

Published online on the Journal's Webpage: <http://deejournal.org/index.php/dee>



deejournal

**Datokarama English Education Journal**

Vol. 4 No. 2 (2023) 109-122

E-ISSN: 2723-4967

## Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills in Describing People through the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) Method at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi

**Nining Angraeni<sup>1</sup>, Nur Asmawati<sup>2</sup>, Zuhra<sup>3</sup>**

Correspondent e-mail: [@nininganggraini38@gmail.com](mailto:@nininganggraini38@gmail.com)

State Islamic University Datokarama Palu Indonesia

### Article History

**Received:**  
(01-12-2023)  
**Revised:**  
(28-12-2023)  
**Accepted:**  
(29-12-2023)  
**Published:**  
(31-12-2023)

### ABSTRACT

This study addresses the students' need for enhanced speaking skills, particularly in terms of fluency. The inquiry posed in this thesis originates from the question: Can the application of the Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) method contribute to the improvement of students' speaking abilities when describing a person at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi? The objective is to ascertain whether the use of the PPP method has a positive impact on students' proficiency in describing individuals. The research adopts a quantitative approach through quasi-experimental methods. The study encompasses the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Sigi, comprising three classes. The experimental class comprises 20 students, while the control class consists of 20 students. Purposive sampling is employed to select students from classes VIII A and VIII B. The research findings demonstrate that the utilization of the Presentation Practice Production (PPP) method significantly enhances students' speaking skills, specifically in terms of fluency. This is evident from the mean scores of the experimental and control classes, which are 17.65 and 8.9, respectively. The calculated t-value of 4.26, with a degree of freedom (df) of 38 (20+20-2) and a significance level of 0.05, surpasses the critical t-table value of 2.00. Consequently, the hypothesis of the research is accepted, affirming that the implementation of the Presentation Practice Production method is effective in improving the speaking skills of eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi.

**Keywords:** *Enhancing, Speaking, Fluency, PPP Method, Describing*



## INTRODUCTION

English has become a global language widely used for communication among individuals, both domestically and internationally. In today's educational landscape, learning English is considered paramount, from elementary school to college, with its mastery being essential in an era characterized by challenges and competencies. Proficiency in both spoken and written English is deemed necessary. Students are expected to acquire and excel in four core language skills: speaking, reading, listening, and writing.

Speaking is a dynamic process involving the construction and processing of meaning, occurring in interactive situations that range from face-to-face conversations to language-based information transfer (Samiya, 2019). It enables students to articulate arguments, express ideas, share opinions, and provide information through the thoughtful arrangement of words for clarity. Various speaking genres, including introductions, discussions, presentations, interviews, and tutorials, are integral components of language learning. In this research, the focus is on teaching the skill of describing a person.

Describing a person falls under the category of descriptive texts, a genre that elucidates characteristics related to people, animals, plants, places, or inanimate objects. The primary objective is to furnish the reader with clear and vivid information about the subject being described. The utilization of the simple present tense in descriptive texts is grounded in the aim to convey factual information about the object, aligning with the tense's function of presenting facts or truths.

Upon conducting a pre-observation at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi, the researcher identified several challenges in the teaching and learning process. Students exhibited difficulty engaging in speaking activities, displayed low self-confidence, and, at times, harbored a fear of making mistakes. The transition to face-to-face learning after a period of online instruction during the pandemic contributed to students' passivity and limited engagement. Recognizing these challenges, the researcher opted for the Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) method as a solution for teaching speaking skills, specifically in describing a person.

The PPP method, widely employed in teaching simple language, is chosen for its potential to enhance students' speaking abilities. The method is structured in three stages: presentation, practice, and production. The presentation stage involves the teacher presenting the material and providing examples. In the practice stage, students are guided by the teacher as they engage in exercises, and finally, in the production stage, students independently apply the newly acquired language skills as taught by the teacher. This method is selected as it fosters a positive mentality and self-confidence among students, addressing the observed challenges in speaking skill development at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Definition of Speaking

Speaking is the main skill that people practice in their daily interactions. Speaking is two or more people who interact which have functions such as expressing ideas to listeners and maintaining social relations between speakers and listeners who are speaking. Speaking



English is very important when interacting with people anywhere, especially when we meet foreigners. As one of the international languages, English is also a subject that must be taught to students at school, because it can be used by students to express their ideas orally in a foreign language. And English teachers should activate students' speaking skills by providing communicative language activities in class and then giving them the opportunity to practice their speaking skills as much as possible.

## **Components of Speaking**

### ***Fluency***

Fluency is the ability to read, speak, or write easily, fluently and expressively. In another words, the speaker can read, understand, and respond in language clearly and concisely while connecting meaning and context. Fluency can be defined as the ability to speak fluently and accurate. Fluency in speaking is the goal of many language learners. Signs of fluency include a fairly fast speaking speed and only slight pauses and "ums" or "ers". These signs indicate that the speaker is not spending a lot of time looking for the language items needed to express the message (Azlina, 2015). Fluency also makes the students deliver what they want to express as clear as possible. So the ideas or statement that they deliver can be run smoothly. Students must be able to convey what they want to be expressed as clearly as possible, so that the ideas that will be conveyed can run smoothly. Students have the highest level of fluency when they are quite comfortable with the speed and rhythm of native speakers in the daily context of speaking activities. The speaker is expected to be able to speak at a normal speed, not too slow and not too fast because if the speaker speaks too fast, the listener will have a hard time understanding the meaning of the speaker's speech.

### ***Accuracy***

Accuray in speaking is when someone produce the correct sentence when speaking. So the listener easily understand the word. Accuracy has three components, namely pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar.

#### **1. Pronunciation**

Pronunciation is a way for students to produce clearer language when they speak. It deals with the phonological process which refers to the grammatical component which consists of the elements and principles that determine how sounds vary and patterns in language. The correlation between pronunciation and speaking is that the various sounds of words must be clear so that the listener can understand what they mean when the speaker speaks. So, pronunciation is very important in communicating when someone speaks and the pronunciation of the word is not clear, the listener will not understand what the speaker is saying.

#### **2. Vocabulary**

When speaking the language, the speaker will issue the words that are in his mind as a means of communication. Vocabulary means the appropriate diction used in communication. Without having an adequate vocabulary, a person cannot communicate effectively or express his ideas both in spoken and written form. The limited vocabulary is also an obstacle that prevents learners from learning the language. Without grammar very



little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed. The correlation between vocabulary and speaking skills is the words used in speaking are needed so that people can express all their ideas and thoughts. Vocabulary is the number of words that make up a language. It consists on conten words; nouns, adjectives, verbs and function words such as prepositions, conjunctions, articles and pronouns.

### 3. Grammar

One of the obstacles for students in learning English is grammar. Grammatical structure is very important because these four skills cannot be achieved easily without mastering adequate grammatical structures. By studying grammar, students will gain confidence to speak English. So students need to arrange the correct sentences in the conversation. The use of grammar is also to learn the correct way to acquire expertise in a language in spoken and written form.

### ***Comprehensibility***

Comprehensibility is the process of understanding the speech sent by the speaker and performed by the listener. Also understanding in speaking that people can understand what we are saying, and they are too. Comprehensibility has two general definitions. In a narrow sense, it shows the construction of meaning, and makes use of the speech act conveyed. For example, when someone gives a question and the listener extract the import and then try to find the answer (Saidna, 2013). So it can conclude comprehension is concerned with how we can respond to what someone is saying by understanding him or her speaking and giving an understandable response to him.

### **Presentation Practice Production Method**

Presentation, practice and production or PPP method is kind of organization typical of many published English language teaching course.

### ***Concept of Presentation Practice Production method***

#### 1. Presentation

Presentation here refers to the introduction to a new subject or lesson. It requires creating a realistic situation in which the target language would be taught and acquired. Usually, this is done through using pictures, dialogue and actual classroom situation.

#### 2. Practice

Practice is learning by repetition. Students gradually move become more active in communicative practice involving procedures such as information gaps actives, dialogue creation, and controlled role play. Practice is seen as a frequency device for creating intimacy and confidence in the new language. These activities though written activities can provide a structure for verbal practice. The teacher is still directing and correcting at this stage.



### 3. Production

Students' practice using the new structure in different context often using their own content or information, in order to developed fluency with the new pattern.

In conclusion, PPP is a kind of teaching method which consists of three steps: presentation, practice and production so that students get sufficient opportunity to learn, practice and acquire the knowledge and skills in a controlled way.

#### ***Procedure of Using Presentation Practice Production Method***

In this procedure the teacher introduces situations that contextualize the language to be taught. Students now practice language using accurate reproduction techniques such as chorus repetition (where students repeat a word, phrase, or sentence together with the teacher leading), individual repetition (where students individually repeat a word, phrase, or sentence in teacher insistence) and cue-response exercises (where the teacher gestures like a movie, nominates students by name or by looking or pointing, and students make the desired response, e.g. do you want to come to the cinema?) lingual ones we saw above, but because they are contextualized by the situations that have been presented, they carry more meaning than simple substitution exercises. Then the students, using the new language, make up their own sentences, and this is called production. The following basic-level example demonstrates this procedure (Jeremy, 2007).

#### 1. Presentation

The teacher explains the material and shows the students the following picture and asks them about the picture.

#### 2. Practice

The teacher gets the students to repeat the sentence "*she is a beautiful*". She may then nominate certain students to repeat the sentence individually, and she corrects any mistakes she hears. Now she goes back and models more sentences from the picture (*her face is oval*), getting choral and individual repetition where she thinks this is necessary. Now she is in a position to conduct a slightly freer kind of drill than the audio-lingual one above:

Teacher: can anyone tell me?

Student: she has a flat nose

#### 3. Production

The end point of cycle is a production, which some trainers have called 'immediate creativity'. Here the students are asked to use new language in sentences of their own.

#### ***The Strengths of Using Presentation Practice Production***

The strengths of PPP method are the teacher will be aware that teaching learning is not only giving material for the students but also giving the opportunity to make their own sentences by using PPP. The students' can understand about the English Language especially speaking ability The advantage of using PPP makes the students interested in speaking skill. PPP method makes the students active in the class (Jeremy, 2013) with the material that will



be given to the teacher in the form of pictures or stories, it is able to attract students' interest in English, especially speaking skills which many students find difficult.

### ***The Weakness of Using Presentation Practice Production***

The weakness of PPP method is that it needs much time to prepare the material. It means that PPP method requires a lot of time to prepare the material, so the teacher should be able to take a manage of the time so that this method can run well.

## **METHOD**

This research consisted of two types of variables namely the independent and dependent variables. The independent variable was a variable that gave an effect to dependent variable, while the dependent variable was a variable that was influenced by the presence of an independent variable. The independent variable of this research was Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) method, while dependent variable was student's speaking skill in describing person of the grade VIII students. Design of this research was quasi experimental. The sample of this research was divided into two groups. They were the experimental group and the control group. The pretest and posttest were given to both classes. In the experimental group, the researcher gave a treatment used the Presentation, Practice and Production method, while in the control group, the researcher used conventional method as the teacher usually before. The sampling technique of this research was purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was a technique of choosing the sample based on the criteria that relate with students problem.

One of the most important activities in conducting research is how to obtain and collect the required data. In this research, the researcher used test as research instrument. The test consisted of pre-test and post-test. At the first meeting, the researcher gave a pre-test as a tool to measure students' speaking ability and focused on students' fluency. After giving the pre-test, the researcher gave treatment to the students, and finally the researcher gave a post-test to measure whether there is an improvement after doing the treatment or not. In collecting of data, the researcher used pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given to students before applying the PPP method as a treatment and post-test was given after applying the PPP method. The two tests were expected to measure students' improvement in speaking describing person and to know an effect of the PPP method in teaching speaking descriptive text.



## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Data Description of Experimental Class

**Table 1. The Result of Pretest Experimental Class**

| No             | Initial name | Score's of Fluency | Category    | Qualification |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1              | AS           | 48                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 2              | AB           | 56                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 3              | DL           | 57                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 4              | DP           | 63                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 5              | F            | 63                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 6              | FSR          | 50                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 7              | IM           | 52                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 8              | K            | 69                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 9              | MJ           | 53                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 10             | MFA          | 55                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 11             | N            | 74                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 12             | NF           | 68                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 13             | R            | 58                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 14             | RK           | 72                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 15             | RA           | 66                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 16             | RI           | 57                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 17             | S            | 73                 | Fair        | successful    |
| 18             | SIL          | 63                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 19             | SIS          | 55                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 20             | WIL          | 60                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>1212</b>        |             |               |
| <b>Average</b> |              | <b>60,6</b>        | <b>Poor</b> | <b>Failed</b> |

Based on the data table, student who got the highest score was 74 and the student who got the lowest score was 48. So, the mean score of students is 60.0 with the category poor and failed in qualification.



**Table 2. The Result of Posttest Experimental Class**

| <b>No</b>      | <b>Initial name</b> | <b>Score's of Fluency</b> | <b>Category</b> | <b>Qualification</b> |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 1              | AS                  | 78                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 2              | AB                  | 80                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 3              | DL                  | 70                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 4              | DP                  | 79                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 5              | F                   | 80                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 6              | FSR                 | 74                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 7              | IM                  | 70                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 8              | K                   | 80                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 9              | MJ                  | 79                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 10             | MFA                 | 70                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 11             | N                   | 95                        | Very Good       | Successful           |
| 12             | NF                  | 83                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 13             | R                   | 71                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 14             | RK                  | 90                        | Very Good       | Successful           |
| 15             | RA                  | 73                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 16             | RI                  | 70                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 17             | S                   | 82                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 18             | SIL                 | 83                        | Good            | Successful           |
| 19             | SIS                 | 79                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| 20             | WIL                 | 79                        | Fair            | Successful           |
| <b>Total</b>   |                     | <b>1565</b>               |                 |                      |
| <b>Average</b> |                     | <b>78,25</b>              | <b>Fair</b>     | <b>Successful</b>    |

Based on the posttest score of experimental class, it was found from the table above that the highest score is 95 and the lowest one is 70. The mean score of posttest experimental class is 78,52. It indicates that the experimental class has significant progress of mean score from 60,6 in the pretest to 78,25 in the posttest.



## Data Description of Control Class

**Table 3. The Result of Pretest Control Class**

| No             | Initial name | Score's of Fluency | Category    | Qualification |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1              | AF           | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 2              | APN          | 55                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 3              | AG           | 48                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 4              | AK           | 69                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 5              | ADP          | 70                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 6              | D            | 50                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 7              | DK           | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 8              | DA           | 62                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 9              | FR           | 58                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 10             | FA           | 63                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 11             | F            | 60                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 12             | LTA          | 55                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 13             | M            | 72                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 14             | MR           | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 15             | N            | 69                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 16             | PA           | 71                 | Fair        | Failed        |
| 17             | RY           | 49                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 18             | RRI          | 51                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 19             | SAR          | 74                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 20             | SS           | 67                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>1220</b>        |             |               |
| <b>Average</b> |              | <b>61</b>          | <b>Poor</b> | <b>Failed</b> |

Based on the table student who got the highest score was 74 and the student who got the lowest score was 48. After knowing the result, the mean score of control class was higher than experimental class. The mean score of pretest for the control class is 61.



### The Result of Posttest Control Class

| No             | Initial name | Score's of Fluency | Category    | Qualification |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1              | AF           | 65                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 2              | APN          | 63                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 3              | AG           | 60                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 4              | AK           | 74                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 5              | ADP          | 70                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 6              | D            | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 7              | DK           | 60                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 8              | DA           | 74                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 9              | FR           | 80                 | Good        | Successful    |
| 10             | FA           | 68                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 11             | F            | 80                 | Good        | Successful    |
| 12             | LTA          | 80                 | Good        | Successful    |
| 13             | M            | 77                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 14             | MR           | 68                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| 15             | N            | 75                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 16             | PA           | 71                 | Fair        | Successful    |
| 17             | RY           | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 18             | RRI          | 59                 | Very Poor   | Failed        |
| 19             | SAR          | 87                 | Good        | Successful    |
| 20             | SS           | 69                 | Poor        | Failed        |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>1398</b>        |             |               |
| <b>Average</b> |              | <b>69,9</b>        | <b>Poor</b> | <b>Failed</b> |

Based on the table, the highest score was 87 and the lowest one was 59 the mean score of control class posttest is 69,9. The calculation above indicates that the mean score of control class also increase from 61 in the pretest to 69,9 in the posttest.



### Deviation Score of the Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Class

| No             | Student's Initial | Pretest (1) | Posttest (2) | Deviation $X_1$ | Squared Deviation |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|                |                   |             |              | (02-01)         | ( $X^2$ )         |
| 1              | AS                | 48          | 78           | 30              | 900               |
| 2              | AB                | 56          | 80           | 24              | 576               |
| 3              | DL                | 57          | 70           | 13              | 169               |
| 4              | DP                | 63          | 79           | 16              | 256               |
| 5              | F                 | 63          | 80           | 17              | 289               |
| 6              | FSR               | 50          | 74           | 24              | 576               |
| 7              | IM                | 52          | 70           | 18              | 324               |
| 8              | K                 | 69          | 80           | 11              | 121               |
| 9              | MJ                | 53          | 79           | 26              | 676               |
| 10             | MFA               | 55          | 70           | 15              | 225               |
| 11             | N                 | 74          | 95           | 21              | 441               |
| 12             | NF                | 68          | 83           | 15              | 225               |
| 13             | R                 | 58          | 71           | 13              | 169               |
| 14             | RK                | 72          | 90           | 18              | 324               |
| 15             | RA                | 66          | 73           | 7               | 49                |
| 16             | RI                | 57          | 70           | 13              | 169               |
| 17             | S                 | 73          | 82           | 9               | 81                |
| 18             | SIL               | 63          | 83           | 20              | 400               |
| 19             | SIS               | 55          | 79           | 24              | 576               |
| 20             | WIL               | 60          | 79           | 19              | 361               |
| <b>Total</b>   |                   | <b>1212</b> | <b>1565</b>  | <b>353</b>      | <b>6907</b>       |
| <b>Average</b> |                   | <b>60.6</b> | <b>78.25</b> | <b>17.65</b>    |                   |

### Deviation Score of the Pretest and Posttest of Control Class

| No | Student's Initial | Pretest (1) | Posttest (2) | Deviation $X_1$ | Squared Deviation |
|----|-------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|    |                   |             |              | (02-01)         | ( $X^2$ )         |
| 1  | AF                | 59          | 65           | 6               | 36                |
| 2  | APN               | 55          | 63           | 8               | 64                |
| 3  | AG                | 48          | 60           | 12              | 144               |
| 4  | AK                | 69          | 74           | 5               | 25                |
| 5  | ADP               | 70          | 70           | 0               | 0                 |
| 6  | D                 | 50          | 59           | 9               | 81                |
| 7  | DK                | 59          | 60           | 1               | 1                 |
| 8  | DA                | 62          | 74           | 12              | 144               |
| 9  | FR                | 58          | 80           | 22              | 484               |
| 10 | FA                | 63          | 68           | 5               | 25                |



|                |     |             |             |            |             |
|----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| 11             | F   | 60          | 80          | 20         | 400         |
| 12             | LTA | 55          | 80          | 25         | 625         |
| 13             | M   | 72          | 77          | 5          | 25          |
| 14             | MR  | 59          | 68          | 9          | 81          |
| 15             | N   | 69          | 75          | 6          | 36          |
| 16             | PA  | 71          | 71          | 0          | 0           |
| 17             | RY  | 49          | 59          | 10         | 100         |
| 18             | RRI | 51          | 59          | 8          | 64          |
| 19             | SAR | 74          | 87          | 13         | 169         |
| 20             | SS  | 67          | 69          | 2          | 4           |
| <b>Total</b>   |     | <b>1220</b> | <b>1398</b> | <b>178</b> | <b>2508</b> |
| <b>Average</b> |     | <b>61</b>   | <b>69.9</b> | <b>8.9</b> |             |

**The sum of squared deviation of the experimental class**

$$\begin{aligned}
 SS_1 &= \sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{n_1} \\
 &= 6907 - \frac{(353)^2}{20} \\
 &= 6907 - 6230 \\
 &= 677
 \end{aligned}$$

**The sum squared deviation of the control group**

$$\begin{aligned}
 SS_2 &= \sum X_2^2 - \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{n_2} \\
 &= 2508 - \frac{(178)^2}{20} \\
 &= 2508 - 1584.2 \\
 &= 923.8
 \end{aligned}$$

**T-test**

$$\begin{aligned}
 t &= \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} \\
 &= \frac{17.65 - 8.9}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{677 + 923.8}{20 + 20 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{20}\right)}} \\
 &= \frac{8.75}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1600.8}{38}\right) \left(\frac{20}{400} + \frac{20}{400}\right)}} \\
 &= \frac{8.75}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1600.8}{38}\right) \left(\frac{40}{400}\right)}} \\
 &= \frac{8.75}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{64032}{15200}\right)}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$t = \frac{8.75}{\sqrt{4.212}} \quad t = \frac{8.75}{2.052} \quad t = 4.26$$

**Degree of freedom** :  $N_x + N_y - 2$   
 $= 20 + 20 - 2 = 38$  (between 30-40)

**Level of significant** = 0.05  
 $30 = 2.042$   
 $40 = 2.021$

Where:  $a = 38 - 30 = 8$   
 $b = 40 - 30 = 10$   
 $c = 2.042 - 2.021 = 0.021$

**The formula** :  $\frac{a}{b} \times c = \frac{8}{10} \times 0.021 = 0.0168$   
 $df (38) = 2.021 - 0.0168$   
 $= 2.00$

In order to make formula clear, there are some explanations provided by the researcher as follow:

a = the subtraction of the degree of freedom is obtained from the number of students in sample and the degree of freedom whose figure precedes right before the degree of freedom is obtained on the table of critical values of the students' distribution.

b = the subtraction of two degree of freedom whose figure precedes and comes after the degree of freedom on the table of critical values of the students' distribution.

c = the value subtraction of the degree of freedom in b.

From explanation above the value of t-counted is 4.26 and value of t-table is 2.00. Hence, the result showed that the value of t-counted is higher than the value of t-table ( $4.26 > 2.00$ ).

## CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data of this research, it can be concluded that the use of presentation, practice and production method can improve students' speaking skill in describing person at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi. It can be proven by the data of the T-counted score (4.26) is higher than the T-table score (2.00) by applying the 0.05 level significant with degree of freedom (df) 38. Thus, related to the hypothesis of this research, if the t-counted is higher than the t-table, the alternative hypothesis was accepted while the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that the PPP method can improve students' speaking skill in describing person at SMP Negeri 5 Sigi.

## REFERENCES

- Al Fauzan, Muh Saefullah. *Improving Student's Speaking ability through Mobile Social Networking*. Muhammadiyah University. 2019.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik, Edisi Revisi V*. Jakarta: Pt Rineka Cipta, 2006.
- Atma, Sayama. *Raising Learners' Level Of English Fluency Through Classroom Participation*. Constantine: The People's Democratic Republic Of Algeria Ministry Of High Education And Scientific Research Mentouri University. 2019.



- Bullock, Richard. & Goggin, Maureen Daly. *The Norton Field Guide to Writing With Reading*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 2013.
- Cohen, Et All. *Research Methods In Education*. London: Routledge Falmer . 2007.
- Douglas, Brown. H. *Teaching by Principles, An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Newyork: Addison Wesley Longman. 2001.
- Harmer, Jeremy. *How To Teach English*. Edinburgh Gate: Longman. 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Practice Of English Language Teaching*. England: Longman. 2007.
- Heaton. *Writing English Language Test*. England: Longman Group Limited. 1988.
- Izzah, Alfiatul. *The Use of PPP. Presentation Practice Production. Technique to Improve Speaking Skill*. JP3. 2013.
- Kane, Thomas S. *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- Kurniati, Azlina. *A Study on The Speaking Ability of The Second Year Students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru*. Riau University.
- PW, Muh Mursyid. *the Learning of Descriptive Text*. Karangdadap: Handout SMPN 1.
- Resha P.W. *Developing Speaking Skill of Grade VIII Through Short Conversation*. Palu: ELTS. 2015.
- Sofan, Novi Nur. *The Application of Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) Technique toward Students' Vocabulary Achievement*. Pancasakti University Tegal: Academia. 2017.
- Susanti, Ervi. & Amri, Zul. *Speakingboard Game to Teach Speaking of Descriptive Text*. State Univertsity of Padang: Journal of English Language Teaching, 2013.
- Tahir, Saidna Zulfikar. *Teaching Speaking English Through Yahoo Messenger*. Jakarta: Qalam Media Pustaka, 2013.
- Yuliani, Dewi. *The Influence of using PPP Technique toward Students' Speaking ability of The Eight Grade at Mts Darul Ulum Tanjung Bintang*. Lampung: UIN Raden Intan. 2018.

