Научная статья
Original article

THE PRESENTATION – PRACTICE – PRODUCTION METHOD AS A WAY OF RAISING GRAMMATICAL AWARENESS FOR LANGUAGE – MAJORING STUDENTS' GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE DEVELOPMENT

ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ МЕТОДА PRESENTATION – PRACTICE – PRODUCTION КАК СПОСОБА ПОВЫШЕНИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЙ ОСВЕДОМЛЕННОСТИ СТУДЕНТОВ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ ДЛЯ РАЗВИТИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЙ КОМПЕТЕНЦИИ

Шикова Анна Алексеевна, магистрант 2 курса, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский педагогический государственный университет» (119991 Россия, г. Москва, ул. Малая Пироговская, д. 1/1), aa.shikova@mpgu.su

ShiKai Anna Alekseevna, a 2-year master student, Moscow Pedagogical State University (119991 Russia, Moscow, Malaya Pirogovskay str., 1/1), aa.shikova@mpgu.su

Аннотация. В течение последнего века между известными учеными не прекращались дебаты о том, как следует преподавать грамматику и развивать грамматическую компетентность. Как ответ на данные противоречия, в 1970-х годах в сфере преподавания иностранных языков появился и популяризировался метод Presentation – Practice – Production (PPP). Начиная с 1990-х годов, эта парадигма обучения подвергалась критике из-за игнорирования основной цели изучения языка - общения. Однако, на наш взгляд данная модель преподавания может быть успешна использована для обучения студентов языковых

специальностей, ведь требования, предъявляемые для студентов лингвистических специальностей, значительно отличаются от требований для студентов, изучающих английский для коммуникации. Студентам лингвистических специальностей необходимо обладать глубоким понимание грамматических систем, грамматической терминологией и грамматически правильной письменной и устной речью. Данная статья посвящена рассмотрению концепции метода PPP, его преимуществ и недостатков, а также обсуждению того, как эта модель обучения может быть эффективно реализована для студентов лингвистический специальностей.

Abstract. Over the last century, there have been heated debates among prominent scholars on the ways how grammar should be taught, and grammatical competence developed. As a response to these concerns, in the 1970s, the Presentation – Practice – Production (PPP) method was emerged and popularized in the sphere of foreign language teaching. From 1990s onwards this teaching paradigm has been under attack of criticisms due to ignoring the primary goal of language learning, which is communication, teacher-centeredness, and focus on form rather on meaning. However, this teaching paradigm can be effectively utilized for language-majoring students since requirements set for graduate students of linguistic department differ from requirements set for learners studying English solely for communication purposes. Language-majoring students need in-depth understanding of various grammar systems and grammatical terminology and accurate oral and written production. This article is devoted to examination of the concept of the PPP method, its advantages, and disadvantages and discussion how this teaching model can be beneficially implemented for language-majoring students.

Ключевые слова: преподавания грамматики, грамматическая компетенция, грамматическая осознанность, PPP метод, студенты лингвистических специальностей

Keywords: grammar teaching, grammatical competence, grammatical awareness, the PPP method, language-majoring students

Introduction

The Presentation - Practice - Production method (PPP) is one of well-established pedagogical method in the context of teaching grammar [Hellstrom, 2016]. PPP employs a classic deductive approach in which, firstly, grammar is explicitly introduced by a teacher, then practice is provided to achieve automatic production and, finally, students are invited to use new target structures in a freer way [Maftoon, 2012]. In last decades this method has attracted a lot of criticisms in ESL (English as a second language) community due to a number of reasons that will be further discussed. However, we believe that PPP can be effectively utilized for language-majoring students since they, as prosperous English teachers, need high level of grammatical competence development. This requirement is presented in Federal State Educational Standard for Undergraduate Studies (FSESUS). According to FSESUS, a graduate student of linguistic department should possess the following competencies: to have substantial understanding of the organization of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic systems; to communicate effectively in the foreign language using a wide range of language means; to acquire the mechanisms of sentence and larger utterances of speech organization [FSESHE, 2014]. All required competencies high level of grammatical competence development. Thus, the current paper is an attempt to discuss how PPP method can be used as a way of raising grammatical awareness for language-majoring students.

Concept of PPP

PPP was introduced in the 1960 and later became one of the most common methods used by professional foreign language schools worldwide [Harmer, 2008]. PPP is a three-stage teaching paradigm consisting of the following parts: presentation, practice, and production. Presentation stage, which is the starting point of PPP, is exploited to provide students with explicit knowledge of the target grammar structure. This stage is crucial since it affects the effectiveness of two others. Presentation of new grammar form can be made with use of model sentences, read out rule from the coursebook or acted out by a teacher. The second stage is devoted to consolidating of understanding of target grammar form and its practice in a controlled way. This stage lasts until students completely master the target grammar structure and will be able to produce it without errors. Hence, the focus of this stage is on accuracy, whereas fluency of speech will be aimed at the

production stage. The most common types of activities are drilling sentences after the teacher, gap-filling, sentence transformation and finishing sentences exercises. At the last stage (production) students are invited to exploit the target grammar structure in more autonomous and creatives tasks such as role-plays, debates, surveys, and guessing games [Criado, 2013]. These activities are an attempt to create real-life situations in English classroom and enable students to employ new target grammar forms in communicative ways.

Advantages of PPP

The implementation of PPP has presented a number of advantages for teaching English as a second language. First, PPP implies use of explicit instruction which can foster more substantial understanding of the organization morphology rules, syntax, and semantics [Zheng, 2015]. Language-majoring students are prospective teachers studying language as a part of a degree in English leading to diploma, thus, profound declarative knowledge of grammar is remarkably important for their future job. High level of grammatical awareness also facilitates creating analytical mindset, which, in turn, promotes better teaching practices. Second, PPP allocates enough time to practice new rules of the target linguistic structures and, thus, enables students to transform declarative knowledge into automatic procedures through extensive practice [Ellis, 2003]. Besides, focus on target grammar structures and its application prevents establishing incorrect use of grammar, namely fossilization. Accurate and situationally appropriate performance is essential for language-majoring students as future English teachers. Third, PPP as a method of explicit instruction facilitates second language learning by developing noticing, which is considered to be a crucial part of learning a foreign language [Schmidt, 1986]. Explicit knowledge gained through instruction allows learners to notice features in the input and to see the gap between the input and their own production. Therefore, students will be better prepared to guide their own future learners towards an accurate and correct grammar use for accomplishing communicative goals.

Disadvantages of PPP

Despite the advantages mentioned above, a great number of criticisms was posed against the PPP method. First, PPP has a primary focus on a linguistic component which does not constitute the core of communicative use [Lewis, 1996]. The practice stage is

often associated with drills and mechanical exercises that do not resemble to real-life communication either. As a result, students who are taught exclusively by the PPP model are not successful in communicating outside of the foreign language classroom [Richards, Rodgers, 2014]. Second, the PPP method emphasizes accuracy rather than meaning neglecting risk-taking as an important part of language acquisition. This might generate fear and anxiety and demotivate students for further grammar exploration. Third, PPP is characterized by teacher– centeredness since teacher presents new grammar material, provides class with activities and leads them. PPP teachers may neglect the learner's needs and not give them enough opportunities to respond to the individual challenges during the class [Scrievener, 1996]. Only at the last stage of the model the teacher's control is reduced, and students have more autonomy.

To address the drawbacks of explicit instruction the PPP method should be combined with a number of communicative activities which will focus on students' real-world communication needs, motivate their autonomy and interest, promote independent collaborative work, and give more opportunities to practice target language in a freer way. Communicative activities can include information gap activities, presentations, role plays, interviews, surveys, etc. Through such extensive practice, students will be able to absorb rules thoroughly and to transform procedural knowledge of grammar into automatic use.

Conclusion

While PPP should not be considered as a teaching framework for every lesson and for all learners, it can be a good choice to utilize for raising grammatical awareness of language-majoring students. Taking into account that these students are prospective foreign language teachers, they must not only be fluent at oral and written production but also employ grammar structures accurately, have comprehensive knowledge of grammar systems and grammar terminology. For these purposes PPP can be effectively implemented due to its focus on developing of profound declarative knowledge, accuracy in grammar use, and noticing skills. PPP method in this case must be supplemented with communicative tasks that will facilitate transformation from declarative knowledge to automatic operations with grammar.

Литература

1. Гувендир Э., Хардакр Б. Обучение языку и грамматике на основе задач. // Энциклопедия преподавания английского языка TESOL, 2020. С. 1-7.
2. Криадо Р. Критический обзор модели presentation – practice – production (PPP) в обучении иностранному языку // Homenaje a Francisco Gutiérrez Díez, 2013. С. 97-115.
3. Кусумавардани, С. А., Мардияни, Э. Взаимосвязь между грамматической компетенцией английского языка и беглостью речи / С. А. Кусумавардани, Э. Мардияни. Профессиональный журнал английского образования 1 (6), 2018. стр. 724-733.
4. Ларсен-Фриман Д. и Андерсон М. Методы и принципы преподавания языков (3–е изд.). - Издательство Оксфордского университета, 2011. 272 с.
5. Ласмиатун И. Потенциальное будущее парадигмы PPP в обучении грамматике EFL: аннотированный обзор // 3-я Международная конференция учителей образования в эпоху цифровых технологий, 2018.
6. Льюис М. Последствия лексического взгляда на язык. в книге Дж. Уиллиса и Д. Уиллиса (ред.). Вызов и изменения в преподавании языков // Оксфорд: Хайнманн, 1996. С. 10-16.
7. Мафтун П. Критический взгляд на presentation – practice – production подход (PPP): проблемы и перспективы для ELT // Мозг. Обширные исследования в области искусственного интеллекта и нейробиологии, 2012. № 3(4). С. 31-36.
8. Ричардс Дж.К., Роджерс Т. Подходы и методы в обучении иностранным языкам (3-е издание) // Издательство Кембриджского университета, 2014. 419 с.
9. Скривенер, Дж. ARC: Описательная модель для работы в классе по языку в книге Дж. Уиллиса и Д. Уиллиса (ред.). Вызов и изменения в преподавании языков // Оксфорд: Макмиллан Хайнеманн, 1996. 186 с.
10. Федеральный государственный образовательный стандарт высшего образования (Образование и педагогические науки) [Электронный ресурс] // URL: https://fgosvo.ru/fgosvo/index/4/94 (доступ 07.05.2022)

11. Хармер, Дж. Практика преподавания английского языка (4-е издание) // Лонгман, 2008. 448 с.
12. Хеллсторм Р. Обучение языку на основе задач в сравнении с PPP // Журнал Линчёпингского университета. 2015. С. 1-36.
13. Чжэн Л. Обучение эксплицитной грамматике и имплицитной грамматике для студентов старших курсов английского языка в университете // Китайско–американское преподавание английского языка, 2015. №8. С. 556– 560.
14. Шмидт Р. Развитие базовых разговорных навыков на втором языке: пример взрослого учащегося. в книге Р. Дэй (ред.), Учимся говорить: Разговор на иностранном языке // Роули, Массачусетс: Ньюбери Хаус, 1986. С. 237-369.
15. Эллис Р. Изучение и преподавание языка на основе задач // Издательство Оксфордского университета, 2003. 400 с.

References

1. Criado R. A critical review of the Presentation-Practice-Production Model (PPP) in Foreign Language Teaching // Homenaje a Francisco Gutiérrez Díez, 2013. P. 97-115.
2. Ellis R. Task– Based Language Learning and Teaching // Oxford Applied Linguistics, Oxford University Press, 2003. 400 p.
3. Federal State Educational Standard for Undergraduate Studies (Education and Pedagogical Sciences) [Electronic resource] // URL: https://fgosvo.ru/fgosvo/index/4/94 (accessed 07.05.2022)
4. Guvendir E., Hardacre B. Task-Based Language Teaching and Grammar. // The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 2020. p. 1-7.
5. Harmer, J. The Practice of English Language Teaching (4th edition) // Longman, 2008. 448 p.
6. Hellstorm R. Task Based Language Teaching versus Presentation Practice Production // Linköping University Journal. 2015. P. 1-36.
7. Kusumawardani, S. A., Mardiyani, E. The correlation between English grammar competence and speaking fluency / S. A. Kusumawardani, E. Mardiyani. Professional Journal of English Education 1(6), 2018. p. 724-733.

8. Lasmiatun I. Potential future of PPP paradigm on EFL grammar teaching: an annotated survey // 3rd International Conference on Education Teachers in Digital Age, 2018.
9. Lewis M. Implications of a lexical view of language. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), Challenge and Change in Language Teaching // Oxford: Heinemann, 1996. P. 10-16.
10. Maftoon P. A Critical Look at the Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) Approach: Challenges and Promises for ELT // BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2012. № 3(4). P. 31-36.
11. Richards J.C., Rodgers T. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (3rd edition) // Cambridge University Press, 2014. 419 p.
12. Schmidt R. Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition // Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1986. P. 237-369.
13. Scrivener, J. 'ARC: a descriptive model for classroom work on language' in J. Willis and D. Willis (eds.). Challenge and Change in Language Teaching // Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann, 1996. 186 p.
14. Zheng L. Explicit Grammar and Implicit Grammar Teaching for English Major Students in University // Sino– US English Teaching, 2015. №8. P. 556– 560.
15. Larsen-Freeman D., Anderson M. Techniques and principles in language teaching (3rd edition). Oxford University Press, 2011. 272 p.

© Шикова А.А., 2022 Научно-образовательный журнал для студентов и преподавателей «StudNet» №5/2022.

Для цитирования: Шикова А.А. ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ МЕТОДА PRESENTATION – PRACTICE – PRODUCTION КАК СПОСОБА ПОВЫШЕНИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЙ ОСВЕДОМЛЕННОСТИ СТУДЕНТОВ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ ДЛЯ РАЗВИТИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЙ КОМПЕТЕНЦИИ // Научно-образовательный журнал для студентов и преподавателей «StudNet» №5/2022.