

Modifying PPP in Promoting Communicative Language Teaching to Improve the Students' English Communicative Competence

Rachma Vivien Belinda (Corresponding author)

The Graduate School, English Education Program, Lampung University,
Lampung, Indonesia
Email: rachmabelinda@gmail.com

Patuan Raja

Master English Education Program, Lampung University,
Lampung Indonesia

Flora

Master English Education Program, Lampung University,
Lampung Indonesia

Abstract

This study was going to find out the significant difference of the English communicative competence between the students who were taught by using original PPP method and the students who were taught by using modified PPP by using CLT. Moreover, the more effective method between original PPP method and the modified one in improving the students' communicative competence was investigated. This is a quasi-experimental research using both control and experimental class comparing the original and modified PPP. The subject was forty junior EFL students whose English were still at the lower level. The result showed that there is a significant difference between students' English communicative competence after being taught by using original PPP method and the modified one. In addition, both original and modified PPP are good to facilitate the learners in having good grammatical competence; however, only PPP that has been modified by using CLT that can facilitate them in having a good communicative competence.

Keywords: PPP; CLT; communicative competence; accuracy; fluency

1. Introduction

English has long been one of the very eminent languages that is learnt by many people from all around the world. Anything that is related with the process of English teaching and learning also became a major topic of discussion in many institutions. The problems, techniques, methods, and anything with respect to learning and acquiring English always get the spotlight everywhere including in Indonesia. Many factors can influence people of learning and acquiring English, one of the examples is the instructional process in

the classroom.

1.1 Background

As a high demand of a good communication skills in English, it made the need for English teaching quite big, resulting in the requirement of good communicative competence as the main objective of English teaching and learning. In 1970, a methodology called Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was proposed. It became so popular that it might influence all of the English teaching approaches until now. Since then, CLT has served as a major source of influence on language teaching practice around the world (Richards, 2006). CLT, also called communicative approach, is an approach to language teaching that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of study. According to CLT, the goal of language education is the ability to communicate in the target language (Savignon, 1997). This belief then become the most acceptable belief among the English language teachers and learners, causing them to have CLT as the main approach because it is the most appropriate methodology to help them obtain the objective of communicative competence. Moreover, there are lots of popular techniques in English teaching which has been influenced by CLT; however, not all of those techniques are suitable to apply to certain students. Choosing the method in language teaching is something crucial in which the students are the most important part to consider since different kind of students might need different treatment even though their need is the same.

In addition, a lot of methods are being implemented and developed in order to achieve the objective and help the students to acquire English language. The classroom is mold into a kind of situation where the instructional process can run well. However, it is undeniable that only a good teacher can implement the method and teaching technique well. The status of a good teacher itself is not something that is static; it is constantly changing as the teacher interacts with learners and other teachers and also emerges with the teacher's experience from how they have practiced as teachers dealing with the teaching methods and paradigms over the past time of their teaching life (Barkhuizen and Mendieta, in Griffiths and Tajeddin 2020). Over the last 40 years, there is this one paradigm that is considered as the most popular and most durable way of lesson planning in English language teaching called PPP (Anderson, 2016). It is proven that the English teacher at school mostly use it despite the critics over it (Ellis 1993a; Willis 1994; Skehan 1998; and Lewis 1996).

PPP stands for Presentation, Practice and Production (Weller, 2019). It is referred to as a procedure, model, paradigm or approach to teaching language components. As the procedure is straightforward, the teacher presents the target language. Then, students are asked to practice it, first in well controlled activities, then in freer activities. It is only later that the students are allowed to produce the desired language. The process starts with the input and ends with the output. Anderson (2016) has identified three potential contexts of using PPP one of which primary and secondary teachers working in low- and middle-income countries and defined the lesson structure on his work as a teacher and teacher trainer well-matched with best practice in conventional teaching process.

Nevertheless, as with any well-established methodology, PPP has its critics mentioned before (Ellis 1993a; Willis 1994; Skehan 1998; and Lewis 1996). One of the very famous criticisms is that some experts consider PPP or Ps incompatible with its students-centered approaches (Lewis, 1993 and Scrivener 1996).

Ps is believed as a teacher-led instruction rather than learner-oriented strategies. Moreover, a couple of relatively new methodologies are starting to gain in popularity beating Ps such as TBL (task-based learning) and ESA (engage, study, activate). However, even strong advocates of these new methodologies do concede that new EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers find the PPP methodology easiest to grasp, and that these new teachers, once familiar with the PPP methodology, are able to use TBL and ESA more effectively than new trainees that are only exposed to either TBL or ESA.

What makes PPP easier to grasp is that as it is stated by Harmer (2009), PPP is commonly used as the way to teach simple language at lower levels. However, many experts believe that it quickly became old-fashioned since the criticism of PPP continued (Kumaravadivelu 2006; Tomlinson and Masuhara 2008; Kiely and Askham 2012). However, the fact that PPP is probably the most commonly lesson structure used in TEFL is undeniable (Anderson, 2016). The model that is so simple and easy to implement makes the teachers prefer using this model in teaching English (Carless in Hellström, 2016). Another reason why PPP is still prominent among English language practitioners (Jarvis 2015; Hellstrom 2016; Lasmiatun and Munir 2018; Sari and Sembiring 2019) is because it is considered as an explicit instruction which is believed to be more effective compared to the implicit instruction (Spada and Tomita, 2010). It happens because the practice in Ps is possible to facilitate the knowledge obtained from the explicit instruction into the more procedural knowledge or implicit instruction (Hulstijn and DeKeyser in Anderson, 2016) which makes the instructional process runs smoothly in the classroom.

Moreover, PPP is also compatible to apply in the classes in which consist of the learners who share their first language or L1 (Spada and Lightbown 2008). Thus, the make use of PPP is proper for EFL learners in Indonesia especially in primary and secondary classroom since many beginner learners mostly share their L1 during the instructional process. Another reinforcement that might proof PPP as the most appropriate method to apply in English teaching and learning classes in Indonesia is due to the theory from Anderson (2016). He claims that PPP is useful for typical low-income countries like Indonesia in which the teaching conditions tend towards the following characteristics such as: 1) curricula are externally imposed and ambitious; 2) classes are large; 3) learners share their L1 or other community language; 4) learners have only a few hours of instruction per week; and 5) educational culture tends towards higher levels of teacher intervention. Those five characteristics perfectly suit the condition of teaching in Indonesia making PPP as the most suitable method to apply compared to the other methods.

Unfortunately, PPP can barely promote communicative language teaching (CLT) because it is more likely to use in teaching grammar since PPP is proved to be useful in promoting grammar teaching to the EFL learners (Ellis and Shintani 2014). Meanwhile, the objective of English teaching is to make the learners comprehend the target language (TL) in which it helps preparing the learners to be able to use it for communicative purposes. Ur (2011) states that teachers of school children in a state school in a country where the TL is not spoken outside the classroom are likely to get best results in grammar learning through systematic explanation plus practice. Thus, the learners tend to have good results in grammar rather than having good communication skills (re. speaking skills). It is believed that grammar offers genuine benefits in language learning (Saaristo, 2015). However, having good grammar does not always mean having good communication skills using TL. There is no guarantee that the learners would be able to use the TL for communicative purposes just because their grammar's result is great. On the other hand, grammar mastery

and communication skills are inter-connected. A language learner will be successful if s/he has both good grammar and good communication skills using the TL. As a result, both teaching grammar and promoting communicative language teaching play an important role for the learners' success in language learning. Even though English teaching and learning has a main objective to make the students communicate using the TL, understanding the grammatical problem is needed as a resource in the creation of spoken and written texts (Richards, 2014). Thus, the teachers need a procedure that can help them to make the students comprehend the grammar well and acquire L2 by promoting communicative language teaching in the classroom at the same time.

Many teachers using new methodologies in teaching English such as Task Based Language Teaching or else focus on communicative activities while not having good result in grammar (Hellstrom: 2016). It ends up making the learners able to communicate without using a good structure in their utterances, meaning that they are fluent in speaking but less accurate. The fact that PPP is good for teaching grammar can be utilized; however, the procedure needs to change a bit so that it can also promote communicative language teaching. That is why PPP needs to be modified with the communicative approach. Molding the instructional process to be more student-centered can be one of the ways to get better result in utilizing the Ps method. Not only it can make the students comprehend the grammatical knowledge, it also might help them be able to acquire L2. As a result, the students are expected to have both fluency and accuracy in communicative competence.

This study tried to compare between the original PPP method and the modified one. In line with that, the research questions were formulated as: 1) is there any significant difference of the English communicative competence between the students who were taught by using original PPP method and the students who were taught by using PPP method modified with CLT, and 2) which one is more effective in improving the students' communicative competence, original PPP method or the modified one.

1.2. Methodology

This is a quasi-experimental research of which the aim was to find whether there was any significant difference between the students' communicative competence in English after being taught by using original PPP and the modified one and also to investigate which one was more effective in improving the students' communicative competence in English between the original PPP method and the one which has been modified or developed using the CLT. In order to find out the first research problem, independent group T-test design was applied. Moreover, The N gain scores was used to find out the more effective method between the two. The concept of the treatment was eight meetings for both control class and experimental class. The original PPP method was applied to the control class, while the modified one was applied to the experimental class. Before each treatment, there was a pretest in order to help the researcher obtain the N gain score in order to find which one is more effective between the two methods in improving the students' communicative competence.

In finding the result of the first research question, the pretest was not used because the main focus was the difference between the result of the two classes. On the other hand, to find the effectiveness of both methods, the pretest was conducted as one of the requirements of the process. Moreover, the test used was adapted from the assessment series of ETS (Educational Testing Service) which was cooperating with the researcher in conducting this study. The pretest and the posttest can be said equal but different, meaning that the tests were not exactly the same but they had the same difficulty level. Thus, it could decrease the possibility of

the students' self-learning as another variable that might interrupt the result of the test. Furthermore, the score of the tests was processed by SPSS to find out whether there is any significant difference between the result of students' English communicative competence after being taught by the original PPP method and the modified one. Moreover, the mean score of each test was compared and measured using SPSS to find out the N gain scores that represent which one is more effective, the original or the modified PPP in improving the students' English communicative competence.

The subjects for each class were 20 young English learners chosen based on their age around 12-13 years old from some junior high schools in the capital city of Lampung Province, Indonesia. However, the subjects chosen were then known as the students whose English was still in the lower level and they did not learn English outside school. Still, these lower-level students had partially learned the grammatical features of English language at school, not those who might learn the new feature because PPP works best on the students who are already exposed to the language partially (Ellis & Shintani 2014). They were the forty students who can also be described as beginner English learners and still have some problems in speaking English.

In this research, the variables are divided into two: independent variable (X) and dependent variable (Y). The modification of PPP method is considered as the independent variable (X) since it was the one which was investigated. Furthermore, students' English communicative competence is considered as the dependent variable (Y) because it was measured in order to see the effect of it using PPP method. The data of this research is in the form of speaking test measuring the students' English communicative competence. The speaking test was done in form of project presentation. The tests were conducted in order to see whether there is any significant difference on the English communicative competence of the students' who were taught through the original PPP method and the modified one.

In fulfilling the criteria of a good test, validity and reliability of the test should be considered. Validity is concerned with the interpretation and use of assessment results. For example, if we infer from an assessment that students have achieved the intended learning outcomes, we would like some assurance that our tasks provided a relevant and representative measure of the outcomes (Gronlund and Waugh, 2009:46). It means that when we would like to measure that the students' ability in speaking is fair good, we need the evidence to support the fact that their ability is fair. This can be done by considering some types of validity in determining the validity assessment result. Moreover, since the instrument used in this research was speaking tests, the reliability of the tests which were considered as performance assessment was measured by using inter-rater reliability. The reliability of these performance judgments can be determined by obtaining and comparing the scores of two judges who score the performances independently. The scores of the two judges can be correlated to determine the consistency of the scoring, or the proportion of agreement in scoring can be computed (Gronlund and Waugh, 2009: 65).

Furthermore, the reliability of each test for this research was calculated using Spearman correlation of SPSS to make ease of the process. The result is presented down below:

Table 1. Reliability result of pretest

			Ps		PsM	
			R1	R2	R1	R2
Spearman 's rho	R1	Correlation	1,00	,828*	1,000	,872*
		Coefficient	0	*		*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,003	.	,002
		N	20	20	20	20

R2	Correlation Coefficient	,828*	1,000	,872*	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	.	,002	.
	N	20	20	20	20

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2. Reliability result of posttest

			Ps		PsM	
			R1	R2	R1	R2
Spearman's rho	R1	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,894*	1,000	,838*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,003	.	,002
		N	20	20	20	20
	R2	Correlation Coefficient	,894*	1,000	,838*	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	.	,002	.	
	N	20	20	20	20	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It can be seen from the table above, the coefficient correlation between the first and second rater of the pretest of original PPP was .828 and .872 for the modified one. It means that they are considered as very high reliable (>0.80). Moreover, the correlation of the posttest was also very high reliable because it is more than 0.80 (.894 for Ps and .838 for PsM). Furthermore, the hypothesis of this research is:

$$H_0 = t_{value} > 0.05; H_1 = t_{value} < 0.05$$

H₀: There is no significant difference between the students' English communicative competence after being taught by using the original PPP method and the modified one.

H₁: There is a significant between the students' English communicative competence after being taught by using the original PPP method and the modified one.

The hypothesis will be statistically tested by using statistical computerization (SPSS 23).

In short, those are the explanations of this chapter which are concerned with research design, population and sample, data collecting technique, research procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability, scoring rubric, data analysis, and hypothesis testing.

2. Result and Discussion

The focus of the present study was to find out whether there is any significant difference between students' English communicative competence after being taught by using original PPP method and the modified one, and which of the two is more effective in improving the students' communicative competence.

2.1 Result

In applying the original PPP, the teacher usually started the class by introduction, greeting the students,

telling a simple story for bridging, and asking them with the questions related to the materials being given at that time. After that, the first stage of PPP which is presentation was applied. The teacher presented or delivered the materials to the students. In modified PPP, the teacher tried to engage the students to participate in the classroom so that they could dominate the whole activity and conversation. Having conducted the treatment, the author obtained the data in a form of speaking scores. Thus, the score of the students’ speaking test is tabulated below:

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Students’ Scores

No	Score	Ps Pretest	Ps Posttest	PsM Pretest	PsM Posttest	Category
1	70-73	6	0	4	0	Very Low
2	74-77	13	3	12	1	Low
3	78-81	1	5	2	2	Enough
4	82-85	0	5	2	2	Average
5	86-89	0	4	0	8	Good
6	90-93	0	2	0	4	Very Good
7	94-97	0	1	0	3	Outstanding
Total		20	20	20	20	

Based on the table above, it can be said that mostly the students’ scores were increased from the pre-test to the post test. As it was mentioned before in the previous chapter that the subjects taken were those whose English-communicative competence was low before the treatment was conducted. It is proven by the students’ score result that there were six students who were considered as very low in the control class and four students in the experimental class. On the other hand, only in the experimental class there were two students considered as average category. Moreover, thirteen students in control class and also twelve students in the experimental class were considered as low, while the rest of the students were on enough category.

Furthermore, most of the students’ score increased on the posttest, meaning that both original and modified PPP gave an effect on the students speaking performance. Thus, it needs further investigation to determine what kind of effect it gave. As it is stated on the table, the majority of the students score on the posttest of the control class was in enough and average category, while it was in a good category for the experimental class. Moreover, both control class and experimental class still have low students on the posttest: three students in control class and one student in experimental class. Interestingly, there was one outstanding score of the posttest in the control class and three outstanding scores in the experimental class.

After being taken, the data were then processed by using computational system called SPSS. There were some tests conducted in order to complete the study of this research. Those tests included normality test, homogeneity test, and independent group T-test. Moreover, a test to find N gain score was also conducted using SPSS.

Normality Test

One of the requirements of using parametric test in SPSS is that the data come from a normal distribution. In order to know whether the data were normally distributed, the normality test was conducted with the hypothesis:

H₀: the distribution of the data is normal

H₁: the distribution of the data is not normal

The null hypothesis (H₀) is accepted if the significant level of the normality test is higher than 0.05, and vice versa. If the result of this test shows that the data is normally distributed, the parametric test can be used. Here is the result of the normality test:

Table 4. Normality Test

	Groups	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Score	1,00	,284	20	,000	,850	20	,290
	2,00	,152	20	,200*	,934	20	,184

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The significant values used in this test are from the Shapiro-Wilk row because the elements (df) were only twenty. If the element is more than 2000, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov is used. According to the table above, it can be seen that the significant levels of the test were higher than 0.05 (0.290>0.05 and 0.184>0.05). Thus, the null hypothesis (H₀) is accepted, meaning that all of the data are normally distributed.

Independent Group T-test

This test is done to measure the first hypothesis in which the null hypothesis (H₀) stated that there is no significant difference between the students’ English communicative competence after being taught by using the original PPP method and the modified one. This hypothesis would be rejected if the significant level is lower than 0.05 and accepted if it is higher than 0.05. The result of the T-test is shown on the table below:

Table 5. Independent Group T-test

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Score	1,00	20	77,2000	1,67332	,000
	2,00	20	86,4000	6,17636	,000

According to the table above, the significant level value is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis (H₁) is rejected. Equally, it indicates that there is a significant difference between the students’ English communicative competence after being taught by using the original PPP method and the modified one. Furthermore, in order to know which is more effective in improving of the students’ English communicative competence, N gain scores were found out.

N Gain score

In order to find out which is more effective between original and modified PPP in improving the students’ English communicative competence, the average of the students’ N gain score (g) needs to be investigated. According to Hake in Meltzer (2002), there are three basic category of N gain:

1. Very effective category is where $g > 0.7$
2. Effective category is where $g > 0.3$ and $g \leq 0,7$ ($0.03 < g \leq 0,7$)
3. Not effective category is where $g \leq 0,3$

After being computed using SPSS, the result of the students’ N gain score is presented on the table below:

Table 6. N Gain Average of the Score

N gain score average	
Control class	Experimental class
0.38	0.70

It can be seen from the table above that the average of g taken from the control class is 0.38 which is considered as not effective according to Hake (2002). Moreover, in the experimental class, the average of

the students' N gain score is 0.70 which is considered as very effective. Thus, it can be said that the use of the modified PPP is more effective in improving the students' communicative competence compared to the original one.

2.2. Discussion

In the first meeting, the pre-test was administered in order to get the data of the students' English communicative competence before being taught by applying the methods proposed. The test was done by referring to the first material taught regarding Relatives and Friends. In the test, they were asked to describe their family member or their friend. The teachers gave the example first, then they could choose whoever they wanted to talk about. After the data was taken, it was really interesting that there are some high achiever students and few low achiever students in both control class and experimental class. High achiever means that even though their communicative competence was not that good, at least they could cope with the instruction given by the teachers. They followed the example with some modification, and they could learn fast. On the other hand, low achievers are those students who got trouble in coping with the teachers' instruction and mostly they just copied what the teachers modeled.

As the treatment was conducted, all of the students were engaging with the lessons well. The main difference was that on the presentation stage, the control class tend to be very quiet since the students were paying attention carefully when the teachers presenting the materials of the target language. Meanwhile, the students in experimental class were usually gave their opinions and thoughts even in the presentation stage, making the class quite noisy; however, the teachers could control the students very well so that they only talked about the material presented or everything related to it during the session. The main focus of the presentation stage of the modified PPP (experimental class) was to replace the approach which initially teacher-centered into more students-centered where the students could dominate the talk in the classroom. The purpose was to make the students practice more to have better communicative competence.

After having the first stage which was presentation, they need to practice the language use that had been presented before. This was the second stage of PPP which is Practice. In the control class, the students practiced the language by doing grammar worksheets or speaking from a dialog. They usually practiced in pairs by having conversation from the dialog provided on the students' textbook. They just needed to follow the instruction from the teachers. After that, they would have a grammar worksheet to do individually. On the other hand, the students in experimental class usually practiced it by having conversation in pairs. They did not copy the dialog from the book, instead the teachers provided them with a flashcards or slides showing the context to practice the conversation. Then, they could imitate or follow the example in the presentation session before in having the dialog practice. They could also develop the conversation as they wished. After having the conversation practice in pairs, they usually had to play games dealing with the worksheet. The worksheet was usually in a form of problem solving or discussion which is also packed with vocabulary and grammar practice but in communicative ways.

The last stage of PPP was production. In this stage, the students were acquired to produce the language which is in line with the material taught before. Basically, there was nothing much in the differences of this stage on both control and experimental class. The students usually produce the language based on the context provided by the teachers for example they would be given a picture or a flashcard, and they had to describe it by using their own words. The only difference was, in the experimental class, the teacher and

the other students usually had questions and answers after seeing the presentation of a student. Meanwhile, there was not much interaction after seeing the students' presentation because the students did not use to talk a lot outside the practice session. They tend to pay fully attention on the other students' performance without having any interruption. There were only few students who were likely to ask questions or give any feedback. This might happen because the teachers did not try to engage the students at the first place, that is why it seemed hard for the students to engage while having their friend present in front of the classroom. In contrast, the students in experimental class were involving so much in every stage. Even some of them always tried to talk every time in the beginning of their friend's performance. Consequently, the teachers had to be able to alter every single respond of the students so that the class could be still well-managed and the run well. The point is the teacher had to control the class and at the same time let the students dominate the class. Thus, the students-centered could happen and also there was no clash in the classroom.

After the treatment had been done, the students then had a posttest. The posttest was also same with the pretest, describing something but in this case was different topic. They were describing the family and friend in the pretest which was also the first chapter of the book. As for the posttest, they were describing a toy they made (see the lesson plan on the appendices for detail information). Their speaking performance for the pretest was then transcribed down below:

Hi guys! This is my mother. She work in home like mother *rumah tangga*. She is cooking, clean the home and wash *baju apa baju?* *Oya* clothes. She a good mom and beautiful. Her eyes is beautiful like stars, shining. She love me and my family. I love my mother and my family. We live in a small house but *nyaman*. What is *nyaman*, Ms? Oh yes comfortable. The house is small but comfortable. I think finish.

T, a student from control class

Hello guys! Good afternoon! This is my friend, Bocil. He is my best friend from we are kid. He live in *deket* my house. He is very funny and like to give jokes. Jokes *recek* he likes. He is always eating many foods. He has favorite food. His favorite food is noodle instant. He's very funny because my friends *yang lain* tertawa when listen to Bocil. He is very good. Good job. That's all thank you.

F, a student from experimental class

From the transcript above, it can be seen that the students from both control and experimental class had a slightly same English level at the first time. They already had the basic knowledge of some English words and how the language works. However, they still had trouble on some other words and also the language structures. That kind of students is the perfect subject for applying PPP methods as the theory from Ellis & Shintani (2014) has been mentioned before on the previous chapter. As it is showed from the first transcript from the control class, the student mentioned some words in Bahasa Indonesia because he did not know the English words for them. He mentioned *rumah tangga* which is actually household, but he intended to say housewife instead because he was mentioning the word mother before. So, instead of mother *rumah tangga*, he should say housewife. There were also some other words he mentioned in Bahasa Indonesia (*baju*: clothes, and *nyaman*: comfortable). Moreover, some grammatical errors he made and incorrect vocabulary he chose were also spotted. Those errors were underlined and could be checked above.

As for the student from the experimental class, he also mentioned some words in Bahasa Indonesia because he did not know the English words as well. The words he mentioned are *deket* (near), *recek* (cheesy), *yang lain* (other), and *tertawa* (laugh). He also had some grammatical error as they are underlined above. From

the examples of those two students, there was nothing that can be concluded yet. In order to see the effect of the methods applied, the result of the posttest is also needed to provide.

Before conducting the posttest, the teachers also re-test the students with exactly the same test with respect to describing relatives and friends; however, this test was done after having four-days treatment on both original and modified PPP. The researcher did this to give the students practice before having the real posttest. Nevertheless, the result of the test was worth to discuss. Thus, it is transcribed down below.

Hello everyone! Good afternoon! Can you see- hmm- the- the picture? Yes, yes, it is hmm- my mother. She is beautiful, right? Look her face! Er- look at the face! She loves cooking -- and making snacks -- for me and my -- my brother. Hmm- she is a -- good chef. I like it hmm- when she hmm- she -- she make -- she make—er she makes chocolate cake and er-- cookies. So, delicious. My mother's birthday is -- in May. But, I don't know er-- her-- her age now. Maybe, thirty er-- thirty-- I don't know haha. I will-- I will-- ask her. She-- has er-- white skin and-- and-- what is-- brown eyes. Her body is not very tall. My father is tall, my mother not. But, er-- but my mother-- my mother is very smart-- because she always help-- she always helps er-- do my homework. Very smart. I think that's all thank you.

- T, a student from control class

The transcript above was taken from the same student in the control class whose pretest was transcribed before. It is really interesting how his grammar is improved: there was only one big mistake he made when saying she always help do my homework where it should be help doing or help finishing my homework. However, the problem laid in the way he delivered the speech. In describing his mom, it took a very long time for him to produce utterances. It seemed like he was thinking the right grammar structure of the language before popping it out. It also was proved by the fact when he tried to said she make, then after that he corrected it himself simultaneously into she makes (look at the underlined words), like he was consciously aware of the mistake he made. The same thing also happened when he said she always help, after there was a pause for a while, he corrected it into she always helps. This is in line with the theory that said PPP method is good to help the students in their grammatical competence over communicative competence, meaning that the fact proves that PPP approach finds accuracy as the precursor to fluency (Harmer, 2001). It can be clearly seen that this student's grammatical competence is better compared to the pretest before; however, the way he delivered it was lack of fluency. Thus, accuracy over fluency did happen here.

Moreover, please take a look at the second transcript taken from the same student in the experimental class.

Good afternoon everyone! Hope you are fine. I just make a poster of my best friend, Bocil. He is a small funny guy, he likes to play and tell jokes. Everyday he come to my house and we play together. We usually play video games because we like it very much. Er-- Bocil is short and his hair is black and curly. He is not handsome but not ugly er-- medium I think. Haha just so so, his face is just so so. He always make my day. Everytime my mom angry with me, I just come to his house and he tell jokes and I laugh. It's very simple but meaningful for me. Also, he is very smart because he is always number one in his class, but he often study. It is not fair, actually. But I like him, so it's okay. Thank you.

- F, a student from experimental class

From the transcript above, it can be seen that the student got some grammatical problem in delivering his speech. The first one is the utterance I just make where it should be I just made. It happened because the students had not been exposed to any past tense material from the treatment because the first chapter mainly focused on simple present tense. The other mistakes were dealing with the absence of s for the singular

verb in the subject he, for example instead of saying he come, the student should say he comes. Look at the underlined words above for more details.

Interestingly, the student was actually really good during the practice session when describing things or people, he made perfect utterances with correct grammar and he could also utter them fluently for example by saying she loves to play football or I like swimming. He just occasionally made mistakes like he did above and the teachers spotted that this might happen because of the tense or pressure when being tested. Moreover, this student spoke swiftly like there was barely any pause here and there, meaning that he could speak more fluently compared to the student in the control class. Moreover, it also happened to the other students in the experimental class. Compared to the students in the control class, the majority of the students in the experimental class could speak fluently, even though they still made mistakes like the student above. Still, they could communicate in a better way compared to those students in the control class. From this test, it can be presumed that the students in the control class have a better grammatical competence but lack of fluency compared to the students in the experimental class. This fact proves the theory that said PPP is useful in promoting grammar teaching to the EFL learners (Ellis and Shintani 2014). Moreover, PPP can also barely promote communicative language teaching is true since it is more likely to use in teaching grammar; thus, the result of the present test gives an authentic evidence of this theory.

Furthermore, looking at the posttest will give more evidence of the theory. The same students' posttest from both control and experimental class was transcribed down below:

Hello! Good afternoon, everyone! Today, I would like to tell you about my puppet. This is Maloch. I-- give the name Maloch because-- er it is the name of my favorite character in-- in the game. Maloch has-- has red and-- black body. His eyes-- er-- his eyes are big and round. And his mouth-- is-- big-- with sharp teeth. So, er-- he can-- eat bad people. Maloch eat-- eats meat and he doesn't want to eat vegetables. He is a good fighter; he-- can fight and-- combat and win. He-- er-- he has many enemies, but-- the enemies er-- the enemies are only bad people. Maloch, er-- Maloch doesn't have hair er-- but he is cool. He has horns-- horns like devil. His face is-- his face looks scary, but he is not bad. If-- you want to be his friend, you can. But, don't make he angry because he will eat you or smash you. Thank you!

- T, a student from control class

The speech above happened after the students had been instructed to make a sock puppet of their favorite character. Based on the transcript above, it can be seen that he still got problem in producing the utterances fluently; there were so many pauses here and there. It also happened to the majority of the students from the control class. They are able to compose a good structured sentence; however, when it comes to speak, they would sometimes be freezing, having pauses, thinking and then after that producing the speech. So, it took a long time for them to communicate using English, resulting in the lack of fluency. Moreover, please take a look at the transcript of the student's posttest from the experimental class.

Hello friends! How are you? I am good, thank you. Today, I would like to introduce my favorite character from Harry Potter, which is Harry. I made a sock puppet of him. I know that it is er-- it is not handsome like him, but it's good right? haha..Harry is a good boy but he always gets problem. He can do magic, avada kadavra! but I don't think my puppet can do it. Harry has black hair. His skin is white and he uses glasses. He is -- not very smart, but also not stupid, just so so. He also has green eyes. He lives with his uncle and aunt. He also has two best friends, er -- Hermione and Ron. He likes to come to Ron's house and live there because he don't ah- he doesn't like to-- live with his uncle and aunt. They are not good people. Harry also has enemy, and I can't mention the name because it is cursed. Last, Harry likes playing quidditch. Quidditch is a sport like football-- but with

magic. I think that's all, please say hi to Harry! Okay, thank you!

- F, a student from experimental class

According to the transcript, the student initially started the speech with asking the condition of the class by saying how are you. This happened because they usually had this kind of conversation on the daily basis in every classroom meeting, while the students in the control class were not used to it. They did practice to speak; however, it seemed like the way they practiced speaking was kind of rigid and also formal. Meanwhile, the students in experimental class usually had casual conversation inside the classroom talking about related materials and their life. It makes the student barely had difficulty in producing utterances in English while doing the posttest. Moreover, he had almost perfect sentence's structure that he uttered, and he did it very fluently. This is not surprising since it had been assumed before that the stages of modified PPP using CLT was predicted to be good to help the students in having better communicative competence. As it is suggested that accuracy and fluency need to be balanced in English teaching and learning process (Richards, 2006) so that the objective of students' communicative competence can be achieved.

It is also not so surprising that the student in control class also had almost perfect grammar, since PPP is really good in promoting grammatical competence (Anderson, 2016). There are also some studies prove that the strategy of PPP is also good in promoting speaking (Yusuf, 2015; and Frans, 2020). Moreover, there is a certain model of PPP that can also facilitate the students to learn how to values character in speaking (Frans, 2020). However, his study has a weakness in the first attempt that the subjects are university students which is actually considered to the people who have better cognitive and comprehension skills. He mentioned in the study that the subjects need to be smart and creative (Yusuf, 2015). As most adults, in fact, have better comprehension and ability to make decision compared to children. The people in that kind of level are better to approach with the method that can promote more cognitive skills and higher order thinking skills like TBLT or ESA. Meanwhile, PPP is actually good for those students who have lower ability in the language and its knowledge since PPP exists to help them engage in the classroom and to help them use the language more (Anderson, 2016) because they still need to be led. On the other hand, if the students have already been able to communicate in intermediate or advance level, or they have better cognitive skills and are able to make decision by themselves, it is more effective for them to use task based to make them use the language on their autonomy without being led by the teacher anymore (Kaouter et al, 2014).

Thus, based on the data and discussions presented before, it can be inferred that the students who were taught by using both original and modified PPP have a really good grammatical competence on their speaking; however, only those who were taught by using modified PPP who are able to communicate more fluently. Moreover, modified PPP is also believed to have a better effect regarding the students' communicative competence compared to the original one.

5. Conclusion and Suggestions.

From the present study, it can be concluded that 1) both original and modified PPP are really good in facilitating grammatical competence for the students in lower level; however, only PPP that has been modified by using CLT that can facilitate them to have better communicative competence. The original PPP is still relatable and recommended to use if the objective of the instructional process is only to be able

to solve grammar problem. Conversely, if the objective of the lesson is to make the students in lower level use the language and have better communicative competence, the make use of modified PPP is highly suggested. 2) It is obvious that modified PPP is more effective in promoting the students' communicative competence compared to the original one since the instructional process of modified PPP can facilitate the students to practice and speak more in the classroom, making them use to the language being learned.

For the further research, it is suggested that: 1) the treatment should be applied more than one and a month in order to get more accurate result of the data. More time or longer frequency of the treatment day is needed, so that better finding will be obtained, 2) perhaps, more data need to obtain not only pretest and posttest; thus, the effect can be spotted more clearly to make the teacher find the limitation of the method so that further modification can be done to make the modified PPP works even better. As a final point, those statements above represent the conclusion of this study during the present research. Moreover, the suggestion above can be considered to conduct a better further research with respect to students' communicative competence and PPP method

6. Acknowledgement

The research is financed by the U.S. Embassy Jakarta designated by a program called English Access Microscholarship held for two years.

7. References

- Anderson, J. (2016). Why practice makes perfect sense: The past, present and potential future of the ppp paradigm in language teacher education. *ELTED* 19, 14-22.
- Ellis, R., and Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1993). Talking shop: Second language acquisition research: How does it help teachers? *ELT Journal* 47 (1), 3-11.
- Gronlund, N. E., and Waugh C. K. (2009). *Assessment of student achievement new edition*. Columbus, Ohio: Pearson.
- Frans, A. (2020). Learning of speaking model development with PPP (Presentation, Practice and Product) approach implying values of character. *International Journal for Innovative Research In Multidisciplinary Field* 6 (4), 210-218.
- Harmer, J. (2009). *How to teach English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hellstrom, R. (2016). *A thesis: Task Based Language Teaching versus Presentation Practice Production*. Linkoping, Sweden: Linkoping University.
- Jarvis, H. (2015). From PPP and CALL/MALL to a praxis of task-based teaching and mobile assisted language use. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language* 19 (1), 1-9.
- Kaouter, K., et al. (2014). The effect of Task Based Language Teaching on Learner Autonomy: A case of pre-university students at the International Islamic University Malaysia. *International Journal of*

Humanities and Management Sciences (IJHMS) 2 (1), 6-10

Kiely, R. & Askham, J. (2012). Furnished imagination: The impact of preservice teacher training on early career work in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 46 (3), 496-518.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1): 59–81.

Lasmiatun, I., and Munir, S. (2018). Potential future of PPP paradigm on EFL grammar teaching: An annotated survey. 3rd International Conference on Education 2018 Teacher in the Digital Age, pp. 151-158.

Lewis, M. (1996). Implications of a lexical view of language. In Willis, J. & Willis, D. (eds.). *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 10-16). Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.

Richards, J. C., (2014). Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction. *RELC Journal* 45 (1), pp. 5-25.

Saaristo, P. (2015). Grammar is the heart of language: Grammar and its role in language learning among Finnish university students. In J. Jalkanen, E. Jokinen, and P. Taalas. *Voice of pedagogical development – expanding, enhancing, and exploring higher education language learning*, pp. 279-318.

Sari, A., and Sembiring, R. (2019). Improving students' speaking skill through the combination of presentation, practice, and production (PPP) method and talking stick method. *Liner Journal*, 2 (3), 68-76.

Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice: Texts and contexts in second language learning*. California: McGraw-Hill.

Scrivener, J. (1996). ARC: A descriptive model for classroom work on language. In Willis, J. & Willis, D. (eds.). *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 79-92). Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.

Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis, *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spada, N., and Lightbown, P.M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly* 42 (2), 181-207.

Spada, N., and Tomita, Y. (2010). Interaction between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 60 (2), 263-308.

Tomlinson, B., and Masuhara, H. (2013). Adult coursebooks. *ELT Journal* 67 (2), 233-249.

Weller, D. (2019). What is 'Presentation, Practice, Production' (PPP)? <https://www.barefootteflteacher.com/blog/what-is-presentation-practice-production-ppp>

Willis, J. (1994). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Yusuf, A. (2015). A PPP (Presentation, Practice, And Production) phase method of teaching speaking to university students: Unpublished script. Jombang: Unipdu Jombang.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).