PRESENTATION-PRACTICE-PRODUCTION (PPP): ELICITATION TECHNIQUE USED BY THE ENGLISH TEACHER TO TEACH GRAMMAR

Fatma Oryza[1], Fitriah Asad[2], Irma Soraya[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
risa.fatma1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) has been a common teaching model to improve grammar understanding. A videotaped classroom found on YouTube uses the PPP model with proper elicitations that create student-centered. This study aims to investigate the number of elicitation questions in each stage of PPP and its role to stimulate learning that most benefits students. A quantitative method was used to determine the most frequently used type of elicitation question in each stage. In addition, the data of the selected transcript extracts is qualitatively analyzed using conversational analysis. The result shows that closed-ended questions are mostly used in the presentation phase. Meanwhile, open-ended questions are mostly used in the practice and production phases. It is concluded that a close-ended question fits the stage that needs high guidance from the teacher like when lecturing. Meanwhile, the open-ended question is suitable for a stage that is freer for students to practice and explore.

Keywords: Elicitation Technique, PPP, Student-centered

INTRODUCTION

Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) is a traditional approach to conducting lessons. In the initial stage, the students listen to the teacher's lecture. In the second stage, the teacher's control becomes lessened by having students practice in a controlled manner. Finally, students do a less controlled task by producing the language. The natural flow of the PPP model is considered easy to implement. Many have criticized the classic PPP implementation that is conducted deductively and explicitly (Maftoon, 2016). The classic PPP approach has too much teacher control (Criado, 2013), making it not optimum for a student-centered environment. Some also argue that this model doesn't free students to learn because it often centralizes only on what the teacher teaches while assuming everything that is taught will be learned (Tomlinson, Dat, Masuhara, & Rubdy, 2001).

Despite getting much criticism, the PPP model has been proven to be effective in teaching grammar. Research shows that PPP implementation increased grammar mastery in a class that taught Subject-Verb Agreement (Arifin, Hafid, & Nurpahmi, 2019) and Simple Past (Apriliani, 2016). PPP staging incorporates layers of practice that are suitable to teach grammar structure. Because of the design, PPP is even believed to be more effective to teach

grammar than the TBLT method (Hellström, 2015). Although previously mentioned to have some downsides, these studies prove the benefits one can still get by implementing the PPP model in grammar-focused classes. Thus, it raises an important issue to modify the PPP model so the optimum potential could be obtained.

The teacher-centeredness of the PPP model can be lowered by implementing several things. Some practices that could be done are using the elicitation technique and the inductive learning approach. Several articles show that elicitation and inductive learning support student-centered activities. They shift the focus of the learning to the students. Elicitation questions improve students' participation because it forces students to talk more (Halim, S., & Halim, T., 2019). The questions provoke students to think rather than just receive information from the teacher (Alsubaie, 2015). In line, inductive learning can also engage students more because it requires in-depth cognitive skills (Vafa & Eza, 2022). Inductive learning, a suitable approach for all ages, develops context from specific examples. Then, the teacher and students will later come up with the general rule from the examples. In this stage, it is important to induce many leading questions that make the class flow reach the targeted result. It is essential to note what kind of questions are needed to elicit the right response.

Some researchers have investigated the kinds of elicitation used in EFL classrooms. The investigation explored elicitation questions based on their social function. Fitri & Neni (Fitri & Neni, 2020) investigated 259 elicitations used by the English Teacher at SMK 13 Medan. The elicitation was used by the teacher to gain information, give confirmation, do commitment, have an agreement, state clarification, and repeat information. The questions need to be formulated to reach the goal of those objectives. However, some factors also need to be recognized because they affect the use of elicitations in the classroom. If the students are not confident, they likely feel reluctant to participate in the classroom (Norman & Hyland, 2003). Their confidence might also be affected by their low level of fluency and large class with lots of students. These affecting factors result in the passiveness of students in the class which makes elicitation ineffective.

Specific types of questions demand specific answers too. Investigation of elicitation in EFL classrooms could also be analyzed from the questions. Alsubaie (2015) categorized elicitation questions from the kind of answers they generate. A similar answer went into the same category. Elicitation questions have three types; yes/no question, closed/display question, and open-referential question. The data was analyzed by classifying the response that was generated by the question. This research focuses on the use of elicitation as a question while ignoring other forms of elicitation.

Other than raising questions, elicitation could also be done by showing pictures and mimicking some gestures. Teachers could point to a picture and ask students to mention the vocabulary. This type of elicitation technique is suitable for younger learners where it is limited to use descriptive words. However, it is still relevant to be used in more advanced EFL classes with some adaptation. The research by (Husna & Amri, 2018) explored the elicitation used in junior high school students. The class focused on targeting speaking skill. As a help to elicit, the teacher used pictures and educational games as means to help the

teacher get students' participation. It is interesting to target specific skills by using elicitation. Speaking skill is the easiest targeted area when using elicitation as it gives an immediate answer when the teacher throws any question.

Not only identifying the types of elicitation, but the previous studies have also revealed interesting points about elicitation. They also explored the affecting factors and the extent of the usage. However, the previous research by Fitri & Neni (2020) and Alsubaie (2015) mainly focused on exploring the types of elicitation and only gave limited space explored in the extension. More exploration is needed when talking about the area affected by the use of elicitation. As it connects the dots on how other teachers could practice the finding in different contexts. Meanwhile, the research (Husna & Amri, 2018) on the use of elicitation to teach speaking was only explored through the pre, whilst, and post-teaching stage. It would give more insight to go into a specific teaching approach. The gap between these studies could be explored further to gain a better understanding of the use of elicitation.

This study aims to analyze the type of elicitation questions used in the classroom and go further on the roles they contribute to the dynamic of the classroom. This study would also specify the class that is analyzed to better give context to the analysis. This study identifies the elicitation used in a specific teaching approach which is the PPP model. The PPP classroom is chosen to prove that it could be modeled to induce student-centered learning by using elicitation techniques. The class targeted grammar skill which had been proven to be suitable for the PPP model classroom (Arifin et al., 2019).

METHODS

This study was conducted quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative method was preferable because we were looking for trends (Albers, M. J., 2017). Counting was used to quantify the data in the question categories. The quantitative method was conducted to determine the most frequently used type of questions in each stage of the PPP. Meanwhile, the qualitative method used was conversational analysis. It was chosen because this research aims to know 'why' rather than 'what' (Ahmad, et al., 2019). It is conducted to understand the relation and role of each type of elicitation question. The data analyzed was a videotaped classroom uploaded on YouTube with the title *How to teach grammar (PPP Model)/ TESOL CELTA.* This video was uploaded to the YouTube Channel Andrew Drummond. This video was chosen because it implements the PPP model but still demonstrates student-centered. This video shows how to conduct a PPP model with an inductive approach. Meanwhile, the PPP model is often conducted using a deductive approach. The technique the teacher used to engage students was also interesting; she mostly used questions when talking. Moreover, this video is interesting to analyze because it becomes the source for many educators to study as it already has 321K views. The data was then analyzed using the method proposed by Miles, et al (2014). The methods consisted of data collection, data condensation, data display, and data conclusion.

Data Collection

The data was collected through a videotaped classroom. This class was recorded during a demo grammar lesson for TESOL trainees at Wits Language School in Johannesburg. This class consisted of 16 adult learners. The targeted skill was Past Simple. The data of this study was obtained through the conversation between the teacher and the students. The video could be accessed through the link https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Re-FWcA03I.

The data was firstly transcribed. Then, the elicitation questions were counted to be categorized into two; open-ended questions and close-ended questions. These two categories could accommodate the questions raised in the classroom. The categorization of the questions was based on the research by Hyman & Sierra (2016). The answer was also the consideration of where we put the elicitation into which category. The categorization was chosen based on the response generated. The data categorization of open-ended and close-ended questions is as follows:

The categorization	Characteristics	Example
Open-ended question	It gives freedom for students to give their thoughts and allows students to give their own opinion.	Question: What do you think about this story? Answer: Entertaining. Question: Why is it entertaining? Answer: Because the characters are funny.
Close-ended question	The teacher could control the kind of answer students should give, usually, it is in the form of a yes/no question or choosing between some options.	Question: Is it past or present? Answer: Past. Question: Do we use verb 2 here? Answer: Yes.

Data Condensation

The conversation analyzed was when the teacher threw elicitation questions. Then, the number of elicitation appearances was counted and categorized based on the stage; Presentation, Practice, and Production. In each stage, the data is categorized into open-ended or close-ended questions.

Data Display

The data were displayed in a table that showed the most frequently used elicitation technique and the answer it generated.

Data Conclusion

Based on the table, the conclusions were drawn inductively in deciding the most used type of question in each teaching stage. Also, the role of each elicitation was analyzed through the response it gave to improve the dynamic of the class.

RESULTS

The result was displayed from the initial stage till the last one. The data was in the form of a conversation between the teacher (symbolled with 't') and the student (symbolled with 's'). The elicitation questions were classified into open-ended and close-ended. In the open-ended question, the subcategories are Wh- question and Instruction. Wh- question consists of what, why, who, where, when, and how that demands a freer answer. The teacher does not hold much control over students' answers. While in instruction, the students are expected to commit to doing the instruction, usually in the form of repeating something and doing something. The instruction could be variational.

Different from open-ended questions, the close-ended one demands stricter and limited answers. The teacher holds big control of what students answer here. Students are only given limited space to answer. There are two categories in the close-ended; yes/no questions and giving options. Yes/no questions will result in only yes/no answers. While 'giving options' will force students to only choose one of the given options.

Presentation Stage

In the first stage, the teacher draws students' attention using answers from reading exercises. The students learn how to form Past Simple and know its function. Wherever possible, the teacher asks questions to facilitate students' noticing how the language works, rather than lecturing.

Table 1. Open-ended questions in the presentation stage

Wh-question	Instruction
T: What is the correct answer for number 3?	T: Read the sentence to me, David
S: (silent)	S: (He started reading)
T: How do we know it is in the past?	T: Say that one more time for me
S: (silent)	S: He did not return to Spain
T: What do you notice about this?	
Ss: Past, adds ed	
T: What form of the verb is this?	
S: past	
T: What's the correct answer for number 5? Can you give me the correct answer?	
S: (one student answers)	
T: What form was this?	
S: Past simple	
T: What If I change it from he to I? What happens to work?	

S: Same

T: What is the sentence on the piece of paper that I gave you?

S: (One of the students' answers)

T: What's the difference between these two?

S:

T: Where's the past in this sentence?

S: did

T: What do I need?

S: Question mark

T: How do I know this is in the past?

S: The -ed

T: Why?

S: Because the past remains in did

| Total: 41% of the presentation stage | Total: 6% of the presentation stage |

Table 2. Close-ended questions in the presentation stage

Yes/no question	Giving options
T: Does everyone agree? S: yes T: Is it true now? S: Yes	T: Is it now/future/the past? S: Past T: One action/many actions? S: one
T: Do we know exactly when? S: Yes, 1891	T: Are they still happening now or is it finished? S: Finished
T: Is it similar to the first one do you think? S: Yeah T: Is it a single action or many repeated actions? S: Single T: Does he work now? S: no T: So, is it something that's still true now or is it finished? S: Finished T: Do we know when? S: Yes, we do T: Does it change? S: Yes T: Can I say I did not? S: yes T: Can I write he returned to Spain? S: yes	T: is it now or the past? S: Past Is that true or false? True T: Positive or negative? S: Positive
Total: 34% of the presentation stage	Total: 19% of the presentation stage

Practice Stage

In the practice section, the teacher makes the lesson to be scaffolded. She divides the practice stage into two phases; controlled practice and freer practice. In the controlled practice, the teacher focuses on the grammar structure application. This controlled activity aims to train students to make accurate sentences. In freer practice, students have a greater opportunity to personalize the language.

Table 3. Open-ended questions in the practice stage

Wh-question	Instruction
T: How many sentences? S: eight	T: Again
T: Alex, what did you have for the next one? S: (Answering)	T: Give me examples of some verbs that you could use Ss: Study, is, work, play, eat
T: What are you going to do for me do you think? S: Complete them T: How is my pronunciation? S: ..ted T: David, can you tell us what did Luke write? David: reading Luke's answer T: Laura, tell us something Laura: (answering)	
Sum: 43% of the practice stage	Sum: 14% of the practice stage

Table 4. Close-ended questions in the practice stage

Yes/no question	Giving options
T: Do we know when? S: Yeah	T: Do you add -ed or just d? S: just D
T: Are both correct? S: Yes	T: What do you do? Do you add another ed or do you just add d? S: Just d
T: Are these complete sentences? S: No	T: Are they in the past or the present? S: past
Sum: 21.5% of practice stage	Sum: 21.5% of practice stage

Production Stage

Using the specific theme, the teacher asks students to enter into an imaginative role. In the contexts she sets up, Past Simple is likely to be used. Since students could do roleplay, there is a sense of fun and freedom that the activity created. This atmosphere may contribute to facilitating the effective practice of the target language.

Table 5. Open-ended questions in the production stage

Wh- question	Instruction
T: If you have any questions, who can you ask question? S: A tour guide or a museum guide T: What do you call someone that visits another city on holiday? S: Tourist T: What do you think you're gonna do? S: Ask question T: How many questions are you gonna ask? S: A lot T: If B ask you difficult question, what are you gonna do? S: We make it up	
Sum: 62.5% of production stage	Sum: -

Table 6. Close-ended question in production stage

Yes/no question	Giving options
T: Can you use negative as well? S: yes	T: Are you usually sitting or standing? Ss: standing T: who is or who .. S: Who was
Sum: 12.5% of the production stage	Sum: 25% of the production stage

DISCUSSION

The type of elicitation questions that are mostly used in each learning stage

Stage	Percentage	The most used type
Presentation	Open-ended question: 47% Close-ended question: 53%	Close-ended question
Practice	Open-ended question: 57% Close-ended question: 43%	Open-ended question
Production	Open-ended question: 62.5% Close-ended question: 37.5%	Open-ended question

Counting was undertaken to determine which type of elicitation question is mostly used. In each stage, the percentage had already been presented. In the presentation stage, the teacher talked about Past Simple using the context from reading activities in the warmer activity. By doing this, the teacher did not use much talking time since students grasped the idea of the targeted skill by imagining the context from the previous activity. The teacher used elicitation questions most of the time. Since the teacher did the presentation inductively, she spent the biggest portion of time here building the flow into the general rule of Past Simple. The teacher mostly used close-ended questions to elicit students'

understanding. 34% of the elicitation used is yes/no question and 19% of the elicitation is giving options. 41% of the elicitation uses Wh-questions that demand explorative answers. The least used one in the presentation stage is instruction (only 6%).

In the practice stage, the teacher varied the activity by allowing students to interact with themselves by doing a quiz. Then, she varied the interaction by instructing the students to give feedback to each other. This variational interaction influenced the type of elicitation questions used in the classroom. The most used elicitation question in the practice stage is the open-ended question (57%) with 43% in the form of Wh- question and 14% in the form of instruction. The teacher uses less of a close-ended question here. She uses yes/no questions and giving options equally 21.5% of the practice stage.

The last stage, production, was similar to the practice stage. However, the production stage gave less authority to teacher intervention. The students practiced what they had done in the quiz from the previous stage in more personalized ways. As a result, the teacher mostly used open-ended questions that were less binding. She used Wh- questions 62.5% of the production stage. This kind of question forces students to give a longer answer. Although the teacher used much open-ended, she still used 37.5% of the total elicitation questions in close-ended. 12.5% was in yes/no question, while the rest was giving limited options (25%).

The role that elicitation questions play in the class

Elicitation questions should be used to ease the process of achieving a learning goal. Since each stage of Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) has its own goal, the elicitation technique mostly used is also different. Open-ended questions result in broader answers that are unpredictable. Open-ended questions require the students to elaborate their opinion, rather than just answering a simple yes/no. The teacher has lower control over students' answers. This condition is suitable for the stage that also needs lower intervention from the teacher. In the PPP case, it mostly fits into the Practice and Production stage. Align with that, the students' answers in the Practice and Production stage tend to be longer and more diverse. It could be resulted from students' higher understanding after getting the materials in the Presentation stage. After all, open-ended questions combined with close-ended questions could maximize learning.

Close-ended is mostly useful when we want to generate short and predictable answers. In relation to the classroom stage, it is most effective to use close-ended in a stage that needs high control from the teacher. In the Presentation stage, the teacher needs to lead students to get to the right conclusion about Past Simple. For that reason, close-ended questions are used most of the time. The video shows the success of using close-ended in the presentation stage. Initially, the teacher did not get any response when she threw questions in open-ended, but after she changed the question to close-ended, she got the proper response. She does this a couple of times because the students might be unfamiliar with the new concept they learn in the first stage of the lesson. From that experience, it echoes the importance of

analyzing the type of questions in specific model teaching. The objective is for the teachers to predict how the class goes, so they could prepare the elicitation question before the class begins. Previous studies haven't shown the interest to conduct elicitation analysis on a specified model classroom.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model has a bright future in the eye of English Language Teaching, especially in teaching grammar. In order to lower the teacher-centered tendency of this model, the teacher could do inductive learning and use elicitation questions. The choice of elicitation question should be suited to the goal of the learning stage. The presentation stage still needs high control from the teacher, so it is best to use close-ended. While starting to get the freedom to explore, open-ended questions could be used in practice and production stages. It is also to invite more participation from students in the freer activity in the practice and production stage.

The elicitation analysis of the PPP model class is still new. None of the other previous studies investigates the kind of questions we could practice in each stage of PPP. This research could be dug deeper by analyzing more samples of PPP model classrooms. It would give a fresh eye to see elicitation techniques used by different teachers. More research on other teaching techniques with a focus on elicitation analysis is also suggested to expand the perspective. The common theory would remain the same, but the result might differ given distinctive situations and steps.

It is suggested for other academicians comprehensively see criticism. When one approach is considered to have flaws, the possibility of improvement arises. It is very possible to modify any teaching approach based on the needs. More experiments need to be supported by the private sector like formal schools. It is also possible for the language center to conduct more experiments as they usually have a less strict curriculum. Last but not least, the government has an important role to support the field of research in ELT. Teachers need to have the freedom to experiment in their class, so the less administrative task would help them focus on improving their teaching ability.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, Sharique & Wasim, Saeeda & Irfan, Sumaiya & Gogoi, Sudarshana & Srivastava, Anshika & Farheen, Zarina. (2019). Qualitative v/s Quantitative Research. 6. 2828-2832. 10.18410/jebmh/2019/587.

Albers, M. J. (2017). Quantitative Data Analysis—In the Graduate Curriculum. Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 47(2), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281617692067

Alsubaie, M. S. (2015). An Analysis of Classroom Discourse: Elicitation Techniques in EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(8), 29–39. Retrieved from www.eajournals.org

Apriliani, D. (2016). The Influence of Using Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) Technique

Towards Students' Simple Past Tense Mastery at the Eight Grade of SMPN 1 Katibung South Lampung in the Academic Year of 2018/2019.

Arifin, M. A., Hafid, E., & Nurpahmi, S. (2019). The ppp model to teaching grammar: Evidence from Indonesian contexts of the effectiveness of explicit teaching instructions. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(3), 415–447.

Criado, R. (2013). A critical review of the Presentation-Practice-Production Model (PPP) in Foreign Language Teaching. In R. Monroy (Ed.), Homenaje a Francisco Gutiérrez Díez (pp. 97-115). Murcia: Edit.um. ISBN: 978-84-15463-55-9

Fitri, K. & H. S. A. (2020). Teachers' Elicitation Techniques in English Classroom Interaction at SMK Negeri 13 Medan. *Retrieved from* http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/39777/1/Fulltext.pdf

Halim, S., & Halim, T. (2019). Elicitation: A Powerful Diagnostic Tool for Actively Involving Learners in the Learning Process. Arab World English Journal, Special Issue: The Dynamics of EFL in Saudi Arabia. 115- 126 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/efl1.9

Hellström, Rasmus. (2015). Task Based Language Teaching versus Presentation Practice Production. Thesis. Linköping University.

Husna, R., & Amri, Z. (2018). The Use of Elicitation Technique in Teaching Speaking to Junior High School Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(4), 611–621.

Hyman, Michael & Sierra, Jeremy. (2016). Open- versus close-ended survey questions. NMSU Business Outlook. 14.

Maftoon, Parvis. (2016). A Critical Look at the Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) Approach: Challenges and Promises for ELT. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297702625

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd Edition). Sage Publication Inc.

Norman, M., & Hyland, T. (2003). The role of confidence in lifelong learning. Educational studies, 29(2-3), 261-272.

Tomlinson, B., Dat, B., Masuhara, H., & Rubdy, R. (2001). Survey review. EFL courses for adults. *ELT Journal*, 55(1), 80–101. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.1.80

Vafa. R. & Rakhmatova. (2022). Inductive and Deductive Approaches in Teaching Grammar