

PPP Teaching Method in Enhancing English Writing Skills for Students at Politeknik Unggul LP3M Medan

Hermansyah

Departement of Secretary, Politeknik Unggul LP3M, North Sumatera, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Email: hermansyahlmb@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the learning outcomes of writing English compositions in the General English II course for second-semester students at Politeknik Unggul LP3M Medan before and after applying the PPP teaching method. Data were gathered through observation and documentation, using assignments, questionnaires, interviews, field notes, and descriptive writing samples. The collected data were analysed using a qualitative descriptive approach, and the findings are presented in tables supported by descriptive explanations. The study is based on theories of language learning and teaching, complemented by writing theory and English grammar theory. Quantitative results show an improvement in students' writing skills. During the pre-action phase, students achieved an average score of 60.8, categorized as "poor." In Cycle I, the average score increased to 78.5, placing it in the "good" category. After implementing Cycle II to enhance the results of Cycle I, the average score rose further to 83.8, also within the "good" category. Overall, the use of the PPP teaching method successfully increased students' motivation. This is supported by questionnaire and interview results, indicating that 85% of the 22 students found the teaching materials easy to understand.

Keywords: PPP Teaching Method, Learning English, Writing Skill Enhancement

INTRODUCTION

Overall, this study aims to identify and evaluate effective methods and techniques for teaching writing, with a particular focus on helping students compose English descriptive texts. More specifically, it investigates students' weaknesses and learning outcomes in writing descriptive texts before and after applying the PPP (presentation, practice, and production) teaching method. The study also examines how this method influences students' motivation to learn.

Initial observations, based on a simple free-writing task, showed that students' average writing score was 60.8, categorized as "poor" and significantly below the minimum mastery criterion of 75. Interviews and questionnaire data indicated that students consider writing the most challenging skill because they struggle with linguistic rules, including grammar and proper writing conventions. In addition, they face difficulties expressing ideas due to limited vocabulary, a lack of engaging learning strategies, and low motivation toward writing activities.

Based on the results of the learning evaluation, the researcher carried out reflection and improvement efforts by applying the PPP teaching method to enhance students' descriptive writing skills. The PPP teaching method functions as a bridge between new material and learners' prior knowledge (Lowe, 2020 :115), allowing students to apply and develop their ideas more critically and communicatively in English (Lane, 2024 :75). This study is expected to contribute to the field of applied linguistics by improving students' English writing abilities through the use of relevant instructional methods. In addition, it aims to expand existing research in language studies and support the development of creative and engaging teaching methods and techniques in general, as well as enhance the teaching and learning of writing in particular (Pelton & Robert P, 2010 :8).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study applies Classroom Action Research (CAR) to address real learning problems and improve students' performance (Afrizal, 2015). It was conducted at Politeknik Unggul LP3M Medan, chosen for its strong focus on English proficiency. The research took place in the second semester because the General English II curriculum includes academic writing instruction.

The sample of this study consisted of the AP2A/23 class, representing all second-semester students in the Tax Accounting Study Program for the 2024/2025 academic year across three classes. The AP2A/23 class was selected because initial observations indicated that it had the lowest average writing score—60.8—compared with AP2B/23 and AP2C/23, both of which had average scores of 70.

This study uses both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative approach analyzes numerical data derived from students' descriptive writing. Meanwhile, the qualitative approach gathers opinions, responses, and descriptive information to identify learning problems related to writing skills. Qualitative data were analyzed descriptively to produce systematic and comprehensive interpretations (Kumar, 2011 :137).

The research is supported by theories of language teaching and learning, writing, and English grammar. These theories help explain how students develop writing skills, understand writing principles, and apply grammatical rules—especially tenses (Kumar, 2011 :3).

The main data consist of students' descriptive compositions collected from the AP2A/23 class at Politeknik Unggul LP3M Medan. Data were gathered through observations, interviews, questionnaires, assignments, field notes, and documentation. Interviews were conducted during initial observation and at the end of the study, while questionnaires were distributed at the end of each cycle to identify learning challenges.

Students completed three writing assignments: pre-action, Cycle I, and Cycle II. These assignments provided the primary data for analysis, which was carried out using a descriptive qualitative method.

Writing was assessed using five criteria: organization, idea development, grammar, mechanics, and writing style (Knoch, 2009 :38). Scores were categorized according to Brown and Bailey's rubric—excellent, good, fair, poor, and very poor. Each student's total score was then compared with the institution's minimum mastery standard.

Table 1. Levels of Competence and Attainment of the Minimum Mastery Criterion

Score Range	Criteria Of Competence	The Minimum Mastery Criterion
90 – 100	Excellent	Exceeded
76 – 89	Good	Exceeded
75	Sufficient	Achieved
61 – 74	Insufficient	Not Achieved
40 – 60	Poor	Significantly Not Achieved

(source: Curriculum of Politeknik Unggul LP3M Medan on the Determination of Assessment and Achievement of the Minimum Mastery Criterion for the English Course)

After determining the students' scores based on the levels of competence and attainment of the Minimum Mastery Criterion, the next step is to measure the students' level of participation by using formulas cited from Tsagari, 2016 to calculate the class mean and the percentage of student responses from the questionnaire, as follows.

$$x = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

Description:

- x = students’ mean score
- N = number of students
- Σ = total number
- X = individual student’s score

Subsequently, the data are presented in tables and diagrams and then explained using a descriptive method in narrative form.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study was conducted in two cycles—Cycle I and Cycle II—over a period of two months. The stages of the research began with planning, implementation, observation, and reflection for each cycle (Abubakar, 2021). The method tested in this study was the PPP teaching method, aimed at improving the descriptive writing skills of 2nd semester students, class AP2A/23 at Politeknik Unggul LP3M.

Comparison of Students’ Average Scores in the Pre-Action Stage, Cycle I, and Cycle II

The following table presents a comparison of the students’ average scores obtained during the pre-action stage, Cycle I, and Cycle II.

Name Students	Pre-Action Act	Cycle Score		Remarks	Minimum Mastery Criterion
		I	II		
S01	55	80	84	Enhance	Exceeded
S02	60	78	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S03	64	80	88	Enhance	Exceeded
S04	56	68	73	Enhance	Not achieved
S05	64	78	83	Enhance	Exceeded
S06	57	85	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S07	46	66	73	Enhance	Not achieved
S08	76	88	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S09	79	87	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S10	62	80	86	Enhance	Exceeded
S11	46	73	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S12	65	83	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S13	61	75	85	Enhance	Exceeded
S14	55	80	84	Enhance	Exceeded
S15	60	78	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S16	64	80	88	Enhance	Exceeded
S17	56	68	75	Enhance	Achieved
S18	64	78	83	Enhance	Exceeded
S19	57	85	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S20	46	66	75	Enhance	Achieved
S21	75	88	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S22	78	89	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S23	62	80	86	Enhance	Exceeded
S24	46	73	82	Enhance	Exceeded
S25	65	80	90	Enhance	Exceeded
S26	61	75	85	Enhance	Exceeded
AVG	60,8	78,5	83,8	Enhance	Exceeded

Table 2. Comparison of Students’ Learning Outcomes in the Pre-Action Stage, Cycle I, and Cycle II.

The comparison of learning outcomes for Class AP2A/23, as shown in Table 2, illustrates the progression of students’ descriptive writing skills throughout the classroom action research. The class average improved with each cycle conducted.

Based on the total individual scores, the average score increased from 60.8 in the pre-action stage to 78.5 in Cycle I, and then to 83.8 in Cycle II. These results demonstrate that the PPP

teaching method effectively enhanced students' ability to write English descriptive texts. It is drawn in the following table 3.

Table 3. The Summary of Students' Learning Outcomes

Pre - Action		Cycle I		Cycle II		Criteria of Competence
0	0%	0	0%	6	23%	Excellent
3	12%	18	69%	16	62%	Good
1	4%	2	8%	2	8%	Sufficient
10	38%	6	23%	2	8%	Insufficient
12	46%	0	0%	0	0%	Poor

Table 3 summarizes students' learning outcomes across the Pre-Action, Cycle I, and Cycle II stages. The data indicate a clear upward trend in achievement following the instructional intervention. During Pre-Action, most students were categorized as *Insufficient* (38%) or *Poor* (46%), with only a small proportion reaching *Good* (12%) and none attaining *Excellent*. After the implementation in Cycle I, substantial improvement occurred, with 69% of students achieving *Good* and no students remaining in the *Poor* category. Further refinement in Cycle II produced additional gains, notably the emergence of the *Excellent* category (23%) and a continued increase in the *Good* category (62%). Meanwhile, the lower categories declined to minimal proportions. Overall, the results demonstrate that the intervention effectively enhanced students' competence, with marked improvement observed across cycles.

Students' Ability to Write Descriptive Compositions Before and After the Implementation of the PPP Method (Presentation, Practice, and Production)

Students' writing performance before and after the application of the PPP teaching method is outlined in three stages: (1) pre-action stage, (2) Cycle I, and (3) Cycle II. The study also examines the factors that influenced their learning outcomes.

Pre-Action Stage

The pre-action stage was carried out on 21st March 2025 and 28th March 2025. English lessons for Class AP2A/23 were held every Friday from 08:00 to 09:40 a.m. During the teaching and learning process, the researcher acted as an observer. In this meeting, the researcher provided a general explanation of descriptive texts writing and presented an example composition titled "My First Gadget." The first meeting served to reinforce and provide basic training on writing descriptive compositions (Linarti et al., 2015). Students were assigned to write a composition based on the theme "Gadget." The researcher continuously monitored and recorded students' activities throughout the learning process.

At the end of the lesson, the researcher assessed the students' descriptive compositions using five criteria: (1) organization—title, introduction, body, and conclusion; (2) idea development; (3) grammatical accuracy; (4) spelling and writing mechanics; and (5) writing style and overall quality. The evaluation revealed several types of errors.

In terms of organization, many students lacked sufficient descriptive detail, resulting in poorly connected and difficult-to-follow sentences. Some students did not include a title, which made their ideas less focused and inconsistent with the intended topic. In addition, limited understanding of the generic structure of descriptive texts led to unclear distinctions between the identification and description sections.

According to Atlee, 2005 in *Advancing Writing Skills*, a good paragraph should include a topic sentence followed by supporting sentences. In the identification section, most students wrote only a single general sentence without further development. In the description section, they did not elaborate on specific characteristics of the subject. As a result, their compositions lacked proper coordination and coherence.

In terms of idea development, students depended too heavily on the example provided by the lecturer. Their ideas were not well-developed, leading to repetitive and monotonous writing. Their descriptions were limited to what they already knew, and they were not yet able to present detailed information effectively.

In the aspect of grammatical structure, five types of errors were identified:

- (1) incorrect use of the copula *be*,
- (2) incorrect use of pronouns,
- (3) incorrect use of adjectives,
- (4) incorrect use of articles, and
- (5) incorrect use of verbs.

Table 4. Grammatical Structure Errors in Pre-Action Stage

KINDS OF ERRORS	STUDENTS' COMPOSITION	CORRECTION
Errors in using pronoun	It is smooth metallic surface fit perfectly in my hand	Its smooth metallic surface fit perfectly in my hand
Errors in using article	<i>Even though modern devices are far more advanced, MP3 player remains special to me</i>	<i>Even though modern devices are far more advanced, the MP3 player remains special to me</i>
	<i>Simple earphones that came with it delivered a warm</i>	<i>The simple earphones that came with it delivered a warm</i>
Errors in using copula "be"	<i>My first gadget a small silver MP3 player that I receives when I am twelve</i>	<i>"My first gadget was a small silver MP3 player that I received when I was twelve."</i>
	<i>creating playlists that is matched every mood</i>	<i>creating playlists that matched every mood</i>
	<i>because it the first gadget that gave me a sense of independence</i>	<i>because it was the first gadget that gave me a sense of independence</i>
Errors in using verb	<i>I spend hours carefully choosing my favourite tracks</i>	<i>I spent hours carefully choosing my favourite tracks</i>
	<i>I like listen music anywhere I went</i>	<i>I liked to listen to music anywhere I went</i>
Errors in using adjective	<i>My first gadget was a silver small.</i>	<i>My first gadget was a small silver.</i>

In Table 4, which presents the grammatical structure aspect, it is evident that the errors made by the students include mistakes in the use of the copular verb *be*, as illustrated in the sentence "My first gadget a small silver MP3 player that I receives when I am twelve." In this example, the student omitted the required *to be* verb. The sentence is a nominal sentence that does not contain a main verb; therefore, a form of *to be* is needed to fulfil the verb function (Chahal, 2024 :36). The correct form of the sentence should be "My first gadget was a small silver MP3 player that I received when I was twelve." Another incorrect use of the copula "be" appears in the sentence "I spend hours carefully choosing my favourite tracks, creating playlists that is matched every mood," which should be "I spent hours carefully choosing my favourite tracks, creating playlists that matched every mood." The error occurs because the verb phrase already contains a main verb (*matched*), and thus the addition of *to be* is unnecessary.

Furthermore, errors were found in the use of possessive pronouns. A noun followed by a possessive pronoun indicates that the noun already has an owner (Ifadah, 2024 :11). An example of this mistake appears in the sentence "It smooth metallic surface fits perfectly in my hand," which should be written as "Its smooth metallic surface fit perfectly in my hand."

Students also made errors in the use of adjectives. One such error is found in the sentence "My first gadget was a silver small". The function of an adjective is to modify a noun; therefore, the sentence should be written as "My first gadget was a small silver." Additionally, errors were found in the use of the definite article *the*, which students have not yet fully understood. The definite article "the" is used to refer to something specific. An example of such an error is seen in "Even though modern devices are far more advanced, MP3 player remains special to me," which should be "Even though modern devices are far more advanced, the MP3 player remains special to me."

Another type of grammatical error involves the construction of verbal sentences. A verbal sentence is one that contains an action verb. One action verb construction that students often overlook is the use of the "to infinitive". The "to infinitive" consists of the base form of the verb

preceded by *to*, following the pattern S + Verb + *to* + Verb. An example of this error appears in the sentence “*I like listen music anywhere I went,*” which should be written as “*I liked to listen to music anywhere I went.*” The verb *play* must be preceded by *to* because it follows the verb *like*.

In terms of spelling and writing mechanics, several students showed limited mastery of correct English spelling, leading to frequent misspellings and mechanical errors. Their compositions contained two main types of mistakes, as shown in Table 5 on Spelling and Writing Mechanics Errors (Pre-Action Stage).

KINDS of ERRORS	STUDENTS' COMPOSITION	CORRECTION
Errors in spelling	<i>My first gadged was Realme</i>	<i>My first gadget was Realme</i>
	<i>I received when I was tweleve</i>	<i>I received when I was twelve</i>
	<i>Eventhough moderen devices are far more advanced,</i>	<i>Even though modern devices are far more advanced,</i>
Errors in punctuation	<i>Although , it could only store a few dozen songs, I spent</i>	<i>Although it could only store a few dozen songs, I spent</i>
	<i>As construction continues the city's developing infrastructure...</i>	<i>As construction continues, the city's developing infrastructure...</i>
	<i>Its smooth metallic surface fit perfectly in my hand and the tiny screen glowed softly</i>	<i>Its smooth metallic surface fit perfectly in my hand, and the tiny screen glowed softly</i>

Table 5. Spelling & Writing Mechanics Errors in Pre – Action Stage

Students made several spelling and writing mechanics errors, such as incorrect use of periods and commas, with many failing to place periods at the end of sentences. Numerous spelling mistakes also disrupted the intended meaning. Their paragraph formatting was often inconsistent, lacking proper left–right alignment and indentation, which made the writing appear disorganized. Additionally, many students began sentences with lowercase letters instead of capital letters.

In terms of style and writing quality, students continued to use inappropriate vocabulary. Their sentences were often overly long and unfocused, lacking a clear main idea. Although their language use was generally acceptable, some sentences were still not logically connected. Diction errors were also common, with students choosing foreign or unsuitable words that did not match the intended meaning—for example: “Although it could be only a little dozen songs of store, I spent hour carefully to choosing my favourite tracks, to creating playlists that is matched every mood.” These issues show the need for improved vocabulary selection and more accurate language use to ensure clarity and prevent misinterpretation. It should be “Although it could only store a few dozen songs, I spent hours carefully choosing my favourite tracks, creating playlists that matched every mood.”

Cycle I

Based on the observations and analysis of students’ learning outcomes in the pre-action stage, Cycle I was planned by revising the lesson plan and incorporating the PPP teaching method to enhance students’ descriptive writing skills. Cycle I took place from 4th to 11th April 2025.

During Cycle I, the lecturer delivered detailed instruction on descriptive texts, covering their definition, purpose, structure, and linguistic features. The PPP method was applied using picture and video media to support students in composing descriptive texts. This approach proved effective, as shown by the improved student scores in Cycle I.

Students’ writing improved in several areas, including organization, idea development, grammar, writing mechanics, and overall writing quality.

In terms of organization—title, introduction, body, and conclusion—students were able to arrange the components of a descriptive text correctly. They began with an identification of the object through a general description to engage the reader, followed by a detailed description that allowed readers to clearly understand the object. In the conclusion, students provided relevant comments about the object described.

Regarding idea development, most students successfully explored and expressed their ideas in writing. Each composition included a clear title aligned with the theme, an introductory paragraph that supported the title, and well-developed supporting sentences that clarified the main ideas.

In the area of grammar, some errors remained, especially in the use of the copular verb *be*, adjective placement, and article usage. These errors are outlined in the following table 6.

Table 6. Grammatical Structure Errors in Cycle I

KINDS of ERRORS	STUDENTS' COMPOSITION	CORRECTION
Errors in the use of article	<i>Clean, fresh air and quiet environment contrast sharply</i>	<i>The clean, fresh air and quiet environment contrast sharply</i>
	<i>...with busy atmosphere of major metropolitan areas</i>	<i>with the busy atmosphere of major metropolitan areas</i>
Errors in the use of copula "be"	<i>IKN futuristic architecture with natural scenery</i>	<i>IKN is a futuristic architecture with natural scenery</i>
	<i>Even in it is growing stage,</i>	<i>Even in its growing stage,</i>
Errors in the use of adjective	<i>...featuring boulevard wide, buildings eco-friendly, and careful preserved forest areas</i>	<i>...featuring wide boulevards, eco-friendly buildings, and carefully preserved forest areas</i>
	<i>IKN, Indonesia's new city capital, stand..</i>	<i>IKN, Indonesia's new capital city, stands...</i>

Based on Table 6 above, it is evident that the students still experienced considerable difficulties in using the copular verb *be*, adjectives, and articles. This can be seen in the sentence "IKN futuristic architecture with natural scenery". The sentence lacks the verb *to be*, which is required in nominal sentences. When a sentence does not contain a main verb, *to be* must be used as its replacement. Thus, the sentence should be written as "IKN is a futuristic architecture with natural scenery."

Furthermore, errors in adjective placement were identified in sentences such as "...featuring boulevard wide, buildings eco-friendly, and careful preserved forest areas." In English, adjectives precede the nouns they modify; therefore, the correct sentence is "...featuring wide boulevards, eco-friendly buildings, and carefully preserved forest areas." In addition, errors related to article usage were still insufficiently understood by the students. The most problematic article was *the*. This can be observed in the sentence "*Clean, fresh air and quiet environment contrast sharply with busy atmosphere of major metropolitan areas.*" Articles are placed before nouns when the noun refers to something specific (Chahal, 2024 :85). The word "*clean*" in that sentence functions as a specific or notable feature being described. Consequently, the sentence should be written as "*The clean, fresh air and quiet environment contrast sharply with the busy atmosphere of major metropolitan areas.*"

In terms of spelling and writing mechanics, students showed a solid understanding of proper writing conventions. They formatted their work neatly, with correctly aligned margins and appropriate paragraph indentation. Only a few spelling errors appeared, indicating that most students wrote with care. Punctuation was generally used correctly and supported the intended meaning of each sentence. However, a small number of students still made spelling mistakes that affected the clarity of their ideas or messages.

Regarding writing style and overall quality, most students were able to choose vocabulary that suited both the sentences and the assigned topic. Their language use was clear, concise, and

easy to understand. They demonstrated the ability to construct sentences with accurate and appropriate word choices, which made their writing more accessible and understandable for readers.

Cycle II

Cycle II was conducted on 2nd May 2025 and 9th May 2025. In Cycle II, the lecturer provided enrichment activities for the students. Enrichment activities were intended to broaden students' knowledge so that their understanding would become more varied and comprehensive. The learning process in Cycle II was designed based on the syllabus and lesson plan, which were similar to those used in Cycle I. However, in Cycle II, the syllabus and lesson plan placed greater emphasis on the use of vocabulary and grammatical structures.

In Cycle II, the students were instructed to write a descriptive text with the theme “*Who Would You Like To Be If You Could Anybody in The World*”, using photos and videos presented through slides by the lecturer as references. In this cycle, the students' ability to write descriptive texts improved significantly. This improvement is supported by the increased scores achieved by the students in Cycle II, which were higher than those obtained during the pre-cycle stage and Cycle I. The students' writing exhibited notable progress in terms of organizational structure, idea development, grammar, writing mechanics, style, and overall writing quality. These improvements can be described as follows.

In terms of organizational structure—which includes the identification of the object, the content of the description, and the conclusion—these elements were clearly apparent in the students' compositions. The students were able to organize their writing according to the appropriate stages of descriptive text structure. They successfully provided more detailed information based on their experiences and ideas. Each paragraph was written with a clear main idea that was adequately developed with supporting details.

Regarding idea development, the students were able to explore and articulate their ideas effectively in written form. The learning process, which began with the *presentation* stage and was combined with the topic of favourite artists, allowed students to generate content that reflected their authentic thoughts. They were able to write clear topic sentences for each paragraph and elaborate them with supporting sentences that clarified the main ideas, thus enhancing the comprehensibility of their writing.

Furthermore, from the grammatical structure aspect, some errors were still found in students' descriptive writing, as shown in the following table 7.

KINDS OF ERRORS	STUDENTS' COMPOSITION	CORRECTION
Errors in the use of Copula "be"	I want to be meet Elon Musk because he a remarkable innovator	I want to meet Elon Musk because he is a remarkable innovator
	Whether he to standing beside a towering SpaceX rocket	Whether he is standing beside a towering SpaceX rocket
	I am imagine the atmosphere around him	I imagine the atmosphere around him
Errors in the use of pronoun	... whose ideas are have transformed the way people to think about technology and the	... whose ideas have transformed the way people think about technology and the future.
	Meeting he would feel like step into the center of modern innovation	Meeting him would feel like stepping into the center of modern innovation
	... and teams working passionately under him leadership.	... and teams working passionately under his leadership.

Table 7. Grammatical Errors in Cycle II

Based on the table of grammatical errors, students were still making several mistakes in their descriptive writing, especially in the use of the copular verb *be* and personal pronouns. Many students had difficulty distinguishing between the singular and plural forms of *be*, and

their use of personal pronouns was often inconsistent, resulting in noticeable errors. Even so, the overall assessment of grammatical structure showed improvement, as students were able to reduce the number of errors compared to the previous cycle.

In terms of spelling and writing mechanics, students in Cycle II demonstrated stronger mastery of writing conventions. The number of spelling and mechanical errors decreased significantly, and their results generally fell into the “good” category. This shows that only a small number of students still made spelling mistakes that affected meaning or clarity. Students also showed better vocabulary choices in their writing.

Regarding writing style, most students produced more organized and coherent compositions. Their language use was appropriate for the topic, as seen in their accurate and relevant word choices, which made their writing clearer for readers. For instance, students used vocabulary related to music—such as *sound character*, *released*, and *pitch control*. Their sentences were concise and conveyed meaning directly without unnecessary explanation.

Based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of students’ average scores, it can be concluded that the PPP teaching method effectively improved students’ descriptive writing skills. This is shown by the consistent increase in average scores across cycles and the reduction of errors from the pre-action stage to Cycle I and Cycle II.

Factors Influencing Students’ Learning Outcomes in Writing Descriptive Texts through the PPP Teaching Method

Based on the findings presented above, the implementation of the PPP learning and teaching method contributed significantly to improving students’ learning outcomes and motivation. Before the PPP method was applied, students’ writing skills and comprehension were still low. Initial observations showed frequent errors in descriptive writing, including grammatical mistakes and problems with writing mechanics. Students also struggled to generate and develop ideas, resulting in simple and limited compositions.

After receiving instruction through the PPP teaching method, students’ understanding and ability to write descriptive texts improved considerably. Several factors contributed to this improvement, based on interview and questionnaire results:

1. The PPP method allowed students greater freedom to think and express their ideas in writing. Visual media such as pictures and videos helped stimulate ideas more easily.
2. Previously, students often had difficulty forming ideas due to a lack of stimulus and feedback. Through the PPP method, especially during the presentation stage, pictures and videos helped them develop main ideas and supporting details.
3. The PPP method encouraged independent thinking. The practice stage, in particular, gave students opportunities to freely explore and develop their imagination, ideas, and thoughts.
4. Continuous motivation and guidance from the lecturer helped students participate more actively in writing. Support provided during challenges—such as creating titles, generating ideas, or forming grammatical sentences—strengthened their critical thinking in producing descriptive texts.
5. Repetition of materials and enrichment activities strengthened students’ understanding of descriptive writing. Regular review, especially of grammatical structures, helped reinforce sentence patterns used in descriptive texts.
6. Reinforcement through repeated material, writing exercises, and verbal praise elicited positive responses and supported improvements in students’ writing performance.
7. Throughout each stage of the PPP method, students showed increased interest and engagement compared to before. Their motivation grew as the lecturer continued providing encouragement during the writing process.

These seven factors were reflected in the stronger compositions produced after the implementation of the PPP teaching method. Overall, the method effectively guided students in applying appropriate text structure and grammatical features in their descriptive writing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Before the PPP method was applied, only 4 out of 26 students (16%) achieved the minimum mastery criterion (MMC) of 75. 10 out of 26 students (38%) were categorized as “insufficient,” while 46% were classified as “poor.” Results from the preliminary test showed that students’ descriptive compositions contained many errors, especially in organization, idea development, grammar, and writing mechanics. The most significant issue identified was the high number of grammatical mistakes.
2. Students’ ability to write descriptive texts after the implementation of the PPP method improved across two cycles:
 - a) In Cycle I, the PPP method led to noticeable progress. 18 of 26 students (69%) achieved the “good” category, 2 out of 26 students (4%) achieved the “sufficient” category, and 23% remained “insufficient” or below the MMC. Improvements were seen in organizational structure—including the introduction, body, and conclusion—as well as idea development, in which students were better able to elaborate on main ideas. However, students still struggled with grammatical accuracy and writing mechanics.
 - b) In Cycle II, student performance continued to improve, with 23% reaching the “Excellent” category, 62% reaching the “Good” category, 8% reaching the “sufficient” category, and 8% still in the “insufficient” category or below the MMC.

Several factors supported the improvement of students’ writing performance when using the PPP method. Visual media such as images and videos served as effective stimuli, helping students generate and develop ideas more easily for descriptive writing. Additional instructional materials also strengthened students’ ability to apply the PPP method in composing texts. Repetition of material and enrichment activities provided reinforcement that enhanced learning outcomes. Furthermore, the lecturer’s ongoing motivation and guidance increased students’ enthusiasm and engagement throughout the writing process.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, R. (2021). *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian*. Suka Press UIN Sunan Kalijaga. [https://digilib.uin-suka.ac.id/id/eprint/42716/1/PENGANTAR METODOLOGI PENELITIAN.pdf](https://digilib.uin-suka.ac.id/id/eprint/42716/1/PENGANTAR_METODOLOGI_PENELITIAN.pdf)
- Afrizal, M. (2015). A CLASSROOM ACTION RESEARCH: IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILLS THROUGH INFORMATION GAP ACTIVITIES. *English Education Journal*, 6(3), 342–355. <https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/2578>
- Atlee, N. (2005). *Advancing Writing Skills - Google Books*. Prufrock Press Inc. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Advancing_Writing_Skills/rvwxzIggJ7wC?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=writing+skills&pg=PA5&printsec=frontcover
- Chahal, R. S. (2024). *15 Secrets to Mastering English Grammar in 30 Minutes a Day - Google Books*. Inkwell Press. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/15_Secrets_to_Mastering_English_Grammar/oB0tEQAAQBAJ?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=mastery+english+grammar&pg=PT6&printsec=frontcover

- Ifadah, N. E. at. all. (2024). *English Grammar Basic To Advance : Teori & Implementasi - Google Books*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/English_Grammar_Basic_To_Advance_Teori_I/72QfEQAAQBAJ?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=betty+schramper+azar&pg=PA178&printsec=frontcover
- Knoch, U. (2009). *Diagnostic Writing Assessment - Google Books*. Peter Lang. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Diagnostic_Writing_Assessment/kZc-1hFVNZsC?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=writing+assessment&pg=PA17&printsec=frontcover
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology - Google Books*. Sage Publication Ltd. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Research_Methodology/a3PwLukoFIMC?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=Research+methodology&pg=PA18&printsec=frontcover
- Lane, S. D. (2024). *Communication in a Civil Society - Google Books* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Communication_in_a_Civil_Society/TeV3EAAAQBAJ?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=verbal+communication+BEHAVIOR&pg=PT80&printsec=frontcover
- Linarti, H., Wijaya, B., & Suhartono, L. (2015). TEACHING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING THROUGH PHOTOGRAPH AS A MEDIA AND GUIDED QUESTION AS A TECHNIQUE. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa (JPPK)*, 4(6). <https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jpdpb/article/view/10333>
- Lowe, R. J. (2020). *Uncovering Ideology in English Language Teaching - Google Books*. Springer. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Uncovering_Ideology_in_English_Language/IizvDwAAQBAJ?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=ppp+teaching+method&pg=PA116&printsec=frontcover
- Pelton, & Robert P. (2010). Action Research for Teacher Candidates Using Classroom Data to Enhance Instruction. In *Rowman & Little Field Education*. <http://www.rowmaneducation.com>
- Tsagari, D. & J. B. (2016). *Handbook of Second Language Assessment - Google Books* (D. & J. B. Tsagari (ed.)). de Gruyter Inc. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Handbook_of_Second_Language_Assessment/3kO7CwAAQBAJ?hl=ban&gbpv=1&dq=assessing+writing&pg=PA161&printsec=frontcover