Abstract
van Gelderen (2003) argues that the viewpoint aspect of the non-finite verbal complement plays a crucial role in determining epistemic and deontic readings. That is, epistemic modals take perfective and imperfective aspect as their complements, while deontic modals do not. Like English, viewpoint aspect seems to play a crucial role in distinguishing between epistemic and deontic modals (Yangklang 2011: 35).

Corder (1981) states that differences between first and second languages may produce interference problems for L2 learners. Similarities, on the other hand, will probably contribute to facilitation of learning. Taking this fact into consideration, this study investigated the distinction of modality in English by Thai L2 learners of English.

69 sophomores from the Faculty of Management Science, Silpakorn University, were asked to judge whether a certain modal statement is OK or NOT in felicitous and infelicitous contexts. The L2 learners were classified according to their L2 proficiency levels: high, mid, low. The results of the experiment show that some of the participants were able to distinguish the deontic modal statements from the epistemic modal statements. However, most of them did not know that the modal statements with aspect markers e.g. BE –ING and HAVE –EN have epistemic interpretation only. These findings suggest that English teachers should pay more attention to the relationship between aspect and modality in English.
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1. Introduction
In second language acquisition (L2), learners, as generally accepted, tend to rely on their native language (L1) (Schwartz and Sprouse 1996: 42). As a result, L1 properties may be transferred and observed in their interlanguage. According to Full Transfer Full Access position (Schwartz and Sprouse 1994, 1996), L1 knowledge or L1 properties play a crucial role in L2 acquisition. Schwartz and Sprouse (1996: 40-41) argue that L2 learners, particularly adult learners, start off the task of L2 acquisition with a fully developed knowledge of their L1 i.e. L1 parameter value, which is constrained by Universal Grammar. If the L1 grammar fails to accommodate the L2 grammar, ‘restructuring’ or ‘parameter resetting’ may occur (White 2003: 61). Over the course of parameter resetting, some learners are successful, while some learners encounter considerable difficulty and fail to restructure L2 grammar.
Saville-Troike (2006:2) argues that L1 transfer can either be positive or negative depending on the effects of the transfer. If the transferred properties exist in both L1 and L2, the transfer will result in correct production of the target language. The similarities between the two languages are assumed to contribute to facilitation of the L2 learning. Thus, the transfer in this case is positive. On the other hand, if the L1 grammar appears to be distinctively different from that of the L2, L2 learners are likely to produce a relatively high amount of frequency errors when producing the target language. The transfer in this case is thus negative. Corder (1981) also states that differences or mismatches between the L1 and L2 may produce interference problems for L2 learners.

Taking this argument into consideration, the fundamental question addressed in the current study is whether similarities between L1 Thai and L2 English yield negative or positive effects in the distinction of modality in English by Thai L2 learners of English.

van Gelderen (2003) argues that the viewpoint aspect of the non-finite verbal complement plays a crucial role in determining epistemic and deontic readings. That is, epistemic modal verbs take perfective and imperfective aspect as their complements, while deontic modal verbs do not. Like English, viewpoint aspect seems to play a crucial role in distinguishing between epistemic and deontic modal verbs (Yangklang 2011: 35). Bearing in mind the fact that epistemic modal verbs in the two languages may take a verbal complement which has either perfective or imperfective aspect, while a deontic modal does not, an interesting question is addressed; are Thai L2 learners of English aware of this fact? In other words, do they know that epistemic modal verbs in English, like their counterparts in Thai, may take either perfective or imperfective aspect as their complement?

2. The relationship between aspect and modality in English and Thai

Comrie (1976:3) states that aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation. Smith (1983) makes a distinction between lexical aspect (or situational aspect) and grammatical aspect (or viewpoint aspect). According to him, situational aspect concerns the internal temporal character (i.e. Aktionsart) of an event expressed by a verb. In other words, it is the inherent temporal properties of a verb, which characterizes whether a situation has a temporal boundary or an end result. Viewpoint aspect, on the other hand, concerns the perspective taken on a situation by relating it to a reference point. In other words it is the perspective adopted by the speaker in viewing a situation described in a sentence e.g. ongoing (progressive/imperfective) or completed (perfective). In English, the situational aspect is typically encoded by verb semantics, whereas grammatical aspect is encoded by morphological markers (e.g. English suffixes –ing and –ed).

It has been claimed that the viewpoint aspect of a non-finite verbal complement plays a crucial role in determining epistemic and deontic readings. van Gelderen (2003) points out that epistemic modal verbs take perfective and imperfective aspect as their complements, while deontic modal verbs do not. This is one of the properties that distinguish epistemic from deontic modal verbs in English.

(1) He must have read that letter. (epistemic)
(2) He must be looking for that letter. (epistemic)
(3) He must read that letter. (deontic)
(4) He must look for that letter. (deontic)

(van Gelderen 2003: 32)
We notice that sentences (1) and (2) have epistemic readings because the verbs in the complement have perfective and imperfective aspects respectively. However, sentences (3) and (4) have deontic readings due to the absence of the perfective HAVE + -EN and the progressive BE + -ING markers.

In Thai, apart from context, viewpoint aspect plays a crucial role in distinguishing between epistemic and deontic modals. That is, epistemic modals may take perfective or imperfective aspect as their complement, while deontic modals do not. When the aspect markers like ลำว ‘already’, อยาจ ‘used to, ever’, อยู่ ‘to stay/IMP’ and ล่าง (progressive) occur in modal complements, the modals will only have an epistemic reading as illustrated in (5) and (6).

(5) ดันต้อง น่าสุข (epistemic) ลำว คั่น ‘Dang must have read the book’

(6) ดันต้อง ล่าง คั่น (epistemic) คั่น ‘Dang must be reading the book’

The evidence that supports the claim that deontic modals do not take perfective or imperfective aspects as their complements is the ungrammaticality of the sentence where a deontic modal co-occurs with an aspectual marker. This can be illustrated in the examples below.

(7) *ดันต้อง อยาจ น่าสุข คั่น (deontic) ลำว คั่น ‘Dang must read the book’

(8) *ดันต้อง อยู่ น่าสุข อยู่ (deontic) คั่น ‘Dang should read the book’

(9) *ดันล่าง คั่น น่าสุข (deontic) คั่น ‘Dang can read the book’

The sentences in (7), (8) and (9) are ungrammatical due to the presence of aspect markers. This evidence supports the claim that deontic modals in Thai, like English, do not take aspect or AspP as their complements.

To summarize, situational aspect plays a crucial role in distinguishing epistemic modality from deontic modality in Thai and English. In general terms, to acquire the modality system of English as an L2, Thai learners have to be able to distinguish between epistemic modality from deontic modality. In order for Thai L2 learners of English to distinguish, they need to know that epistemic modals in English may take perfective or imperfective aspect as their complement, while a deontic modal does not. For these reasons, an experimental study was conducted. The purposes of the study were (1) to investigate L2-English learners’ ability in distinguishing epistemic modality from deontic modality; (2) to compare the ability in distinguishing epistemic modality from deontic modality of the L2-English learners from different proficiency levels.
3. Research Methodology
   a. Participants
L2 participants in the current study include 69 sophomores from the Faculty of Management Science, Silpakorn University. The participants were divided into three subgroups according to their placement test scores: high, mid, and low. The placement test is the test that was designed to measure English proficiency of the first year students. The test consisted of three parts: listening, grammar and structure, and reading. The test scores were used as criteria for allocating students into subsections for studying English I course. The high proficiency group consisted of 22 students, and their scores ranged from 60 – 66. The mid proficiency group consisted of 21 students, and their scores were all 43 (all of them?). The low proficiency group consisted of 25 students, and their scores were between 34 and 35.

b. The Task
In order to find the answers to the questions of whether or not the participants know that, like their counterparts in Thai, viewpoint aspect plays a crucial role in distinguishing epistemic modality from deontic modality in English, a truth value judgment task was designed. The specific questions which were therefore addressed in the experiment are as follows.

   (1) Do the L2 participants know that deontic modals in English do not take viewpoint aspect as their complement?
   (2) Do the L2 participants know that deontic modals in English take viewpoint aspect as their complement?

A truth value judgment task was designed to trace the L2 learners’ distinction of modality in English. The task consists of six modal statements which acted as the test sentences. The modal statements were presented under epistemic and deontic contexts (see appendix 1). Therefore, there were 14 test items plus 3 fillers. Each context consists of scenarios which have been designed to force certain type of modal interpretations. The format of the test was a questionnaire.

The participants were asked to judge whether a certain modal statement is OK or NOT in felicitous and infelicitous contexts. The participants who know the role of aspect in distinguishing epistemic from deontic modality were expected to choose ‘OK’ when the sentences were presented under the right conditions, or when the meaning of the modal statements is felicitous to the scenarios. They were also expected to accurately reject or choose the sentence to be ‘NOT OK’, if they found the sentences not felicitous to the scenarios. For example, the sentence ‘John must read the map’ was presented to the participants under deontic context. The participants are expected to choose ‘OK’ because this sentence has deontic interpretation.

A: John is going to Nina’s house next Sunday. It will be his first time.
   He has never been there before.
B: In order to find where Nina’s house is, ………………
C: John must read the map.

On the other hand, the sentence ‘John must have read the map’ was presented to the participants under deontic context. The participants are expected to choose ‘NOT OK’ because this sentence has epistemic interpretation.

A: John is going to Nina’s house next Sunday. It will be his first time.
He has never been there before.
B: In order to find where Nina’s house is, ..................
C: John must have read the map.

The participants’ responses were classified into two categories as follows.

(i) ‘Accurate rejection’ refers to a ‘NOT OK’ response expected in the infelicitous conditions. For example, a ‘NOT OK’ response when the deontic modal statements were presented under epistemic context or vice versa.

(ii) ‘Accurate acceptance’ refers to an ‘OK’ response expected in the felicitous conditions. For example, an ‘OK’ response when the deontic modal statements were presented under deontic context, and when the epistemic modal statements were presented under epistemic context.

In order to decide whether participants are able to distinguish deontic modality from epistemic modality, participants were expected to consistently provide accurate acceptance when a single modal statement was presented in a felicitous context and consistently provide accurate rejection when it was presented in an infelicitous context.

c. Procedure

The participants were asked to perform the test individually. The task was conducted by the researcher’s assistant, a senior university student who was very well trained by the researcher. The experiment took place in the students’ common rooms at a university. Before the task started, participants were given the test, and the research assistant explained the task to the participants. The participants were told that they were going to read little stories, and after each little story, Bee and Ant would say something about the story. Bee always speaks well, but Ant does not. The participants, therefore, had to decide whether what Ant said was OK or NOT OK. The participants had to circle or mark OK on the answer sheet, if they thought the sentence which was said by Ant was OK, they had to circle or mark NOT OK, if they thought the sentence which was said by Ant was not NOT OK.

The experiment began with a warm-up session to familiarize participants with the task and to check whether or not they understood the task. The warm-up session consisted of 5 short stories, which were different from the real task. After the warm-up session ended, the participants were asked to do the test by themselves. However, the assistant was sitting with participants to assist and to explain vocabulary just in case they did not understand. It took 30 minutes for participants to complete the task. At the end of the task, the tests were collected.

4. The results
   a. Group results

To provide an overview of the participants’ performance, the percentage of the responses for the modal statements given by each proficiency group is presented. To begin with, table 1 shows the percentage of the participants’ responses for deontic modal statements. Note that the participants who provided only a single response or the same response for all test items were excluded from the analysis.
The results show that none of the participants in each proficiency group consistently provided accurate acceptance or accurate rejection when a single modal statement was presented in both felicitous and infelicitous contexts. With respect to the participants’ responses for the deontic modal statements, it seemed that participants from the low proficiency group provided an accurate acceptance the most at 76.19%. However, when considering the percentage of accurate rejections, we see that participants in this group provided accurate rejections the least at 34.92%. This may suggest that participants from the low proficiency group did not genuinely know that the modal statements in question have only deontic meaning, and cannot be used in an epistemic sense. Participants who appear to know this semantic property were expected to consistently provide accurate acceptance and accurate rejection when the modal statements of this category were presented in felicitous and infelicitous contexts.

With respect to the participants’ responses for the epistemic modal statements, we can notice that the percentage of accurate acceptances for the modal statements provided by each proficiency group did not correspond to the percentage of accurate rejections. The percentage of accurate acceptances for the modal statements in this category was relatively higher than that for accurate rejections. This, however, suggests that the participants from each proficiency group did not genuinely know that the modal statements in question have only an epistemic meaning, and cannot be used in a deontic sense.

When comparing the percentage of the participants’ accurate rejection for deontic modal statements alone, as shown in table 2, it is found that participants from the high proficiency group are more accurate in rejecting modal statements with ‘MUST’. The participants from the mid proficiency group are more accurate in rejecting the modal statement with ‘MAY’, whereas participants from the low proficiency provided accurate rejection for the two modal statements relatively low.

### Table 2

The participants’ accurate rejections for a single deontic modal statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency groups</th>
<th>Deontic modality</th>
<th>Epistemic modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurate Acceptance</td>
<td>Accurate rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 71.42</td>
<td>20 41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>22 55</td>
<td>25 41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32 76.19</td>
<td>22 34.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency groups</th>
<th>Deontic modality</th>
<th>Epistemic modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10 63</td>
<td>6 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>10 50</td>
<td>10 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6 29</td>
<td>7 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ responses for the modal statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency groups</th>
<th>Deontic modality</th>
<th>Epistemic modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurate Acceptance</td>
<td>Accurate rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 71.42</td>
<td>20 41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>22 55</td>
<td>25 41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32 76.19</td>
<td>22 34.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also consider the percentage of accurate rejections for the epistemic modal statements provided by participants from the three proficiency groups. We want to see whether the participants know that epistemic modal statements with different aspect markers indicate a different reference time of the modal complement. The modal statements with the imperfective aspect marker ‘BE – V-ING’ will have present reference time, and the modal statements with perfective aspect marker ‘HAVE – EN’ will have past reference time.

Let us remind ourselves that in the experiment participants were asked to judge whether modal statements were OK or NOT OK under present and past conditions. Participants were expected to accurately accept and reject when the modal statements were presented in temporally appropriate conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency groups</th>
<th>The modal statements with Imperfective aspect</th>
<th>The modal statements with Perfective aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ accurate rejection for the modal statements with the two types of aspect marker was not very high. Nevertheless, we can notice that the percentage of accurate rejections for modal statements with an imperfective marker was relatively higher than that of the modal statements with a perfective marker. This probably suggests that the participants appear to know that the modal statements with imperfective marker have a present reference time interpretation before they know that the modal statements with perfective marker have a past reference time interpretation.

In addition, when looking at the percentage of accurate rejections for the modal statements with a perfective marker provided by the participants from different proficiency groups, we can see that accurate rejections provided by participants from the high proficiency group were relative higher than those provided by participants from the mid and low proficiency groups. Accurate rejections for these modal statements provided by the participants from the low proficiency group were the least.

b. Individual results

As group results show that participants did not perform as expected, we are not able to make a conclusion based on the group results alone. We, therefore, also need to consider the participants’ individual results. Individual results may reveal interesting patterns which may provide answers to the questions raised earlier.

When considering individual results, we found that the percentage of accurate acceptances provided by most participants from each proficiency group was relatively higher than that of accurate rejections. These results thus suggest that the participants’ knowledge relevant for
making distinctions between deontic modality and epistemic modality in English is premature.

On the other hand, there are only a few participants from each proficiency group, as shown in table 2, who provided an accurate acceptance corresponding to an accurate rejection. The percentage of accurate acceptances and accurate rejections provided by these participants are over 60%. Whilst it could be argued that these participants may have developed the relevant knowledge, it is not robust.

Table 4 The responses for the modal statements provided by participants from high proficiency group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The participants</th>
<th>Accurate acceptance</th>
<th>Accurate rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

So far in this article, we have considered the results of the study in terms of group and individual results. Now we turn to our original research questions, which were presented in section 1. That is ‘Do Thai L2 learners of English know that epistemic modals in the two languages may take a verbal complement which has either perfective or imperfective aspect, while a deontic modal does not?’

According to the group results, it seems that participants in the study did not realize this fact. Given the participants who are able to make distinction between deontic and epistemic modality were expected to consistently provide accurate acceptance when a single modal statement was presented in a felicitous context and consistently provide accurate rejection when it was presented in an infelicitous context, the group results gained so far seem to suggest that participants from each proficiency group are not able to make a distinction between the two types of modality in English.

Based on these results we may assume that the participants’ L1 relevant knowledge does not facilitate the participants in distinguishing deontic modality from epistemic modality in English. In review, deontic modality in Thai and English is quite similar in that epistemic modals take perfective and imperfective aspects as their complement. If the L1 relevant knowledge appeared to facilitate in such distinguishing, the participants should have demonstrated that they were able to accurately accept and reject when a single modal statement was presented in felicitous and infelicitous contexts respectively. The participants in the current study, on the other hand, failed to accurately accept and reject.

The findings in the current study can be one of evidence for the argument that similarities between L1 and L2 may not always facilitate the acquisition of L2 properties unlike what Corder (1981) argues for. Nevertheless, this assumption might be tenable. It is possible that
participants in the current study are yet to acquire aspectual markers, the linguistic properties that determine the types of modality in English. These properties probably predetermine the knowledge relevant for the distinction between the two types of modality. Thus, participants will not be able to make a distinction between deontic modality and epistemic modality until they have already acquired aspect markers in English. This opens for further study.

In addition, the results per proficiency groups also suggest no close correspondence between the participants’ performance and their L2 proficiency. The participants with higher proficiency did not consistently provide the expected responses, particularly an accurate rejection; indeed, they performed no higher than L2 children with a lower proficiency. This gives rise to the question of whether the proficiency measure is flawed – given that the researcher had trouble with that measure, it seems possible. That is, the placement test utilised in the current study may not have been a suitable means for measuring L2 proficiency.

6. Conclusion and implications for SLA

This article presented the results of an experimental study which aimed to investigate Thai L2 learners’ ability in making distinctions between deontic and epistemic modality in English. The results show no evidence that participants were able to make such a distinction. Nevertheless, the findings of the study give rise to several interesting points. First, it is not always the case that similarities between L1 and L2 may facilitate the acquisition of L2 properties, particularly when the L2 properties being learned are encoded in linguistic forms which consist of complex semantic ‘something (properties?)’. Second, the results of the study suggest that knowledge about aspect probably predetermines the knowledge relevant for the distinction between deontic and epistemic modality in English.

As mentioned earlier, view point aspect plays a crucial role in distinguishing between epistemic and deontic modals in English and Thai. However, teachers in some classrooms never introduce this fact to learners (Yangklang 2012: 4). In other words, teachers do not normally draw learners’ attention to the fact that epistemic modals take perfective and imperfective ‘something’ as their complements, whilst deontic modals do not. This kind of knowledge is, therefore, not explicitly taught in typical English language classrooms. It is assumed to be part of the implicit knowledge of English native speakers. This therefore points to the ‘poverty of stimulus’ phenomenon.
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Appendix

The truth value judgment test

Participant’s information

[ ] Male   [ ] Female   Age……………..

Year………………………

When did you start learning English?                           ..............................................................

Do you speak English at home?..............................................................

Have you been lived in any English-speaking country?.................................

Are these sentences OK or not OK?

You are going to read little stories. After each story, Bee and Ant will say something about the story. Bee always speaks correctly, but Ant does not. You will have to decide whether what Ant says was OK or not OK. Circle or mark OK, if you think the sentence which was said by Ant is OK, and circle or mark NOT OK, if you think the sentence which was said by Ant is not OK.

Examples

A  Story:   Mary has a little brother. Her brother is crying.
    Bee:   What do you think Mary will do?
    Ant:   She will give him a cuddle.
    Was that ok or not ok?

[ ] OK   [ ] NOT OK

B  Story:   Tomorrow is New Year Day.
    Bee:   We are not going to school.
    Ant:   We have had a party.
    Was that ok or not ok?

[ ] OK   [ ] NOT OK

Practice

(i)  Story:   Kate is not feeling well today. She has a headache and cough.
    Bee:   What do you think Kate will do?
    Ant:   She will go swimming.
    Was that ok or not ok?

[ ] OK   [ ] NOT OK

(ii) Story:   Kate is very clever. But she does not always study hard.
    Bee:   Tomorrow she will have an exam
    Ant:   She could fail the exam.
    Was that ok or not ok?

[ ] OK   [ ] NOT OK

(iii) Story:   There was no more milk in the fridge yesterday.
    Bee:   So, Nancy went to the supermarket this morning.
    Ant:   She buys some milk.
    Was that ok or not ok?

[ ] OK   [ ] NOT OK
(iv) Story: Nancy was so hungry when she arrived at home yesterday evening.
Bee: Her mum made a pizza for her.
Ant: She ate the pizza.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

(v) Story: There is no more milk in the fridge.
Bee: So, Nancy is going to the supermarket tomorrow morning.
Ant: He will buy some milk.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

1. Story: The students’ concert is over. The hall is closing in a few minutes.
Bee: It’s very busy at all exits.
Ant: Students may be leaving the hall.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

1. Story: John is going to Nina’s house next Sunday. It will be his first time.
He has never been there before.
Bee: In order to find where Nina’s house is, ……………
Ant: John must have read the map.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

2. Story: The students’ concert is now over. It’s very late now.
Bee: The hall is closing in a few minutes. So the head teacher announces…
Ant: Students may leave the hall.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

3. Story: Jerry is going to the train station to pick Ben up. Unfortunately, the traffic on the road is very bad because it is raining heavily. He is only half way to the station.
Bee: What do you think will happen?
Ant: Jerry will be late.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

4. Story: John was driving to Nina’s house last Sunday. He had never been there before.
Bee: But he did not get lost. He found Nina’s house.
Ant: He must read the map.

Was that ok or not ok?

OK NOT OK

5. Story: The students’ concert is now over. It’s very late now.
Bee: The hall is closing in a few minutes. So the head teacher announces…
Ant: Students may have left the hall.

Was that ok or not ok?
6. Story: John is driving to Nina’s house. He has never been before. He has just realized that he is getting lost.
   Bee: John suddenly stops the car, and takes the map out of his bag and starts reading.
   Ant: John must be reading the map.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   OK
   NOT OK

7. Story: The students’ concert is over. It’s very late now.
   Bee: The hall is quiet.
   Ant: Students may leave the hall.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   OK
   NOT OK

8. Story: Ben had a bad cold yesterday. He did not come to school.
   Bee: Where do you think Ben was yesterday?
   Ant: Ben might be at home.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   OK
   NOT OK

9. Story: John is driving to Nina’s house. He has never been before. He has just realized that he is getting lost.
   Bee: John suddenly stops the car, and takes the map out of his bag and starts reading.
   Ant: John must read the map.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   OK
   NOT OK

10. Story: John is going to Nina’s house next Sunday. It will be his first time. He has never been there before.
    Bee: In order to find where Nina’s house is, ………………..
    Ant: John must read the map.
    Was that ok or not ok?

    OK
    NOT OK

11. Story: The students’ concert is now over. It’s very late now.
    Bee: So the head teacher announces…
    Ant: Students may be leaving the hall.
    Was that ok or not ok?

    OK
    NOT OK

    Bee: Tomorrow the teacher will ask Ben when The Queen’s Palace was built.
    Ant: Ben should know the answer.
    Was that ok or not ok?

    OK
    NOT OK

13. Story: John was driving to Nina’s house last Sunday. He had never been there before.
    Bee: But he did not get lost. He found Nina’s house.
    Ant: He must have read the map.
    Was that ok or not ok?
14. Story: The students’ concert is over. It’s late very late now.
   Bee: The hall is closed.
   Ant: Students may be leaving the hall.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   **OK**

15. Story: John is going to Nina’s house next Sunday. It will be his first time. He has never been there before.
   Bee: In order to find where Nina’s house is, .................
   Ant: John must be reading the map.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   **OK**

16. Story: The students’ concert is over. It’s very late now.
   Bee: The hall is quiet.
   Ant: Students may have left the hall.
   Was that ok or not ok?

   **OK**