Nadja Wulff
University of Education Freiburg

Sandra McGury
Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Preliminary findings and research perspectives on the German modal *sollen* in L2 written assessments

Abstract. Modal verbs represent a special verb category and constitute an essential component of L2 German semantics. While Abrams and Rott (2017) suggest that German learner texts depict a 90% accuracy in the correct use of modal verbs in integrative writing tasks, the correct semantic use of the modal *sollen* ('supposed to'; 'should') seems to pose a particular challenge (Jentges 2016), especially in an assessment context. In this corpus analysis, 1,032 L2 German assessment texts across all CEFR levels were analyzed with respect to the L2 semantic use of *sollen* against the backdrop of the assessment prompts. 68% of instances of all uses of *sollen* in A1 texts and 53% of all uses of *sollen* in A2 texts showed an inappropriate semantic use of *sollen*. The discrepancy between these results and Abrams and Rott (2017) can be attributed to the prompts used in the assessments analyzed in this paper: They do not take into consideration the semantic mismatch between the use of the modal in the prompt and its inappropriate use in the texts produced.

Keywords: L2 written assessment, writing tasks, L2 modal verbs, the CEFR.

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to their high frequency in various languages, modal verbs represent a special verb category and constitute an essential component of German grammar. In the traditional sense, modal verbs such as *können*, *müssen*, *sollen*, *dürfen*, and *mögen* are used to mark the conditions of validity of a statement and allow speakers to express their attitudes or opinions regarding an utterance. The speaker's or writer's modification of a statement can take on a variety of readings, from necessity and possibility to desire and permission. In this context, the modal verb modifies the validity of the predication, while the non-finite lexical verb determines the predication (Weinrich 2003: 297; Hentschel & Weydt 2021).

Especially for learners of L2 German, the correct use of modal verbs can be challenging, not only with respect to morphological and syntactic features, but also on the level of meaning (e.g., deontic and epistemic uses with a wide range of readings or with different modes of use). Scheffler and Cinciala (2011), Dimroth (2008), Prévost (2003), or Jentges (2016) emphasize the lengthy process involved in the acquisition of L2 German modal verbs, caused by various factors.

In order to better understand the mechanisms involved in L2 writing in the context of L2 writing assessment, particularly in L2 German telc tests across all levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (the CEFR), we are working on a comprehensive study of L2 modal verbs in German. However, in this paper, we will only present part of the study, narrowing the results down to only one modal as well as to some preliminary results.

The comprehensive study's goals are to (i) describe the distribution of German modal verbs in L2 writing across different evaluation levels and (ii) determine their correct semantic use (see Maden-Weinberger 2009). Furthermore, the study seeks (iii) to determine the morphosyntactic features (subject verb agreement, V2 and V-final positioning in main and subordinate clauses, and implementation of the German sentence bracket) for each assessment level, to complement work done by Boss (2008), Scheffler and Cinciala (2011), Dimroth (2008), or Prévost (2003). Then, the findings from (i) and (ii) will be examined in the context of developing effective L2 writing assessment tasks (cf. Sasayama et al. 2021). The study is expected to shed light not only on the challenges of correctly implementing modal verbs in German L2 written assessments, but also on the consequences for L2 writing assessment design and L2 writing pedagogies.

This paper, however, only focuses on some preliminary findings from the comprehensive study with regards to the modal verb *sollen.* First, we present the theoretical basis for analyzing *sollen* in the (L2) German context, followed by a brief presentation of the methodology used to obtain the results. We then highlight some preliminary findings of the use of the modal verb *sollen* in L2 written assessments and discuss the significance of writing prompts in connection with the (mis)use of the modal verb *sollen*. A summary of the main findings and some implications that can be expected once the broader study is conducted, conclude the paper.

2. GERMAN MODAL VERBS AND SOLLEN

While modal verbs are highly frequent in language use, their acquisition is challenging at the morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels. Formal features at the morphological level include 1) zero inflection in the 1st and 3rd person

(similar to German irregular verbs in the preterite), 2) vowel alternation in the present tense between singular and plural (except for *sollen*), and 3) formation of the preterite forms with *-te*, and the past participle forms with *ge-t*, similar to weak verbs in German. On the syntactic level, modal verbs take an infinitival lexical complement to form a clause bracket. The perfect is formed with an *Ersatzinfinitiv* 'double infinitive' instead of the past participle (e.g., *Ich habe arbeiten müssen* 'I had had to work'). Thus, modal verbs share some of their morphological and syntactic features with other verbs of German, i.e., these features do not apply exclusively to the group of modal verbs.

The semantic function of modal verbs is to modify the conditions of the validity of a statement. Traditionally, a distinction is made between the subjective (epistemic) and objective (deontic) uses of modal verbs.[1] Modal verbs in their deontic use can be divided into three verb pairs which are assigned to the categories "possibility" (*können*, *dürfen*), "necessity" (*müssen*, *sollen*) and "will / desire" (*wollen*, *mögen*) (Hentschel & Weydt 2021: 72–73). Further semantic differences can be assigned to these pairs in accordance with certain characteristics, namely third instance (the interest that another instance or person demands from the grammatical subject) and intensity (degree of necessity or obligation).

Table 1. Categorization of modal verbs in their deontic use

–	–	+ third instance	+ intensity
Possibility	können 'can'	dürfen 'allowed to'	–
Necessity	–	sollen 'supposed to'	müssen 'must', 'need'
Will / desire	mögen 'would like'	–	wollen 'want'

Source: Hentschel & Weydt 2021: 73.

Müssen und *sollen* express necessity, while *sollen* implies a third instance and *müssen* is marked by a higher degree of obligation. The following examples shall demonstrate the different contexts of use of *sollen*.

---

[1] *Die Grammatik der deutschen Sprache* [The Grammar of the German Language] published by the Leibniz-Institut for the German Language (Zifonun et al. 1997) does without this distinction and introduces the pragmatic concept of *Redehintergrund* 'speech background'. Speech backgrounds are part of text and discourse knowledge. They are dependent to the speaker and interaction as well as the interlocutors (Zifonun et al. 1997: 1882f.). Hence, even a non-epistemic speech background cannot be deontic (Zifonun et al. 1997: 1886). The difference between epistemic and non-epistemic speech backgrounds is thus that the epistemic speech background includes and infers all the knowledge that can be of importance in the context of the subject matter. In non-epistemic situations, certain factors or pieces of knowledge are consciously or unconsciously neglected (Zifonun et al. 1997: 1886).

(1) Ich soll eine Woche lang im Bett bleiben. (= der Arzt hat es mir verordnet.)
    'I am supposed to stay in bed for a week' (= the doctor's orders)

(2) Ich muss eine Woche lang im Bett bleiben. (=Ich habe so starke Schmerzen, dass ich nicht aufstehen kann.)
    'I need to stay in bed for a week' (=I am in so much pain that I cannot move.)

Sollen can also take over the function of the imperative in indirect speech in a command or demand, but only if an indirect command or demand is part of the message:

(3) (Meine Nachbarin sagte,) ich soll die Tür immer abschließen. (Sie sagte: "Schließen Sie bitte die Tür immer ab!")
    '(My neighbor said) I am supposed to always lock the door' (she said: "Please always lock the door!")

Sollen frequently occurs in prescriptive texts such as regulations or laws and, compared to *müssen* but not *dürfen*, is interpreted as not binding, but as a more or less urgent recommendation of a norm (cf. Zifonun et al. 1997: 1914).

(4) Die Schule soll eine eigene Schulordnung erlassen.
    'The school is supposed to issue its own school regulations'

For advice and recommendations, the Konjunktiv II form of *sollen* is used in order to achieve a certain restriction of the imperative (Weinrich 2005: 306). In English, this meaning is usually expressed by use of *should*.

(5) Sie sollten sich wirklich überlegen, ob Sie ihre Arbeit fristgerecht einreichen können.
    'You should really think about whether you will be able to submit your work on time'

The German modal *sollen* is characterized by a variety of usage contexts, which cannot be presented exhaustively within the scope of this paper. However, the examples provided in (1) through (5) shall stress some of the main distinct readings that might pose difficulties to L2 learners of German.

3. *SOLLEN* IN L2 GERMAN

L2 learners have traditionally been introduced to German modal verbs as part of the L2 grammar, as opposed to the lexicon despite their various semantic nuances. Modal verbs are usually displayed as a grammatical phenomenon due to their distinct verbal inflection pattern, their word order, and the requirement that they take an infinitival lexical verb as a complement. Consequently, studies relating to modal verbs in L2 German have mainly focused on grammar, followed by studies on the pedagogies of modal verbs.

Numerous studies on the overall acquisition of specific grammatical aspects such as the acquisition of verb morphology (Boss 2008) include modals; however, studies focusing specifically on L2 German modal verbs are rare. Scheffler and Cinciala (2011), Dimroth (2008), and Prévost (2003), for example, study the acquisition of L2 German modal verbs in relation to awareness of explicit grammar rules, to negation and finiteness, and to finiteness and inflection acquisition, respectively. Jentges (2016), Anthonissen and Mortelmans (2016), and Nikolova (2018) look at L2 German modal verb acquisition through a pedagogical lens, but only Jentges (2016) dives a little more deeply into the overall difficulties related to the meaning of modal verbs, while Maden-Weinberger (2009) provides a comparative investigation of a corpus of learner German and other L1 and L2 corpora, showing the differences between native and learner uses of modal verbs at various levels of proficiency.

Jentges (2016) examines German *sollen* 'to be supposed to' vs. *sollten* 'should' through the lens of *text-type pedagogy*, focusing on how they are typically presented in Dutch teaching materials for L2 German. She asserts that adopting a construction-grammar approach is more favorable in this context, as it appears to facilitate a more effective acquisition of understanding the semantic differences between the indicative and Konjunktiv II forms of German *sollen.*

Maden-Weinberger (2009) also contrasts the uses of *sollen* in indicative form versus *sollte* in Konjunktiv II. She dedicates a section to the prominence of *sollen* in learners of different levels, concluding that *sollen* is acquired later than *wollen* 'want', *müssen* 'must', and *können* 'can'. Her findings stress the learners' difficulties with the semantic distinction between the use of indicative and Konjunktiv II forms across modal verbs in general (Maden-Weinberger 2009: 249–253), speculating that these difficulties stem from L1 transfer issues. She furthermore posits that the problem to distinguish between the meanings of the two forms is morphological in nature because "more morphological forms have to be distinguished in German in comparison to English and on the other hand, anecdotal evidence points to the fact that the learners' difficulties can be traced to a general failure in phonological discrimination" (Maden-Weinberger 2009: 250).

The results presented in this paper shall complement existing literature by highlighting the errors identified in L2 written German, looking more closely at the potential causes for poor performance in assessment contexts.

4. METHODOLOGY

This corpus analysis comprises 1,032 authentic L2 German assessment texts spanning CEFR levels A1 through C1. The texts were accessed through the free MERLIN corpus.[2] MERLIN is an error-annotated written learner corpus for German, Italian and Czech. The MERLIN corpus contains texts from standardized language tests and are analyzed in accordance with the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020). The German texts were produced by learners from various L1s.[3] They were downloaded from the MERLIN corpus and separately annotated in MAXQDA for further analysis.

The main study's goal is to better understand the mechanisms involved in L2 writing in the L2 writing assessment context. The study set out (i) to describe the distribution of German modal verbs in L2 writing across varying assessment levels and (ii) to determine their correct semantic use (cf. Maden-Weinberger 2009). Furthermore, to complement Boss (2008), Scheffler and Cinciala (2011), Dimroth (2008), or Prévost (2003), the study seeks (iii) to determine the morphosyntactic features (subject verb agreement, V2 and V-final positioning in main and subordinate clauses, and implementation of the German sentence bracket) for each assessment level. Additionally, the results obtained in (i) and (ii) will be discussed against the backdrop of designing efficient L2 writing assessment tasks (cf. Sasayama et al. 2021). The results are expected to provide insight into the challenges of implementing modal verbs in German L2 writing assessments prompts.

To stay within the scope of this paper, the preliminary findings presented below will not include morphosyntactic results. Rather, we are limiting the discussion of the results to the use of the modal verb *sollen* in L2 written assessments and the importance of writing prompts in relation to the (mis)usage of the modal verb *sollen*.

---

[2] https://www.merlin-platform.eu/.

[3] Note that the preliminary results does not take into account any connection between the L1 and German modal verbs.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As summarized in table 1, the overall results show that 86% of all 1,032 texts contain at least one modal verb. In total, there were 3,839 modal verbs across all texts. Narrowing down the focus to analyze the use of *sollen*, 23 sections of texts were eliminated, either because a sentence containing a modal verb could not be deciphered semantically, or because the modal used was part of a direct quote. Finally, 3,640 modal verbs were analyzed, which yielded 294 uses of *sollen* across 184 texts. Since the occurrence of *sollen* and its (in)correct uses vary depending on the assessment levels, the analysis and discussion of the results below are adjusted accordingly. While the use of *sollen* only makes up just over eight percent (16 occurrences in 13 texts) of all modal verbs used in the A1 texts (n=206), its use is not evenly distributed across the three text genres, or rather, the three prompts within that level (prompts A1a, A1b, and A1c). In fact, there are no uses of *sollen* in any of the A1c texts (a letter to congratulate a friend on the birth of their baby) and only three occurrences in one text written for the A1b prompt. That A1b text was, furthermore, rated at a much higher level (B1)[4], so it should be excluded when analyzing A1 level L2 writing. What is most notable at this level is that almost a quarter of all texts submitted for the A1a prompt contain the modal verb *sollen*. Among those 13 occurrences, eleven uses of *sollen* are considered inappropriate uses within the semantic and text genre's context[5]. Consider examples (6) and (7):

(6) Du   sollst   einen Bickini [sic!] mit bringen.
     You are supposed to a   bikini   bring.with
     'You are supposed to bring a bikini'
     Intended reading: You should bring a bikini.

(7) Du   sollst   Bikini, Stoffbanh   mitbringen.
     You are supposed to bikini ?   bring.with
     'You are supposed to bring a bikini and a ?'
     Intended reading: You should bring a bikini.

The mismatches between the readings and the intended readings as glossed above stem from the mismatch between the prompt instructions and the texts

---

[4] Each text available in the corpus includes some metadata including the official test results. In this case, a text was produced as part of an A1 test; however, the text was rated at B1 level.

[5] Note that the prompt instructions usually evoke a specific text genre such as a letter to a friend, an invitation, or a written complaint, and that the assessment takes into consideration genre specific expressions, style, and language use (cf. Hyland 2007).

produced. In fact, the prominent use of *sollen* for prompt A1a is a direct result of the wording used in the writing task causing the test takers to use *sollen*: The prompt asks the test taker to write to a friend to invite her to go swimming. It also instructs the test taker to include information regarding the following keywords (i) where, (ii) when, and (iii) what their friend is supposed to bring along (*was sie mitbringen soll*, 'what she is supposed to bring along').[6] *Sollen* in this sense is used to express an indirect necessity or obligation, indirect in the sense that the prompt instructs the test taker to tell another person what they are supposed to bring along. Thus, *sollen* in the prompt represents a necessity conditioned by a third person or entity. *Sollen* as exemplified in (6) and (7) also denotes a necessity or obligation involving a third person or party. However, the text genre and the intended meaning within this genre would not logically allow for necessity or obligation, especially one conditioned by a third person or entity. For sentences (6) and (7), a correct alternative could be achieved by using *sollte* (the Konjunktiv II form) to express a suggestion, a simple imperative (e.g., *Bring einen Bikini mit* 'Bring along a bikini'), or even a modal of possibility (e.g., *Du kannst einen Bikini mitbringen* 'You can bring a bikini'). Due to this contextual mismatch between the prompt and the text produced, the test taker is misled into using *sollen*, which is, however, inappropriate within the text genre and context of the text produced.

Texts submitted at A2 level yield a similar result. 20 of 209 A2 texts (approx. 9%) include at least one *sollen*, and approx. 16% of all texts for prompt A2c use *sollen* at least once, with 14 occurrences across eleven texts. Looking only at the *sollen* occurrences in the A2c texts, five of them demonstrate an appropriate use of *sollen*, while nine do not use it correctly. Similar to the observations in the A1 texts, there seems to be a correlation between the prompt and the (mis)uses of *sollen* in the L2 texts. In the prompt, the test taker is asked to write an email to a friend. In the email, the test taker is supposed to ask the friend to look after the test taker's pet while away from home. Similar to the prompt discussed above, the prompts provide certain keywords and phrases that should be part of the text produced, namely (i) what type of pet, (ii) when, (iii) what the friend is supposed to do, and (iv) where the test taker is going. Here, again, the use of *sollen* to instruct the test taker (*was die Freundin tun soll* 'what the friend is supposed to do') in the prompt represents a necessity or obligation conditioned by a third person or entity. The text produced, however, should not contain constructions expressing

---

[6] Thank you to the anonymous reviewer who pointed out that here, the use of the verb *sollen* is only secondary and that the correlation between the student text and the sentence used in the prompt seem to be more important. We agree and highlight below that the correlation is important in the sense that, independently, the uses of *sollen* are correct, but one in response to the other provides a wrong reading.

the necessity or obligation involving a third person or entity, but rather, the test taker should express necessity marked by intensity. Compare examples (8) to (9).

(8) Du   sollst   es jeden Tag   dushen [sic!].
     You are supposed to it every day shower
     'You are supposed to shower it everyday'
     Intended reading: You must / need to wash it everyday.

(9) Du   musst   es jeden Tag   waschen.
     You must / need   it every day   wash
     'You must / need to wash it everyday'

Sentence (8) is an example from the corpus demonstrating the inappropriate use of *sollen*. Example (9) is an acceptable alternative for such a request: in order to list the duties and responsibilities entailed in looking after the pet, the use of modal *müssen* is appropriate (as well as its Konjunktiv II option *müsste*). For these texts, we can therefore speculate, again, that the mistakes made with respect to the use of *sollen* are a result of the incorrect adaption of *sollen* from the prompt.

   Among 209 texts submitted for the B1 level, *sollen* only occurs in 6% of them (eleven tokens across eleven texts). Due to this small number of occurrences, they are not included in this paper. Moving on to texts submitted as part of the B2 tests, over 15% of them contained at least one instance of *sollen*: among 204 texts, 30 submissions contained 39 instances of this modal verb. At this test level, the texts revealed a notable change in correct and incorrect uses, but, similar to the lower levels, the occurrence of *sollen* is dependent on the text genre and the prompt. While only two texts submitted for prompt B2a (an application cover letter) include one *sollen* each, 13% of texts submitted for prompt B2b (complaint letter) and almost 30% of texts submitted for prompt B2c (information request about a job) contain the modal verb. In all but one case, the B2b and B2c texts depict the correct semantic use for *sollen.* In the B2b texts, the *sollen* instances describe scenarios that provide the basis for the complaint (example 10), while the uses of *sollen* in the B2c texts occur in direct questions pertaining to the job duties and obligations (see example 11).

(10) Ich soll mit der Gastfamilie wohnen, leider habe ich in einer Garage ge-
      wohnt.[7]
      'I am supposed to live with the host family, unfortunately, I lived in a garage'

---

[7] Note that the use of present tense in the first clause and the preterite in the second clause in the German sentence makes the sentence clash and sound unnatural; however, the use of *sollen* in this case is still semantically correct.

(11) Wie viele Stunden pro Tag soll ich arbeiten?
      'How many hours per day am I supposed / required to work?'

    Sollen occurs much more frequently in the texts submitted at C1 level. Across all 204 texts, 113 (55%) contained at least one *sollen*. Among 1,337 occurrences of *sollen*, only ten were semantically odd (see ex. 12 and 13). All ten inappropriate uses were submitted for the C1c prompt (a report on housing in their home city; containing the instruction to include 'what one must consider if one wanted to rent or buy a house or apartment', *was man beachten muss, wenn man ein Haus oder eine Wohnung mieten oder kaufen möchte*). Furthermore, these ten uses occurred in seven different texts, and four of them received an overall rating of B1 or B2, that is, the quality of these texts were rated below the test level.

(12) Aber wenn du ein Haus kaufen möchtest, sollst du viele Beamtete [sic!] treffen.
      'But when you want to buy a house, you are supposed to meet many officials.'
      Intended reading: But when you buy a house, you need / must meet many officials.

(13) Je mehr man sich von dem Zentrum entfernt, desto weniger soll man für Miete zahlen.
      'The further away from the center, the less one is required to pay for rent.'
      Intended reading: The further away from the center, the less one should / needs to pay.

In order to get the intended readings for (12) and (13), the candidates should use German *müssen*:

(12′) Aber wenn du ein Haus kaufen möchtest, musst du viele Beamte treffen.
      'But when you buy a house, you need / must meet many officials.'

(13′) Je mehr man sich von dem Zentrum entfernt, desto weniger muss man für die Miete zahlen.
      'The further away from the center, the less one should / needs to pay.'

While the three prompts at this level also determine the semantic context that would require or allow test takers to use *sollen*, there is no relation between

the prompt and the inappropriate use of *sollen* as seen across the lower levels above.[8]

The results from this corpus do not confirm Abrams & Rott's (2017) study in which students across different levels had a 90% accuracy rate with respect to choosing the correct modal verb in integrative writing tasks. However, these preliminary findings do not consider the accuracy of other modal verbs, so this statement needs to be revisited once the other modal verbs have also been analyzed.[9] As of now, the results show that *sollen* was used semantically inadequately in 68% of instances in the A1 texts and in 53% of instances in the A2 texts. The accuracy rate rises in the B2 and C1 levels, where *sollen* shows 87% and 95% of accuracy respectively. If the use of other modal verbs in this corpus confirms Abrams & Rott's findings, *sollen* will require more attention in the future, in particular in the context of L2 pedagogies.

The high inaccuracy in the A1 and A2 levels mainly stems from a mismatch between the instructions in the prompt and the text produced. This mismatch is caused by the change of perspective that takes place between the instruction (the prompt instructs the test taker) and the final text that is written from the test taker's perspective: The commands implied by the use of *sollen* in the texts produced are interpreted as given by or linked to the writer of the text (i.e., the test taker), rendering these expressions inappropriate (cf. Maden-Weinberger 2009: 40ff.) because, as discussed above, *sollen* in this context should be linked to a third instance. Therefore, we can firmly conclude that test takers at A1 and A2 levels do not yet comprehend the semantic nuances of *sollen*, which, in turn, require further didactic attention (e.g., as attempted by Jentges (2016) with a focus on a contrastive approach for Dutch learners of L2 German, or by Nikolova (2018) who highlights cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching modals by making use of the similarities between modal semantics and polysemic lexical items). The findings support Maden-Weinberger's (2009) findings regarding learners' difficulties distinguishing the meanings of indicative and Konjunktiv II forms of modal verbs. Contrary to her findings, our data, however, show that the use of *sollen* in both indicative and Konjunktiv II forms increases drastically at higher levels (here: at B2 and C1).

---

[8] It is important to highlight that *sollen* does not occur in the prompt at this level. *Müssen* 'must' is the modal used in the instruction allowing the use of *müssen* or *sollte* (Konjunktiv II). We can posit that test takers at this level were thus not triggered to use *sollen*, as opposed to test takers at lower levels whose prompts included *sollen*.

[9] Note also that Abrams and Rott (2017) investigate a more homogenous group.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper set out to present preliminary findings of a comprehensive study on the semantic and morphosyntactic implementation of modal verbs in L2 German written assessments. The analysis comprised 1,032 L2 German texts across the CEFR levels A1, A2, B2, and C1. The focus of this article was on the presentation of findings and a discussion of the semantic use of *sollen*, against the backdrop of the assessment prompts.

With respect to the incorrect use of *sollen*, we identified 68% of instances in the A1 texts and 53% of instances in the A2 texts. The accuracy rate rises on the B2 and C1 levels, where *sollen* shows 87% and 95% of accuracy respectively.

Our findings do not support Abrams and Rott's (2017) study in which students across different levels had a 90% accuracy rate with respect to choosing the correct modal verb in integrative writing tasks. The difference can be attributed to the discrepancies in writing scenarios studied. Not only did Abrams and Rott study low-stake writing tasks, as opposed to written assessments, and across a group that is more homogenous than the corpus we investigate, but the prompts in our study most likely have caused the misuse of *sollen* in the lower level assessments. Also note that Abrams and Rott's results include all modal verbs and are not restricted to *sollen*.

While our results support Maden-Weinberger's (2009) findings regarding learners' difficulties distinguishing the meanings of indicative and Konjunktiv II forms of modals, they also show that the correct uses of *sollen* in both indicative and Konjunktiv II forms drastically increase at the upper levels (here: at B2 and C1).

These preliminary findings demonstrate the need for more insights from a differentiated approach to analyzing modal verbs in L2 written assessments. The semantic uses of modal verbs in written assessments seem to be particularly interesting because of their correlation between prompt instructions and text produced.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. / Rott, S. (2017). Variability and variation of L2 grammar: A cross-sectional analysis of German learners' performance on two tasks. *Language Teaching Research, 21* (2), 144–165.

Anthonissen, L. / Mortelmans, T. (2016). German modals in second language acquisition: A constructionist approach. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association, 4* (1), 9–30.

Boss, B. (2008). Exploring the acquisition of German verb morphology by instructed learners. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 31* (2), 14.

Dimroth, C. (2008). Age effects on the process of L2 acquisition? Evidence from the acquisition of negation and finiteness in L2 German. *Language Learning, 58* (1), 117–150.

Hentschel, E. / Weydt, H. (2021). *Handbuch der deutschen Grammatik*. Fifth edition. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16* (3), 148–164.

Jentges, S. (2016). Deutsch lernt man meistens auf Niederländisch. Zielsprachengebrauch im schulischen Fremdsprachenunterricht in den Niederlanden. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 43* (1), 107–121.

Maden-Weinberger, U. (2009). "Modality in learner German: A corpus-based study investigating modal expressions in argumentative texts by British learners of German". Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University.

Nikolova, M. (2018). Teaching German modal verbs through cognitive linguistics insights. *German Journal Sprache Literatur Kultur, 1* (1), 3–37.

Prévost, P. (2003). Truncation and missing inflection in initial child L2 German. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25* (1), 65–97.

Sasayama, S. / Garcia Gomez, P. / Norris, J.M. (2021). Designing efficient L2 writing assessment tasks for low-proficiency learners of English. *ETS Research Report Series, 2021* (1), 1–31.

Scheffler, P. / Cinciała, M. (2011). Explicit grammar rules and L2 acquisition. *ELT Journal, 65* (1), 13–23.

Weinrich, H. (2003). *Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Third edition. Hildesheim: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Zifonun, G. / Hoffmann, L. / Strecker, B. (eds.) (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.

Wstępne wyniki i perspektywy badawcze związane z niemieckim czasownikiem modalnym *sollen* w ocenach pisemnych w L2

ABSTRAKT. Czasowniki modalne są specjalną kategorią czasowników i stanowią istotny element języka niemieckiego jako drugiego (L2). Podczas gdy badanie Abrams i Rott (2017) sugeruje, że teksty pisane przez osoby uczące się języka niemieckiego wykazują 90% dokładność w prawidłowym użyciu czasowników modalnych w zintegrowanych zadaniach pisemnych, prawidłowe semantyczne użycie czasownika modalnego *sollen* („powinien") wydaje się stanowić szczególne wyzwanie (Jentges 2016), zwłaszcza w kontekście oceniania. W ramach niniejszego badania korpusowego przeanalizowane zostały 1032 niemieckie teksty egzaminacyjne L2 na wszystkich poziomach CEFR pod kątem poprawności znaczeniowej użycia czasownika modalnego *sollen* z uwzględnieniem kontekstu pytań egzaminacyjnych. W 68% wszystkich przypadków użycia *sollen* w tekstach A1 i 53% wszystkich przypadków użycia *sollen* w tekstach A2 czasownik ten był niewłaściwie zastosowany. Za przyczynę rozbieżności między uzyskanymi wynikami a wynikami Abrams i Rott (2017) można uznać polecenia stosowane w analizowanych zadaniach – nie uwzględniają one rozbieżności semantycznej między użyciem czasownika w instrukcji a jego niewłaściwym użyciem w tworzonych tekstach.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: ocenianie tekstów pisanych w języku obcym, zadania pisemne, czasowniki modalne w języku obcym, CEFR, ESOKJ.

NADJA WULFF
University of Education Freiburg
nadja.wulff@ph-freiburg.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0812-461X

SANDRA MCGURY
Zurich University of Applied Sciences
sandra.mcgury@zhaw.ch
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2883-2568