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Although the choice of pedagogical method is important for the effectiveness of second language teaching, there is a relatively limited body of research on the strengths and weaknesses of different methods. This study compares the effectiveness of two different methods in teaching English as a second language, Task Based Language Teaching and Presentation Practice Production.

The idea of TBLT (Task Based Language Teaching) is to encourage communication in the classroom, put the learner in center, give the learner language input and guide the learner. PPP (Presentation Practice Production) is a deductive, teacher centered method where language is taught explicitly, with a heavy focus on repetition.

Two groups of students were given instructions on the use of different verb forms, one using PPP and the other TBLT. Both groups where tested before and after the lesson. The study compares and analyzes the data to give information about the advantages and disadvantages of the methods.

The results of this essay suggest that PPP is more effective in teaching grammar than TBLT in the short term, where TBLT showed an improvement by 0.5 % and PPP by 3.6 %. Even though the improvement of the learners in both methods is limited, the result works as a basis for discussion and suggests that further research is necessary to give teachers a better foundation to stand on when choosing methods for teaching a second language.
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1. Introduction

Teaching involves many elements. One might be to have a good knowledge about a subject, another might concern the pedagogical aspect of teaching. Most teachers aspire to be good teachers, to possess as many skills and abilities as possible, or elements that the learner finds necessary. One important element is of course how to reach the learners and have them learn what is intended by the teacher, such as math or geography, health or ethics. To be able to do this, to be an educator who successfully teaches other people things that they did not know or could not accomplish before, teachers need research to rely on when they enter a classroom. They need pedagogical methods that are based on sound empirical evidence.

This study is about the comparison of two established methods in language teaching, more specifically grammar teaching. One method is well known, traditionally well-established and has been applied for a long time, in this text referred to as PPP (presentation-practice-production). The core ideas of this method are to present a rule or fact, practice how to deal with it and then have the students produce their own material related to what they have been working with. The other method is called task-based teaching, a teaching method that focuses on language meaning rather than on form. This is a more recent method that challenges the older and more used PPP method. These two methods are very likely the most frequently used ones in Swedish schools today, and the former one is perhaps the most common. To compare these two methods is therefore relevant, as a contribution to the field in its search for sound empirical evidence for different methods of teaching.

This study is intended to bring new knowledge to how to assess different methods of teaching and increase the awareness of what methods should be used in different situations. The goal of the study is to test, analyze and discuss two frequently used methods in second language acquisition. To compare them, expose their weaknesses and point out their advantages. This will be accomplished with the help of four classes in the Swedish “Gymnasium”, equivalent to an American high school.

In order to do this I designed a test, which was handed out to four classes, or just over 100 students in a Swedish high school. The two classes with the lowest score were then selected. These two classes had a one hour lesson with me, one where I used the PPP method and one where I employed the TBLT method. The test was then handed out again, and new data were
obtained. The results gave me a starting point for a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of two established methods of second language teaching.

To sum up, the aim of this study is to compare Task-based language teaching with the more traditional PPP method which many language teachers are familiar with and use. Hence, my research questions are formulated as follows:

How effective is a Task Based Language Teaching method in teaching the usage of different verb forms to students at a high school level?

How effective is a PPP teaching method in teaching the usage of different verb forms to students at a high school level?
2. List of Terms

Here follows a list of terms which I use throughout the essay. Note that there are a number of terms that all relate to a task-based way of teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Comprehensible Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Method Comparison Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Presentation Practice Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFLT</td>
<td>Second and Foreign Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>Task Based Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBLT</td>
<td>Task Based Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>Task Based Syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Theory and Previous Works

The background of this study is the debate about the advantages and disadvantages of two different methods of teaching language. The first one is the PPP method that follows the principle of Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP). The second one is what is called Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT).

3.1. PPP Method
Firstly, The PPP method is generally used in many other contexts than only second language acquisition (SLA). However, in this study the PPP method will be set in the context of SLA. The method of PPP is a well-established pedagogical method, or approach according to Shehadeh (2005:14). However, there is a conflict in the field of language researchers that concerns what PPP should be seen as. Criado (2013:99) asserts that “PPP is not a 'method' or an 'approach' (labels that some authors such as Skehan, 1998, use to refer to this model), but a pedagogical strategy at the teachers’ disposal […]”. However Criado lacks arguments for this assertion.

Furthermore, Swan (2005:386) argues that PPP is more of a frame of reasoning in language teaching than a pedagogical method. Regardless of whether PPP is called a pedagogical strategy, method or approach, it is based on the idea that a rule or linguistic feature of some kind should be declared early in the teaching process, followed by different ways to practice and apply this rule or feature in different environments (Shehadeh 2005: 14).

As Shehadeh (2005: 14) states, the PPP method is well established and also “difficult to shake. From my own experiences and in discussion with other teachers, I would not be surprised if this method is the most frequently used method of language teaching in Swedish schools today. However, the aim of this study is not to examine which method is currently the most common in second language acquisition in Sweden. This study aims to compare two different pedagogical methods in terms of their effectiveness.

The theory of the PPP method includes three main parts and I intend to give a brief explanation of these parts in the following section. The first one, presentation, involves presenting the grammar item, which can be in the form of a rule, function, pattern etc. It is important to bear in mind that this method is constructed to teach language explicitly to a larger extent than TBLT. Presenting the grammar item at the beginning of the learning process is consequently an essential part of the
PPP approach. It is also a method that is generally teacher controlled, which is most obvious in the first stage (i.e. the presentation) (Shehadeh 2005: 14).

The second stage in PPP is practice. The purpose of this stage is to repeat and practically apply the new information that the student has learned in the presentation stage (Shehadeh 2005: 14). This is the stage where the learner is supposed to grasp what the teacher has presented.

The third and last stage in PPP is production. The idea is to repeat and apply the language item correctly after having been presented to it in the first stage and from repeating it in stage two. There is an element of individuality in this third stage, to produce language freely. Carless (2009) claims that the learners are meant to produce the language for themselves, expressing what they want to say rather than what the teacher has directed them to say. However, the argument that PPP actually encourages the learner to produce language freely has encountered criticism. Willis (1996:135) suggests that the idea of free production is ironic since production can hardly be free if students are required to produce forms that have been specified.

One advantage of PPP according to Carless (2009) is that the role of the teacher is very clear and the teacher can control the pace of the lesson easily. Furthermore, Carless (2009) states that interviewed teachers in his study claims that one of the advantages of PPP (compared to TBLT) is that for teachers PPP is easier to understand and more manageable. PPP also contributes to the teacher’s instructional role, which by Carless is seen as another advantage compared to TBLT. Educators in the Hong Kong based study admit that direct grammar instructions were more effective with PPP than TBLT. (Carless, 2009)

3.2. TBLT Method
TBLT is a pedagogical method that is based on the idea that language is best taught when the learner uses the language in the way it is used in natural communication. Natural communication is not something to explain objectively, as many teachers probably interpret natural communication differently. However, in this study natural communication is simply conversations between learners where they have no script to keep to. To achieve natural communication TBLT uses different tasks, such as discussions, games, problem solving, reading texts, comparing, debating and so on. By design, the task segment should have a non-linguistic goal. This goes hand in hand with the idea of having a focus on real language use. The non-linguistic goal can be almost anything, for example constructing a text, playing a game (with the goal to win) or setting a
play. However, at the end of the task segment, the teacher should focus on a linguistic element which the learner should use and apply to the former task. Hence, if working with grammar, the teacher should present a grammar rule that is applicable to the task, and at this point focus changes from meaning (the task) to form (grammar). (Willis and Willis, 2007:21-25)

The method developed in the 1980’s and is a result of the debate about how to teach language most effectively. According to Bygate, Norris and Van den Branden (2009:4), a second language was not as easily acquired as the PPP method perhaps assumed. Many preeminent language researchers and educationalists advocated a more holistic and learner-driven pedagogy, and had done so since the beginning of the nineteenth century. The idea of a method that was not restricted to only presentation, practice and production of language continued to develop and in 1978 Henry Widdowson wrote *Teaching Language as a Communication* and R.L Allwright published an article with the headline *The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning*, which both are good examples of what the core ideas of teaching would be. Hence, TBLT is a product of a pedagogical shift that has been ongoing for decades and where the core and the most important feature is communication. Bygate et al. argue that it was a logical development at the time to put communication “at the heart of the teaching procedures”, much because of previous research concerning the field of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Bygate et al., 2009:5).

In practical terms, the task in task based language teaching can be divided into different stages, often called segments. The names and in some cases the order and types of the stages do sometime diverge between different researchers and authors, but the basic principle is the same. The present study’s lesson-design is constructed with Willis and Willis’s book *Doing Task-based Teaching* (2007) as a framework, with four main stages.

1. Priming stage
   - including stimulation of the students’ pre-knowledge of the subject
   - including a facilitating task
2. Main task stage
3. Language focus
4. Report stage
The function of the priming stage is to prepare the learner for the upcoming task segment and engage their pre-knowledge of the subject and to stimulate it. The facilitating task is meant to be a help for the learner in the upcoming task by using knowledge that already exists, activating this knowledge and in that manner help the student to complete the main task in a better way. The main task stage is the core of the task segment, and also the stage where, to a large extent, the language is produced by the students. This is where the learner uses the language communicatively. In the third stage, the focus changes from meaning to form, which includes a shift from using the language communicatively to also being able to look at the language with more attention to structure and grammar. This helps the learner to make sense of the language they have experienced and used, and it motivates the students as they are made aware of what it was they were actually studying. As Willis and Willis (2007: 25) point out: “By putting grammar at the end of the cycle there is every chance that we can increase motivation.”

The purpose of the last stage called report is to have the learner conclude the prior stages and use the language that has been acquired. To sum up, the priming stage stimulates the learner and prepares the learner for the upcoming task. In the main task stage, the learner uses the language communicatively, which is followed by a focus on language form where, for example, a grammar rule is presented. The focus on an element of grammar or structure is connected to the task and the learner can then apply the linguistic element to the former tasks. This new knowledge is shown in the report stage and by putting grammar at the end - the motivation is increased since the learner can connect the grammar to real world communication.

3.3. Differences between the Methods
In 1994 Ron Sheen wrote an article which critically analyzed many of the works written by well-reputed authors and advocates of a task-based syllabus, for example Michael H. Long, Graham Crookes, David Nunan and Stephen Krashen (Sheen, 1994). Sheen concludes that advocates of a Task Based Syllabus (TBS) should try to demonstrate the strengths and advantages of that method compared to a PPP method, instead of only criticizing the one that they do not use (PPP). He argues that the TBS is not scrutinized and that there is actually no evidence of its advantages. The text begins with a critical view of how past revolutions in the field of language teaching have occurred when the contemporary paradigm has been criticized, only to end up with a failure to produce the intended progress and instead create uncertainty and insecurity for students and
teachers (Sheen, 1994:128). Sheen claims that language teachers and researchers should learn from this and review the TBS thoroughly, something he does not think has been done.

One text that Sheen (1994) criticizes multiple times is Michael H. Long and Graham Crookes’s paper ‘Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design’ (1992). When discussing the long term effects of new methods in teaching, both Sheen and Long & Crookes seem to agree that no recommendations should be made before results that support long-term positive effects have been found. However, Sheen argues that while Long & Crookes suggest this in their work, they actually do the complete opposite, in that they recommend teachers to give up traditional methods without providing any reference to any studies that support such long-term effects (Sheen, 1994:134).

One important difference between TBLT and a PPP is that, generally speaking, TBLT is inductive and the PPP method is deductive. The main features of a deductive approach are that it is teacher centered and consequently straightforward in the sense that there is limited room for interpretation for the learner. An inductive approach values student interaction and activates the learners. It is more time consuming and there is a risk (with inductive teaching) that the student does not acquire the grammar implicitly, hence the student may fall behind in development (Widodo, 2006). However, the last stage of TBLT is a focus on form and includes a linguistic element, which could involve a more deductive approach. At the same time, a PPP method could of course include inductive components during the progress.

Supporters of TBLT argue that the method is theoretically fairly simple. East (2015:7) argues that TBLT gives the students the opportunity to learn to communicate by communicating. Moreover, East cites Willis and Willis who support the former suggestion and mean that “the most effective way to teach a language is by engaging learners in real language use in the classroom”. Willis and Willis (2001:173) base their opinion partly on the claim that language should not be seen as a list of forms to be learned, something they argue is the case in other opposing teaching methods.

Knowing that the TBLT is mostly implicit in its design with an explicit component in the end (the language focus), and the PPP method is mostly explicit, it is interesting to state that Sheen (1994) finds that, in general, explicit methods are found to be better than implicit. He also states that some of the studies used as support to a task-based syllabus actually found that a deductive method is better than an inductive one when it comes to reading and writing. Furthermore, in one large study that supports TBLT, Sheen finds that traditional methods (such as PPP) are more
effective than audio-lingual methods. The criticism here is of audio-lingual methods and not of TBLT, however, this argument is rather a criticism against the nature of paradigm shifts in language teaching. He claims that there is a tendency for new ways of teaching to go unchallenged, and when the new paradigm is established, new dissensions emerge. In the past, the audio-lingual method was argued to be better than a PPP method. Sheen argues that advocates of TBLT treat this method like the way the audio-lingual supporters treated theirs, with lack of research about the method they endorse and only criticism about the ones they condemn. Regarding the audio-lingual method, this is a behavioristic model and the goal is to engender good patterns in the learner’s language, for example by repeating what the teacher is saying (Harmer, 2001:79-80).

Sheen (1994:132) is also very skeptical of how TBS supporters view the methods that they do not support, that is, more traditional methods. He states that often all the other traditional methods are merged into one single expression, instruction. To reduce a method to one single term and not specify what it actually means only leads to ambiguity and is destructive rather than constructive, Sheen argues.

Today more research has been conducted in this area. A recent study by Gonzales-Lloret and Nielson (2014) analyzes the outcomes of TBLT compared to a lesson based, more traditional pedagogical method. In the traditional method a text-book was used as the main teaching material. The research was carried out in the US at a police department where police officers are taught Spanish. Gonzales-Lloret & Nielson divided the police officers into two groups; one group followed a TBS and the other a more traditional method which they chose to call “the grammar-based group”. Detailed information about the grammar-based method is not given in the research. However, from what can be concluded from the article, it has similarities to the PPP method which I use in this study. Gonzales-Lloret & Nielson (2014) have two hypotheses which they test in their study:

1. “Students in the TBLT group would outperform students in the grammar-based group on measures of fluency, lexical complexity and syntactic complexity”

2. “students in the grammar-based group would outperform students in the TBLT group on measures of grammatical accuracy”
In the study, they present results that support their first hypothesis. However, they cannot find any support in their data for their second hypothesis. Gonzales-Lloret and Nielson (2014) come to the conclusion that TBLT is better than the traditional method when it comes to fluency, lexical complexity and syntactic complexity, but the two methods showed similar results in terms of grammar. As Gonzales-Lloret’s and Nielson’s hypotheses suggest, the TBLT method might have more advantages when it comes to teaching fluency in language, lexical complexity and syntactic complexity. It could be argued that this is because of its use of real-language, non-linguistic goals and active learning. However, as mentioned, the report showed almost no difference between the two pedagogical methods in the development of grammatical accuracy among the students.

A generic term for methods that use communication in language teaching is CLT, Communicative Language Teaching. As TBLT is a method where communication is an important ingredient, it is interesting that East (2015:7) points out that in CLT, a focus on grammar is only necessary if it arises from the communication that the task required. Furthermore he reflects about the belief that grammar is considered to be best learned incidentally and implicitly, which raises the question of how good the TBLT method is when it comes to actually teaching grammar.
4. Methodology

This study has an experimental research framework, and consists of two main elements: test and lesson. The test (Appendix 1) was given to four groups of students (4 different classes) of which two of the groups qualified for the next round - the lessons. The two lessons differed from each other in pedagogical method (TBLT/PPP) (when carried out) and after the lesson the same test was given again to see differences in development from the first occasion.

The test was designed to examine the students’ grammatical knowledge of how well they used different verb tenses and forms, more exactly the present and past tense together with the simple and continuous form. The study was carried out at a Swedish “Gymnasium”, equivalent to senior high school (Am.). The test was handed out to 112 students in four different classes. The respondents were all in their first year in the program and they were all in either the science or the technical science program.

4.1. Collecting Data - Test
As the collected data consists of two main parts (test and lesson), I will go through these separately. I will begin with the design of the test, which was the starting point of the study.

The test, which has a multiple-choice format, was designed to examine the student’s ability to use the ing-form. All of the questions in the test are closed. The test is constructed by me and edited by the current study’s supervisor and a professor of English at the University of Linköping. The test was given to a dozen volunteers (students) at the university to secure the quality of the questions and the format of the test. Before the test was handed out, the students were informed of the fact that it was anonymous and was part of a project at the teacher training program at Linköping University.

The method of having a test in the form of a questionnaire was chosen for a number of reasons. Compared to an interview, questionnaires are quicker to administer (Bryman, 2012), which is an advantage given the limited time given for the study. Moreover, questionnaires are more convenient for the respondents and do not suffer from interviewer effects (Bryman, 2012:233-234). Bryman (2012:146) shows that interviewer effects can be caused by the sex, ethnicity, or social background of the interviewer. This may influence the respondent and affect the answers.
4.2. Teaching Sessions
The teaching was divided into two different sessions and the aim was to use two different pedagogical methods, PPP and TBLT. Two different classes were chosen based on the results from the test. The two classes with the lowest results on the test were picked out, to ensure as large a difference as possible in terms of level of grammatical skills.

4.2.1. Teaching Session 1 – PPP Method
In the first group I used a PPP method of teaching. This was done through a Keynote presentation (Appendix 4) and a sheet including both practice exercises and a more communicative part, as part of the production stage (Appendix 5). Afterwards, the exercises were discussed and analyzed in groups. The students were given the same test at the end of the lesson (Appendix 1), to provide data for the comparison before and after the lesson.

I chose to organize the first stage of the PPP lesson, the presentation, as a keynote presentation. Here, the grammar issues were presented to the students. They were also given the answers to how to deal with the grammar issues. The first two slides (Appendix 4) are more of an introduction to what the lesson will be about. The last four slides are simply presenting the grammar problem and the solution to the problem, as it goes through the two different verb forms and the two different tenses that the test was about. After the presentation, when the students were aware of the problem and how to tackle it, the lesson continued to stage 2 - practice.

The students were given the opportunity to practice with the help of an exercise sheet (Appendix 5), in a "fill in the blanks" exercise. The sheet also included the last stage, production, as the students were asked to form sentences of their own with different verb forms and tenses. As a result, all three stages had been covered during the lesson, and the students were asked to complete the test again.

4.2.2. Teaching Session 2 – Task-Based Language Teaching
In lesson two a TBLT method was applied, teaching language on the basis of a task. The task that was used was about personal advertisements, and the non-linguistic goal in the task segment was to construct a personal advertisement for oneself or for a famous person. To help the students in this, a facilitating task was constructed to be completed before the main task. The idea of this task was for the students to come up with different facts about me, the teacher, in class. Things that came up were: if I liked to work out, if I had a girlfriend or boyfriend, if I was married and so on.
Prior to this facilitating task, the students were introduced to a number of already constructed personal advertisements, some of a more serious kind and some more humorous (see Appendix 6, slide 2). This was done to activate the students’ pre-knowledge of the subject, together with the facilitating task. Both these exercises were accomplished to prepare the learners for the upcoming main task. The main task was then presented to the students. While the students were writing I tried to give them guidance in how to build up the text, and I also tried to have them use verbs in the different forms and tenses that the lesson was focusing on. For example, I tried to discuss interests they had, or what interests the famous person might have (verbs) and then help them formulate this when they were writing the ad. After about 20 minutes the students were told to stop and they all had a text to present. There was neither time nor need to read all of the ads in class, but a few of them were presented to everybody in the class.

After the main task, there was a shift from meaning to form, and a linguistic element was introduced. The students were taught how to use the present and past tense, together with the simple and continuous form. The shift is an important part of the TBLT method, and it is also important to connect meaning to form. The connection was made by giving each student an ad that had been written by another student. In groups, they were asked to find sentences that contained verbs using the present or past tense and the simple or continuous form. They were to discuss if the verb was used correctly or incorrectly, and to correct the verb if needed. Again, they got guidance from the teacher. The last stage during this lesson was to ask one representative of each group to tell the rest of the class what they had found. Findings could be grammar corrections in any of the ads, but also to explain why they had not made any corrections, if that was the case. Consequently, they had to explain why the grammar was correctly used and not only incorrectly used. All groups had a number of sentences to discuss. As a result, all the stages of TBLT had been covered and they were asked to complete the test again.

As the results can be influenced not only by the test or the methods as such, but also by how the lesson was performed, I will have a section with my reflections of the lessons in a qualitative way. Personal notes from the two lessons, which I collected during and after the implementation of it will be the only material used when writing this part.
5. Results

In this section I will present the results from the tests. I will present the results from the first four tests as well as the second test in the two classes that were taught with different methods. I will also go into some specific questions and look at the difference in result in terms of present and past tense. Lastly a qualitative analysis of the results is presented, where it is brought up how the lessons were interpreted and to what extent they followed the lesson plan.

5.1. Results after the First Test

I handed out the test to a total of 112 students in four different classes and I got absolute answers from everyone, that is, no completed test had to be excluded. I will refer to the four classes that completed the test as group 1, 2, 3 and 4. In table 1 the results from each of these groups are shown.

Table 1 - Test results after the first time the classes answered the test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average correct answered questions (out of 30 possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the groups are quite small, as Table 1 shows. Additionally, the results also indicate that a vast majority of the students answered most of the questions correctly. As mentioned in the methodology section, the aim was to pick the two groups with the lowest results, yet have in mind that the two should have fairly similar results. Based on these criteria group two and three were chosen for my two different teaching sessions. The number of respondents was similar in the different classes. In group 2, 28 students answered the test. In group 3 the number was 31 and the other two groups, group 1 and 4, contained 25 and 30 students respectively.

5.2.1. Results for Group 3 (PPP method)

As shown in Table 1, group 3 had an average score of 22.8 on the test the first time they answered. The following week I had the class for a one hour lesson, dealing with verb tenses and verb forms, organized according to the structure which is presented in the methodology chapter.
Planning notes, exercises and presentation for this lesson can be found in Appendix 2, 4 and 5. Table 2 shows the results for the students in the class before and after the lesson was carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Average correct answered questions (out of 30 possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the PPP-class</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the PPP-class</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent improvement in the class</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 shows, the group improved by 3.6 percent, to score an average of 23.7. With the first results in mind one can observe that, on average, almost every student scored one point higher than they did the first time. It should be mentioned that the attendance went down from 31 to 30 the second time. The first time the class scored a total of 708 and the second time a total of 710. Adding their average score of approximately 23 correct answers to the second time of total correct answers, the class got a total improvement of 25 more correct answers the second time (compare 708 with 733). As the test was anonymous there was no possibility to identify and exclude the student from the second session.

### 5.2.2. Results for Group 2 (TBLT method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Average correct answered questions (out of 30 possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the TBLT-lesson</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the TBLT-lesson</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent improvement</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2 had a slightly lower result than group 3 in the first test, and was taught for an hour with the same goal of improving their skills in using verb tenses and forms. The difference was the method of teaching, hence this time a Task Based lesson was carried out.

The students’ average result went up from 22.6 to 22.7, a remarkably small difference of not even a half percent. The class attendance was unchanged, consisting of the same 28 students, scoring a total of 633 correct answers the first time and 636 correct answers the second time.
When studying the questions individually, there are some questions that score differently. In Table 4 and 5, the top three questions that got the biggest improvement in the two groups respectively are presented. For the specific question, see Appendix 1.

**Table 5 - questions with the highest improvement in correct answers for 3 (PPP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Percent improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the tables demonstrate, the number of correct answers to question 15 showed large improvement in both classes.

Looking at the opposite end of this scale, the highest decrease in the number of correct answers in the two classes, the results show that no question sticks out and the percentage is overall lower than the improvement percentage. Table 6 and 7 show the highest decrease in correct answers in the two classes.

**Table 6 - Questions with the highest decrease in correct answers for group 2 (TBLT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Percent regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>−18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>−14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>−14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>−14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>−14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>−14 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - questions with the highest decrease in correct answers for group 3 (PPP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Percent regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>−7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>−7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>−7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>−7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another comparison that can be made is the difference between the usage of present and past tense. 15 questions in the test used the present tense and 15 used the past tense. Tables 8-10 illustrate the results for each set of questions and each test, followed by the improvement/decrease in the two sets respectively. Table 8 shows the results from the first test in the two classes and how many percent of the class that answered correctly in each category, that is, questions using the present tense and questions using the past tense.

Table 8 - Division into present/past tense - First test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage of the students that answered correctly (present tense questions)</th>
<th>Percentage of the students that answered correctly (past tense questions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (PPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (TBLT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Division in present/past tense - Second test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage of the students that answered correctly (present tense questions) second test</th>
<th>Percentage of the students that answered correctly (past tense questions) second test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (PPP)</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (TBLT)</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the results after the teaching session. Group 2 after a TBLT session and group 3 after a session where the PPP method of teaching was used.

Table 10 shows the improvement or decrease in both classes and both categories, present and past tense.
Table 10 - Improvement/decrease in present/past tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Improvement present tense (percentage points)</th>
<th>Improvement past tense (percentage points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (PPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (TBLT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>−1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up the results before giving my qualitative analysis of the lessons, both group 3 and 2 improved in their overall result, although the latter not as much. One question in the test sticks out and is improved in both classes to a very large extent (question 15, see Appendix 1). Regarding the difference between present and past tense it is hard to conclude that one tense is easier for the students than another. Regardless of the four tests, the highest score for each group is found in the present tense category (76.7 for group 2 before and 79.1 for group 3 after). On the other hand, the only decrease in the study is seen in group 2 when it comes to the present tense correct answers, a decrease in 1 percentage unit. In contrast, the highest improvement is also seen in the present tense category, as group 3 went from 75.9 to 79.1 percent of correct answers. When analyzing the statistical reliability of the data, the population of the study is too small to ensure significant changes. However, this was known prior to the study and I will also give my reflections about this in the next chapter.

5.2.3. Qualitative Analysis of the Lessons
The first teaching session was the one where the PPP method was used (see Appendix 2 for a detailed time plan). From what I could observe the students were aware of the grammatical problem but they had some problems producing the right form. The ordinary teacher of the class told me in class that I should refer to the continuous form as “the ing-form”, because that was the more familiar expression when using verbs ending in -ing. I did not go into the difference between the “ing-form” and the continuous form, but it was pointed out to me that the difference had probably not been taught in class¹. The activity amongst the students was low during the lesson, only a few questions were asked and no discussions occurred without my initiation. When the exercises were handed out, the students sat in groups of two or three and discussed how they could form sentences in the way the exercise asked for. The first part of the exercise sheet was done mostly individually, and some students finished the whole exercise individually.

¹ i.e. “the continuous form” relating to a verb used in the continuous. The “ing-form” relating to a verb used with the ending -ing.
Approximately half a dozen students did not write anything in the second part of the exercise sheet, that is, forming their own sentences with different verb forms and tenses. When I summarized the exercise together with the students, they were asked to explain why they chose a particular verb tense, which they could explain to a large extent. To sum up the observation during the PPP session, the activity was low during the lesson. The interest seemed to be limited but the students tried their best in doing the exercises that they were given. In the end, about a third of the class got the chance to explain why they used a specific verb form or tense and almost every student did this in a satisfying manner. Overall, the students did very well during the lesson in that they listened to the instructions and completed the exercises to a large extent.

During the TBLT lesson, in contrast to the PPP session, the students seemed more confused. The students were not as aware of what we were doing as during the PPP session. This is partly because I did not tell them that we were going to work with grammar that lesson, instead they were told that they would do an exercise dealing with personal advertisement. The students seemed to be full of expectations, interested and as mentioned, a little confused, about the exercise. I felt that the first exercise, “Who am I?”, where the students were supposed to guess who I was, went really well. The students were active, many raised their hand and there were many different suggestions from many students. The idea was to trigger and stimulate the students’ pre-knowledge in this first facilitating task. This I felt succeeded, as they used many verbs in different forms and tenses, and they all had the opportunity to think about what a person is like, what interests they have and so forth. The main task went well although a reduced interest in the task was noted, and some of the students seemed to have some problems with the writing in terms of creativity related to the actual advertisement. The students did not get a lot of time to write, which I think affected them negatively. When I shifted focus from meaning to form, they seemed to grasp the relationship between the grammatical rule and the exercise that preceded it, giving a number of arguments for when to use a specific tense or form of the verb. To conclude the TBLT session, the activity was high during the lesson, the interest was high and the students tried their very best to follow my instructions and complete the task. Overall, the students listened to the instructions very well and completed the tasks fairly well.
6. Discussion and Conclusions

The aim of this study was to compare two methods of language teaching and evaluate the effectiveness of them. When summarizing the results, they indicate that TBLT is not as effective as PPP in teaching how to use the present and past tense together with the simple and continuous form. Both lessons resulted in an improvement, although the PPP method resulted in a bigger improvement. I will interpret and discuss my results in the perspective of the research questions and the previous studies that I presented in chapter 3. I will also discuss the reasons for why the scores of some questions improved or declined more than others, which will lead me to a discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of this study, together with a view of what further research should focus on.

I will start with the positive change in the test results when teaching grammar with a PPP method. One of the main research questions of this study was if the PPP method is effective in improving the students’ ability to use the progressive and simple form. The results show that the average score of the students increased. In that sense the PPP method is shown effective in the study, although as stated earlier the population of the study is too small to show any significant changes. As Carless (2009) points out, the PPP method is teacher controlled and the teacher has a clear role where he or she can control the pace of the lesson easily. Taking my qualitative analysis into account, it can be argued that this was true also in the lesson given with the PPP method. The students listened carefully and the teacher was in charge in the classroom. Carless also states that the PPP method is easy to understand for the learners, resulting in a more effective grammar teaching. This too is reflected in the current study, as the students in the classroom gave the impression of understanding the exercises and instructions very well.

The results of this study also indicate that the TBLT method improves the student’s ability to use the progressive form, although it is not as effective as the PPP method. The impression of the TBLT lesson was that the students had a harder time understanding the task and the teacher was not in control of the learning process to the same extent as in the PPP lesson. This is a result that is backed up by Carless (2009), where he states that a TBLT method is not as straightforward as the PPP method. Furthermore, Sheen (1994) argues that research has shown that a deductive method such as PPP is better suited for teaching reading and writing, where grammar is one component. This backs up the thesis that PPP is better to use when teaching grammar.
Looking at specific questions, it can be stated that 26 and 15 stick out. Question 26 is the one that improves most, 21% in group 2, together with number 15 which is in the third place in this respect in the other class, group 3. The questions were formulated as follows:

15. A. Henrik Larsson used to play football but he does not play anymore. (Correct)
   B. Henrik Larsson used to play football but he is not playing anymore.
26. A. I was at the car repair shop and saw that they were driving my car around. (Correct)
   B. I was at the car repair shop and saw that they drove my car around.

It can only be speculated why these two questions were the ones that improved most, but if we assume that the lessons are part of the improvement, the lessons have in common that they both at different points explained the fact that the -ing form (continuous form) is used when something happens at that specific moment, and the simple form does not (to oversimplify). Furthermore, question 15 and 26 are formulated in a way which makes this rule relatively easy to apply. If a learner who is unsure if he or she should use the present or continuous form in these two examples, it could be the case that the learner reflects about if the action is happening at the specific moment or not.

When it comes to the question with the highest decrease in correct answers, only one question sticks out. In group 2 question 27 has a decrease in correct answers of -18%. The next step is seen in question number 5, 9, 12, 17 and 18, and all of these have a decrease of -14%, and none of these questions are among those that decrease most in the other group. In group 3 the highest decrease is -7% and is seen in question 1, 11, 13 and 25. Number 27, however, is formulated as follows.

27. Tänk dig att meteorologen på TV talar om väderleksrapporten (Eng: A meteorologist on TV is talking about the weather forecast)
   A. It is ten o'clock and it is raining a lot in New York at the moment. (Correct)
   B. It is ten o'clock and it rains a lot in New York at the moment.

In contrast to the question that improved most, it is harder to see why this question decreased to such an extent.
Both of these analyses assume that the linguistic element, the rule, is accurately or inaccurately acquired by the learners, which brings me to the discussion about how this study can be improved and how the weaknesses of it can be avoided. Firstly, how to test the learner’s skills would benefit from being improved and made more extensive. The multiple choice question form that was used in this study took about 15 minutes for the students to finish and gave the study a useful set of data, although the results would improve if the data were more extensive. The same test was used again to measure the improvements/decreases, and based on the fact that no exclusions had to be made, it was simple and understandable which was a positive aspect of the test. However, the test had only 30 questions and 28 of them had only two different alternatives, which gives a 50/50 chance of correct answer (25 % chance in the other two questions). Furthermore, it only tested a limited number of grammatical issues, in this case two different verb forms alongside two different tenses, which of course is a fraction of the field of grammar.

Indeed, a more longitudinal study would be preferable when measuring language skills in this manner, together with a more thorough test. In a more comprehensive study, research should be made based on learners’ general language skills rather than looking at specific grammar issues. This should in my opinion be completed through an exhaustive examination, and this data would thus be used as the foundation of the research. To survey a greater number of learners, and map out their skills, weaknesses and strengths before going into the learning part, would improve the reliability of the results drastically. This is one reason why it is hard to draw any conclusions from this study, and from many of the previous works cited as well.

As stated earlier in the text, the largest study referred to in this essay is the one by Gonzáles and Nielson (2014), which included 39 students and lasted for eight weeks, which brings me on to the second element that needs to be improved for further research. I have already discussed how the test period and the test design have to improve. Moreover, it would also be beneficial if further studies in this area focused on not only expanding and improving the test period, but also expanding the time for teaching. This study looked at the effects after one lesson by giving a test shortly after the educational session. This gave a result that is, perhaps not less interesting, but probably less useful to language teachers in general, because most educators want the knowledge to be retained. To find methods that yield such an outcome, the research has to stretch over a longer period of time, and it should include a test after the learning process that is not given directly afterwards. This is important because of the fact that the aim is for the learner to acquire knowledge and not only repeat what the teacher has talked about during the lesson. My
conclusion is that if there is a period of time in between the lesson and the test, the risk that the students repeat the teacher will be reduced.

Neither my study nor the study by González and Nielson (2014) find support for TBLT being an effective method for grammar teaching. However, no extensive investigation has tried out the two different methods for a longer period than eight weeks. A comprehensive study over a longer period of time would be able to investigate the long term effects of different pedagogical methods. When summarizing the current study, TBLT was not as effective in grammar teaching as PPP. The study by González and Nielson (2014) was conducted over eight weeks, and found that TBLT was more effective in fluency, lexical complexity and syntactic complexity and was as effective as PPP in teaching grammatical accuracy. Taking these two studies into consideration, it seems that in a short period of time, TBLT is not effective. Over a time period of 8 weeks, it showed more effectiveness. Regardless of whether the method proved more effective if it was applied for a longer period or not, language teachers would have great use of an extensive comparison between the two methods.

What should also be taken into consideration when comparing different language-teaching methods is whether the knowledge that the learner has prior to the teaching session influences the outcome. In this study I had a group of students that all had relatively good understanding of the English language in general. The test proved this to some extent, and in discussing this with the students I could confirm this impression. However, classes differ in language development and how the effectiveness of a TBLT and PPP method differs when taking this into account would also be of great importance to teachers. If there is a certain stage in the second language acquisition process when one of the methods proves to be more effective than the other, that would obviously be relevant for language teachers to know. This is why an extensive test prior to and after a session of a specific language teaching method is of considerable importance.

In conclusion, in this study I have tested and analyzed two different teaching methods, TBLT and PPP. The theory behind the methods differs in many ways, the most distinct difference being that PPP is a method where the learner is presented with new information and is expected to acquire this new information through practice. In contrast, TBLT values communication to a larger extent, and expects the learner to develop his or her language through more language input and above all, the usage of it. The results of this study indicate that PPP is more effective in teaching a grammatical feature (different verb forms/tenses specifically) than a TBLT method is, as the PPP
group improved more than the TBLT group. The reasons for this can be connected with both the nature of the methods, and the design of this study. I have also insisted through this study that it is important for language teachers and learners to have scientific research to rely to, and I have made some suggestions of how this can be achieved.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 - Questionnaire (version where correct alternative is marked green)


Klass ____________________________  

Exempel
A:  My name are Kalle
B:  My name is Kalle

1. A. Lady Gaga is singing for a living.  
B. Lady Gaga sings for a living.

2. A. I cleaned your room for two years!  
B. I was cleaning your room for two years!

3. A. I run twice a week.  
B. I am running twice a week.

4. A. Before I knew about deodorant I smelled bad for three years.  
B. Before I knew about deodorant I was smelling bad for three years.

5. Någon berättar en historia om en man som blev skjuten på en teater när han spegela på pianot.  
A. He played the piano when he was shot.  
B. He was playing the piano when he was shot.

6. A. I am sorry I did not answer yesterday when you called. I ran.  
B. I am sorry I did not answer yesterday when you called. I was running.

7. A. When I am bored, I play DOTA 2 to feel happy again.  
B. When I am bored, I am playing DOTA 2 to feel happy again.

8. A. Taylor Swift writes songs about her ex-boyfriends.  
B. Taylor Swift is writing songs about her ex-boyfriends.

9. A. When I was a kid I was not playing with dolls.  
B. When I was a kid I did not play with dolls.

10. A. Every Monday Sally is driving her kids to football practice.  
B. Every Monday Sally drives her kids to football practice.

11. A. On Thursday I am meeting Kate for coffee.  
B. On Thursday I meet Kate for coffee.

12. A. Do not forget to take your umbrella. It rains.  
B. Do not forget to take your umbrella. It is raining.

13. A. Usain Bolt was running in the London Olympics in 2012.  

14. Två kompisar står på en bus och pratar  
A. I am sorry I can not hear what you say because everyone is talking so loudly.  
B. I am sorry I can not hear what you are saying because everyone is talking so loudly.  
C. I am sorry I can not hear what you are saying because everyone talks so loudly.  
D. I am sorry I can not hear what you say because everyone talks so loudly.

15. A. Henrik Larsson used to play football but he does not play anymore.  
B. Henrik Larsson used to play football but he is not playing anymore.
16. A. During World War 2 many civilians died.
   B. During World War 2 many civilians were dying.

17. A. One of my bad habits is that I am texting while I’m driving.
    B. One of my bad habits is that I text while I’m driving.
    C. One of my bad habits is that I am texting while I drive.
    D. One of my bad habits is that I text while I drive.

18. A. I sang for two years.
    B. I was singing for two years.

19. A. I could not pick you up when you arrived yesterday because I coached my swim team.
    B. I could not pick you up when you arrived yesterday because I was coaching my swim team.

20. A. I am eating right now.
    B. I eat right now.

21. A. I realized that I was running out of time when I began to answer the last question on the exam.
    B. I realized that I ran out of time when I began to answer the last question on the exam.

22. A. What do you do for a living?
    B. What are you doing for a living?

23. A. The person who shot President Kennedy was tall.
    B. The person who was shooting President Kennedy was tall.

24. A. I love living in Linköping because the sun always shines here.
    B. I love living in Linköping because the sun is always shining here.

25. A. Eminem was writing the lyrics to "Cleaning out my closet".
    B. Eminem wrote the lyrics to "Cleaning out my closet".

26. A. I was at the car repair shop and saw that they were driving my car around.
    B. I was at the car repair shop and saw that they drove my car around.

27. Tänk dig att meteorologen på TV talar om väderleksrapporten
    A. It is ten o’clock and it is raining a lot in New York at the moment.
    B. It is ten o’clock and it rains a lot in New York at the moment.

28. Två vänner diskuterar en fotbollsspelare som spelade dåligt tidigt i en fotbollsmatch och sedan skadade sig.
    A. He was playing really badly when he got injured at the beginning of the match.
    B. He played really badly when he got injured at the beginning of the match.

29. A. My dog barked so loudly that I had to keep him inside for an hour.
    B. My dog was barking so loudly that I had to keep him inside for an hour.

30. Två vänner är på en nattklubb och pratar med varandra om vad de dricker
    A. I drink a beer now but I think I will have a Martini after this one
    B. I am drinking a beer now but I think I will have a Martini after this one.

Tack så mycket!
Rasmus Hellström, Linköpings Universitet
### Time Plan for Lecture (Traditional Method, PPP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minutes)</th>
<th>Teacher's function</th>
<th>Students' function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From start</td>
<td>Introduction of teacher's reason for being there; what will happen in this class and how it will be conducted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time Plan for Lesson (PPP Method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minutes)</th>
<th>Listen</th>
<th>Answer questions</th>
<th>Conclude what the students learned today and hand out the questionnaire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Give examples and explain the function of the rule. Give examples of incorrect use of the two verb tenses and what happens in the meaning of the sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Let the students work with the exercise and help students that are having problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Work with exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Go through the correct answers. Go through some examples of the students'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Listen/participate in the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Let the students answer the questionairae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Answer questionairae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Listen/participate in the discussion. (see appendix X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Hand out exercises (see appendix X).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- PPP method
- Time plan for lesson
- Additional notes for participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Teacher’s function</th>
<th>Student’s function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>A. Introduction to the lesson</td>
<td>A. Follow the teacher’s instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10</td>
<td>B. Explanation of the lesson content</td>
<td>B. Listen and understand the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:20</td>
<td>C. Group work activity</td>
<td>C. Participate in the group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>D. Individual work activity</td>
<td>D. Complete the assigned task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:40</td>
<td>E. Review of the lesson content</td>
<td>E. Summarize the key points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:50</td>
<td>F. Summarization and Q&amp;A</td>
<td>F. Ask questions and clarify doubts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- TBLT: Team-based Learning and Teaching.
- Students should actively participate in group discussions and individual tasks.
- Teachers should facilitate and guide the learning process.

**Appendix 3 - Time plan for lesson (TBLT method)**
Appendix 4 - Keynote presentation for the PPP method lesson (slides from left to right)

English grammar
4 different verb forms

- Present simple
- Past simple
- Present continuous (progressive)
- Past continuous (progressive)

Stative or dynamic verbs

- Compare countable/uncountable. Event (for a period of time) or state (less clear or no beginning and/or end).
- Verbs that usually has to do with senses, what goes on in our minds or relations between different units.
- Believe (I believe I can fly)
- Doubt (I doubt that)
- Love (She really loves cookies!)
- See, seem, smell, sound, hear, taste and feel (There seems to be a problem with the computer)

Present simple

- "I eat pizza everyday"  
- "I promise I will be there for you"  
- "The plane arrives at six tomorrow morning"

- To express habits or general truth
- To talk about something in the future that is definite and specified in time

Past simple

- "I ate pizza yesterday"

- To indicate a past habit or an action already completed

Present continuous

- "I am eating pizza right now"  
- "I am reading a very well written novel by Stephen King"

- To indicate an action going on at the time of speaking
- To indicate temporary action which may not be happening at the time of speaking

Past continuous

- "I was eating pizza when you arrived"  
- "They were watching TV"
- "I was dancing when I suddenly stepped on the floor"

- To indicate not necessarily completed actions of the past
- To indicate temporary action which may not be happening at the time of speaking
Appendix 5 - Exercise sheet for PPP method lesson

Exercises

Fill in the blanks and make a note on every sentence if you think the verb is used in the present or past tense and if it is in the progressive or simple form.

I __________ right now. (Dricka)
I __________ eight to ten times every month. (Springa)
For two years I _____________ at Burger King. (Jobba)
What ___________ for a living? (Vad jobbar du med?)
When you called yesterday I __________ the apartment. (Ståda)

Construct one sentence of each of the following alternatives.

Present simple

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Present continuous

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Past simple

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Past continuous

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Well done!
Appendix 6 - Keynote presentation for TBLT lesson (slides from left to right)

### English - Personal ads

**Today’s plan**
- Introduction
- Some personal ads
- Write a personal advertisement for and then reply to one.
- Assign exercises to follow, more information about this later.

**Family**
- Boyfriend/Girlfriend?
- Pets?
- Where do I live?
- Where do I come from?

**Interest**
- How many kids do I want?
- Political views

**Write a personal ad for...**
- Name:
- Age:
- Location:
- How are you?
- How do you feel?
- What do you want?
- What do you like?
- What do you dislike?
- What are your interests?
- How many kids do you want?
- What is your political view?

**Present simple**
- “I eat pizza everyday”
- “I eat pizza tomorrow”
- “I eat pizza once a week”
- “I eat pizza tomorrow morning”

**Present continuous**
- “I am eating pizza right now”
- “I am eating pizza right now”
- “I am reading a very well written novel by Stephen King”

**Past simple**
- “I ate pizza yesterday”

**Past continuous**
- “I was eating pizza when you arrived”
- “I was eating pizza at 8PM”

**Now look at the ads you are given**
- Can you find any verbs?
- What verb tense is used? Present or past?
- What form is the verb used in? Simple or progressive?

---

My name is Emma and I'm 23 years old. I'm looking for a partner in my age who's interested in the same things as I am. I run twice and swim three times every week. As you may understand, I'm very interested in sports and training. I'm studying to become a psychologist, which takes a lot of time. I do not have any children at the moment, but I would like to have children in the future. I was born in Sweden but I moved to the States to study. I'm living in Queens, but I'm moving to Manhattan next month. Another interest I have is dancing. I danced a lot in my younger years, but I had to quit because of an injury. I hope to see you if you think that we would be a great match.

All the best,
Emma
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