn its gaze backwards to the 'glories' of the French regime. (ICE-CAN, W2A-005)

7. Following in the footsteps of the pioneering masters, we shall try to focus attention on key questions. (ICE-CAN, W2A-015)

Not knowing whether Kevin is really home or not, the speaker in sentence (1) makes an assumption and expresses a certain possibility, whereas the speaker in the next sentence (2) utters the necessity that Kevin works harder in order to get better grades. In sentence (3), the subject asks for permission to go to a party, while sentence (4) is about the ability of a very gifted boy. Possibility is also the main theme of sentence (5). It is possible, but not obligatory, that John becomes the new head of department. Another use of modal verbs can be to make predictions, which is done in sentence (6). One of the meanings that mainly focuses on the act, is obligation. This can be found in sentence (7), where the act is 'focusing on the key questions'. What stands out, is that the same modals can express different meanings. Depending on the amount of background information, it is often the case that utterances “can be interpreted in either of the ways shown” (Huddleston 1984: 166) in the sample sentences above. Those meanings are either deontic, epistemic or dynamic. (Palmer 1990) What can be understood by these terms, will be explained in the next paragraphs. As different authors use different terms and classifications, other concepts for the same meanings will be given first.

“In English analytic modality, we can make an initial distinction between epistemic and non-epistemic, or root modality.” (Depraetere, Reed 2006: 273) Both types base on the notion of possibility and necessity, “but the former deals with the necessity or possibility of the truth (or non-truth) of propositions” (Depraetere, Reed 2006: 273f.), while root modality deals with the act itself. Since there is a certain likelihood that the proposition is true or not according to the speaker's judgment, there is also a scale that ranges “from week epistemic possibility (That may be John) to epistemic necessity (That must be John).” (Depraetere, Reed 2006: 274) Within root modality, there is root necessity, root possibility, volition and ability. (cf. Depraetere, Reed 2006: 274) Coates (1983) also prefers the concept of root modality rather than the one of non-epistemic modality. Root possibility and root necessity are also referred to as deontic modality, which is about “the necessity and possibility of acts
performed by morally responsible agents.” (Lyons 1977: 823) Deontic sources, such as a set of rules, persons or social norms, impose the deontic obligation or permission as in *Luca must stay at our house until midnight* or *Luca can stay at our house until midnight*. (cf. Depraetere, Reed 2006: 274) What other scholars like Frawaley (2006) and Portner (2009) refer to as dynamic modality, is called non-deontic root possibility and non-deontic root necessity according to Depraetere and Reed's (2006) definition, since it differs from both ability and epistemic possibility. (2006: 274) An utterance as *The chicken have to be fed once a day* does neither include a speaker's value judgment nor does it imply a certain ability of being able to do something. The modal verb can be replaced by 'it is important to', 'it is possible for' or 'it is necessary for/ that'. (cf. Depraetere, Reed 2006: 274). The linguist Paul Portner (2009), whose point of view will be given in the next paragraph, is one that categorizes dynamic modality as a third way of reading modality.

According to Portner, epistemic modality is based on knowledge and deontic modality is concerned “with right and wrong according to some system of rules”. (2009: 2) Deontic modality, deriving from the Greek word *deon* meaning duty, is about giving permission or making things obligatory or necessary. (cf. Endley 2010: 274) *You must leave the room* makes it obligatory for you to go. *If you want to go to University, you must get your A-level first* is a duty or law that derives from society. The main focus is thus not on the speaker, unlike in epistemic modality, but rather refers to the proposition or act. In epistemic modality, the speaker’s value judgment of the utterance is the center of the proposition. Palmer (1986) notes that there is another type of modality, the evidential one, that belongs to the same category as the epistemic modality, to wit to the propositional category. The only difference is that the speaker is giving evidence for his utterance in evidential modality. (Palmer 2001: 24) If I say *Sheila may be working today*, I am expressing epistemic modality whereas *Sheila may be in her office, at least her blazer is hanging here and I could hear her saying something* belongs to evidential modality. Furthermore, Portner introduces a third type of modality, namely dynamic modality. This reading does not express the speakers opinion (epistemic), but is about abilities, actions, needs and potentials. It derives from the Greek word *dynamis*, meaning strength and power. If I say *Lisa can speak perfect Spanish*, I am stating a fact, but not giving my opinion. Or while saying *It is snowing outside*, I am only describing a situation that is fact, whereas I cannot affect it (deontic). However, this type of modality is not going to be included in this analysis.

Biber et al. (1999) and Quirk et al. (1985) find the terms *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*
modality as most suitable. Intrinsic modality involves “some kind of intrinsic human control over events” (Quirk et al. 1985: 219) and hence includes obligation, permission and volition. Extrinsic modality usually involves “human judgment of what is or is not likely to happen” (Quirk et al. 1985: 219) and refers to necessity, possibility and prediction. Quirk et al. (1985) also note that each modal has both uses and that their meaning can overlap. It is therefore hard to identify the exact meaning of a certain modal verb in an utterance. In I will see you on Friday then, “the meanings of volition and prediction” (Quirk et al. 1985: 219) are combined. The issue of overlapping will be addressed in the further analysis again. It is also possible, that a sentence entails two meanings, in which case the reader or listener does not have to decide for one meaning. Therefore, take a look at the following example:

(8) One more thing, please tell us if you come across any software that you think we should know about. (ICE-CAN, W1B-017)

Should, in this case, can be read as deontic and epistemic. It is not clear whether the speaker talks about a software that the listener is already familiar with because it is necessary for him to know about it (deontic) or if it is a popular software that he definitely has to get to know (epistemic). Even though it is more likely that should is used here as an epistemic meaning, both could be the case.

As various different terms for basically the same concept have been introduced, a brief overview of the above mentioned terms and the relative author(s,) that support this concept, is given. This diagram is based on a table by Katja Seidel (2004: 14). The distinction between epistemic and deontic modality will be adopted for the remainder of this study.

Table 1: Classification of modalities
3. METHODOLOGY: A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS

3.1. Corpus Linguistics

Corpus Linguistics, namely the study of language, is a field of study that is conducted on the basis of various text corpora. (cf. Viana, Zyngier, Barnbrook 2011: 83) The name corpus derives from the Latin word 'body' and describes a collection that consists of at least two texts. (cf. McEnery, Wilson 2001: 24) Most corpora also consist of transcribed speeches. From the 1960s onwards, electronic corpora have become a very popular resource for linguists. (cf. McEnery, Gabrielatos 2006: 33) From the 1980 onwards, “Corpus studies boomed, as corpora, techniques and new arguments in favor of the use of corpora became more apparent.” (McEnery, Wilson 2001: 24) Using the method of corpus linguistics to first obtain and then analyze data in a qualitative and quantitative way, became an essential part in the field of linguistics.

According to McEnery and Wilson, a corpus should fulfill four criteria. (1998: 29) Firstly, it has to be representative and hence consist of useful samples. This, for example, means that no utterances should be left out only because they are too rare, as Chomsky criticized. A corpus should be a good representation of both common and uncommon utterances. Further, a certain variety of texts from different genres or fields should be used in order not to be one-sided. Secondly, the size of the corpus must be finite. Before starting the project of building a new corpus, the kind of sample texts, the number of texts and also the length of the texts has to be considered and defined. Constantly in size changing corpora are not as rigorous as finite ones. Thirdly, the corpus should be machine-readable. Finding a printed version of a collection of texts is nowadays rather an exception. (cf. McEnery, Wilson 2001: 30 ff.) Since our society is a fast moving one and new technologies are constantly being invented, having a corpus as a book format would be very inconvenient for research. What can be researched within minutes or even seconds with the help of a machine-readable corpus, would take hours or even days with a corpus in the format of a book. Fourthly, the corpus should be widely available and consequently “constitute a standard reference.” (McEnery, Wilson 2001: 32)

The text samples of a corpus are usually analyzed with the help of special computer programs like AntConc or WordSmith. In this study, the program AntConc by Laurence Anthony has been used. This free toolkit offers different tools like a file view tool,
concordance (plot) tool, a word list tool, key word list tool as well as collocates and clusters tool. Considering that a great amount of data can be processed within a short period of time, working with an electronic corpus for this research topic seemed ideal. Furthermore, it was not necessary to run a time-consuming sample collection as most corpora are available to everybody either online or on a CD-ROM. On top of that, contextual factors like the speakers' sex, age, profession or education can easily be investigated and compared. (cf. Biber et al. 1998: 3) Taking all these advantages into consideration, it was decided to work with ICE-CAN, which will be introduced in the next subsequent chapter, to investigate the usages of shall and should.

3.2. The ICE-CAN Corpus

ICE-CAN is the Canadian component of the International Corpus of English (ICE). Before describing this particular component, the International Corpus of English will briefly be introduced. The ICE “is an international project that was initiated by Professor Sidney Greenbaum in 1988.” (Scheben 2006: 3) Eighteen countries from all around the world make up this corpus which is an investigation of national varieties. Greenbaum had the idea of compiling a collection of texts because by that time, it was not possible to compare writings and speeches in American English nor was it possible to compare American and British speeches. (cf. Scheben 2006: 3) With publishing his first proposal of the ICE, Greenbaum provided “a resource for comparative studies of the English used in countries where it is either a majority first language (e.g. Canada or Australia) or an official additional language (e.g. India or Nigeria).” (Scheben 2006: 4) The British component (ICE-GB), the East African component (ICE-EA) and the Singapore component are other available corpora to name but a few. This corpus also “serve as a basis for intra- and international comparisons.” (Schmied 2011: 1) According to Joseph Schmied, “this was a major achievement since it meant that for the first time the sociolinguistic stratification of English language variation was seriously discussed in corpus compilation.” (Schmied 2011: 1) For this analysis, the Canadian component has been used, which is introduce in the next paragraph.

The first release of ICE-CAN was in 2010. This corpus consists of 300 Spoken English Files and 200 Written English Files. As all the other individual corpora, ICE-CAN follows a certain corpus scheme and design. It consists of 500 texts with about 2 000 words each. Hence, the whole corpus contains approximately one million words. The spoken files
include both dialogues and monologues, whereas the dialogues are either public or private and the monologues scripted or unscripted. The written files are, for example, letters, student essays, popular writings, press news reports or novels and short stories. The speakers and authors of all the individual texts are at least 18 years old and were educated through the medium of English. Furthermore, they were either born in Canada or moved there at an early stage of their life. “The corpus contains samples of speech and writing by both males and females, and it includes a wide range of age groups.” (Nelson 2009) However, not all age groups and both sexes are equally represented in the country as well as the corpus. For example, there are not as many speeches and writings by females for the field of law and politics as there are by males and not all age groups are represented among academic and student writings. For the purposes of this study, ICE-CAN is more than adequate and a great tool to compare the uses of particular words such as the modals shall and should.

3.3. Limitations of Corpus Linguistics

As it is with most data collections, programs and other language research tools, corpora also have some disadvantages next to all their advantages. First of all, when the number of words is rather small as it is the case with ICE-CAN, which contains about one and a half million word tokens, an absolute representativeness cannot be guaranteed. Some language phenomena that are quite common might seem rather uncommon due to the number of selected data. Other phenomena that are uncommon might not appear at all in the texts. In short, some language characteristics might be under- and others overrepresented and hence, not all findings can be absolutely generalized.

When conducting a data analysis with the help of a corpus, the limitations of corpus linguistics have to be kept in mind. A corpus cannot be used for all kinds of researches that are supposed to provide representative conclusions. (cf. McEnery, Wilson 2001: 125) It is also hard to achieve fully statistical reliability, since variables are also used for “sampling and coding the corpus” (McEnery, Wilson 2001: 24), as for example in genres, periods and sociological variables. When searching for one particular word, the program AntConc also shows words that are tagged in the notes added by the editors of the corpus and not the

2 A detailed description is to be found in 4.1.1.
author of the text. For that reason, all the data has to be dealt with carefully. Depending on the field of research, a corpus-based analysis can bring great results, but in some cases it can also only give a partial view.

Another factor is the quality of the data. Especially in the spoken files, it often occurred that parts of the sentences were missing or incomplete. In other cases, the data was incomprehensible and hence the utterance did not make sense. This was mostly the case in the category of 'Spontaneous Commentaries' where there is no real dialogue and a sentence is often started, but not finished. In the category of 'Telephone Calls', it often occurred that one person did not finish his sentence because he or she was interrupted by the other person. Whereas it is not surprising that telephone calls do not consist of complete sentences only, it makes it difficult to analyze this data for a special purpose like the uses of modal verbs. Further, some words were unclear due to the quality of the recordings. In some cases, it was possible to guess the missing or unclear word(s). However, guessing what could have been the complete sentence would falsify the results. Therefore, such cases were left out in this data collection.

Another disadvantage is the limitation to one region or one particular group of people. With ICE-GB, for example, the problem “is that it is clearly centered on the Survey of English Usage at University College, London; it does not adequately cover other regions of England, to say nothing of Scotland.” (Schmied 2011: 2)

The just mentioned limitations have nothing to do with the program used to analyze the data or the tagging of the words, but rather with the spoken files the researchers have chosen for this corpus. In the case of modal verbs, it was often hard to differentiate between deontic and epistemic meaning simply because decisive parts of the sentences or utterances were missing or incomplete. Apart from that, the ICE-CAN as well as AntConc were a big help in comparing the two modal verbs shall and should.
4. ANALYSIS OF THE USES OF THE MODALS SHALL AND SHOULD

4.1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to find out the different usages of the modal verbs shall and should and whether the English we find in German School books corresponds to the English we find in computerized data-collections. Furthermore, the corpus analysis is to reveal if shall is really used in a few selected contexts only today and if should is indeed the past tense of shall. As the German School books have already been analyzed, the focus will now be on the corpus-based analysis of the usages of the modals shall and should. Before, however, a brief overview of the frequency in ICE-CAN as well as the ranking of the nine central modals, which have been mentioned before, will be given.

Table 2: Comparative frequencies of individual modals in ICE-CAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Modal verb</th>
<th>Number of hits</th>
<th>% (N=12569)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>can</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>might</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>shall</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total words</td>
<td>1593960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total modals</td>
<td>12569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.79 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the nine modals, should is right in the middle with 1005 hits and shall in last place with only 87 hits. Should is more than eleven times more frequent in ICE-CAN than shall. It has to be noted that some lexemes have the same spelling, but not the same meaning, which is called a homograph. (cf. Ganske 2000: 166) This is the case with the modals will, might, can, must and may in this context. Homographs for will are the male name Will and someone’s last will. An armed might has nothing to do with the modal verb and is hence a homograph of might. Someone might drink a can of beer, in which case can (‘metal container’) occurs as a noun and not as a modal verb. (cf. Cowie 1999: 147) The same
counts for must, which can also be used as a noun as in It is a must. Furthermore, a woman might be named May or the talk might be of the month May. In both cases, may has a different meaning than the modal verb may. The occurrence of homographs should not be ignored in order to gain an accurate result. As only the modals shall and should are relevant for this paper and the ranking does not influence the overall outcome of the analysis of this study, the homographs of the other modal verbs found in the table above have not been sorted out. The ranking only serves as a general overview. The table has been conducted with the help of the computer program Antconc, which allows the search of single lexical items within selected parts of ICE-CAN or the whole corpus.

An additional point that must be considered when conducting such an analysis, are the negative forms of the modal verbs, such as won't, couldn't and shouldn't. Because there is no such negative form of the modal shall and the frequency of shouldn't is comparatively low, it was decided to neglect the negative forms. Furthermore, the contracted form 'll should also be paid attention to. Since there are only two cases of 'll in ICE-CAN, which could either stand for will or shall, they will not be included in this study either.

According to Renkema, “knowing what other scholars have done can help […] to identify the place of the present research in relation to other studies.” (2009: 165) Gotti, for example, has done a study on the modal verbs shall and will, which will be mentioned again in 4.2. However, as this study focuses on German School Books, the findings were not compared to another study since this would lead too far. Now, a closer look will be taken at the selected texts of the corpus.

4.1.1. Selection of Texts

For this analysis, all of the 500 texts and categories of the ICE-CAN have been taken into consideration. The 200 spoken and 300 written English files are divided into the following text categories: 'Dialogue' and 'Monologue' for the spoken files and 'Printed' as well as 'Non-Printed' for the written files. The category of 'Non-Printed' files refers to texts such as students essays that have not been published. These text categories each have at least two subcategories. Those can be found in the table below.
Table 3: Categories of ICE-CAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Categories</th>
<th>Nr. of texts</th>
<th>Nr. of word tokens</th>
<th>Nr. of Modals</th>
<th>Text Categories</th>
<th>Nr. of texts</th>
<th>Nr. of word tokens</th>
<th>Nr. of Modals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPOKEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WRITTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALOGUE</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NON-PRINTED</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Conversations</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>345129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NON-PROF. WRITING</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25950</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40215</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Student Essays</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27281</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Lessons</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75742</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>CORRESPONDENCE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41119</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Discussions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65153</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Social Letters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38860</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Interviews</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31846</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Business Letters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35296</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Debates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Cross-examinations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37796</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRINTED</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Transactions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37201</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOLOGUE</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSCRIPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Commentaries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62753</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NON-ACADEMIC WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscripted Speeches</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>101540</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30561</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34491</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27312</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Presentations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29774</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26519</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35296</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast News</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Talks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60080</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>REPORTAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-broadcast Talks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Press News Reports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55145</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27153</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1032099</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>561861</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only includes the modal verbs *shall* and *should*
The table shows with how many texts each category is represented. It further shows how many incidences of *shall* and *should* are found in the texts compared to the total number of words in the particular texts. Whereas there are only fourteen out of the 32 subcategories that contain at least one incidence of *shall*, the modal verb *should* occurs in every single category and subcategory. That is why none of the categories will be excluded. All the different subcategories, as for example 'Direct Conversations', 'Legal Presentations', 'Broadcast Talks', 'Student Essays', 'Humanities' and 'Press News Reports', display a good variety and representation of most of the fields that there are in our daily lives when it comes to speaking and writing. Which category has the most and which the least occurrences of *shall*/ *should*, will be analyzed in 4.2. and 4.3.

4.1.2. Methods of Investigation

In order to find out about the different usages of the two modals, there are going to be three methods of investigation, which are as follows:

1. The word frequencies of the two variables will be compared.
2. A brief look will be taken at the structure of the modal verb phrases.
3. The semantic meaning of both modals will be analyzed.

(1) Modal verb frequencies

As Jan Renkema states, it is helpful to begin with comparing “the distribution of certain lexical and grammatical features across registers and then turn to more comprehensive register features.” (2009: 162) For such an analysis, comparing the modal frequencies is the best thing to start off with. A comparison of the frequencies is very useful because it gives both an overall idea of the modal verb frequency and the frequency in the text types. It hence offers an insight into the differences of the usages in different contexts. An advantage of corpus linguistic is that it “is possible to compare the frequencies of a word in spoken and written corpora.” (Esser, 1999: 91) After the first method of analysis is more general, the second and especially the third one are more detailed and give a better idea of the differences in the usages of the modals *shall* and *should*. 
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(2) Structure of the modal verb phrase
As “the goal of corpus-based research is not simply to report quantitative findings, but to include qualitative, functional interpretations of quantitative patterns” (Renkema, 2009: 162), it is important to not only give the word frequencies but to go a step further and look into their semantic as well as syntactic meaning. Even though this study focuses almost exclusively on the semantic notion of two modal verbs, it is also interesting to take a look at the syntactic notion of those modals. After screening all the data, it was decided to differentiate between four basic syntactic categories which there are: 'Infinitive' (8), 'Passive' (9), 'Progressive' (10) and 'Perfect' (11) (cf. Seidel 2004: 31). Those are the four categories that are represented in the sentences that include the modal verb *should* in ICE-CAN. Nevertheless, there will not be a whole section on the phrase structures of the modal verbs due to limited space and a different focus of the study. The findings will be briefly analyzed in connection with the semantic meanings of *shall* and *should*.3 Four examples are given below.

(8) That is to say, I have ten thousand dollars, *should* I start a business or *should* I put it in the bank. (ICE-CAN, S1B-010)

(9) The Labour / Management Committee shall be established within thirty (30) days of the signing of this agreement. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

(10) I feel like there's something I *should* be doing. (ICE-CAN, S1A-084)

(11) I *should* have done it a long time ago. (ICE-CAN, S1A-013)

(3) Semantic meaning
A closer look will be taken at the semantic notion of *shall* and *should* after providing a diagram that shows all the usages, including the most common and rather uncommon ones. The most well-known expression of *should* is obligation- but is it also the most common one? What other expressions of *shall* are there apart from prediction? These and other questions will be given an answer in the following sections. In short, all the different expressions and meanings of *should* and *shall* will be analyzed and explained in greater detail in the respective sections 4.2.2. and 4.3.2..

---

3 A detailed table of the findings on the modal verb phrase structures is to be found in the appendix.
4.2. **SHALL**

4.2.1. Frequency Overview

The table below shows the number of occurrences of *shall* in the corpus in the selected text categories.

**Table 4: Frequency of *shall* in the selected text categories in ICE-CAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text category</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th><em>shall</em></th>
<th>Per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Conversations</td>
<td>345129</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Lessons</td>
<td>75742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Discussions</td>
<td>65153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscripted Speeches</td>
<td>101540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>34491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Talks</td>
<td>56119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Essays</td>
<td>25950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Scripts</td>
<td>27281</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Letters</td>
<td>41119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (Academic Writing)</td>
<td>30561</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences (Academic Writing)</td>
<td>27312</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (Academic Writing)</td>
<td>26519</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Writing</td>
<td>26820</td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novels &amp; Stories</td>
<td>58392</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>942668</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Frequency of *shall* in Spoken and Written English (N=87)**

As can be seen in Table 4, *shall* occurs in fourteen of the 32 text categories only, so in less than half of the text types. However, only three subcategories are actually worth considering. There are 87 incidences of *shall* in the whole corpus, out of which one is not
going to be included in the semantic analysis due to the missing context. Shall occurs 9 times per 100,000 words in the selected categories and only 5 times per 10,000 words in the whole corpus. The modal shall is most frequent in 'Administrative Writing' and occurs at least six times in the categories of 'Examination Scripts' and 'Social Sciences'.

The modal shall is almost non-existent in the spoken English files and only partly existent in the written English files as Figure 5 shows. Even though shall occurs eight times more in the written files than in the spoken ones, the number is still rather small. Overall, it can be said that shall “is in present day English a rather rare auxiliary.” (Palmer 1987: 136) As Gotti and various other scholars state, shall has taken a “rather profound dips in frequency in both British and American English.” (Mair 2006: 100) This is also confirmed by the low frequency of shall in ICE-CAN and will be shown in the semantic analysis below.

There are only a few people nowadays who actually use the word shall in their everyday speech. Most of them are elderly persons who are still used to the vocabulary that was used many years ago or people who are active in the fields of legislation. Already back in 1961, linguists have observed a change in the frequency of shall. A table published in Mair and Leech 2006 shows, that the decline of the modal verb is not one that happened in the recent past, but already back in 1961. (cf. Mair 2006: 102)\(^4\) Hence, the observed change was not completely surprising. There are various studies on the modal shall. Maurizio Gotti (2003) and Merja Kytö (1991), for example, focused on the modal verbs shall and will with a “first person subject future time reference […] in a corpus of Early Modern English texts.” (Gotti 2003: 91) Their study even goes back to the time period of 1640-1710. This study is interesting to take a look at because it shows the common usages of shall a few hundred years ago. It was found out that “in the first person, shall is simply used for prediction.” (Gotti 2003: 92) In second person, however, shall is used for threatening, promising and commanding. According to Cooper (1685), shall can also indicate declaration or an order. (cf. Gotti 2003: 92) Since tense and subject play a bigger role than the semantic analysis in the studies of Cooper, Gotti and Kytö, their results do not serve as a basis for comparison.

When looking at older texts, the contracted form ’ll is often to be found. Nowadays, it is hard to identify whether the modal shall or will was used in those contexts. “In Middle English, shall was definitely more frequent than will.” (Gotti 2003: 101) Today, the

\(^4\) The table is to be found in the appendices.
contracted form ‘ll is usually associated with the auxiliary verb will. It can even be said that will took over the predicting function of shall, which also contributed to the decline of shall. However, when looking at older texts, it sometimes might be mistaken to identify will instead of shall. As already mentioned before, the contracted form ‘ll only appears twice in ICE-CAN, which is the reason why it was omitted.

As can be seen in Table 4 and the examples given below, shall is particularly used in one field, namely in the field of 'Administrative Writing'. Shall occurs with 201 words per 100,000 words. It “is used in archaic and formal style for commands as in […] the Ten Commandments, and is often found in legal language which imposes a law or regulation.” (Palmer 1987: 141)

(12) For the purpose of administration of the Collective Agreement, unless otherwise stipulated, the Labour Relations Office shall act on behalf of the Employer. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

(13) The Employer shall deduct an amount equal to the dues established by the Association from the salary of each part-time faculty member. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

(14) No later than 1 June each year, the Employer shall supply the Association with a complete alphabetical listing of all part-time faculty members for the preceding academic year. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

As Mair states, shall seems also to be still common among adult–child interaction as for example in “Daddy shall I show you”. (2006: 103) Hence, it can be assumed that shall “is not going to disappear completely because of its secure base in specific uses.” (Mair 2006: 103) The different usages of shall will be analyzed in the next section.

4.2.2. Semantic Analysis

Figure 2: Frequency distribution of syntactic constructions of shall (N=87)
Shall is most commonly followed by infinitive phrases. There are only fourteen cases where shall is followed by a passive construction (1), which makes up 16 percent. As Table 6 shows, the modal shall is almost exclusively used in connection with the infinitive, as also shown in the following examples.

(15) Any disputes between you and a merchant shall be settled by you or the user of the card and the merchant. (ICE-CAN, W2D-010)

(16) Such violations shall include, but not be limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory. (ICE-CAN, W1A-005)

(17) Or shall I let the reader imagine them all? (ICE-CAN, W2F-019)

(18) The Association shall receive a copy of every departmental seniority list. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

In 22 percent of the cases, shall is either preceded or followed by the personal pronoun I, or we (17). Compared to I shall or shall I, we shall is the collocate that, occurs most often in the text files with ten hits. Since this study is not primarily concerned with the syntactic notion of shall, the next paragraphs will exclusively focus on the semantic notion of the modal auxiliary shall.

Figure 3: Semantic distribution of shall (N= 86)
In contrast to other modal verbs, *shall* has, in most cases, a deontic function only. (cf. Palmer 1987: 136). Other linguists, as Leo Hoye, argue that *shall* also has an epistemic meaning. (1997: 120) This analysis does not confirm the notion of Palmer, but shows that *shall* is almost exclusively used in a deontic way. With *shall*, the speaker utters what should become true, what can be suggested or he makes an offer or expresses politeness, which belongs to the deontic notion. Epistemic meaning can be conveyed through the modal verb *shall* as well when making a prediction. The speaker states what he thinks will come true, so he expresses his own opinion and herewith the probability that an event or action is going to come true. As all the other modal auxiliaries, *shall* has more than two different meanings. The three different categories, which are represented in ICE-CAN, have been termed as follows: 'Obligation', 'Prediction' and 'Offer, Suggestion, Advice, Tentativeness, Politeness'. (See Figure 3) In the third broad category, five usages have been put together since there are only very few incidences of them in the corpus and because it is sometimes hard to differentiate between them. In the following, all three categories and the usages of *shall* as well as the respective frequencies will be explained in more detail.

**Category 1: Obligation**

Figure 3 clearly shows that the most predominant usage of *shall* in ICE-CAN is obligation. In 84 percent of the cases, *shall* is used to influence or direct someone’s behavior and is therefore performative. (cf. Palmer 1987: 141) The following examples give an insight into the deontic use of *shall* in the corpus.

(19) Though Marx and Marxism are highly controversial subjects, we *shall* try to discuss his work objectively, with the aim of highlighting his sociological contributions. (ICE-CAN, W2A-015)
1. In our discussion of the family, we shall concern ourselves mainly with the question of whether the family is in a state of decline. (ICE-CAN, W2A-015)

2. Three (3) times a year (August 31, January 15, May 15), the Employer shall supply the Association with a complete alphabetical listing, by Department, of all part-time faculty members who are teaching that term. (ICE-CAN, W2D-002)

This broad category includes making promises or threats, where the speaker “guarantees that an action will take place.” (Palmer 1987: 141) Further, talking about a necessity is included in this category. Offers, asking for advice and suggestions are included in an extra category since a different meaning is conveyed and in order to show that these uses have a very low frequency. In (19), the speaker talks about the necessity of staying objectively, which is clearly an example for category one. The second example (20) is concerned with the obligation of thinking about the family situation. When only looking at the sentence itself, it is not clear whether the speaker is talking about the present or future. However, when looking at the context, it becomes obvious that the speaker is not referring to the future. In sample sentence (21), the speaker obliges the employer to provide the Association with a certain list. In this case, shall does not express a threat nor a suggestion, but simply an obligation.

Category 2: Prediction

Another usage of shall, which makes up 7 percent, is that of conveying prediction.

3. I’m going to go call this guy and then I shall return. (ICE-CAN, S2A-060)

4. Durkheim’s reply, as we shall see, raises the critical question of whether a social order resting on basic social inequalities can be stable. (ICE-CAN, W1B-007)

5. In a few days I shall visit you, and I shall bring the champagne with pleasure. (ICE-CAN, W2F-012)

As can also be seen in the examples (22-24), the speaker makes a prediction when he states that an action or event will take place in the future. It has to be mentioned that “it is not always easy to decide whether the speaker undertakes to act or merely indicated that he will do so in the future.” (Palmer 1987: 141) In most of the cases, when shall is used, it can be argued that the speaker is talking about the future and not the present. Hence, it was not
always easy to decide for the one or the other in the given data. When taking a look at sentence (22), it is clear that the speaker is making a prediction about his return. The modal shall in (23) can be replaced by be going to and is hence obviously referred to an act in the future. In example (24), however, it is not obvious whether the second part of the sentence has to be considered as a prediction or not. Another example for an unclear case is the utterance I shall apologize for my rudeness. (cf. Palmer 1987: 141) The sentence could be understood in a futurity sense and at the same time as a necessity or obligation.

**Category 3: Offer, Suggestion, Advice, Tentativeness, Politeness**

The third category comprises four different usages of shall that are rather rare. In ICE-CAN, they only make up 8 percent.

(25) Not to say that the job wasn't well done but it was **shall** we say open to interpretation. (ICE-CAN, S2A-022)

(26) **Shall** we dance? (ICE-CAN, S1A-085)

(27) **Shall** I part my hair behind? (ICE-CAN, W1A-014)

(28) It is the question the writer asks when writing a book: **Shall** I fill in all the details? Or **shall** I let the reader imagine them all? (ICE-CAN, W2F-019)

In sentence (25), the speaker is not quite sure how to put it, so **shall**, in this context, expresses tentativeness. Whereas the speaker in example (26) makes a suggestion to the addressee, the speaker in (27) and (28) request someone's opinion and ask for advice. To indicate offers or suggestions, **shall** is used in questions. (cf. Oxford Dictionaries 2012)

**Conclusion**

With 84 percent, the predominating usage of the modal verb **shall** is that of obligation. However, since 54 incidences of **shall** are out of one text category, namely ‘Administrative Writing’, whereby 46 are out of one text, a Collective Agreement between "Jackson" University and the "Jackson University Part-time Faculty Association", the results are not really representative. "From the beginning of ICE, a major discussion has always been the balance between representativeness vs. Comparability." (Schmied 1990) As mentioned earlier, some characteristics might be under- and others overrepresented due to the selected data. ICE-CAN might not be the most representative corpus for this part of the research, but
the general tendency in other corpora would surely be similar. The overall result, namely that the use of *shall* is not as frequent as it has been a few decades ago, would still be the same. Nevertheless, these findings cannot be absolutely generalized.

*Shall* is most often (with 90 percent) used in written English and almost exclusively in formal texts. If there is a personal subject in the sentence, it is either *I* or *we*, which was the case in 22 percent of the data. The use of *shall* with the second person has completely declined. Used “in legal or quasi-legal discourse […] *shall* is close in meaning to *must*. (Quirk et al. 1985: 230) Depending on the context and the proposition, *shall* can be and is nowadays often replaced by other modal verbs such as *must* (strong obligation) or *will/ be going to* (prediction/ volition). Aside from the fact that *shall* is not used very often anymore, if not nearly never, the predominant meaning of *shall*, with 92 percent, is deontic.
4.3. SHOULD

4.3.1. Frequency Overview

Table 5: Frequency of should in selected text categories in ICE-CAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text category</th>
<th>Word Tokens</th>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Per 10,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>660,189</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>371,910</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Printed</td>
<td>133,210</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>428,651</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,593,960</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the frequency ranking over the occurrences of should in the corpus. The distribution of should per 10,000 words ranges from 5 to 8, which is a relatively balancing number. With a frequency of 6 words per 10,000, the modal should is most commonly used in spoken English, especially in private dialogues. Compared to the number of word tokens in the categories, however, there are more incidences of should in the 'Non-Printed' texts of written English. With 245 occurrences (24.4 percent), should is by far most often used in direct conversations. The text categories that show the lowest frequencies of should are the academic category of 'Natural Science' and the non-academic field of 'Social Science'. This is not surprising because scientist do not often make use of works expressing obligation, duty or prediction. Whereas shall is almost exclusively used in formal written language, should is rather used in spoken colloquial language.

Figure 4: Frequency of should in Spoken and Written English (N=1005)

Should is almost twice as frequent in spoken English as it is in written English, which is not surprising since should is a modal verb that is used in everyday language and is more common in colloquial style. Nevertheless, should is "common in both speech and writing.”
(Hoye 1997: 109) Before the semantic meaning of *should* will be explored in more detail, there will be a brief analysis of the syntactic notion of *should* in the next paragraphs.

### 4.3.2. Semantic Analysis

**Figure 5:** Syntactic distribution of *should* in the different categories (N= 694)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Printed</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6:** Syntactic distribution of *should* no-infinitive context (N= 102)

To make the syntactic distribution of *should* more visible, it was decided to use two figures. With only a small percentage of progressive and perfective constructions, *should* mainly occurs in infinitive constructions in the corpus. *Should*, in connection with infinite constructions, is predominantly found in 'Direct Conversations'. In the printed texts, *should* occurs in 13 percent of the cases in connection with a passive construction, which is fairly high compared to the other categories. In the 'Non-Printed' as well as 'Printed' texts, the progressive and perfective constructions are equally represented. Even though the percentage remains rather low, perfective and progressive constructions (3) are not
absolutely uncommon in dialogues. The following examples give a better understanding of the four different constructions used in connection with the modal verb *should*.

(30) I guess we *should* take a look at this. (ICE-CAN, S1B-005)

(31) *Should* the law *be changed* instead of splitting everyone into a no committee and a yes committee? (ICE-CAN, S1B-030)

(32) And three of the five days I'm including her group too because she really doesn't know what she *should be doing* with the kids so I thought well so that they're involved as well I'd... (ICE-CAN, S1B-007)

(33) I *should have* married you. (ICE-CAN, S1A-040)

The examples show that *should* is used in a variety of different topics ranging from everyday situations as shown in (31) and (32) to classroom discussions (29) to discussions about laws and politics (30). Is the agent unknown or consciously left out, a passive construction (30) is often used in a more formal context, since there is no need of an agentive- subject here. The topics in direct conversations are usually more personal, which is also shown by the high frequency of infinitive constructions (29). The speakers are directly addressing his/ her dialogue partner and hence need a subject in the sentence. Another sign of the more informal, but more personal, context is the length of the sentences. People use rather short sentences in direct conversations, such as small talks, and longer sentences in a more formal context. When telling a story or stating their personal opinion, speaker tend to use more perfective constructions (4) in informal styles, which is also the case in the ICE-CAN texts. With 7 percent, the perfective construction is the second most used syntactical form in 'Dialogues'. As will be be seen in later examples, *should* is not limited to specific personal pronoun, but can be used with any of them.

Following the same structure of the previous chapter, the semantic meaning of *should* will now be analyzed with regard to all the different categories. *Should* can express both deontic as well as epistemic meaning. To be more precise, *should* can convey obligation, duty, probability, certainty, prediction as well as politeness and tentativeness.
For the semantic distribution of *should*, only 978 occurrences were taken into consideration due to the fact that fourteen sentences were either incomplete or part of the context was missing and thirteen cases have been classified as ambiguous. The categories chosen for this analysis of the corpus data, which are also shown in Figure 7, are as follows: 'Obligation', 'Putative Meaning', 'Tentative Inference', 'Tentativeness/Politeness' and 'Ambiguity'. Except the last two categories, all were selected according to the classification of Quirk et al. (1985). The second last category is taken from Palmer who states that *should* “expresses tentative epistemic necessity.” (2001: 204) All the categories and usages of *should*, which are shown in Figure 7, will be explained in more detail in the following.

**Category 1: Obligation**

In its deontic meaning obligation, *should* generally implies the speaker's authority. (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 227). The usage is mostly performative because there is a certain degree of an “expectation that an action will be carried out or an event will take place.” (Hoye 1997:112) Compared to the modal *must*, which expresses an absolute obligation (Palmer 1987: 132), the speaker also allows for a certain possibility that the event will not happen or that the expectation is going to stay unfulfilled when using *should*. (cf. Hoye 1997:112) In some cases, the speaker even implies that an action will not be carried out as demonstrated in the example by Palmer (1987: 132): *I should/ ought to be ashamed, but I'm not* implies that the action is not going to be carried out. With *should*, which “is generally interchangeable with *ought (to)*” (Huddleston 2002: 186), the speaker indicates what he “considers ‘right’- whether morally or as a matter of expediency.” (Huddleston 2002: 186)

The category of obligation in this study includes general and personal obligations.
(33), advices (34), necessities as well as duties. As those meanings sometimes overlap and are difficult to differentiate, they were combined in one category. Obligation is the most common use of the modal verb should as Table 11 shows. With at least 56 percent up to 87 percent, Canadian speakers used should very frequent in all categories. Four illustrative sentences are:

(34) That's why we shouldn't flee we should fight because we have to ensure that those that can't flee are protected. (ICE-CAN, S1B-038)

(35) You should have seen her laughing. (ICE-CAN, S1A-094)

(36) In my opinion we should get rid of the distinct society. (ICE-CAN, S1B-035)

(37) Yes I'm sorry I should have specified that. (ICE-CAN, S1B-032)

Category 2: Putative Meaning

The second most frequent usage of should is the 'Putative Meaning'. “In using should, the speaker [states] that it [a putative world] may well exist or come into existence.” (Quirk et al. 1985: 234) Should “describes something that is generally accepted, supposed to be or to become true.” (Seidel 2004: 79) Perfective and progressive constructions are possible, but here again, infinitive constructions are predominant. There is no big difference in spoken and written English. With 56 percent, there are slightly more infinitive constructions in the written files. The following examples show different aspects of should used “as a marker of 'Putative Meaning'” (Quirk et al. 1985: 234)

(38) We know that Jean Charest is siding with the separatists that the federal government should not have intervened. (ICE-CAN, S1B-029)

(39) If you're gonna scrub the glue off, and get all the glue off and then we're gonna be throwing that stuff away then why should (I) take the glue (off). (ICE-CAN, S1A-005)

(40) So, Greta Chambers feels that in order for the Federal Government to maintain any goodwill there should be more concessions to Quebec. (ICE-CAN, S1B-040)

(41) Do you believe that the existing law should stay in force with all expenses being declared under either the no or the yes umbrella? (ICE-CAN, S1B-030)

Should is used in subordinate that-clauses as in (37) and (40), in conditional clauses (39) as well as in rhetorical questions (38), whereby the rhetorical questions mostly start with 'Why should...?'. In 61 percent of the cases, should is used in subordinate that-clauses in the category of 'Putative Meaning', followed by conditional clauses with 21 percent.
Category 3: Tentativeness/Politeness

The modal should can also contribute to other meanings like tentativeness and politeness. (Binnick 2012: 989) Even though there are only seven cases in ICE-CAN, it was decided to include this category as well and explain it separately. As can be seen in the following examples, the speaker is unsure how to put or phrase his statement and hence uses a tentative wording such as 'I should say'.

(41) Well, no one wants to think about dying but preparing for that eventually I should say certainly saves a family and friends a lot of confusion and frustration. (ICE-CAN, S1B-041)

(42) The Ukrainian-Canadian community I should say has come a long way. (ICE-CAN, S2B-027)

(43) A previous speaker I should say an earlier speaker referred to the duty of the opposition when the opposition looks at legislation such as we have before us today. (ICE-CAN, S1B-051)

Showing uncertainty is more common than expressing politeness with the modal should. Since there are other modal verbs like may and could that express politeness in a more intensive way, should is not the most popular modal used in such a context. Hence, it is not surprising that this category remains rather small with 0.8 percent.

Figure 8: Semantic distribution of epistemic should in the category of ‘Tentative Inference’ (N= 126)

Category 4: Tentative Inference

The category that includes different usages of the epistemic should has been termed ‘Tentative Inference’. This term “best seems to characterize the 'noncommitted necessity'.” (Quirk et al. 1985: 227) On the basis of what he knows, the speaker “tentatively concludes
that it [his statement] is true” (Quirk et al. 1985: 227), even though he does not know for sure. Other than with the modal must, the speaker frequently refers to something in the future with this usage of should. By stating that something is tentatively possible, the speaker suggests action. (cf. Palmer 1987: 132) As shown in Figure 8, probability, certainty as well as prediction are included in this category. Furthermore, the use of “should as a marker of hypothetical meaning” (Quirk et al. 1985: 234) has been added to this category. As shown in the following examples, the speaker expresses that he thinks something is likely to happen with tentative inference.

(44) You should get it soon (the letter). (ICE-CAN, S1A-096)

(45) That's what's going on in self-reflection so what you come in with should influence what's going to come out. (ICE-CAN, S1B-001)

(46) It should be enough to make people realize that there's a lot of violence in this society. (ICE-CAN, S1B-050)

(47) That should be interesting especially if Ally comes around. (ICE-CAN, S1A-087)

In all the examples, the speaker expresses a certain likelihood or probability that something is going to happen. In (45), the speaker is relatively sure that a certain influence is going on in self-reflection. In sentence (46), 'Tentative Inference' is also used in the examples (44) and (45). To be more precise, the speaker is making a prediction in this case. He cannot be 100 percent sure if the letter is really going to be in the mailbox in the next few days or if it is actually going to more interesting if Ally is there too. Nevertheless, based on his knowledge, the speaker can predict that. With 93 percent, should is almost exclusively used in connection with an infinitive construction in this category while it is very unlikely to find a passive construction in this context. Probability, certainty and predictions are very common usages in the text category 'Broadcast News'. Here, the modal should is especially found when talking about the weather forecast. As the news presenter can never be 100 percent sure how the weather is really going to be, tentative inference fits very well in this context. When expressing “hypothetical meaning in main clauses” (Quirk et al. 1985: 234), the modal would is commonly used. However, in some cases, namely with a 1st person subject, should is also used to mark hypothetical meaning. In ICE-CAN, there are only three occurrences of hypothetical should. They are found in the 'Non-Broadcast Talks'. Due to the low frequencies of should in hypothetical and conditional sentences, it is assumed that native speakers of English prefer the modal would in these contexts.
Category 5: Ambiguity

Finally, there are some incidences where it was not clear what the speaker wanted to express by using should. 1 percent of the data of ICE-CAN has been categorized as ambiguous. In most cases, the possible meanings were either 'Obligation' or 'Tentative Inference.'

Conclusion

Should is very “common in colloquial speech” (Palmer 1987: 132), but also frequently used in written English. The modal should can express various different meanings such as obligation, tentativeness, tentative inference and a putative one. The usage of should is topic induced. When taken a look at the categories, it is not surprising that the obligational should is more often used than the epistemic notion of should. 'Class Lessons', 'Student Essays', 'Demonstrations', 'Unscripted Speeches', 'Broadcast Talks' and interviews, to name but a few, are categories that can very much vary in topics. In this corpus, the texts are mostly about topics that require a deontic modal verb. Especially in essays of students, the use of should can be very different according to the task and topic. Hence, a corpus with different texts could show a different result. However, the overall outcome does not necessarily have to be very divergent from the findings of this study.
5. CONCLUSION

The main aim of this study was to find out about the different usages of the modal verbs *shall* and *should* in present day English in order to see if the explanations in German School Books correspond to these usages. Therefore, the Canadian component of the International Corpus of English has been analyzed. The emphasis was on the semantic notion of the two modal verbs as the syntactic notion of *shall* and *should* is not as important when it comes to the meaning of the words. The findings are summarized in the following. Furthermore, suggested improvements for German text books for learners of ESL as well as suggestions for further research will be given.

ICE-CAN displays an decline in the use of the modal verb *shall* when compared to the findings of Mair. He found out “that the frequency of *shall* […] has been decreasing steadily throughout the twentieth century- from 60/10,000 quotes in 1901-1920, to 50 for 1921-1940, […] to 22 for 1961-1980, and down to 9 per 10,000 quotes for the quotations from 1980.” (Mair 2006: 102) In ICE-CAN, there are only 5 cases of *shall* per 10,000 word tokens, which confirms the steadily decline of *shall*. What has been found out by means of the ICE-CAN analysis is that *shall* is almost exclusively used in formal written English. Its main usage is deontic. *Shall* is almost non-existent in spoken English anymore and usually only found in connection with administrative texts. Mair calls *shall* congruously a modal “on the way out.” (2006: 100)

The frequent use of *should* in dialogues, especially in direct conversations, shows, that this modal is still very popular and common in spoken English. Even though there are some usages that are rather rarely used, *should* is often found in everyday language. Its most frequent use is 'Obligation', followed by 'Putative Meaning'. It is often wrongly assumed that *should* is the past tense of *shall*. When looking at the frequency ranking of both modals, this seems unrealistic. If *should* was really the past tense form of *shall*, the differences between their frequencies in ICE-CAN would not be as high. Even though both modals are predominantly used in deontic expressions, the usages of *shall* and *should* are considerably different. *Shall* does not have as many different meanings as *should*. Hence, there cannot be a direct relationship between the two modal verbs. Huddleston also states that “some major uses of the preterite *should* - as in *You should be more careful* - have no close analogues in the present tense: the meaning is thus not systematically derivable from the meaning of *shall*.” (Huddleston 2002: 109) The assumption that *should* is the past tense form of *shall* in
all cases has been disproved by this analysis. However, *should* can function as the past tense of *shall* in reported speech (cf. Palmer 1987: 131) and is justified as the preterite counterpart of *shall* in conditionals and backshift. (cf. Huddleston 2002: 202)

One of the advantages of corpus linguistics is “that language researchers do not have to rely on their own or other native speakers’ intuition […], but can draw on a large amount of authentic, naturally occurring language data produced by a variety of speakers or writers.” (Müller, Waibe 2012) With this analysis, it was shown that the usage of the modal verbs *shall* and *should* in the corpus indeed are varied. Hence, it is important that learners of ESL are aware of all the different meanings. Thus, explanations in text books for learners have to be explicitly and comprehensive, but not confusing. It was discovered that the German text books do not explain the different meanings of *should* in enough detail. The text books only concentrate on the modal's main usages, which have been analyzed in this study. To be more precise, the usages of the modals *shall* and *should* explained in German school books do correspond to the usages in 'real' English, but are incomplete. Since the use of *shall* is more and more declining, the explanations in the text books are sufficient. The next paragraphs will give some suggested improvements for German school books in regard to the modal *should* in order to make its various meanings a bit more understandable.

In order to avoid misunderstandings and confusion, textbooks for learners have to give a clear definition of the different meanings of modal verbs. The explanations in the books itself are good, but one-sided. The authors of the books usually mention that some modals have more than one meaning, but give no further explanation. The explanations on the usages of *should* are hence only limited to one or two meanings. The given are examples are mostly well done, but it does not become clear, that *should* can have more than two different meanings, depending on the context. To make this concept more understandable, a few suggestions are made in the following.

Firstly, the whole field of modal verbs should be introduced as one topic. Therefore, it is enough to mention the different modals and their possible meanings when introducing this topic. It is not necessary to run through all the modal verbs in detail in two sessions, but it is effective for students to be introduced to the all the different modals in an introductory session, which can be in 5th or 6th grade. It is helpful to create a certain basic knowledge of the topic and then keep on adding information, explanations and exercises in the following grades. According to the current curriculum of Germany, modal verbs are covered in grades five through ten. This is very good and effective since the topic is repeatedly addressed. However, an introductory session is missing. This is, however, important to connect the
learned vocabulary and the concepts. Once the students have already heard about modal verbs in an earlier session or grade, the auxiliaries will sound familiar to them and make it easier to understand the whole idea. It is also simpler for the teacher to convey the concept of modality. Otherwise the teacher would have to start from scratch again every time he talks about a new modal verb.

Secondly, the epistemic meaning of should has to be explained in more detail. The emphasis in the school books is almost exclusively on the deontic should. As this study has shown, should is predominantly used deontically. However, the epistemic use is still fairly frequent and its usage should not be underestimated and swept under the table. When students learn and use the modal should, the main focus is usually on the act. The emphasis is on making things obligatory, but students have to know that the emphasis can also be on the speaker or the proposition itself. When using should, the speaker is not always expressing what someone has to do, but he can also express a certain value judgment and likelihood of an utterance. This aspect often lacks of explanation and exercise, if it is mentioned at all.

Thirdly, the concept of modal verbs should be explained and illustrated in more effective ways and with more visual examples. The topics of the exercises currently used in the books are everyday themes and problems, which is great to bring the concept close to the students. They are familiar with most of the topics, which makes it easier for them to apply the rules and learn new vocabulary. However, the variety of different exercises is not big enough. The students mostly have to translate sentences that include a modal verb. This is important and useful, but can become too monotonous over time. A change in the structure of exercises is needed. Most people apply rules better when learning them visually. There are a lot of simple pictures and signs that can be used in connection with modal verbs. Street signs, no swimming or no smoking signs and people playing instruments are for example a good starting point to let students create their own sentences with the modal verbs can, could, must, may and should. Instead of using already given sentences, the students should create as many as possible on their own. It is also important to let the students explain their choices. Teacher often rush through exercises without asking the students for their particular choices. Picking the right modal in a sample sentence does not mean that the students have understood the concept. Even though there are some nice pictures and comics in the book, there are none that show the contrasting meaning of the modals. The following pictures could be used when introducing the epistemic meaning of should and must and explaining the difference to the deontic meaning.
Picture 1: Explaining the difference in deontic and epistemic meaning of modal verbs

With the help of these pictures, students can practice the usages of epistemic and deontic *should* and *must*. They can be very creative and build their own sentences and explain the meaning behind them. Sentences such as *He should be home by 8pm* (epistemic meaning), *My mom said I should be home by 8pm* (deontic meaning), *We should eat more fruit, You should walk your dog twice a day* or *He should be in his office by now* are only some possible examples. Over time, the practices should become more and more challenging without pressurizing the learner to be creative all the time.

A good method that challenges the students, is the cognitive code approach introduced by Chomsky. Hereby, students are “an active processor of information.” (Hutchinson, Waters 1987: 43). Students have to find out the concept behind the 'rule of the day'. After having learned the deontic meaning of *should* with a different method, the task of the day could be to find other possible meanings of the modal verb. The students are given a text passage including modal verbs and enough details around the target sentence. Following, the meaning of the modal verb has to be understood and explained. To understand the difference in meaning, the students will get several text passages with a similar content, but different intentions and emphases. Once the students have found out differences in meaning and explained them to their fellow students, the teacher is going to give a clear definition of the concept to the class. For most students, a concept is easier remembered when they had to find out the rule and structure by themselves. This approach does not work for all topics and grammatical rules in SLA. However, when applied with a suitable topic, this way of learning can be very effective.

To summarize the suggestions, there should firstly be a kind of introductory session on modal verbs even if not all of them are explained in the same grade. Secondly, the epistemic meaning of *should* should be explained in more detail and thirdly, there should be more effective teaching methods and more visual examples to learn and practice the uses of...
modal verbs.

As more and more German people find themselves working abroad or in an international business, speaking fluent English is nowadays a common precondition on the job market. Competition in the market is tough. Misunderstandings due to language problems in English can lead to financial disadvantages and minor errors can turn into expensive mistakes. Therefore, the training of language awareness and suitable as well effective teaching and learning is very important; not only concerning the usages of modal verbs.

Future research on the topic of modal verbs and SLA could include other corpora to investigate where German learners of English specifically have difficulties in applying modal auxiliaries. This further study could use German corpora of learner English. The best corpora for this purpose are those including student essays, exams, term papers and presentations as well as everyday conversations. Furthermore, a survey could be conducted at several schools and in different grades. The survey should be conducted right after modal verbs have been introduced and new meanings explained in order to see if the teaching method was effective and successful. A second run could be done a few month later so see what the students still know about the topic. In this way, the researcher gains a deeper insight into the issues in language application of learners of ESL.
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