

## HOW GENERATIVE GRAMMAR HELPS BUILD SENTENCE SKILLS FOR THAI STUDENTS: A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING WRITING

Somsak Kaewnuch<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Education, Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University, Phitsanulok 65000, Thailand

\*Corresponding Author, E-mail: noneandnone02@gmail.com

### Abstract

Although the teaching of EFL writing in Thailand has mostly focused on the grammar and structure of the language, it may not have sufficiently demonstrated to students how the knowledge about sentence parts and sentence patterns explained by generative grammar (GG) may be useful in coping with the differences between Thai and English sentences. Generative grammar is a structuralist and cognitivist approach to make students visualize not only how sentence parts are arranged together to form complete and grammatical sentences but also how modifying phrases or clauses are tied to core sentence parts to get rid of redundancies as well as to achieve clarity. Cognitive theory supports generative grammar in that it helps students to imagine the locations of sentence parts and imprint them in their memory. Through comparison of sentence parts in Thai and English, the present article illustrates that for the most part sentences of the two languages are syntactically similar, and as a result students, using cognitive or mental ability, should be able to keep the same or similar sentence structures in their minds and to restore them for use when encountering differences between the two languages. Specifically, the paper shows how knowledge created by generative grammar can help get rid of the redundancies prevalent in the Thai language.

**Keywords:** Generative Grammar, Basic Sentence Patterns, Cognitive Theory

### Introduction

Generative grammar (GG) involves studying the syntax of a language; in other words, it explains the rules governing the combinations of words, phrases, and clauses into sentences of that language (Generative grammar; Eppler & Ozon, 2013). Generative grammar mainly relies on Chomsky's syntactic principles (Conde, 2005), and Chomsky refers to the principles as a person's tacit knowledge of the grammar of his or her native language (Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, & Harnish, 2001). With this knowledge, the person has the intuitions to judge the grammaticality of sentences

in his or her language. This knowledge is interchangeably called “generative grammar”, “transformational grammar”, and “universal grammar” (cf. Bavali & Sadighi, 2008).

The universal grammar (UG), however, is the grammar that Radford (1997) refers to as “a set of hypotheses about the nature of possible and impossible grammars of natural (i.e. human) languages” (p.12). Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, and Harnish (2001) define the UG as consisting of “a finite set of rules and principles that form the basis for the speaker’s ability to produce and comprehend the unlimited number of phrases and sentences of the language” (p.151). Generative grammar, or the UG, thus, got its name because it explains how sentences are generated from the finite set of rules and principles and also from intuitions about the correctness and incorrectness of sentences in a language.

The application of GG in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context is prevalent due to a number of factors, the most reasonable one being that EFL students always need the language to develop all four language skills. One popular teaching method making use of GG is called the Grammar Translation Method (GTM), which basically refers to teaching grammar via translation between the target language and the mother tongue. Common teaching activities of GTM include, for instance, memorizing rules and applying them to new examples, filling blanks with words, and listing words of the same categories (The Grammar Translation Method). According to Prator and Celce-Murcia (as cited in Asl, 2015), GTM “provides the rules for putting words together, and instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words” (p.19). And this method has been applied for a long time in the EFL context, for it is appropriate when considering factors such as availability of the target language, learning goals, cultural expectations, and students’ linguistic competence (Ahmad & Rao, 2013).

The popularity of GTM and GG in the EFL context, however, is challenged nowadays by the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT), which has emerged due to the worldwide increasing demands for communication in English. GTM is attacked for failing to produce competent users of English. CLT is thought to be more appropriate for the conditions of globalization in relation to businesses, jobs, and higher education, where now non-native speakers of English outnumber native speakers (Ahmad & Rao, 2013). In Thailand, CLT is said to be adopted during the 1990s when the Thai National Education Act tried to promote learner-centered instruction and the Communicative Approach (CA) in the teaching of English (Islam & Bari, 2012).

CLT, in fact, has created a widespread sense among people that the ability to communicate is more important than grammatical knowledge. This idea is well supported by the fact that after many years of English education via GTM, most university students and graduates cannot communicate effectively (Islam & Bari, 2012), and also by examples of people who learn English informally but can speak English better. Examples include women married to foreigners, students studying abroad, workers in foreign companies, and foreigners who can speak Thai after living in the country for a short while.

When considering theories in language acquisition, however, it is more believable that the acquisition of a language relies on both internal capacity and the environment. Claims by theorists who support the UG about the “poverty of stimulus,” or the condition in which the limited linguistic rules allow the learner to produce an unlimited number of sentences although they do not have enough input or have never uttered some sentences before (Lightfoot, 1999) is convincing. But arguments that language learning relies upon stimuli, responses, imitations, and memorizations given by Imitation Theory (Bergmann, Hall, & Ross, 2007) and Behaviorist Theory (Mehrpour & Forutan, 2015) are not less believable. The combination of the two, innateness and environment, therefore, should yield positive results, with the condition that teachers adjust their teaching to incorporate more of the social aspects of language.

Nevertheless, in the EFL context, the author believes that emphasis should be on teaching the structure of the language first. The structure or innate system enables a person to create and comprehend utterances they have never uttered or heard (cf. Foster-Cohen, 1999; Hawkins, 2001). Many have also insisted on the importance of grammar. For example, Drew Badger, co-founder of Englishanyone.com, states that grammar is very important in speaking but we must teach it in an appropriate way. Kent (1993) indicates that grammar is part of the background knowledge necessary for writing. Therefore, without a decent grammar, it is unlikely that a learner can prosper in any of the four skills.

The present article is written out of two dominant ideas: that practice makes perfect and that basic sentence patterns are the foundation of writing skills. The article, thus, focuses on explicating the usefulness of basic sentence patterns, drawing on generative grammar, and suggesting how we might have our students practice basic sentence patterns. However, apart from those, the article, believing that cognition plays an important role in mastering sentence patterns, also elaborates on how cognition is related to learning sentence patterns. How cognition helps students to master sentence skills may be clarified by meta-cognition theory, which explains that learners with meta-cognitive skills are mentally contemplative and aware of what they are doing and what they need to do, and are able to judge what is right or wrong (Kusolsong & Sittisomboon, 2017). The author believes that students with such skills are able to distinguish between the similarities and differences between Thai and English and to absorb the rules governing the basic English sentence patterns.

The article starts from explaining the basic English sentence patterns, comparing them with equivalent Thai sentences and pointing out what problems Thai students might have switching between the two languages. Then it explains how we may apply generative grammar and some cognitive theories to help students use their cognitive faculty and practice sentence patterns effectively. Finally, the article sums up the advantages of generative grammar and cognitive theories in the Thai EFL context.

## Sentence Patterns

Noam Chomsky claims that all human languages share rules or principles that govern the use of them (Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, & Harnish, 2001; White, 2003). Chomsky refers to the shared rules or principles as “the Universal Grammar” (UG). This grammar, according to Pesetsky (1999), is an innate system of categories shared by all human languages. To clarify, the innate categories form different parts of sentences functioning as nouns, verbs, direct objects, adjectives, noun clauses, and so on. All those categories are shared by all human languages. However, it is not just those syntactic categories that are shared; most languages share some sentence patterns, or the same orderings of sentence parts. The shared sentence patterns are said to be part of the UG.

Thai and English, too, share some sentence patterns. Thai students should acquire these more easily than those with features not existing in Thai or those with words of the same meanings and/or functions are arranged in different positions. The same or similar sentence patterns shared between English and Thai may be divided into two groups. The first group includes the patterns in which the major words with the same meanings and functions in both languages are ordered similarly. Thai students should acquire this group easily. The second group contains the patterns in which words with the same meanings in both languages occur approximately in the same positions, or are switched in some positions. The words do not necessarily have the same functions. The grammaticality of English in this group is achieved either by adding a word or words of the two languages to the sentence, or by deleting them, or by both ways. As a result, sentences in this group are more strictly governed by rules and more open to mother tongue (L1) interferences. This group is likely to be harder to acquire.

Below are sample sentences in the two groups in both languages. This article is intended for native Thai speaking readers; however, English words are parenthesized beside the important Thai words for non-native Thais to understand.

### Group One

Pattern	English	Thai
S + VI	The bird flew fast.	นก (bird) บิน (flew) เร็ว (fast)
S + VT + DO	I eat meat.	ฉัน (I) กิน (eat) เนื้อ (meat)
S + Be + SC	Father is a doctor.	พ่อ (father) เป็น (is) หมอ (doctor)
S + Be + Prep.	The box is under the table.	กล่อง (box) อยู่ (is) ใต้ (under) โต๊ะ (table)
S + VT + DO + OC	I help my father work in the garden.	ฉัน (I) ช่วย (help) พ่อ (father) ของฉัน (my) ทำงาน (work) ใน (in) สวน (garden)

## Group Two

Pattern	English	Thai
S + VT + DO + OC	I painted my room blue.	ฉัน (I) ทา (painted) ห้อง (room) ของฉัน (my) เป็นสี (-) ฟ้า (blue)
S + Be + Adj.	Alex is handsome.	อเล็กซ์ (Alex) – (is) หล่อ (handsome) ("Handsome" is a verb in Thai.)
S + VT + DO	I will marry you soon.	ฉัน (I) จะ (will) แต่งงาน (marry) กับ (-) คุณ (you) ในไม่ช้า (soon)
S + VT + IDO + DO	The seller gave the girl a cake.	คนขาย (seller) ให้ (gave) เค้ก (cake) แก่ (-) เด็กหญิง (girl)
S + VT + DO + OC	I think John a good man.	ฉัน (I) คิด (think) ว่า (-) จอห์น (John) เป็น (-) คน (man) ดี (good)

Although an exact number cannot be given, the above tables show that Thai and English sentences are similar in structure. The sample sentences in the tables, however, show that in general Thai students can have problems about tenses, prepositions, the addition and omission of grammatical words (such as the use of *be* to link the subject and the adjective), and grammar (such as the knowledge that an object complement can be an adjective or a noun). Unfortunately, there are still many other more features that make English difficult for Thai students even if the sentence patterns are the same or similar. For example, there is the use of *do* in negatives and questions, the subject-verb inversion in questions, and the adverb-auxiliary verb-subject beginning to emphasize an idea (such as "Hardly had I talked to him...").

However, the most difficulty for Thai students comes from the fact that English sentences are mostly strictly structured, with each word or part having a function in the sentence, but Thai sentences are not. Fragments are in most cases prohibited in English. Besides, English sentences start with a capital word and end with a period. To put another way, English sentences have their borders. On the contrary, Thai sentences are borderless (Thep-Ackrapong, 2005). Thai tends to be wordy, and usually readers or listeners can imply what is missing and understand how parts are connected to each other, even though they are not complete or grammatical. In the following Thai passage, for example, the parts that may be translated into complete sentences are underlined, while those that may cause redundancies if translated into English are not. The phrases that can be made into modifiers and then tied grammatically to the preceding or following sentences are italicized. Places where words are missing and therefore have to be implied are marked with a ^. The sentence borders are marked with a /. Note that when deciding these parts, the author thinks of how we might translate the Thai passage into English economically and straightforwardly.

ฉันอยู่บ้านนอก..ของกรุงเทพฯ หรือเรียกง่าย ๆ ว่า กรุงเทพฯรอบนอก/ ความที่^อยู่ในสวน  
ทำงานใกล้บ้าน นั่งมอเตอร์ไซด์ 10 บาทก็ถึงที่ทำงาน ทำให้ฉันไม่ค่อยได้เข้าเมือง/ วันหยุด^ก็พักผ่อน  
หย่อนใจ จับจ่ายซื้อของในตลาดนัด หรือไม่ก็^ห้างแถวบ้านที่คล้ายตลาด/ ^ไม่หรูหราถึงกับ^ต้องเกร็ง  
คอเพื่อกันคนล้อว่า^บ้านนอกเข้ากรุง. (Taken from คู่สร้างคู่สม (A Thai magazine), August 22,  
2014, p. 20)

To see that English is more straightforward, consider the following paragraph translated from the Thai paragraph above. The translation is not word-by-word but tries to keep the original meaning.

I live in the country of Bangkok, or in outskirts Bangkok. Living in an orchard near my workplace, I take a ten-baht motorcycle to work and do not often go to town. On holidays, I take a rest, or shop in an open market or in a mall near my home. It is a luxury life, but I need not put my neck straight to avoid being called a jaw.

When the two paragraphs above are compared, the Thai paragraph shows that when it is informal, Thai sentences are borderless and the subject is often omitted. The last underlined line is subject less. In addition, Thai tends to be redundant. For example, we do not have to say ทำให้. That phrase can cause some Thai students to make an error by including the verb “make” in the sentence. Certainly, the omissions and redundancies interfere with English. In contrast, the English paragraph shows borders between sentences. All the sentences contain a subject and a verb. In other words, English sentences are easier to follow.

Therefore, it is advisable that Thai learners of English study and practice basic English sentence patterns in order to be able to write sentences that are easy to grasp and to avoid grammatical errors due to omissions and redundancies from Thai to English. Teaching sentences, therefore, should be one of the good choices that EFL writing teachers should try.

## Generative Grammar and Cognitive Theories

The section above shows that there are shared sentence patterns between Thai and English that supposedly ease the switch between them, and also that there are many features that do not exist in both languages. It seems, hence, that a minimalist approach is useful; that is, learning the shared categories of words, phrases, and clauses and how these are combined to make English sentences is useful.

The author argues that generative grammar is useful in developing students’ sentence skills. Generative grammar is based on the work of Noam Chomsky, who argues that every healthy child possesses what he calls “the universal grammar,” sometimes equated with LAD (language acquisition device) (Chomsky as cited in Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, & Harnish, 2001). The universal grammar is innate and usually referred to as a set of rules governing how different levels of

linguistic constituents (words, phrases, and clauses) are put together. In other words, the universal grammar provides grammatical categories and invariant principles for operating them (White, 2003). Generative grammar, therefore, tells us what is possible and what is not. For example, without knowing the meanings of the words, we know that this sentence “The dodo is the coco in the bobo of the jojo” is grammatical and acceptable, while this sentence “Dodo the is of the coco in bobo the jojo” is not.

Generative grammar can be applied with cognitive theories to help students develop their sentence skills. Cognitive theories describe the working of the mind, that is, how the mind creates mental images. In one aspect, it sounds contradictory to apply generative grammar and cognitive theories together. Generative grammar is a formalist approach, but most cognitive or critical theories, especially in linguistics, are functional approaches (cf. Fairclough, 1989; Fowler, 1991). Cognitive linguistics attends to various theories, such as metaphor theory, mental space theory, frame semantics, and cognitive grammar (Hart & Luke, 2007), all involved with the function of language. In general, cognitive linguistics explains how mental images, cultural experiences, and linguistic structures create feelings. Metaphor works with culture to create love, hatred, scorn, and so on. How words and phrases are punctuated or repeated can create emphases that intensify sadness, heartiness, and so forth. Reading a story, our mind can cast back to an event we once witnessed, thus, developing a feeling of some kind.

There is one aspect of cognitive theory, however, that should be applicable with formalist approaches, and with generative grammar. Generative grammar provides categories and describes how they combine to create sentences by specifying not just the rules governing the combinations but also the locations of those parts. Yet, without the written words, we are still able to visualize those locations. It is in this way that cognitive theory is useful in building sentence skills; it enables one to memorize those locations and also to say whether a part that contributes to the completeness is missing, or whether a wrong part of speech is used. Mental space theory, such as that by Turner (1991), explains that our mind can visualize a movement on a continuum or a straight line. we can imagine speaker A and speaker B sitting at the opposite ends of a line in a warlike debate and whether the former wins the latter by passing the half-line spot to the opposite side through his speech. Such mental power, of course, can help us mentally spot the locations of the core parts of a sentence although each part is separated or modified by a phrase or a clause.

The same mental power is also able to recognize the function of a long part replacing a shorter one. For example, it can equate a noun clause with a noun phrase. Our mental power can help expand our syntactic knowledge about short and long categories. What is better than this is that when we are advanced, that is, when we can recognize the functions and locations of all categories, we still know the functions of contracted clauses and are able to identify the omitted word or phrase. For example, we know that in “This lesson is very valuable for me, but

^ ^ not ^ for you,” three words (it/is/valuable) are omitted. In this sentence, “Jerry was walking along the beach when he saw a strange object buried in the sand,” we know that “buried in the sand” is a past participial phrase contracted from an adjective clause “which was buried in the sand.” Both the phrase and the clause modify the noun “object.” The knowledge from generative grammar on one side and our cognition (our ability to recognize parts of sentences and how they combine to create phrases, clauses, and sentences) on the other side, therefore, help us develop our sentence ability, from simple sentences to compound and complex ones.

Before mentioning ways to apply generative grammar and cognitive power in practicing sentence patterns, the author would like to point to the application of generative grammar and cognitive theory in the field of Composition. It could be said that generative grammar has long been applied in the current-traditional approach, a method probably adopted since the birth of EFL writing instruction. Current-traditional rhetoric is a structuralist paradigm that focuses on correctness and form (Crowley, 1998; Kaewnuch, 2012). Books of this rhetoric start with the smallest units—words. They explain the functions of words and the grammatical rules by which phrases, clauses, and sentences are created from words; generative grammar and cognition (the ability to apply rules) are used in this field in this way.

In Composition, however, cognitive theory is adopted more at the discourse level. Current-rhetoric, which stresses form, exploits the five-paragraph theme, thus enabling students to mentally locate the major parts: introduction, body, and conclusion. These already make use of cognition; however, cognition is further applied in thinking of the major supporting details or points in the thesis statement, which is normally located at the end of the introduction. Students, who can think of three major points and anticipate how to explain them in the three body paragraphs, could be said to exploit their cognition. Being able to do so, they are supposed to write effectively and quickly.

In another area of the field, theorists explain discrete stages in the writing process. For example, Rohman depicts that writing process as consisting of prewriting, writing, and rewriting, and Britton as a series of linear growth consisting of conception, incubation, and production (as cited in Sommers, 1997). Similarly, Flower and Hayes (1997) state that “[t]he process of writing is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers orchestrate or organize during the act of composing” (p.252). Flower and Hayes indicate that the stages by Rohman and Britton are the best examples of stage models. The cognitive processes or strategies that go through the writer’s mind or that are applied by the writer, however, are more various than the linear stages mentioned by Rohman and Britton. For example, Kinneavy (as cited in Flower and Hayes, 1997) thinks that the writer’s purpose plays an important role in choosing the diction, syntactic, and organization pattern. Moffett and Gibson believe that it is the writer’s sense of the relation of speaker, subject, and audience that determines those choices.



The author, however, wants to stop at any of the stage models, by forgetting for a while other cognitive processes such as considering audience and emphasizing an emotion. The purpose of this article is to point out the usefulness of combining generative grammar and cognition in helping Thai students improve their sentence skills. Generative grammar expounds the functions and locations of sentence parts, and this knowledge can be combined with mental space theory, as explained by Turner (1991), and with a stage model in helping Thai students to recognize the functions and locations of sentence parts and practice writing sentences. Stage models are often accused of dividing the writing process into discrete, unrelated stages, of ignoring the discursive and recursive characteristics of writing. However, the author thinks that at the level of teaching sentences such contradiction of a stage model can be satisfied by giving more time for students to go back and forth continually revising their sentences in all the stages.

To put the notion of combining generative grammar, space theory, and a stage model into practice, the author did a small experiment by teaching a class of thirty-five English major students ten basic sentence patterns, including, for example, Subject + Be + Adjective (John is tall) and Subject + Transitive Verb + Indirect Object + Direct Object (John gave me some money). The students were supposed to use the knowledge from generative grammar to decipher such patterns, and also to memorize them, using their mental space ability. In interviews, 100% of the students confirmed that they could recall the locations of different parts of sentences but still produced grammatical errors because they had not memorize all grammatical rules.

To combine generative grammar, space theory, and a stage model, there are actually many creative activities. One of the activities is translating Thai sentences into clear English sentences, helping the students to see that Thai sentences tend to be wordy. This activity is divided into three stages: planning, writing, and rewriting. In planning, the students divide the Thai sentence into recognizable parts by slashing, coloring, underlining, or parenthesizing the core parts, and also crossing out the unnecessary words. After that, they write a simpler Thai sentence that means the same as the original sentence. Then they write down the sentence pattern. Then they think of the lexical words, the important words inside the sentence. In the next step, they think of the grammaticality of the sentence, such as using articles, tenses, adverbs, conjunctions, and modal verbs. Finally, they write and rewrite the sentences, having some time to look back and forth between the lines in those three stages. Look below at how such an activity might work.

ในชีวิตของฉัน ฉันยังไม่เคยได้รับความรักที่ยิ่งใหญ่จากใครๆ

**Planning:**

Slashing: ในชีวิตของฉัน ฉันยังไม่เคยได้รับความรักที่ยิ่งใหญ่จากใครๆ

Simpler Thai sentence: \_\_\_\_\_

Sentence pattern: \_\_\_\_\_

Lexicon: \_\_\_\_\_

Grammaticality: \_\_\_\_\_

(Three minutes given to recheck the planning)

**Writing:**

---

(One minute given to recheck the writing)

**Revising:**

---

The above activity can expand to complex sentences, from easy daily-life texts to more difficult, abstract academic texts. It can subsume other activities such as finding the missing parts in long sentences, deleting the unnecessary words and clauses, and parenthesizing sentence parts in academic readings. For example, in reading this sentence, “The chemicals that are needed to grow GM crops can be harmful to animals and insects, and so disturb the food chain” (Craven, 2009, p.58), students may be taught to parenthesize the adjective clause “that are needed to grow GM crops” first in order that they see that the subject “chemicals” has two verbs, that is, “can be” and “disturb,” and also that two sentence patterns in the main clause: S + Be + Adj. and S + Vt + DO.

Next, writing at the discourse level, students may be asked to consciously think of the parts of each sentence, one after another. After the students are familiar with basic sentence patterns, they can be asked to apply them in speaking and listening. They can be assigned to read a text or watch a YouTube video and jot down sentences according their patterns; meanwhile, they learn the function of the language. After writing about a typical weekend, an activity that makes them use the vocabulary they only have in their heads and the sentence patterns that they learned from the classroom, they can talk about it in front of a classroom, or they can record it for their friends to listen to on a website. It can be concluded, therefore, that students can learn sentence patterns from many activities, not just from listening to the teacher’s explanation. In fact, in any language classroom now, learning activities should be as various as possible.

## Conclusion

Generative grammar is a cognitive approach that teaches the structure of English, and students can internalize the structure of English through learning the basic sentence patterns in one or two semesters. However, the teaching must include both knowledge and practice. One obvious advantage of generative grammar, as the above diagram shows, is helping students to translate Thai sentences into English not only grammatically but also economically. Students learn to get rid of the wordiness in Thai sentences, using English sentence patterns as guidelines. They can also learn how to change fragments prevalent in Thai into English and tie them with the core sentence parts grammatically. Another advantage is that the basic sentence patterns are the foundation of compound and complex sentences. In addition, with the knowledge from generative grammar, students can tell what is omitted from contracted phrases and clauses and thus are able to write compound and complex sentences by themselves. Finally, the knowledge about basic sentence patterns can also help students to tackle texts full of complex sentences. In reading, students can use the knowledge to understand difficult sentences full of punctuation marks and phrasal and clausal modifiers.

However, learning about sentence parts and sentence patterns does not suffice. To teach language at any rate, what EFL teachers need to do regarding teaching sentence patterns, therefore, is to add more practice to teaching. In fact, generative grammar, which entirely focuses on form or rules (Wodak, 2001), exploits mainly the ability to memorize, and memorization ranks low in Bloom's taxonomy (cf. Krathwoht, 2004). Generative grammar mainly makes use of cognition, which is not enough. Language learning must also rely on the help of society. Indeed, there are more theories that focus on the influence of society than those that believe in the capacity of the mind. For example, in the field of language acquisition, there is the behaviorist theory, which insists that society reinforces language learning through the stimulus-response process (cf. Tomic, 1993). In the field of education, Dewey (1997)'s progressive education refers to education acquired from and with others. And in Composition, Bruffee (1997) discusses the benefits of collaborative learning in the writing classroom, saying that knowledge gained through consensus is reliable. Collaborative learning, in one aspect, encourages the practice of language with others.

EFL teachers, as a result, only need to put the teaching and learning of sentence patterns into real practice. There must be real teaching of sentence patterns, teaching of all of them in one roll, and real practice. In other words, it is not enough for the teacher to explain sentence patterns only and have students memorize them without really using them in different skills. As said above, in one or two semesters, or even more, after students are familiar with basic sentence patterns, teachers can have them practice through reading, writing, listening, and speaking, preferably from media and various texts, and also with peers. Supposedly, students can develop the high-order skills in Bloom's taxonomy from those activities. From time to time they revisit the sentence patterns. Research may be conducted to see if they retain the sentence patterns.

## References

- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2001). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication* (5th ed.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). Applying communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language: A case study of Pakistan. *Porta Linguarum*, 20. Retrieved from [http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL\\_numero20/12%20%20Saeed.pdf](http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero20/12%20%20Saeed.pdf)
- Asl, E. H. (2015). Comparative study of Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in language teaching methodology. *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology*, 1(3), 16-25.
- Badger, D. (n.d.). *Importance of grammar*. Retrieved from <http://webboard.sport.sanook.com/forum/index.php?topic=3861184.msg19474210#msg19474210>
- Bavali, M., & Sadighi, F. (2008). Chomsky's universal grammar and Halliday's systemic functional linguistics: An appraisal and a compromise. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 11-28.
- Bergmann, A., Hall, K., & Ross, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Language files: Materials for an introduction to language and linguistics*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Bruffee, K. (1997). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk Comp Theory: A Reader* (pp.393-414). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Conde, X. F. (2005). *An introduction to syntax according to generative grammar theories*. Romania Minor. Retrieved from <http://www.romaniaminor.net/ianua/sup/sup08.pdf>
- Craven, M. (2009). *Reading keys: Skills and strategies for effective reading student book 3*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. Massachusetts, MA: Free Press.
- Eppler, E. D., & Ozon, G. (2013). *English words and sentences: An introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Foster-Cohen, S. H. (1999). *An introduction to child language development*. London: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1997). A cognitive process theory. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk comp theory: A reader* (pp. 251-275). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Generative grammar. Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generative\\_grammar](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generative_grammar)

- Hart, C., & Luke, D. (2007). Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis. In C. Hart and D. Luke (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis* (pp. ix-xiii). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hawkins, R. (2001). *Second language syntax: A generative introduction*. New York: Blackwell Publishers.
- Islam, M. J., & Bari, I. S. (2012). Implementation of CLT in Bangladesh and Thailand: Problems and challenges. *Outlooks: VUB*, 2(1). Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/5753157/Implementation\\_of\\_CLT\\_in\\_Bangladesh\\_and\\_Thailand\\_Problems\\_and\\_Challenges](https://www.academia.edu/5753157/Implementation_of_CLT_in_Bangladesh_and_Thailand_Problems_and_Challenges)
- Kaewnuch, S. (2012). Balancing structuralism and postructuralism in EFL writing instruction and assessment. *Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University "Multicultural, Lifestyle and Language,"* 4(1), 39-47.
- Kent, T. (1993). *Paralogic rhetoric: A theory of communicative interaction*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2004). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-225.
- Kusolsong, S., & Sittisomboon, M. (2017). A development of instructional model to enhance metacognitive strategies for Rajabhat University students. *Journal of Education Naresuan University*, 19(1), 114-130.
- Lightfoot, D. (1999). *The development of language acquisition, change, and evolution*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mehrpour, S., & Forutan, Ali. (2015). Theories of first language acquisition. *Journal of Language, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(1), 30-40.
- Pesetsky, D. (1999). Linguistic universals and Universal Grammar. In R. A. Wilson & F. C. Keil (Eds.), *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Radford, A. (1997). *Syntax: A minimalist introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommers, N. (1997). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk comp theory: A reader* (pp.43-54). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. The Grammar Translation Method. Retrieved from <https://eslmethods.wikispaces.com/file/view/The+Grammar+Translation+Method.pdf>
- Thep-Ackrapong, T. (2005). Teaching English in Thailand: An uphill battle. *Journal of Humanities Parithat, Srinakharinwirot University*, 27(1), 51-62.
- Tomic, W. (1993). Behaviorism and cognitivism in education. *Psychology, A Journal of Human Behavior*, 30(3/4), 38-46.
- Turner, M. (1991). *Reading minds: The study of English in the age of cognitive science*. New Jersey, NJ: Oxford University Press.

White, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about—a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.