Modal *Must* in Philippine Editorials: A Corpus-based Study

Rodrigo Concepcion Morales
University of Santo Tomas Graduate School, Manila, Philippines
Parañaque Science High School, Parañaque City, Philippines
Bernardo College, Las Piñas City, Philippines
Email: rcmoralesust@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study examines the semantic functions and the dominant verb-phrase structure of the modal *must* under the category of printed written texts of persuasive writing in press editorials found in the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PHI) compiled by Bautista, Lising, and Dayag (1999). Moreover, the study aims to determine whether the modal *must* conforms to or deviates from the standard modal usage in American English. A total of 36 texts were analyzed for the study with approximately less than 32,000 words. The findings revealed that the dominant verb-phrase structure of the modal *must* is *must + base form of the verb*, which is favored by Filipino press editorial writers because of the seemingly overtly authoritative tone of the modal *must*. Overall, the results of the present study further confirm Gustilo's (2011) findings that the modal *must* in Philippine editorials maintains its conformity to the standard modal usage in American English. Based on the study results, a number of pedagogical implications are provided for ESL/EFL instruction and for future research.

Keywords: Modal *must*, Philippine English, semanticity, editorials, standard usage in English language

1.   Introduction

The system of modality in English language has been an interesting linguistic topic for a number of applied linguists (e.g., Abdul-Fattah, 2011; Coates & Leech, 1980; Collins, 2009; Gustilo, 2011; Hernández-Guerra, 2013; Jacobsson, 2008; Nkemleke, 2005) in terms of its possible deviations found in varieties of English. In fact, many users of the English language tend to use modal verbs to mean the following five parameters of systemic linguistics as proposed by Halliday (2004, as cited in Toolan, 2009):

Probability,
    Billings might be in Montana.;
Obligation,
    Billings should be in Montana.;
Willingness,
    Billings would be in Montana if it were given the choice.;
Usuality,
    Billings is usually in Montana.; and,

Certainty,
    Billings must be in Montana.
(p. 46)

Toolan (2009) posited his supposition as regards the aforementioned sentences:

> …[T]hose sentences are not actually ungrammatical, and their oddness does not simply rest in the sentences themselves but points back to some oddness in their speakers. This is the essence of modality: to be revealing of the speaker's attitudes and judgments. (p. 47)

Furthermore, Maclin (2001) expounds that "modals show many meanings that are shown by the subjective or another mood in many other languages" (p. 192). On the one hand, modals do not commonly seem to exhibit a happenstance; on the other, "they show thoughts about actions" (p. 192). This particular assumption is demonstrated by employing the functions presented below;

thus, the following sentences carrying the modals *may*, *should*, and *must* may take different semantic implications:

Permission
[1] *May we cook?*
Advisability
[2] *Should we cook?*
Necessity
[3] *Must we cook?*
(Maclin, 2001, p. 192)

In [1], the questioners may sound indecisive whether or not they will cook in the future, although the implication is that they want to cook, and if the answer to this inquiry is "yes," then, they probably will cook. In [2], the questioners are likely offering an opinion whether cooking is a good idea or not for that matter. Lastly, in [3], the implication of the modal *must* is that the questioners do not likely want to cook, and if the answer to this inquiry is "no," they probably will not cook.

In his paper, "Modality and the English modals," Palmer (1990) noted that modality is concerned with opinions and attitudes of speakers. In fact, modality and modal verbs are differentiated as the former refers to the formal properties of a certain class of words, while the later refer to the meaning of those words. In addition, he elucidated two types of modality and their definitions. The first is epistemic modality, which is concerned with the speaker's judgment of the truth of the proposition embedded in the statement. Furthermore, Halliday (1970) provided a comprehensive definition of epistemic modality as the "speaker's assessment of probability and predictability" (p. 349), thereby, externally declaring the speaker's attitude embedded in the content of his utterance.

[4] *John must be home.*

In [4], the speaker is telling the truth of the proposition that John is certainly coming home in an indefinite time.

The second, in contrast, is deontic modality, which is characterized by Palmer (1990) as "influencing actions, states, or events" (p. 6). Further, this definition is attributed to the performing acts as in:

[5] *John may go home now.*

Nkemleke (2005) explains the distinction between epistemic and root modality:

… [Epistemic modality] imputes a state of belief to the speaker/writer regarding the truth of some proposition x, such that a statement of epistemic 'necessity', for example, takes the form: 'circumstances constrain the speaker to believe that x' … [whereas the latter (root modality) considers x which refers not to a proposition, but to a phenomenon (an event, state, or set of events), the occurrence of which is influenced by some other phenomenon. Therefore the form of a statement of root 'necessity' can be generalized as follows: 'circumstances constrain the occurrence of x'. (p. 50)

Nkemleke (2005) further illustrates this assumption:

Epistemic meaning
x may y' = 'it is possible that x [will] y' = 'perhaps x [will] y'.
'x must y' = 'x must necessarily y' = 'it must be that y'.
Root meaning
'x can y' = 'x may y' = 'it is possible for x to y'.
'x must y' = 'it is necessary for x to y'.
(p. 50)

To exemplify the abovementioned identity equation, below are sentences to represent the epistemic and root meanings.

Epistemic meaning
'x may y' = 'it is possible that x [will] y' = 'perhaps x [will] y'.
He may see her.
It is possible that he sees her perhaps if he will take a day off.

'x must y' = 'x must necessarily y' = 'it must be that y'.
He must see her.
It is necessary that he sees her because he needs to borrow a book from her.

Root meaning
'x can y' = 'x may y' = 'it is possible for x to y'.
She can cook.
If she sees an opportunity to cook tonight she may cook.
Thus, it is possible for her to cook if she arrives home
early.

'x must y' = 'it is necessary for x to y'.
He must submit his research paper tomorrow.
It is necessary for him to submit his research paper
otherwise he will obtain an incomplete grade.

It should be noted that the said identity equation has limitations; however, it shows the "categorical nature of the epistemic/root distinction" (Nkemleke, 2005, p. 50). Possibility and necessity are demonstrated as semantic labels occurring in both epistemic and root paraphrases.

Coates and Leech (1980) described the contrast between 'permission'/'obligation' and 'possibility'/'necessity' in terms of a cline of restriction:

> At one end of the scale the nature of the determining or constraining circumstances is unrestricted, while at the other end they belong to a restricted world of man-made freedoms and obligations. It is here that a paraphrase such as 'x is permitted to y' becomes more appropriate than 'it is possible for x to y'. (p. 7)

For instance,

[6] *I am permitted to go home.*

is more appropriate than

[7] *It is possible for me to go home.*

In [6], the possibility of the speaker to go home is unrestricted, whereas in [7] the restriction of going home is controlled by the circumstance.

Abdul-Fattah (2011) further explained the use of the modal *must*, which expresses present obligation, future obligation, external obligation, prohibition, and logical judgment at pre-present.

Conversely, Azar (2002) proposed a simple model of modal meanings, which is the paradigm employed in this study. These two semantic functions of the modal *must*, i.e., (1) obligation/compulsion/advisability/strong necessity and (2) logical deduction, are illustrated in the following statements:

[8] *I must go to class today.*
[9] *Mary isn't in the class today. She must be sick.*

In [8], the speaker expresses obligation or compulsion. The speaker is strongly necessitated to go to school in order to attend his or her classes. Logical deduction, on the other hand, is expressed in [9]; thus, the speaker is assuming that Mary is sick. This assumption logically leads the speaker to the context that Mary will not absent herself from the class unless illness is given as an excuse for her absence.

Gustilo (2011) conducted an investigation on modals in Philippine English newspapers. She explored the semantic functions and syntactic patterns of modal auxiliaries. Specifically, one of her findings revealed that the modal *must* is predominantly attached to the construct of obligation or compulsion. More importantly, the modal *must* appeared "to conform to the norms of the dominant native English varieties" (Gustilo, 2011, p. 104; Ki, 2011).

Jacobsson's (2008) analysis of the modal necessity of *must* in particular revealed a distinction from the quasi-auxiliary *have* to, i.e., *must* carries "a connotation of binding duty, strong moral obligation, inescapable necessity, strong desire, or perverse constraint" (pp. 308-309). In addition, the internal as in [10] and the external necessity or obligation as exemplified in [11] expounded the semanticity of *must* and *have to*.

[10] *I must go now*.

[11] *I have to go now.*

In [10], the obligation comes from the speaker himself, whereas in [11], the obligation comes from some external sources given these sample contexts, *I have to go now because it is likely to rain* or *I have to go now, for I have to attend my in-laws 50ᵗʰ wedding anniversary*. To further emphasize this assumption, Palmer (1974) in his book, *The English Verb*, suggested that the modal *must* and quasi-auxiliary *have to* be

called "discourse-oriented" verbs because "the obligation is imposed by the speaker or, in question, the hearer, while with *have to* the obligation comes from some external source or from no source in particular" (p. 38). In a more recent study, Abdul-Fattah (2011) highlighted the "discourse-orientedness" of modal *must* and quasi-auxiliary *have to* because they denote strong desire, obligation, and necessity, thereby, "exhibiting a performative function and referring to the present time only" (El-Hassan, 1990, p. 158, as cited in Abdul-Fattah, 2011).

In relation to this, Collins (2009) presents relevant concepts regarding modals and quasi-modals in light of the emergence of World Englishes. Analyzing the modals used by American, British, and Australian English users from norm-providing countries in the inner circle corroborated by Kachru (1985), Collins revealed the semantically-related modal counterparts of quasi-modals. In particular, the modal *must* is the closest counterpart of quasi-modal *have to*, whose primary meaning is strong deontic necessity. On the contrary, the quasi-modal *have to* and the modal *must* are different; the former is commonly believed to be more objective − "the source of the obligation being external to the speaker" as in [12], and the latter is assumed to be more subjective − "the speaker typically being the source of the obligation" as in [13] (Collins, 2009, p. 287).

> [12] "<ICE-HK:S1A-0063303:1:A>
> *And you **have to** find some phrases similar to the meaning or of some terms. And then you **have to** fill in the blanks, and when this paper is over you have about ten minutes ten minutes're and uhm people will just go crazily to the bathroom.*

> [13] <ICE-IND:S1A-017#32:1:1>
> *Safety safety is first than everything else comes next yeah. You **must** be facing it but whether it is your place or not".* (Collins, 2009, p. 288)

Furthermore, according to Collins (2009), the use of the modal *must* is less attractive and less objective because of its overtly authoritative tone.

Another meaning of the modal *must* found in the study is the dynamic *must*, which "expresses a need

that typically derives from internally-driven factors" (Collins, 2009, p. 288) as in [14].

> [14] <ICE-SIN:S1A-004#21:1:A>
> *You must do reservist this this that aiyoh. Now I think I **must** really think first of migrating you know.*

In addition, Jacobsson (2008) concluded that "it is convenient to make a distinction between obligative *must* (root) and conclusive *must* (epistemic). While the obligative must has been steadily losing ground, especially in American English, conclusive *must* is very much alive" (p. 310).

Newson (2008, as cited in Nartey & Yankson, 2014) posited that the modal *must* is "a strong deontic modal auxiliary verb, for it is used in a manifesto to express (strong) obligation and/or compulsion and logical necessity" (p. 27).

> [15] *Our education policy must address the deficiencies in our human resource.*

In [15], the strong deontic expression of the modal *must* is likely felt, for its proposition forcefully obliges the hearer to address the deficiencies in the immediate future. Also, the speaker impliedly expresses the failure of the implementers of the education policy to address the probable problems in the educational system.

In 1966, Hoffman differentiated systematic meanings of modals between social interactional (root) and logical probability (epistemic) through the following exemplifications:

> [16] *You may leave the room.* (social interactional)

> [17] *It may rain tomorrow.* (logical probability)

According to Inchaurralde Besga (2012, p. 1) "root modality," on the one hand, "deals with obligation, permission, ability etc.," showing attitudes that apply to the world of things and social interaction; on the other, "epistemic modality deals with probability, possibility, certainty, etc.," showing assessments of potentiality that relate to the world of knowledge and reasoning.

In [16], the speaker may be of sufficient

authority to give the permission to leave. Likewise, it can be inferred that the possible context is formal, which probably dictates the speaker to use the modal *may* instead of *can* for that matter; thereby, determining the social situation allows the speaker to choose the appropriate modal for any social interaction. On the contrary, in [17], Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) explicate that the "knowledge of the social situation would have little or no effect on the modal selected. The speaker is intending to put across that low probability of precipitation; therefore, the speaker would likely use the modal *may* regardless of whom the speaker's listener was or where the interaction took place" (p. 83).

The present study is anchored on the theoretical linguistic framework proposed by Azar (2002) concerning the two semantic functions of the modal *must*: obligation/compulsion/advisability/ strong necessity and logical deduction. The interesting nature of the modal *must* prompted the researcher to conduct a study that would shed light on the linguistic framework of the functional semanticity of the modal *must* as suggested by Azar (2002), which is employed in editorial texts found in the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PHI).

Several studies and constructs on the modal *must* have been carried out (e.g., Collins, 2009; Gustilo, 2011; Jacobsson, 2008; Nartey & Yankson, 2014; Nkemleke, 2005); however, less attention has been given to the functional semanticity of the modal *must* found in editorial texts. The present study aims to ascertain the semantic functions of the modal *must* and its conformity to or deviation from the standard usage in the English language. Specifically, the present study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the dominant verb-phrase structures of the modal must in the ICE-PHI corpus press editorial texts?
2. What semantic functions attached to the modal must were identified in the ICE-PHI corpus press editorial texts?
3. Are there distinctive features found in the use of the modal must in the said press editorials that do not conform to the standard modal usage in English?

2.   Method

The present study utilized the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PHI) compiled by Bautista, Lising, and Dayag (1999), particularly the corpora under Persuasive Writing, *Press Editorials* with text category and numbered texts as shown inside the parentheses (W2E-001 to W2E-010). The complete and total number of texts found in ICE-PHI was only 36 with approximately 31,578 words. Moreover, the data for semantic functions were adapted from the study of Gustilo (2011). Azar's (2002) theoretical linguistic schema was likewise used in the present study with regard to the functional semanticity of the modal *must*: obligation/compulsion/advisability/ strong necessity and logical deduction. The researcher manually analyzed the functions of the modal *must* found in the 36 editorial texts based on the linguistic framework of the study. Further, sentences served as the units of analysis in the study. Also, WordSmith Tools was employed as far as the occurrences of the modal must were concerned.

3.   Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distributions of verb-phrase structures of the modal *must* in the ICE-PHI Press Editorial texts.

As shown in the table, the verb-phrase structure *must + base form of the verb* obtained the highest frequency among other verb-phrase structures. This finding suggests that a number of Filipino press editorial writers may have chosen to write simple sentence structures in the active voice as shown in [18] and [19]:

[18] <ICE-PHI:W2E-005#72:4>
*But having said that, we also **must** urge authorities to exercise extreme caution in enforcing the law.*

[19] <ICE-PHI:W2E-001#98:3>
*When you are the president, you <it> **must** </it> know you cannot meddle in the affairs of a constitutionally mandated body.*

Table 1. Frequency of Verb-phrase Structures of Modal Must in the ICE-Phi Press Editorial Texts

Modal Structure	Sample Text and Root Data	Frequency	Percentage
must + be	We don't know about his paper, but this one never let up on its warning that a progress so rapid as that touted by the administration *must be* a sham. </p> <ICE-PHI:W2E-010#40:1>	4	11.11%
must + base form of the verb	Faced with a currency crisis, we *must brace* ourselves for the daunting task of finding elusive solutions pertaining to two things about which nobody has any certain ideas: our present problems and the real state of our country. <ICE-PHI:W2E-010#27:1>	17	47.22%
must + be + past participle	Somehow, the cost of war *must be counted* in pesos and centavos, because the same taxpayers ' money used in fighting a war can very well be used to securing the peace that Filipinos want. </p> <ICE-PHI:W2E-008#62:4>	12	33.33%
must + have + been + past participle	Congressmen, including the whistle blowers, are certainly aware of this constitutional requisite and they *must have* already *been alerted* to the fact that whatever provisions were included in the Omnibus Power Bill on second reading would be no different when the third reading comes about. </p> <ICE-PHI:W2E-009#88:3>	1	2.78%
must + be + present participle	SEN. Benigno Ninoy and Aquino Jr. *must be turning* in his grave as the nation commemorated his 14th death anniversary yesterday. <ICE-PHI:W2E-006#38:2>	1	2.78%
must + have + past participle	Singapore's prime minister *must have* already *anticipated* the relatively trouble-free reception. <ICE-PHI:W2E-003#42:3>	1	2.78%
Total		**36**	**100%**

In [18], the subject pronoun *we* is probably given emphasis in the said statement rather than the object of the verb *urge*. It can be inferred that the speaker is likely expressing compulsion to the readers and the urge to appeal to authorities to whom he should not be considered an intruder. This finding exercises extreme caution in enforcing the law. In addition, in [19], the speaker pronounces the use of the pronoun *you* as the subject of the statement, possibly pressing the president not to interfere or get involved in the affairs. This supports Collin's (2009) claim that the modal *must* carries an overtly authoritative tone as implied in the appearing intentions of the speakers in [18] and [19]. Moreover, this result confirms Jacobsson's (2008) finding that the modal necessity of *must* upholds the connotation of a strong moral obligation as particularly seen in [18], apparently imposing a duty to the readers although all of them would impossibly become the president of the Philippines. It may also imply that

intruding in a person's affairs would probably make one morally decadent. In addition, the modal *must* in [18] carries the obligation, which is imposed by the speaker himself, lending support to Palmer's (1974) assumption with regard to the modal *must* as a discourse-oriented grammatical element.

On the contrary, another interesting finding is the use of the verb-phrase structure *must + be + past participle*, favored by the Filipino press editorial writers with less than 34%. For instance,

[20] <ICE-PHI:W2E-002#52:2>
*If <indig> Lakas </indig> kicks out Ramiro, then it **must** be prepared to expel most of its members.*

Since the verb in the said structure is passivized (*must be prepared*) in the main clause of [20], then the absence of the subject (*other political parties in that*

context) may mean demotion of its significance, as in [21] (sentence in active voice) and in [22] (complete transformation from active to passive voice):

[21] *Other political parties must prepare the Congress to expel most of its members.*

[22] *The Congress must be prepared to expel most of its members by other political parties.*

The noun phrase (the Congress) movement has not been realized in [22]; instead the editorial writer seemed to have chosen the pronoun *I* in the subjective case as in [20] and dropped *by other political parties* as a less significant agent in the passive voice as in [22]. Then, the probable knowledge of social situation would have a little effect on the selected modal *must*, thus, seemingly giving that particular Filipino press editorial writer the power to challenge other political parties to possibly expel most of its members in the Congress. Therefore, this finding supports the assumption of Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) on the epistemic (logical probability) meaning of the modal *must*.

A verb-phrase structure with the modal *must* hardly favored by the editorial writers is *must + have + been + past participle*, which had one of the lowest percentages in Table 1. In fact, only one text representative was found in the ICE-PHI as in [23].

[23] <ICE-PHI:W2E-009#88:3>
*Congressmen, including the whistle blowers, are certainly aware of this constitutional requisite and they **must** have already been alerted to the fact that whatever provisions were included in the Omnibus Power Bill on second reading would be no different when the third reading comes about. </p>*

On the one hand, [23] is a compound-complex sentence in which the first main clause in the compound sentence in the compound-complex structure,

*"**Congressmen**, including the whistle blowers, are certainly **aware** of this constitutional requisite,"*

possesses a complement adjective, *aware*, which is the subjective complement of the noun, *Congressmen*. On the other, the second main clause possesses a pronoun subject, *they*, in the subjective case, which serves as an antecedent of the subject in the first main clause:

*and **they** must have already been alerted to the fact that whatever provisions were included in the Omnibus Power Bill on second reading would be no different when the third reading comes about. </p>*

Moreover, the inconsistent use of the voice is apparent since the verb phrase in the second clause of the compound sentence is passivized, *must have already been alerted* in the absence of the agent; the assumed subject of the second clause, if the verb is not passivized, serve as the one who alerted the congressmen as regards the provisions included in the first and second reading of the *Omnibus Power Bill*. In contrast, the editorial writer may have likely been consistent because of the use of the antecedent as a way to be coherent to the first clause of the compound sentence in the compound-complex structure of [23]. In addition, the use of the modal *must* in [23] apparently asserts compulsion, which is an obligatory function of the one who strongly alerted the congressmen regarding the provisions included in the first and second reading in the *Omnibus Power Bill*. In this case, this particular result lends support to Collin's (2009) assumption concerning the overtly authoritative tone of the modal *must*. On the contrary, such a result does not seem to support Jacobsson's (2008) claim that the obligative *must* has been gradually receding in standard American English. Then this specific finding may prove that the status of the obligative *must* in Philippine English article is favored by press editorial writers.

Table 2 illustrates the frequency and percentage distributions of the semantic functions of the modal *must* in the ICE-PHI Press Editorial texts. It should be noted that the data in Table 2 were adapted from Gustillo's (2011) study on modal auxiliaries in Philippine English newspapers.

Table 2. Frequency of Semantic Functions of the Modal *Must* in the ICE-PHI Press Editorial Texts

Modal Functions	Frequency	Percentage
Logical Necessity	5	13.9%
Obligation/Complusion/ Advisability	31	86.1%
Total	**36**	**100%**

*adapted from Gustilo (2011)

As shown in Table 2, the semantic function of obligation/compulsion/advisability, which is exemplified in [24], is most favored by Filipino press editorial writers. On the other hand, an example of the semantic function of logical necessity, which is hardly favored by the said editorial writers, is given in [25].

[24] < ICE-PHI:W2E-005#67:4>
*The group takes another tack, saying that the constitutional mandate (Article II-Section 15) requiring the State to protect and promote the right of health of the people and instill health consciousness among them, **must** include the duty to warn the people of products, places and conditions that may be injurious to their health.*

[25] <ICE-PHI:W2E-009#88:3>
*Congressmen, including the whistle blowers, are certainly aware of this constitutional requisite and they **must** have already been alerted to the fact that whatever provisions were included in the Omnibus Power Bill on second reading would be no different when the third reading comes about.*

In [24], the modal *must* has semantically taken the function of compulsion, for it likely obliges an entity or a body that will assume a probable duty to warn the people not to take products detrimental to one's health. This result would likewise stem from internal necessity (Jacobsson, 2008) that typically derives from internally-driven factors (Collins, 2009). Since [24] is drawn from a written press editorial, the press editorial writer may have expressed his own informed opinion regarding the issue; thus, his judgment possibly comes from his own familiarity with the issue and not from others who may have the same informed opinion as his. This specific finding maintains Jacobsson (2008) and Collin's (2009) assumption on compulsion as one of the functions of the modal *must*.

On the contrary, in [25], the modal *must* carries the construct of logical necessity because the prior clause, *Congressmen, including the whistle blowers, are certainly aware of this constitutional requisite,* has given the second clause with the modal *must* a reasonable basis why congressmen should have been alerted as regards the provisions included in the first and second reading of the Omnibus Power Bill.

The present study did not find any distinctive features of the modal *must*; as a result, the modal *must* in editorial texts found in the text category of printed written texts of persuasive writing did not yield deviation from the standard modal usage in English. Likewise, the results of the present study further confirm the findings of Gustilo (2011) claiming that "most of the modal auxiliaries conform to the norms of the dominant native English varieties" (p. 104).

One interesting finding of the present study is the employment of the obligative *must*, which is favored by Filipino press editorial writers. Conversely, Jacobsson (2008) claimed that the obligative *must* is progressively losing ground in American English as contrasted with the conclusive *must* likely preferred by American writers, thereby, suggesting that the obligative *must* is widely accepted in Philippine English, which is an outer-circle English variety. However, this result remains inconclusive until further empirical investigations are conducted to support such a claim.

4.   Conclusion

The present study attempted to determine the semantic functions of the modal *must* and to identify its conformity to or deviation from the standard usage in the English language. Gustilo's (2011) findings were further confirmed by the results of the present study, substantiating that the modal *must* found in press editorials conforms to the modal usage provided by dominant English varieties. Secondly, there is a progressive usage of the obligative modal *must* in Philippine English, whereas the said usage steadily declines in American English (Jacobsson, 2008). As far as the verb-phrase structure of the modal *must* found

in press editorials in the ICE-PHI is concerned, the structure, *must + base form of the verb*, is commonly employed among the six others as revealed in the corpus. This finding implies that the verb-phrase structure, *must + base form of the verb*, suggests an overtly authoritative tone (Collins, 2009). Collins further emphasizes that such a claim makes "the speaker typically being the source of the obligation" (p. 287).

English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers should make their students aware that virtually, all modals have semantic functions; therefore, as suggested by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983), "students should be provided some guidance in working with the system operating within each of these functions of the modal auxiliaries" (p. 83).

One useful activity for logical modals in particular is to make inferences about current states or situations. In this activity, students should be provided with a modal paradigm, which serves as their guide.

Teaching students to write dialogues using different modal auxiliaries could be an enjoyable activity for ESL/EFL students. Some possible topics for this kind of activity are as follows:

- You were stuck in traffic for two hours.
- You heard a loud dance music coming from the staff room.
- No students came to class.
- When you walked in, all the students started laughing.

The findings of the present study may significantly lead Filipino ESL/EFL teachers to explicitly inform their students about the functions of the modal *must* in editorial texts written by Filipino journalists. Firstly, this linguistic assumption may help the teachers gradually eliminate their prejudice on the supremacy of Englishes in the inner circle, American and British Englishes in particular. One useful way is to discuss with them in a seminar or in-service training the concentric circles proposed by Kachru (1985) and the significance of the Kachruvian paradigm; thus, this may help them be cognizant of the globally progressive emergence of World Englishes. Furthermore, if an English language teacher is informed as regards contrastive rhetoric, he or she would apparently consider the notion of

"language and writing as cultural phenomena" (Kachru, 2001, as cited in Madrunio, 2008). For instance, citing Jacobsson's (2008) claim that the obligative *must* is less preferred by American editorial writers (who belong to the inner circle) but is favored by Filipino editorial writers (who are from the outer circle) could be a good example of Kachru's assumption. Likewise, introducing the concept of English varieties would allow students to demonstrate understanding of the levels of communication: "intelligibility," which refers to the level of sounds; "comprehensibility," the meaning of utterances; and "interpretability," the purpose as well as the intent of the utterances (Smith & Nelson, 1985, p. 11). Having acquired such knowledge about varieties of English may motivate the teachers to address the linguistic needs of their students. Moreover, Madrunio (2009) suggested that "raising awareness among students on the different types of Englishes would make students better appreciate why they speak and write English the way they do, especially when they are exposed to people coming from different cultures" (p. 18).

Pedagogical implications for English language curricula have been brought to the fore because of the notion of World Englishes. At present, English teachers would be expected to be more tolerant of their students as regards the expected outputs they produce. As averred by Madrunio (2009):

> … the end goal of the World Englishes paradigm is for the Filipino to be more aware of this development and to feel pride in the educated Philippine English variety, and for all users of English to accept the characteristics and features of Philippine English as an evolving branch of the language. (p.18)

In addition, it is noteworthy for English language and literature teachers to explicitly teach their students the distinct features of Philippine English and compare them with the norms of American English and any other varieties. In doing so, the students could learn how to shift their use of specific varieties of English when communicating in local and foreign contexts. In literature, the teachers must also inform their students about different writing styles that are culturally conditioned. This may assist the students to write with more liberty and to consider the context and audience

when writing.

As regards the implications of the present study for future research, the modal *must* may be compared and contrasted employing varieties of English in the outer and expanding circles to determine if other English varieties conform to or deviate from the standard modal usage in the inner circle. Potentially, instructional writing texts found in the Asian ICE may be used in a study on auxiliary verbs. The said corpus is probably an unexplored category under printed texts. Moreover, another feasible intercultural and comparative study on the modal *must* can deal with a particular literary genre written by Asian men and/or women. Examining the occurrences of modal auxiliaries in literary genres could be one noteworthy study, which can employ stylistics within the tradition of linguistics, since such a topic seems to have received little attention among stylistics researchers. One insight that could be gained from this stylistic exploration is that the researchers may analyze how modal auxiliaries project different functions and meanings or interpretations in sentences found in literary genres. Lastly, other researchers may be interested to investigate the modal *must* and any other auxiliary verbs found in research article introductions and any other subgenres of research articles written by Filipino or other Asian academic writers.

Although the findings drawn from the present study may provide partial explanations about the semantic functions of the modal *must* found in text category of printed written texts of persuasive writing, press editorials found in the ICE-PHI in particular, future studies should be conducted to substantiate the linguistic assumption of the modal *must* in Philippine editorials, thereby, further intellectualizing the Philippine English variety.

References

Abdul-Fattah, H. (2011). A formal-functional analysis of the English modal auxiliaries. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature, 3*(1), 39-63.

Azar, B.S. (2002). *Understanding and using English grammar* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Bautista, M.L., Lising, J.L., & Dayag, D. (1999). *International Corpus of English: The Philippine corpus*. Manila, Philippines: De La Salle University-Manila.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Coates, J., & Leech, G. (1980). The meanings of the modals in modern British and American English. *York Papers in Linguistics, 8*, 23-24.

Collins, P. (2009). Modals and quasi-modals in World Englishes. *World Englishes, 28*(3), 281-292.

Gustilo, L. (2011). Modal auxiliaries in Philippine English newspapers: A corpus-based analysis. *Philippine ESL Journal, 6*, 81-109.

Halliday, M. (1970). Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of Language, 6*, 322-361.

Hernández-Guerra, C. (2013). Textual, intertextual and rhetorical features in political discourse: The case of President Obama in Europe. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas, 8*, 59-65.

Hoffman, T.R. (1966). *Past tense replacement and the English modal auxiliary system*. Harvard Computation Laboratory Report NFS-17. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Inchaurralde Besga, C. (2012). Modals and modality in English. Retrieved from http://fyl.unizar.es/MISCELANEA/MISCELANEA.html

Jacobsson, B. (2008). Modality and the modals of necessity *must* and *have to*. *English Studies, 60*(3), 296-312.

Kachru, B. (Ed.). (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realm: The English language in the outer circle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ki, K. (2011). *The modal of obligation and necessity MUST in Hong Kong English* (Unpublished thesis). Retrieved from http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/lin/new/doc/ma_papers/malin/Kung%20Wan%20Ki_2010-11.pdf

Maclin, A. (2001). *Reference guide to English: A handbook of English as a Second Language*. Washingston, D.C., USA: CBS College Publishing.

Madrunio, M. (2008, August 17). New perspective in English instruction. *Manila Bulletin*.

Madrunio, M. (2009, October 18). Philippine English in the classroom. *Manila Bulletin*, pp. 11, 18.

Nartey, M., & Yankson, E. (2014). A semantic investigation into the use of modal auxiliary verbs in the manifesto of a Ghanaian political party. *International Journal of Humanities and Social*

Sciences, 4(3), 21-30.

Nkemleke, D. (2005). *Must* and *should* in Cameroon English. *Nordic Journal of African Studies 14*(1), 43-67.

Palmer, F.R. (1974). The English verb. London: Longman.

Palmer, F.R. (1990). *Modality and the English modals* (2nd ed.). London: Longman Group Ltd.

Smith, L., & Nelson, C. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes, 4*(3), 333-342.

Toolan, M. (2009). Assessing students' writing: Just more grubby verbal hygiene? In M. Toolan (Ed.), *Language teaching and integrational linguistics* (pp. 171-188). Retrieved from Routledge e-Book.