# Teaching and Learning English Verb Tenses in a Taiwanese University

Pei-ling Wang

Applied Foreign Languages Departments, National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences 415, Chien-Kung Rd., Kaohsiung, 807, Taiwan

Tel: 886-7-381-4526-3276 E-mail: peiling@cc.kuas.edu.tw

Received: March 19, 2012 Accepted: April 5, 2012 Online Published: June 5, 2012

doi:10.5430/elr.v1n1p18 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/elr.v1n1p18

#### Abstract

This study compares the effect of inductive and deductive approaches in teaching English verb tenses to Taiwanese English-majored freshmen of field independent/dependent (FI/FD) cognitive styles. Research questions include: 1) what is the effect of the two approaches on students' learning outcomes? 2) What are the learning outcomes of FI/FD students? 3) Do FI students outperform FD students in the inductive group? Do FD students outperform FI students in the deductive group? The Group Embedded Figure Test was used to identify student cognitive styles. A self-designed test was conducted to realize student learning outcome. T-test, ANOVA, and descriptive statistics were applied to analyze the data. Results indicated that both approaches were effective, and the deductive group had more significant improvement. Next, both FI and FD students improved significantly, and FD student improvement was especially evident. Moreover, FD students in both groups improved more than FI students, but the difference was not significant.

**Keywords:** Inductive, Deductive, Field independent, Field dependent

#### 1. Introduction

The growth or the decline of an approach to language teaching often depends on which language skills students need at that time. In the last two decades, the focus of language education has shifted from an analysis of language forms to authentic use of the target language. Many scholars advocate not only teaching students correct linguistic forms, but also when and how to use those appropriate forms to express their meanings in various situations (Ho, 2007).

The importance of grammar instruction has also gone through three stages: the prosperous stage (the first half of the twentieth century), the period of recession (1950-1960), and the period of revival (1980- to date). During the prosperous stage, the Grammar-Translation Method, which stresses linguistic analysis and translation ability, was the main approach to English teaching, especially in the study of Latin and Greek literature. With the passage of time, the increased contact among Europeans required English communication competence. English teaching methods changed to (e.g. the Direct Method) stressing English usage instead of mechanical grammatical drills and pattern practices. During World War II, people needed to learn the target language in a short time for military purposes. The Audio-Lingual Method, which focuses on the development of listening and speaking skills, became the tide of fashion. Thus, the importance of grammar teaching declined and teaching approaches (e.g. The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning, and The Total Physical Response Method) disregarded teaching grammar rules. These approaches paid much attention to student communicational skills; however, student communication was grammatically inaccurate or insufficient. Therefore, after the 1980s, teaching approaches (e.g. the Communicative Approach) emphasized combining functions, meanings, and forms of English (Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

The recent trend of grammar instruction emphasizes the importance of meaningful practice and authentic communication. Instructors have applied teaching strategies that enhance structured input to direct the attention of students to sentences with the same structure, to raise student consciousness (Ellis, 2001; Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Sharwood-Smith, 1993). For example, teachers first target a linguistic feature that is salient to students using underlining or italic fonts, and then ask students to use this target form in their communicative tasks. This method might awaken internalized grammatical knowledge of students to help them generalize structures on their own.

Some scholars (e.g. Ellis, 1999; McLaughlin, 1990; Van Patten, 1996) divide information processing of foreign language into three parts: input, processing, and output. Teachers who manipulate input of a target language (e.g. the

#### References

Abraham, R. G. (1985). Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (4), 689-702. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586671

Andrews, J. D. (1984). Discovery and expository learning compared: Their effects on independent and dependent students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78 (2), 80-89.

Ausubel, D. P. (1974). Adults vs. children in second-language learning. The Modern Language Journal, 58, 420-423.

Bardovi-Harling, K., & Reynolds, D. W. (1995). The role of lexical aspect in the acquisition of tense and aspect. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 107-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587807

Barnwell, D. (1992). *Applications of foreign language aptitude and learning style research*. Paper read at Central States Conference on Language Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364075).

Boyle, E. M. (1994). This is the dictionary of Ivan Petrovich: Balancing the role of grammar in the Russian communicative classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 33 (1), 10-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405849409543609

Brown, H. D. (1977). *Cognitive and affective characteristics of good language learners*. Paper presented at the Los Angeles Second Language Forum, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184381).

Brown, H. D. (1980). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching(5th). NJ: Pearson Education.

Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 420-423.

Carr, T. H., & Curran, T. (1994). Cognitive factors in learning about structured sequences: Applications to syntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*, 205-230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012882

Carroll, J. B. (1964). Language and thought. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1985). Making informed decisions about the role of grammar in language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18 (4), 297-301. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1985.tb01807.x

Chang, S. H. (2005). A comparative analysis of two approaches to grammar teaching: Constructive vs. lecturing (Unpublished master's thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Chapelle, C., & Green, P. (1992). Field independence/dependence in second language acquisition research. *Language Learning*, 42, 47-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb00700.x

Chiou, M. H. (2008). *An analysis of tense errors by junior high school students* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Chou, M. C. & Wu, K. H. (2007). The temporal system of interlanguage of college EFL learners in Taiwan. *Hua-Kang English Journal*, 13, 29-57.

Dekeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules. *Studies in SecondLanguage Acquisition, 17,* 379-410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310001425X

Douglass, C. B. (1978). *Effects of field dependent-independent instructional sequence on high school biology.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. Toronto, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 167352).

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51 Supplement, 1-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x

Ellis, R. (1999). Cognitive approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 22-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190020

Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 242-260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00188

Fischer, A. R. (1979). The inductive-deductive controversy revised. *The Modern Language Journal*, 63, 98-105. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1979.tb02433.x

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 605-628. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587079

Fourier, M. J. (1984). Disclosure of cognitive style information: Effects on achievement of adult learners. Adult

Education Quarterly, 34, 147-154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0001848184034003003

Garrett, N. (1989). The role of grammar in the development of communicative ability. *Applied Language Learning*, 1 (1), 15-32.

Gass, S. (1991). Grammar instruction, selective attention and learning processes. In R. Philipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 134-141). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Goodstein, L. (1978). Group embedded figures test: A review. In Oscar K. Buros (Ed.), the eighth mental measurements yearbook (Vol. 1) (pp. 837-838). Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon.

Hansen, J., & Stansfield, C. (1982 a). *Field dependence-independence as a variable in second language cloze test performance*. Paper presented at the International Conference of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Honolulu, HI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215585).

Hansen, J., & Stansfield, C. (1982 b). Student-teacher cognitive styles and foreign language achievement: A preliminary study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(3), 263-273. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06988.x

Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *The French Review, 65* (5), 708-718.

Higgs, T. V. (1985). Teaching grammar for proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18 (4), 289-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1985.tb01806.x

Ho, S. C. (2007). *Effects of using contrastive context in teaching English tense-aspect* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Chin-Hwa University, Taiwan.

Hoffman, S. Q. (1997). Field dependence/independence in second language acquisition and implications for educators and instructional designers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30 (2), 222-234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02344.x

Horak, V. (1978). The effects of inductive-deductive teaching methods and field-dependence-independence cognitive style on student achievement in mathematics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. SanDiego, California. (ERCI Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161700).

Huang, H. S. (1994). *An analytic study on tense errors committed by Chinese learners of English in southern Taiwan* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Huang, Y. M. (2006). Learners' tense awareness and error analysis of English interrogatives by EFL junior high students in Taiwan (Unpublished master's thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Jamieson, J. (1992). The cognitive styles of reflection/impulsivity and field independence/dependence and ESL success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76, 491-501. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1992.tb05398.x

Keefe, J. W. (1991). *Learning style: Cognitive and thinking skills*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). Techniques and principles in language teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Liao, H. C. (2007). The relationship between student-teacher cognitive styles and students' English performance in junior high school (Unpublished master's thesis). National Chengchi University, Taiwan.

Lin, M.H. (2007). The effects of the inductive and deductive approaches on elementary school students' English grammar acquisition (Unpublished master's thesis). Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan.

Liu, P. H. (1999). A study of the effect of cognitive styles learning approaches on identifying English clause tasks (Unpublished master's thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Mahlios, M. C. (1978). *Implications of cognitive style for teachers and learners*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152704).

McLaughlin, B. (1990). Theories of second language acquisition. London: Edward Arnold.

Messick, S., & Associates. (1976). *Individuality in learning* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mohammed, A. M. (1993). Towards a learner-centered technique of teaching grammar. Language Learning Journal,

7, 59-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571739385200171

Mohammed, A. A., & Jaber, H. A. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive approaches of teaching on Jordanian University students' use of the active and passive voice in English. College Student Journal, 42(2), 545-553.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H. & Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Piaget, J. (1974). The future of developmental children psychology. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3 (2), 87-94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02215168

Raschio, R. A. (1987). The effects of the presentation of Spanish CAI lessons on field dependent/independent college students of beginning college students of beginning Spanish (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (1), 87-111. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586356

Robinson, P. (1994). Computers, corpora and language. The Teacher Trainer, 8, 3-8.

Robinson, R. E. (1995). The aspect hypothesis revisited: A cross-sectional study of tense and aspect marking in interlanguage. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 344-370. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.344

Ruin, I. (1996). Grammar and the advanced learner: On learning and teaching a second language. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Scott, V. M. (1990). Explicit and implicit grammar teaching strategies: New empirical data. *The French Review, 63* (5), 779-789.

Scott, V. M. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 14-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb05303.x

Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 395-403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb05319.x

Shanks, D. R., & St. John, M. F. (1994). Characteristics of dissociable human learning systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 17, 367-395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00035032

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 159-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/2.2.159

Sharwood-Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 15, 165-179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100011943

Swaffar, J. K., & Woodruff, M. S. (1978). Language for comprehension: Focus on reading: A report on the University of Texas German Program. *The Modern Language Journal*, 60, 27-32.

Shih, J. Y. (2008). Effects of inductive and deductive approaches in grammar instruction for junior high school students of differing English proficiency (Unpublished master's thesis). National Pingtung institute of commerce, Taiwan.

Terrell, T. D. (1991). The role of grammar instruction in a communicative approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75 (1), 52-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb01083.x

Thomas, A. C. (1987). The effects of inductive and deductive teaching strategies in computer-based language lessons on the performance of high school students identified as being field-dependent or independent (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University. Columbus, OH.

Tucker, G. R., Hamayan, E., & Genesee, F. H. (1976). Affective, cognitive and social factors in second language acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 32,* 214-226.

Van Patten, B. (1996). Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wang, L. Y. (2002). Effects of inductive and deductive approach on EFL learning collocation patterns by using concordancers (Unpublished master's thesis). National Yunlin University of Science and Technology, Taiwan.

Wang, P. L. (2001). The impact of cognitive styles on technical colleges students' English teaching method preferences. *Journal of National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences*, *31*, 479-510.

Witkin, H. A. (1976). Cognitive style in academic performance and in student-teacher relations. In S. Messick (Ed.), *Individuality in learning* (pp. 38-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Hanna, F. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A. (1962). *Psychological differentiation*. New York: John Wiley.

Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., Goodenough, D. R., & Cox, P. W. (1977). Field dependent and field independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 1-65.

Witkin, H. A., Oltman, P., Raskin, E. and Karp, S. (1971). *A manual for the embedded figures tests*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Wu, M. J. (2008). Principal approaches of grammar instruction. US-China Foreign Language, 6 (11), 29-35.

Yu, H. (1997). A study on the use of English tense-aspect forms in narrative compositions by Taiwan college students and its pedagogical implication (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Table 1. Students' Test Difference between Groups (Independent t-test)

Class	N.	Pre-test			Post-test			(Post-Pre)-test					
		Mean	S.D.	t	p	Mean	S.D.	t	p	Mean	S.D.	t	p
A	51	55.61	12.73	-1.17	0.246	81.22	12.13	2.945	0.004**	25.61	14.41	4.056	0.000
В	49	58.86	15.05			74.37	11.07			15.51	10.00		***

A= Deductive group, B= Inductive group, \*\*= p<0.01, \*\*\*= p<0.001

Table 2. Students' Learning Outcomes within Each Individual Group (pair t-test)

Class	N.	Pre-test		Post-test		t	p
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
A (Deductive Group)	51	55.61	12.73	81.22	12.13	-12.70	0.000***
B (Inductive Group)	49	58.86	15.05	74.37	11.07	-10.85	0.000***

<sup>\*\*\*=</sup> p < 0.001

Table 3. Pre-, Post-, (Post-Pre)- test Scores Difference between FI/FD Students (ANOVA)

	1	Í -			\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \					
Cognitive	N	Pre-test			Post-test			(Post-Pre)-test		
Style		Mean	SD.	p	Mean	SD.	p	Mean	SD.	p
FI	43	58.88	13.91	0.483	76.79	13.67	0.411	17.91	12.17	0.191
FD	27	54.74	12.00		76.81	10.37		22.07	13.67	
FN	30	57.00	15.61		80.33	11.43		23.33	14.45	

FI:GEFT 14-18, FD:GEFT 0-10, FN=GEFT 11-13

Table 4. Learning Outcomes Difference within Individual FI/FD Students (pair t-test)

		<i>u</i> ,						
Cognitive style	N.	Pro	Pre-test		Post-test		p	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
FI (GEFT 14-18)	43	58.88	13.91	76.79	13.67	-9.652	0.000***	
FD (GEFT 0-10)	27	54.74	12.00	76.81	10.37	-8.390	0.000***	
FN (GEFT 11-13)	30	57.00	15.61	80.33	11.43	-8.842	0.000***	

<sup>\*\*\*=</sup> p<0.001

Table 5. The Interactive Effect of Inductive/Deductive Approaches and FI/FD Cognitive Styles on Student Performance Difference (ANOVA) (N=100)

Class	N.	Pre-test			Post-test			(Post-Pre)-test		
		Mean	S.D.	p	Mean	S.D.	p	Mean	S.D.	p
Deductive										
FI	23	58.87	12.52	0.243	80.52	13.74	0.698	21.65	13.05	0.195
FD	14	52.14	10.74		80.00	11.42		27.86	14.06	
FN	14	53.71	14.38		83.57	10.38		29.86	16.11	
Inductive										
FI	20	58.90	15.70	0.920	72.50	12.55	0.385	13.60	9.66	0.727
FD	13	57.54	13.07		73.38	8.18		15.85	10.47	
FN	16	59.88	16.53		77.50	11.11		17.63	10.23	

Table 6. Summary of FI/FD Students' Pre-test, Post-test, and Learning Outcomes

Test Score	Deductive Group	Inductive Group
Pre-test	FI>FN>FD	FN>FI>FD
Post-test	FN>FI>FD	FN>FD>FI
(Post-test)-(Pre-test)	FN>FD>FI	FN>FD>FI

FI/FD Cutoff score = Mean+-0.5SD

### **Appendix** English Tenses Comprehension Test

1."Hurry up! We're waiting for you. What's taking you so long?"	
"Ifor an important phone call. Go ahead and leave without me."	
A. wait B. will wait C. am waiting D. have waited	
2."Robert is going to be famous someday. He in three movies already."	
"I am sure he'll be a star."	
A. has been appearing B. had appeared C. has appeared D. appeared	
3."Where's Polly?" "She"	
A. is in her room studying C. studies in her room	
B. in her room is studying D. has in her room studied	
4. "Hello? Alice? This is Jeff. How are you?"	
"Jeff? What a coincidence! I about you when the phone rang."	
A. was just thinking B. just thought C. have just been thinking D. was just though	t
5. "What about the new simplified tax law?"	
"It's more confusing than the old one."	
A. are you thinking B. do you think C. have you thought D. have you been think	ing
6. "When is Mr. Fields planning to retire?"	
"Soon, I think. He here for a long time. He'll probably retire either next year or the year	after that."
A. worked B. had been working C. has been working D. is working	
7. "Why did you buy all this sugar and chocolate?" "I a delicious dessert for dinner tonigi	nt."
A make B will make C am going to make D will have made	

8. "Les's go! What's taking you so long?" "I'll be there as soon as I my keys."						
A. found B. will find C. find D. am finding						
9. Next week when there a full moon, the ocean tides will be higher.						
A. is being B. is C. will be D. will have been						
10. While I TV last night, a mouse ran across the floor.						
A. watch B. watched C. was watching D. am watching						
11. Fish were among the earliest forms of life. Fish on earth for ages and ages.						
A. existed B. are existing C. exist D. have existed						
12. The phone constantly since Jack announced his candidacy for president this morning.						
A. has been ringing B. rang C. had rung D. had been ringing						
13. The earth on the sun for its heat and light.						
A. is depend B. depending C. had depend D. depends						
14. I don't feel good. I home from work tomorrow.						
A. am staying B. stay C. will have stayed D. stayed						
15. Today there are weather satellites that beam down information about the earth's atmosphere. In the last t decades, space explorationgreat contributions to weather forecasting.	wo					
A. is making B. has made C. made D. makes						
16. On July 20, 1696, Astronaut Neil Armstrong down onto the moon, the first person ever to set foot on anot celestial body.	her					
A. was stepping B. stepped C. has stepped D. was step						
17. The plane's departure was delayed because of mechanical difficulties. When the						
weary passengers finally boarded the aircraft, many were annoyed and irritable because they in the aircraft for three and a half hours.	ort					
A. are waiting B. were waiting C. have been waiting D. had been waiting						
18. If coastal erosion continues to take place at the present rate, in other fifty years this beach anymore.						
A. doesn't exist B. isn't going to exist C. isn't existing D. won't be existing						
19. Homestead High School's football team a championship until last season, when the new coach led them win first place in their league.	to					
A. has never won B. is never winning C. had never been wining						
D. had never won						
Non-native speakers need many years of intensive language study before they can qualify as interpreters. By the end of this year, ChenEnglish for three years, but he will still need more training and experience before he masters the language.						
A. will be studying B. has studied C. will have been studying						
D. has been studying						
21. We for a couple of days, so you won't be able to call us.						
A. travel B. will travel C. will be traveling D. will have traveled						
22. "When are you going to ask your boss for raise?"						
"to her twice already! I don't think she wants to give me one."						
A. I've talked B. I've been talking C. I was talking D. I'd talked						
23. "Do you think Harry will want something to eat after he gets here?"						
"I hope not. It'll probably be after midnight, and we"						
A. are sleeping B. will be sleeping C. have been sleeping D. be sleeping						

24.	Paul, could you please turn off the stove? The potatoesfor at least thirty minutes.
	A. are boiling B. boiling C. have been boiling D. were boiling
25.	"Is it true that spaghetti didn't originate in Italy?"
	"Yes. The Chinesespaghetti dishes for a long time before Marco Polo brought it back to Italy."
	A. have been making B. have made C. had been making D. make
26.	"I once saw a turtle that had wings. The turtle flew into the air to catch insects."
	"Stop kidding. I you!"
	A. don't believe B. am not believing C. didn't believe D. wasn't believing
27.	"Could someone help me lift the lawnmower into the pickup truck?"
	"I am not busy. Iyou."
	A. help B. will help C. am going to help D. am helping
28.	Just relax, Antoine. As soon as your sprained ankle heals, you can play soccer again. At this time next week, you soccer again.
	A. will playB. are playing C. play D. will be playing
29.	"Are you going to be in town next Saturday?" "No, I my aunt."
	A. will be in Chicago visiting B. visit C. am visiting D. will have visited
30.	I know you feel bad now, Tommy, but try to put it out of your mind. By the time you're an adult, you all about it.
	A. forget B. will have forgotten C. will forget D. forgot
31.	Mary was born in 1975. By the year 2025, she on this earth for 50 years.
	A. will have been living B. is living C. lives D. had lived
32.	After ten unhappy years, Janice finally quit her job. She along with her boss for a long time before she finally decided to look for a new position.
	A. hadn't been getting B. isn't getting C. didn't get D. hasn't been getting
33.	They about something when I walked into the room.
	A. were arguing B. argued C. had argued D. have argued
34.	At one time, huge prehistoric reptiles dominated the earth. This Age of Dinosaursmuch longer than the present Age of Mammals has lasted to date.
	A. lasted B. was lasting C. has lasted D. had lasted
35.	Jim, why don't you take some time off? Youtoo hard lately. Take a short vacation.
	A. worked B. work C. were working D. have been working
36.	The city is rebuilding its dilapidated waterfront, transforming it into a pleasant and fashionable outdoor mall. Next summer when the tourists arrive, they 104 beautiful new shops and restaurants in the area where the old run-down waterfront properties used to stand.
	A. will found B. will be finding C. will have found D. will find
37.	A minor earthquake occurred at 2:07 A.M. on January3. Most of the people in the village at the time and didn't even know it had occurred until the next morning.
	A. slept B. had slept C. were sleeping D. sleep
38.	The little girl started to cry. She her doll, and no one was able to find it for her.
	A. has lost B. had lost C. was losing D. was lost
39.	What? He got married again? At this rate, he a dozen wives by the time he dies.
	A. has had B. had had C. has D. will have had

40.	. Jane's eyes burned and her shoulders ached. Sheat the computer for five straight hours. Finally, she took a break.
	A. is sitting B. has been sitting C. was sitting D. had been sitting
41.	She will almost \$ 1000 by then.
	A. save B. have saved C. have been saving D. be saving
42.	. By the time I go to bed tonight, I my work for the day.
	A. will finish B. have finished C. will have finished D. finish
43.	. By next year, Roger will here for 10 years.
	A. live B. be living C. have been living D. be going to
44.	. Fatemach looked down to discover a snake at her feet. When she saw it, she
	A. was screaming B. had screamed C. screamed D. screams
45.	. By the time Alfonso finally graduated from high school, heseven different schools because his parents moved frequently.
	A. attended B. was attending C. had attended D. had been attending
46.	. By April, I my new car for a year.
	A. have driven B. will have been driving C. will have been driven
	D. will drive
47.	. I borrowed four books on gardening the last time I to the library.
	A. go B. went C. had gone D. have gone
48.	Before I started the car, all of the passengers their seat belts.
	A. will buckle B. had buckled C. buckle D. have buckled

## Twelve Tenses and Their Corresponding Test Questions

Tenses	Question numbers
Simple Present	8. 9. 13. 26.
Present Progressive	1. 3. 5. 14.
Present Perfect	2. 11. 15. 22.
Present Perfect Progressive	6. 12. 24. 35.
Simple Past	16. 34. 44. 47.
Past Progressive	4. 10. 37. 33.
Past Perfect	19. 38. 45. 48.
Past Perfect Progressive	17. 25. 32. 40.
Simple Future	7. 18. 27. 36.
Future Progressive	21.23. 28. 29.
Future Perfect	30. 39. 41.42.
Future Perfect Progressive	20. 31. 43. 46.