A Conversational and Compositional Grid for Freshman University Students*[1]

Koot van Wyk
Visiting Professor
Department of Liberal Education
Kyungpook National University
Sangju Campus
South Korea
Conjoint lecturer of Avondale College
Australia

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to put together a tool for Freshman University Students with an ESL level, which will assist them to avoid errors in syntax precision and sentence generation. Both these aspects are problematic for students with a SOV language as mother-tongue who then have to produce with a SVO challenge. When their own language is a post-positional language as opposed to English as a prepositional language, that situation may complicate matters for these students even more. The grid is designed in such a way to allow the student to start from the left and work his way to the right selecting one item from the list constructing a meaningful communication as he/she goes along. The overall intention is towards greater precision and correctness, raising the level of accuracy in syntax and other grammatical aspects. The grammar selected for this purpose is the traditional grammar chosen for its simplicity, stability, and continuity functional in millennia of grammar didactics. The role of transformational-generative grammars are not overlooked but none of the recent grammar approaches in sentence grammar, discourse grammar, HPSG (Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar), universal grammar or syntax grammar could serve the purpose of designing this tool except sequencers or DM (discourse markers) discussed by Heine (2013). The limitation to this study is that the Conversational Grid tool has not been tested yet and that task calls for another future article describing the results of experimentation utilizing this tool.

1. Introduction

One of the main problems for Korean students is that they struggle to get the order of the words up to standard. The second problem is that they do not use definite articles[2] and prepositions[3] in their own mother-tongue, so that these are either deleted or wrongly placed. To overcome this handicap in their English language processing, this tool is meant to help in a methodical way to overcome the disabilities.[4]

---

[1]*The present study is the result of this researcher's ongoing ESL teaching experience in Japan and Korea. The analysis of syntax elements is the result of linguistic background.Courtesy to Mrs. Mi-hwa Park from Kyungpook National University, Sangju Campus, South Korea for beautifying the diagram.

[2]There is an article by B.-S. Park (1973): 63 where the example included a particle that is used in Korean that can be translated as either "that" or "the" but to say that the definite article exists as a constant applicant in Korean, is maybe not the case (B.-S. Park [1973].On the multiple subject construction in Korean.*Linguistics* 11(100): 63-76). Park used the example kisalam = "the man".

[3]It is not only Korean that do not use prepositions, the most ancient language Sumerian is also a *post-positional language*rather than a *prepositional language*like English. In Sumerian a number of prefixes and suffixes are added to the nouns and verbs as an intricate system but it is still a SOV language "the number of prefixed morphemes varies between zero and six for the verb, zero and one for the noun; the number of suffixed morphemes between zero and three for the verb, zero and three for the noun" (Dietz OttoEdzard, *Sumerian Grammar*[Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003], 1). Similar to Sumerian, Korean students learning English have the complex situation of switching verbs and objects in their attempts to compose and bringing in gender which their language do not have, infix prepositions, which they also do not have, and delete postpositional suffixes of their language from their final product in English.

[4]Behr 1980, 49 indicated that university students adapt their learning to their conception of what is required from them. "With this type of knowledge there thus does seem to be a possibility that what is learned may in fact differ even when the outcome is identical."

Scholars who are active in theoretical linguistics are not always preoccupied with the slips present with learners of a language, slips which are witnessed daily by scholars of applied linguistics or more specific, English didactics.

The present setting is L2 in a Korean society by a young generation or dig modernistic generation[5] strongly interactive with their smart-phones. The task of the applied linguist is to strive to find a "way out of the dilemma". Functionally it means that in a practical and pragmatist way, the scholar needs to develop a linguistic grammar tool that will solve this persistent occurrence of syntax-grammar slips. It is not easy to find literature that works with this objective in mind. The very beginner is in mind since that is where the rectification of the slips needs to start. A system needs to be simplistic and practical and finally helpful and successful for better quality of products, whether writing, talking, speaking or narrating. Learners think with their own language and then literally try to translate into English producing a syntactical mess that complicates semantics.[6]

English is a language engine among other "engines" of the world and globalism, trading, tourism, security,and migrationism have made it essential to be willing to adapt English grammar to function serving these roles. The standard is not lowered rather than that it is adapted with efficiency in mind. A. Cain in a short note in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 6th June 2014 wrote on "The death of Grammar and punctuation?"[7] Her examples are asking for "short-cuts" to be taken instead of insistence on minute variety and distinctions. SMS technology is bringing linguistic brevity to all cultures. *What's* became *wotz*. This is not really the death of grammar as it is rather attempts to suggest adapting to current global linguistic functional trends. The approach in my article is not to go to that extreme suggested here by Cain. The intricacies of cognitive linguistics and the role of implicit rather than explicit linguistic communication is not to be ignored but for the beginners' level it is better to be explicit in short correct sentences as to what they wish to communicate. Four or five sentences clustered together around a common theme will serve the purpose of appealing with a thought unit that can be semantically related to across the globe. Many thought units like this strung together is conversation. Meaningful conversation will be functional.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Choice between Traditional and Transformational Grammar

Scholars are still using the Traditional grammar[8] for teaching basic knowledge of different ancient and dead languages.[9] These grammars were not updated with modern developments since the 1950's of the previous century. Current didactics of these languages are mostly, if not all, written with the traditional grammar approach.

Although Generative Grammars tend to define terms differently and uses jargon fitting to their purpose in the description of transformational grammars, it is pointed out by Malmkjær that the traditional grammars cannot be pushed aside as not important since the terms, as used in this article, are actually derived originally from a Greek Grammar adaption Latin by a certain Priscian in the sixth century.[10] This simply means that in this article noun, verb, particles, pronoun, adverb, interjection or conjunction will be used for the grammar and linguistic terms. These are the parts of speech.

---

[5]A. Kirby (2009). *Digimodernism: How new technologies dismantle the postmodern and reconfigure our culture.*New York: Continuum.http://digimodernism.blogspot.com/2009/08/another-interview-i-gave-long-but-good.html. Post-modernism died in 1989 and was succeeded by digimodernism which had two developments with the power-point internet and e-learning (electronic learning) as a first trend and since 2000 a switch to m-learning (mobile learning) of which the current smart-phone using generation is living side by side with the older power-point generation. Educators tend to be the multimedia users and the students at Highschools, Universities and Colleges tend to be the smart-phone users.

[6]Slips that are very common by Korean users of their SOV language are: syntax errors with SOV instead of SVO, typographical errors, punctuation errors, inverted letters, absence of prepositions and absence definite articles, inverted word-order that are barriers for a listener or reader on a semantic level.

[7]A. Cain (2014).The death of Grammar and punctuation?*Sydney Morning Herald* of 6th June. Retrieved online, see bibliography.

[8]A simple overview of the traditional grammar is given by Malmkjær 1991: 477-482.

[9]The grammars for the following languages in modern times were all in traditional grammar format: Latin, Greek, Syriac, Coptic,Hebrew, Aramaic, Middle-Egyptian, Akkadian, Sumerian, Arabic, and the list can go on.

[10]Malkjær 1991: 478.

Admittedly, transformational grammars, discourse grammars and head-phrase sentence grammars studied aspects of cognitive linguistics from various levels but the contributions of these fields of study are not the subject of analysis here. One needs to be eclectic and choose and pick from a variety of modern options.

2.2 Developments in TESOL Literature 1980-1990's

At the last part of the post-modernism period (until 1989) and the early part of dig modernism since 1990, the TESOL literature moved thematically from sentence grammar to discourse grammar learning.[11]

Discourse grammars are still popular and scholars working on discourse grammar are Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2012, and 2013. Heine indicated in an article in 2013 that aspects of discourse grammar application by the learner arise from a cooption between *sentence grammars* and *discourse grammars.*[12] The move from sentence grammars to discourse grammars in the end of post-modernism and discourse grammar's continuation in the new past future or paramodernism (since 911) means that the focus is on the function of linguistic elements.

Although very necessary to understand and helpful for cognitive linguistics, one have to admit that the concepts are too advanced for the beginner of a language. In this article the goal is for the student to use the elements of the traditional grammar to function in a sensible way connecting each sentence with a discourse marker (DM) or sequencer as one can see in the diagram.

2.3 The Role of the Sequencer in the Tool Below

Kirsten Malmkjær distinguished between three oral communication aspects: situation, event and act.[13] A speech event consists of several speech acts or only one speech act. Rules are written for the occurrence and characteristics of speech events and speech acts.[14] The speech situation is almost the genre or kind of series of events or acts taking place, e.g. a poem, a prayer, an anecdote.

In speech-event analysis the assumption is that "members of all societies recognize certain communicative routines which they view as distinct wholes, separate from other types of discourse . . . and often distinguishable by clearly recognizable opening and closing sequences."[15]

Sequencers, listed in our first column A, are the first words attached to a main sentence and they stand in relation to other sequencers to move the anecdote or story forward to completion, which will be silence or a break, to allow others to respond or also talk. *Sequencers* were studied by Schegloff and he indicated that their internal structure is such that it places constraints on following sequences in the conversation[16] or as can be added here, also the composition. Recently, B. Heine (2013) indicated that they are called DM or Discourse Markers. He was wondering exactly what they are and indicated with other scholars that it is uncertain as to their identity.

---

[11]Rebecca Hughes and Michael McCarthy (Summer 1998). From sentence to discourse: discourse grammar and English language teaching *TESOL Quarterly* 32(2): 263-283. Retrieved from:
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3587584/abstract.

[12] Bernd Heine (November 2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics*. Volume 51, Issue 6: 1205–1247.

[13] Kirsten Malkjær, *The Linguistics Encyclopedia* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), 106-107. He explained that speech events take place in a speech community and it involves also speech situations and speech acts.

[14]Malkjær 1991: 107.

[15] J. Gumperz, "Introduction," in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: Ethnography of Communication* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 1-25 at 17; op. cit. Malkjær 1991: 107.

[16] E. A. Schegloff, "Sequencing in conversational openings," *American Anthropologist* 70 (6) (1968): 1075-1095. Schegloff however, focused more on conversation as follows: "I mean to include chats as well as service contacts, therapy sessions as well as asking for and getting the time of day, press conferences as well as exchanged whispers of 'sweet nothingness'" (E. A. Schegloff, "Sequencing in Conversational Openings," *American Anthropologist* 70/6 [28 October 2009]: 1075-1095, page 1075-1076). His doctoral degree in 1967 was on "The first five seconds: the order of conversational openings". The purpose of sequencing the way it is used in this article and grid is to link or chain one complete sentence with a next and next to form a series of thoughts under one umbrella topic. Livia Polanyi, "Discourse Structure and Discourse Interpretation," (495-503) is a good article on the simple elements involved in discourse and anecdote. For the purpose of this paper, the analysis did not focus on the initial "openers" of the sentence or sequencers in the first Table A of the Grid. *Transitional Tags* is a word used for these phrases listed in Table A and is discussed under various headings by R. W. Burchfield editor, *The New Fowler's Modern English Usage* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, England. 1996).

Heine indicated that scholars suggested alternative functional terms like "discourse connective" or "pragmatic marker" or "pragmatic particle". Some even called them "vocal hickups."[17]

My view is that they are what a doorframe is to a room. They function as "entry-point" to a new flow in the total concept. The beginner of English can season the sentence better by adding the sequencers or DM to the sentence and thus it is included in the tool.

2.4 Contribution on the English Sentence or Syntax

When one investigates the syntax grammatical publications dealing with mental spaces theory framework (Dancygier and Sweetser 2005) utilized by I. Kwon,[18] one notices that although she did use the mental spaces theory framework she "introduce some new elements to the diagrams, including using the layering of spaces to represent additional distancing strategies". This is how it should be since no descriptive system is watertight. Again the results are functional with phenomena of advanced speakers. The beginner cannot be served by these discussions in the agony of the absence of communicative sensibility. Linguistic theories and linguistic didactics need to be interactive and informative to each other as field of study, otherwise we end up with esoteric knowledge that has no applicational value. Kwon's work is valuable but not for the beginner's grammar with the goal of teaching elementary correct grammar application.

2.5 Contributions on Prepositions in English

Another area of problem for the L2 Korean students is the use of English prepositions. M. L.-Y. Wong has demonstrated in 2014 that verb-preposition constructions in Hong Kong English are not arbitrary but due to semantic aspects related to the verb and the preposition.[19] Language has a long history evolving from conceptuality of context.[20]

2.6 Subject Construction in Korean and Its Influence on English Construction inLiterature

ByungSoo Park (1973) wrote on the multiple subject construction in Korean.[21] The problems the Korean student experience in constructing an English sentence can be seen in Park's example on page 63:

[나는	꽃을	좋아하고	그	사람은	새를	좋아한다]
Na nin	k'ocil	cohahako	ki	salam in	se lil	cohahanta
I TM	flower OM	like and	the	man TM	bird OM	likesuffixes.

I like flowers and the man likes birds.[22]

---

[17] Heine, B. (November 2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics.* Volume 51, Issue 6: 1205–1247. Retrieved from:
http://www.workshopgramaticalizacao.uff.br/images/RioDM.pdf. Heine pointed out that there are 42 terms used for the *sequencers* by scholars.

[18] I. Kwon (November 2013) Evidentiality in Korean conditional constructions *Linguistics* 51(6): 1249-1270.

[19] M. L.-Y. Wong (April 2014). Verb-preposition constructions in Hong Kong English: A cognitive semantic account. *Linguistics* 52(3): 603–635.

[20] The verbs or actions that are connected to the prepositions are classified in the Grid designed below as: actions of force, cognitive, existence, deprivative, ablative, comparative, judiciary, emotive, receptive, and security focused. These allocations are not coming from Panini's Sanskrit grammar or other Modern cognitive linguistic grammars since the work of N. Chomsky (a reboot of the Hindu grammarian Panini) but from a Classical Greek grammar, also known as the*Traditional Grammar*. The prepositions connected to them are classified in the Grid as: prepositions of direction, position, relation, agency, means, cause, association and purpose. The earliest civilizations like Sumerian, used pictures, very similar to Old Egyptian grammar, for their writing systems. The cognitive aspect of the origin of those languages can be clearly seen in a comparison between pre-sargonic Sumerian (2305 BCE) which are somewhat pictographical and new-Sumerian (2112 BCE) which are cuneiform nails script.

[21] B.-S. Park (1973), 63-76 especially page 63.

[22] Compare the case in Korean with the case in ancient Sumerian on Babylonian Texts:

lu-	e	bi-	mudua- šu
man	house	OM	who built prepositional suffix (to)
S	O		V

"to the man who built this house"

(A. Poebel [1914]. *Historical and Grammatical Texts* [PBS 5] [Philadelphia: 19]).

The object noun is after the verb in English but in Korean it is before the verb. With their mental frame skilled in using this pattern they have to switch codes and try to communicate thoughts with English words. It is to be expected that slips like "I flower like and that man bird like" are common. A tool is needed to rectify this problem but it must be grammatically based otherwise the problems will occur always.

The mind of the learner has to conceptualize the grammar quickly and in a simple way in order to gain confidence in correct expressions which leads to better semantics and better communication.

The *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* which was developed since the middle of the 1980's as an alternative to Transformational Grammar by Pollard and Sag (1987, 1994) and Sag and Wasow (1999) focused on syntactic theory, language typology, computational linguistics and grammar development.[23] This flourished during the early *digimodernism* period. Also in the same HPSG tradition is the book of J-B. Kim and P. Sells which came out in 2008 and attempts to serve beginners in English.[24] The purpose of the book serves our purpose as well:

"Focusing on the descriptive facts of English, this volume provides a systematic introduction to English syntax for students with no prior knowledge of English grammar or syntactic analysis. English Syntax aims to help students appreciate the various sentence patterns available in the language, understand insights into core data of its syntax, develop analytic abilities to further explore the patterns of English, and learn precise ways of formalizing syntactic analysis for a variety of English data and major constructions such as agreement, raising and control, the auxiliary system, passive, wh- questions, relative clauses, extrapolation, and clefts."

J-B. Kim will understand very well how in a Korean setting one can expect beginners to struggle with the inclusion of the definite article in the syntax of their English constructions. The two scholars focused on syntactic forms, grammatical functions and semantic roles interface. Sells is interested in generative syntax with functionalistic approaches. That region of Europe is long known for functionalistic linguistics.

Advances that Kim et al made on the syntax of the HPSG, cannot help the tool that will be described in this article will take the grammatical functions of the classical traditional grammar and use it as navigational mapping towards generating a qualitative syntax form. The syntax is qualitative when it fulfills the communicative and semantical function as long as the tool is simple and can be easily used for beginners. The earlier book of J-B. Kim[25] was based upon the theory of HPSG mentioned above. The linguistic theory underlying this approach, just like transformational grammar approach cannot serve the purpose of the endeavor in this study at this stage. In an article by Johan van der Auwera he summarized his feelings browsing over decades of articles:

[23]Pollard, C. J. and Sag, I. A. (1987).*Information-Based Syntax and Semantics Volume 1 Fundamentals*. CSLI Lecture Notes, No. 13,Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.Pollard, C. J. and Sag, I. A. (1994).*Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, Chicago, London:University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from: http://hpsg.stanford.edu/ and http://www.dfki.de/lt/HPSG/ (Literature).

[24]J-B. Kim and P. Sells (2008). *English syntax: an introduction*. CSLI Publications.

[25]J-B.Kim (2000).*The Grammar of Negation* (Cambridge University Press, 2000). The phenomena that Kim studied like NICE (Negation, Inversion, Contraction, Ellipsis) phenomena are very important to understand functional variations in conversational and written language (J.-B. Kim Negation, VP Ellipsis, and VP Fronting in English: A Construction-HP S G Analysis. pp. 271-282. Retrieved from:http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/Y/Y01/Y01-1025.pdf). It emphasizes the reality that language is used and flexible as instrument of thoughts. As to what exactly the focus is during a negation in a sentence may be important like the sentence on page 274 (15) a. *What the president could not do is ratify the treaty.*(Explanatory after the fact of the ratification possibility).The reporter's announcement of failure of the president to accomplish something as fact without subjective reflection about it. b. *What the president could do is not ratify the treaty.*(Advisory prior to the fact of the ratification possibility). The reporter's suggestion of possible future actions as navigation of actions the president is able to still take with of course the reporter's own subjective decision involved that the president should not ratify it. One is eyes looking back and one is eyes looking forward. One is an objective reading of past events and the other is a subjective outlining of a possible course of future action he should or could take. Negation is with *do* [past context] in (a). Negation is with *ratify* [future context] (b). One focus is on the president (a) and the other is a focus on the treaty (b). This mental focus of the speaker predicts the construction that will fulfill meaningfully the lexical function of the horror bare data that: president treaty not. There is not an example of the use of negation in the Grid tool below in this article.

"When I went, with a lot of nostalgia, through these old issues, I was overwhelmed by two impressions: first, how much good work was published over all of those years, and second, how much of that work has gone more or less unnoticed; there must be something deeply wrong with our way to do research, if we can afford such a waste."[26]

This observation is symptomatic of the inability of TG and HPSG to provide a theoretical accepted model for applied linguistics or English didactics for beginners of a new language.

Beginners cannot be overwhelmed by a complex set of data and structures that do not place the words in a proper syntax in a quick and efficient way. Taking students on a jargon-war scenario will just complicate the immediate basic focus. Despite the work of R. O. Ulin and B. J. Schlerman (1978), *For the sake of teaching writing, deliver us from traditional grammar*[27] one will have to admit that traditional grammar theory underlying classical linguistics since the Middle-Ages may be just what is needed for the tool. In 1991 S. M. Walsh was lamenting that despite new developments there were no tangible improvements in students' compositional abilities.[28]

2.7 The Effectiveness of Transformational and Traditional Grammars

The effectiveness of the transformational grammar for students use was investigated as early as 1966 by D. R. Bateman and F. J. Zidonis.[29]

The syntax comparative approach by S-S. Kim has some promising aspects to it in this way that comparative linguistics may offer designers of tools a better opportunity to design a simple tool for beginners. S-S. Kim works primarily in comparative syntax and the syntax-semantics interface, with special reference to Korean. She did research together with P. Sells.[30] Unification grammar scholars were more interested in selling their ideology of grammar than the simple analysis of grammar.[31] For that matter, the classical traditional grammar description is preferred for this tool.

2.8 Reasons for Applying the Traditional Grammar for the Tool

There is also a pragmatic reason for selecting the classical traditional grammar theory: continuity. Anyone interested in "dead languages" will do better to stick to the traditional grammar theory since most books attempting to teach beginners about those languages are using that model. That accounts for hundreds of grammars of nearly every language on earth for centuries. Transformational grammars are still transforming and fluid and stability is not in sight. On the contrary, traditional grammars reached descriptive stability at a very early time.The Korean Grammar by정치근 (2009). 1일 1과 100일완성기본영어. 서울: 경심사, will serve the purpose of this article very well. It was written to reduce the problems of the beginners in English. It was designed by J.-K. Chung with English didactics as objective.

3. Method

3.1 Table/Grid

---

[26]Johan van der Auwera (August 2013) *Linguistics, the first fifty years … and a little more.Linguistics* 51 Issue Jubilee, pp. 1-8.

[27] R. O. Ulin and B. J. Schlerman (1978) For the sake of teaching writing, deliver us from traditional grammar. *English in Education* 28: 20-26.

[28] S. M. Walsh (1991) Breakthroughs in composition instruction methods without evidence of tangible improvements in students' composition: When will change come? New York, NY. USA: State University of New York. ERIC document number ED336744.

[29]D. R. Bateman and F. J. Zidonis (1966).The effect of a study of transformational grammar on the writing of ninth and tenth graders. Champagne, IL, USA: National Council of Teachers of English. Their conclusion was that the use of a generative grammar enabled students to increase the proportion of well-formed sentences in their writing and enabled students to increase the complexity without sacrificing the grammaticality of their sentences and lastly, helped the students to reduce their errors in writing. They concluded that the generative grammar represents the psychological process of sentence formation. It is not clear what grammar they used in 1966 but the grammar of C.-G. Chung seems appropriate for my article (정치근. (2009). 1 일 1 과 100 일완성기본영어.서울: 경심사).

[30]S-S. Kim and P. Sells (2011) Reconstruction and Scope of Negation in Korean (and Japanese). *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics*. Editor Andrew Simpson. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 139-153.

[31] For an example of a unification grammar see ShulyWintner(2008)*Unification Grammars*. Department of Computer Science, University of Haifa, Israel.Retrieved online from http://www.cs.haifa.ac.il/~shuly/malta-slides.pdf.

In order to enhance the improvement of a weaker student's syntax with that of a better performer, this table/gird is provided using some of the eight terms of a traditional grammar as honored by some linguists, even currently.[32]

Table/Grid 1: Conversational and Compositional Syntax Grid in Alphabetized Sequential order as in Normal English Communication

Sequencers A	Time B	Article C	Pronominal D	Person Thing E	Action Aux F Potential not real	Preposition G	Tense Future H Potential not real	Action/Motion Emotion I Indicative real	Tense Past J not real	Preposition K	Pronominal L	Article M	Person Thing N	Quality O
Beginning At first, First of all, To begin with, In the first place **Following** Then, Next, The next step is. . . After that, **Concurrent** Meanwhile, Simultaneously, With this in mind, In the meantime, For now, Soon, At the same time, For the time being, **Time** Soon, In the meantime, Earlier, Later, Afterwards, Later on, **Concluding** Finally, In conclusion, **Cause and Effect** For this reason, Subsequently, Consequently, Therefore, As a result, **Making a Point** The point is, My point is, What I want to say is that … **Illustrating** As an illustration, For instance, For example, **Giving reasons** The main reason is, The main things is, **Surprising facts** Surprisingly, Strangely enough, Believe it or not, You may not believe it but, Oddly enough, **Summarizing** To summarize, All things considered, To sum up, **Synthesis** Frankly, Actually, On reflection, It is fair to say that, To tell you the truth, The fact of the matter is that, To be honest, **Stating the question** The real problem is, The things is, The problem is, **Generalizing** Generally, On the whole, In my experience, Generally speaking, In most cases, **Clarifying** To put it more clearly, Let me explain, For example, **Adding a point** In addition, On top of that, Equally important, Likewise, Furthermore,	yesterday today this morning this evening winter, January, next month this month this year next year this semester season at 5 o'clock	a the	my his her our your their	**Indirect Pronouns** I he she it we you they **Direct Family** mother sister friend father grandmother classmate host guest partner husband wife uncle aunt cousin niece nephew **Professions** policeman fireman teacher leader chairman principal president manager farmer engineer doctor specialist clerk secretary owner car book house company school office money food news message airplane parts computer smartphone textmessage bed table chair shirt pants shoes notes	planned intended wanted hoped decided resolved began	to	**Subjunctive** will shall **Optative** may ought to would could	**force** take hold of touch claim aim at hit attain miss **cognitive** taste smell hear perceive comprehend remember forget desire care for spare neglect wonder at admire despise regard name choose appoint think **motion** go sing write come speak jump **existence** be (is are) become **deprivation** ask demand from conceal from deprive of take away from **ablative** (separated) remove [ ]from restrain [ ]from release [ ]from cease from depose [ ]from differ from give up **comparison** surpass inferior to excel overcome by prevail over **judiciary** accuse [ ]of prosecute [ ] for convict [ ]of acquit [ ]from condemn [ ]for indicted [ ]for dispute **emotions** admire envy forgive pity [be] angry **reception** receive get obtain **security** protect defend enhance support	-ed thought went sang wrote care spoke was were became	**Direction** Up From Through Out of Into Unto To Up to Along Down Upon Throughout Beyond To the side of Around About Toward **Position** In By On At Among Within Before Over Down From Beside Behind Above Under **Relation** In exchange for Instead of For Besides As Against In respect to After In the time of According to W/t reference to Contrary to In behalf of Concerning About Pertaining to On behalf of **Agency** By In **Means** Through By means of With **Cause &** Because of On account of **Association** With **Purpose** For the sake of For the purpose of For	my his her our your their	a the	**Indirect Pronoun** me him her it us you then **Direct Family** mother sister friend father grandmother classmate host guest partner husband wife uncle aunt cousin niece nephew **Professions** policeman fireman teacher leader chairman principal president manager farmer engineer doctor specialist clerk secretary owner car book house company school office money food news message airplane parts computer smartphone textmessage bed table chair shirt pants shoes notes biology Engineering	**quality** vehemently strongly mildly softly **now and then** suddenly regularly daily consistently successively often **non-stop** endlessly continuously uninterrupted y **volition** deliberately intentionally voluntarily **emotive** annoyingly surprisingly gladly pleasantly sweetly happily blatantly foolishly **cognitive** mannerism politely gently respectfully thoughtfully faithfully

---

[32]Malkjær 1991: 478.

3.2 Procedures

The data on the table or grid came from a number of grammars listed in the reference and traditional grammar parts of speech are utilized for the various columns. The columns are given uppercase alphabet letters in succession for identification. There are many choices available for the speaker or writer to choose from. Movement is from the left to the right and returning going slightly lower than before to continue with the next sentence.

4. Results and Discussion

This discussion is to explain how to use the grid.

4.1 Sequencer as Starter

Sequencers are where all students should start. Select in column A an appropriate phrase to start talking or writing. Normally, when one starts, the beginning sequencer in Column A is where one wants to select a phrase from.

Time is optional but one can add it to the sequencer from Column B.

Columns C-D cannot be used together. It is an either/or option. One cannot use Column C together with Column D. One should choose only one from either C/D.

4.2 Subject of the SVO String

Selecting some item from Column C or Column D is then placed together with an item in Column E. That means that C+E or D+E goes together. This will be the Subject in the SVO string.

4.3 Auxiliary verb of the SVO string

From Column F one has to choose an optional auxiliary action or auxiliary verb[33] which will be the mood of the action of the Subject in Column E. The mood means that the action is either potential not real for in Column I will be the action that is real.

If the auxiliary action is potential one has to use the preposition in Column G with it.

There is an option here that it is either F+G or H but not together. One cannot use F +H or G+H or F+G+H.

Column H is also potential[34] and not real but related strongly to the Future Tense. *Subjunctive*[35] means that it is more likely to happen and *Optative*[36] means that it is less likely to happen.

---

[33] For English as a SVO language, it is discussed in broad by Otto Jespersen at 23.5 (*have*); 23.5. *had better*; 32.1$_7$*have to* (infinitive); in passive 24.1; with no s in the third person 23.1$_4$. *May* 4.92; with infinitive 23.8$_2$. *Will* as auxiliary at 25.1$_2$. *Shall* at 25.5; 25.7$_2$. *Should* as rejecting condition at 26.6.*Be* as auxiliary at 23.5 (Otto Jespersen, *Essentials of the English Grammar* [London: University of Alabama Press, 1964]). In Sumerian, which is a SOV language, the verb is the most complex part of speech. It has an extremely variable set of prefixed particles as well as a number of suffixed particles. The verbal base in itself may be subject to variation. The verb may express: person, class, number, action, direction, tense/aspect, mood (Edzard 2003: 26). Features of Sumerian are shared also by a SOV language like Korean. Instead of auxiliary particles helping the main verb, in Sumerian there is a string of suffixed particles which are sometimes up to five in a row. One example will suffice: enim hu-mu-na-ni-ib-ge$_4$-ge$_4$ is the *noun* word + *verily* (hu-) + *ventive* (mu-) + *dative* (to him/her) (na) + *directive/causative* (ni) + *absolutive* (it as ib here) + *verbal root called marû base*: make return = meaning: "he/she verily answers him/her thereupon" (Edzard 2003: 72).

[34] What it means is that *Indicative Mood* is used for reality for example *he writes* but the non-real Moods are potential or future or conditional *he shall write*, *he may write*, *he would have written*, *if only he writes*.

[35] Otto Jespersen indicated that the unreality in English was indicated by the mood rather than the tense. He discussed the *Subjunctive* in early times under the heading of "imaginative use of tenses." The *Indicative* and *Subjunctive* in English became so blended that it is almost impossible to distinguish which one is active (Jespersen, 1964, 255 at 24.2$_2$). He also indicated that it is used in main sentences "to express a [realizable] wish" (Jespersen, 1964, 293 at 27.31. It was known in the Classical languages of Greek and Latin that the S*ubjunctive* "in its simplest and apparently most primitive use, expresses simple futurity, like the future indicative" for example "*I shall see*" "*one will say*" "*let us go*" "*do not do this*" (William W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar* [London: Macmillan and Co., 1978], 281 at 1320-1321). See also Burchfield 1996, 746-747.

[36] The *Optative* is "a vaguer and less distinct form of expression than the subjunctive, indicative or imperative, in constructions of the same general character" (Goodwin, 1978, 282 at 132*3). "The same change in relation is expressed in English by a change from shall, will, may, do, is etc. to should, would, might,did,was*, etc" (idem). See also Burchfield 1996, 555.

4.4 Verb of the SVO String

In Column I the student will select one of the verbs or actions listed or another similar verb or action. This is real or *Indicative*.[37] There are many kinds of verbs: force; cognitive; motion; existence; deprivation; ablative; comparison; judiciary; emotions; reception and security. The list is selective and not exhaustive.

If one selected any of Columns F; G or H one cannot select Column J. It is the past-tense indicator attached to the verb in Column I and can only be used if one goes directly from Column E to Column I. Thus E+I+J go together but not F+G+H+I+J. F+G+I is possible and H+I is also viable but only E+I+J is permitted.

Column K goes well with Columns E+I+J but it is possible to have H+I+K also. One has to select between Columns L and M.

4.5 Object of the SVO String

a) Rules pertaining to the Indirect Object

In Column N, one has to select between an Indirect Object (person/thing) or a Direct Object (person/thing). One cannot use the Indirect Object (person/thing) in Column N with Columns L and M. To use the Indirect Object (person/thing) in Column N, one has to go from Column K to N.

b) Rules pertaining to the Direct Object

For the Direct Object (person or thing) one can choose Column L+N(direct). One cannot choose Column L+N(indirect). One can also choose M+N(direct) but not M+N(indirect). Column O is optional.

Once the first sentence is completed, one then return to Column A and select from the other sequencers: following; concurrent; time; concluding; cause and effect; making a point; illustrating; giving reasons; surprising facts; summarizing; synthesis; stating the question; generalizing; clarifying; adding a point.

5. Some Examples Using the Grid

5.1 Some Samples

A	B	D	E (direct)	F	G	I	K	L	N	O
At first,	*this morning*	*my*	*sister*	*wanted*	*to*	*go*	*to*	*my mother*		*happily*.

A		E (indirect)	I-J	K	L	N (direct)	O
Consequently,		*she*	*spoke*	*to*	*her*	*teacher*	*respectfully*.

If in the first sentence one uses the Direct Object (person/thing) then in the second sentence one can use the Indirect Object (person/thing) to describe the same person or thing. Column E (direct) is replaced in the second sentence by Column E (indirect).

From the *Surprising facts* list in Column A one selects the sequencer for the next sentence:

A	C	E (direct)	I	J	L	O
You may not believe it,	*the*	*teacher*	*embrace*	*–ed*	*her*	*gladly*.

A		E (indirect)	I	J	L	N(direct)
The main reason is,		*she*	*admire*	*–ed*	*my*	*mother*.

Column E (direct) is replaced in the fourth sentence by Column E (indirect).

A	D	E (direct)	I	M	N(direct)
Let me explain,	*my*	*mother*	*is*	*the*	*principal*.

This simple unit of five sentences forms a conversational anecdote or narrative that is supposed to last about two minutes in general conversation. It is a mini-drama in itself in real life events.

---

[37] Jespersen sees the *Indicative* "used in all ordinary statements and questions. From simple matter-of-fact sentences it has been extended to many sentences in which formerly the subjunctive was used, so that now it is the normal mood of English verbs" (Jespersen, 1964, 293 at 27.$_2$). Jespersen traces the evolution of English amid the Classical languages like Greek, Latin and other.

Reactions after that are followed by giggles or other emotions of surprise and gestures of nodding by both speakers. In composition it forms a complete paragraph. In any conversation between two parties, many such closed units are narrated back and forth and "filled-up" with emotive reactions strung together.

5.2. Pilot Application in Class-settingUsing the Grid

Kyungpook National University Freshmen for conversational English on Sangju Campus in South Korea were given during March and April of 2015 this diagram for syntax to practice a *descriptive paragraph* with the help of the syntax grid-tool. They were asked to watch Boston Dynamics' "Big Dog" video online at www.youtube.com.

The dog is more like a donkey since dogs do not carry that weight that this robot donkey did. They were able to generate ten major sentences about the donkey on the following items: about its length, width, height, color, the company that made it, what they saw, and then five aspects as to what it can do. From this last section (five aspects it can do) a number of errors could be identified:

Grid Practice

Surprisingly,	it	can	climb	the	mountain	easily.			

__A__   __E__   _H_   __I__   __M__   __N__   __O__   _____   _____   _____

  Some students had problems with the definite article.

Surprisingly,	it	can	climb	mountain	easily				

__A___   __E__   __H_   __I___   __N__   ___O__   _____   _____   _____   _____

  Rectification is very simple. The teacher just say: "You do not have an M before the N". The student is send back to the drawing board.

  Another error was Subject-Object confusion.

Surprisingly,	it	can	climb	the	mountain	easily.			

__A___   __E__   __H_   __I___   ___C___   __E__   ___O___   _____   _____   _____

  Although the grammatical definitions were correct, C and E is only for the Subject and M and N is only for the Object in the sentence.

  Punctuation is a problem for some students.

Surprisingly	it	can	climb	the	mountain	easily			

__A___   __E__   ___H_   __I___   __M__   ___N__   __O___   _____   _____   _____
  There are no commas and no periods.

  Capitalization was also a problem with many students. They did not realize that after a comma one should use a small letter.

Surprisingly,	It	can	climb	the	mountain	easily.			

__A___   __E___   __H_   __I___   __M___   ___N__   __O___   _____   _____   _____

  What the grid helped achieve for the teacher, is that at least the SOV confusion is minimized and it appeared that syntax is in a better shape. Further investigation statistically is a need to verify the role of the grid for effective syntax applications.

5.3 Limitations in the Grid Itself

Limitations to the grid are that *numbers* and *adjectives* are not given a separate column. The reason for this is that the target audience is the low beginner or beginner with major problems in SOV (source language) conversions to SVO (target language).

They were asked to keep numbers and adjectives unidentified by the grid and no alphabetic symbol given underneath the word. "It is 3 meters long" did not have an alphabetic letter under "3".

6. Conclusions and Implications

This tool may enhance the students' ability to be more accurate in English syntax especially when the source language is SOV and not SVO. A couple of rules pertaining to columns chosen together needs to be closely watched but otherwise a Freshman University Student should be able to express him/herself accurately. Utilizing this tool may make a difference between a C+ and a B+ or higher. Higher level Freshman students have already this capability to naturally follow these rules without the need of a tool. However, many students, due to their peculiar backgrounds, may not have had the luxury of English Institutes to coach them into the syntax and grammatical rules of conversation and composition. The limitation of this study is that the tool was not majorly tested except a pilot study with some of the students.[38]

The simplicity of the model anticipates workable results however. More similar studies are needed to take care also of Beginners and pre-Intermediate andAdvanced students.

<참고문헌>(*References*)

정치근. (2009). 1일 1과 100일완성기본영어.서울: 경심사.

Andrews, R., Torgerson, C., Beverton, S., Locke, T., Low, G., Robinson, A., Zhu, D. (2004). The effect of grammar teaching (syntax) in English on 5-16 year olds' accuracy and quality in written composition. In:*Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit Institute of Education.

Asker, W. (1923). Does knowledge of formal grammar function? *School and Society* January 27, 109-111.

Bateman, D. R. and Zidonis, F. J. (1966).The effect of a study of transformational grammar on the writing of ninth and tenth graders. Champagne, IL, USA: National Council of Teachers of English. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED018424

Behr, A. L. (1980). *Teaching and Learning at University. A Theory and Practice of Instructional Science within the University Context*. Durban, South Africa: Butterworths.

Boraas, J. (1917). Formal grammar and the practical mastery of English.Unpublished doctoral thesis.University of Minnesota.

Burchfield R. W. editor. (1996) *The New Fowler's Modern English Usage*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Cain, A. (2014). "The death of Grammar and punctuation?"*Sydney Morning Herald* of 6th June. Retrieved from: http://www.smh.com.au/small-business/trends/blogs/the-big-idea/the-death-of-grammar-and-punctuation-20140606-39mdv.html#ixzz3KeG91AcM

Edzard, D. O. (2003).*Sumerian Grammar*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Goodwin, W. W. (1978). *A Greek Grammar*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Gumperz, J. (1986) Introduction. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1-25.

Harris, R. J. (1962) "An experimental enquiry into the function and value of formal grammar in the teaching of English, with special reference to the teaching of correct written English to children aged twelve to fourteen. Unpublished PhD thesis.University of London.

Heine, B. (November 2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics*. Volume 51, Issue 6, 1205–1247. Retrieved from:http://www.workshopgramaticalizacao.uff.br/images/RioDM.pdf

Hughes, R. and McCarthy, M. (1998). From sentence to discourse: discourse grammar and English language teaching.*TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 263-283. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3587584/abstract.

---

[38] Application of the tool was done on a limited scale during the first semester of 2015 at Sangju Campus, Kyungpook National University for the Freshmen students and by the fifth week some positive points could be listed: The students were asked to compose a description paragraph of about ten sentences. They were then given a grid of empty spaces with space underneath each block to allocate each element in their sentences to an alphabetic letter as in the grid. They shared their analysis with the help of the tool of their own sentences with the teacher and immediately the teacher could see their grammatical shortfalls, using a code to tell them about it and they could go back to the grid to discover what element is missing where in the sentence. They teacher was saying to the student: "You N does not have an M". They would then discover in the grid that the definite or indefinite article is meant and could rectify it immediately. The applicational ease with which the task is done by the student, the teacher to evaluate it on the spot and the student to return fixing the problem made writing a pleasant experience for both the teacher and the student. The grid moves the onus of error hunting from "peer-checking" to "self-checking" but in this case the teacher was the peer. It is anticipated that in future exercises "peer-checking" could replace the teacher's task for error-hunting.

Jespersen, O. (1964*). Essentials of the English Grammar.*London: University of Alabama Press.

Kim, J.-B. (2000). *The Grammar of Negation* (Cambridge University Press).

___. Negation, VP Ellipsis, and VP Fronting in English: A Construction-HP S G Analysis. pp. 271-282. Retrieved from: http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/Y/Y01/Y01-1025.pdf.

Kim, J.-B.and Sells, P. (2008). *English syntax: an introduction*. CSLI Publications.

Kim, S.-S.and Sells, P. (2011). Reconstruction and Scope of Negation in Korean (and Japanese).Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics. Editor Andrew Simpson. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 139-153.

Kwon, I. (November 2013). Evidentiality in Korean conditional constructions.*Linguistics*, 51(6), 1249-1270.

Malkjær, M. (1991).*The Linguistics Encyclopedia*.London and New York: Routledge.

Norris, J. M. and Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: a research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.

Poebel, A. (1914). *Historical and Grammatical Texts*.PBS 5.Philadelphia.

Polanyi, L. (1997). "Discourse Structure and Discourse Interpretation," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Para session on Pragmatics and Grammatical Structure*. 492-503.

Pollard, C. J. and Sag, I. A. (1987).*Information-Based Syntax and Semantics* Volume 1 Fundamentals. CSLI Lecture Notes, No. 13,Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Pollard, C. J. and Sag, I. A. (1994).Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.*Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, Chicago, London:University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from: http://hpsg.stanford.edu/and http://www.dfki.de/lt/HPSG/

Robinson, N. (1960). The relationship between knowledge of English grammar and ability in English composition.*British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 30, 184-186.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968*, 2009).Sequencing in conversational openings.*American Anthropologist*, 70 (6), 1075-1095.

Segal, D. and Barr, N. R. (1926). Relation and achievement of formal grammar to achievement in applied grammar. *Educational Research*, 14, 401-402.

Symonds, P. M. (1931). Practice vs. grammar in the learning of correct usage. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 22, 81-96.

Ulin, R. O. and Schlerman, B. J. (1978). For the sake of teaching writing, deliver us from traditional grammar. *English in Education*, 28, 20-26.

Van der Auwera, J. (August 2013).Linguistics, the first fifty years … and a little more.*Linguistics* 51 Issue Jubilee, pp. 1-8.

Van Wyk, K. (2015). Critical Evaluation of a Smartphone Movie Project for University Students.*The Society for Teaching English through Media Journal*, 16 (1), 191-216.

Walmsley, J. (1984). The uselessness of formal grammar?*Birmingham: British Association for Applied Linguistics/ Linguistics Association of Great Britain, Committee for Linguistics in Education*(CLIE Working Papers, no. 2).

Walsh, S. M. (1991). Breakthroughs in composition instruction methods without evidence of tangible improvements in students' composition: When will change come? New York, NY. USA: State University of New York. ERIC document number ED336744.

Wong, M. L.-Y. (April 2014). Verb-preposition constructions in Hong Kong English: A cognitive semantic account. *Linguistics*, 52(3), 603–635.

밴윅, 쿳. (2014). 대학교신입생의대화및작문영어를위한그릿

이연구의목적은
ESL수준의대학교신입생들이문장을만들거나정확한구문을구사함에있어실수를피하도록돕는하나의도구를제시하려는것이다.　　　　　주어-목적어-동사(SOV)　　　구조의모국어를사용하는학생들은주어-동사-목적어(SVO)의문장을구사하는도전을시도하면서이두가지측면에서어려움을경험한다.
영어가전치사를사용함과는대조적으로그들의언어가후치사를사용하는종류라면이는학생들에게더복잡한문제를안겨준다.

여기제시된그릿은학생들이표의왼쪽에서시작하여오른쪽으로옮겨가면서각항목에서한단어를선택함으로의미있는대화를구성하는것을돕도록설계되었다.

이연구의전반적인의도는구문론이나다른문법적측면에서정확도를높임으로더정확하고올바른표현으로이끄는것이다.   본연구에서는그단순성과안정성, 지속성으로수천년간문법교수법의기능을해온전통적문법을선택하여적용하였다.   변형-생성문법을간과하지는않았으나하이네(Heine, 2013)에의해토의된순서매김어휘(sequencers)나담화표시어휘(discourse   markers,   DM) 외에이도구를고안하는목적을위하여문장문법, 담론문법, HPSG (Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar) 문법,보편적문법,또는구문론문법에서의최근연구방법동향을적용할수없었다.

본연구에는대화를위한그릿이라는도구를아직시험해보지못한한계가있다.

그러한과제를위하여장차이실험적도구를사용한결과를보고하는또다른연구논문이발표되어야할것으로사료된다.

[lexical complexity/lexical density/lexical sophistication/lexical variation/
어휘적복잡성/어휘적응집성/어휘적정교성/어휘적다양성]