

INDIVIDUAL VARIATIONS IN MONITOR HYPOTHESIS OF MICRO TEACHING STUDENTS

Gregoriana Nobilio Pasia Janu

Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta

correspondence: janumargaretha@yahoo.com

<https://doi.org/10.24071/uc.v1i2.2958>

received 4 October 2020; accepted 7 November 2020

Abstract

The paper aims to find out the types of users in performing English as a second language and to figure out principal conditions that might affect students' monitoring process as proposed by Krashen (1982). Two research problems were formulated, namely: First, what individual variations are shown by students in the Micro Teaching class? Second, to what extent do Micro teaching students regard the three principal conditions in the monitor hypothesis? Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. The qualitative method of data collection was participant observation. Nineteen students' Micro Teaching videos were recorded to be observed to answer the first research problem. The quantitative method was applied through a questionnaire to answer the second research problem. An interview was also done to support the analysis of the questionnaire. The results showed that only two types of monitor users occurred in Micro Teaching Class A. The two types were monitor under-users, who were not aware of the conscious checking, and monitor over-users, who seemed to consciously check their L2 output.

Keywords: individual variations, principal conditions, micro teaching class

Introduction

Since English is not a native language of Indonesia, people perform differently. This may be caused by the way people develop English as their second language. Krashen (1981) states that people use the subconscious (acquisition process) and conscious learning (learning process) to deal with a second language and groups these two into what is called "Monitor Theory". In Indonesia itself, English is developed as a second language, mostly through educational platforms meaning the learned system is used. This shows that conscious learning plays a role in a learner's performance. Krashen (1988) argues that language learning is not only described as a conscious process but also as an explicit process of knowing about the language (as cited in Zafar, 2009). Since the acquired system is an implicit process, the learned system cannot become an acquired system.

Speaking is one skill that can effectively show how well a learner performs his second language learning. It gives English learners other benefits not only as a learner but also as a good teacher (Lelita, 2016). Some people may speak fluently and some may not. It depends on how their awareness works while performing.

Ellis (2008) argues “Speaking is the result of an acquisition, not its cause” (p. 247).

Nevertheless, in second language learning, it can be considered that speaking becomes the result of the learning. In a study about learning strategy in speaking class, Lelita (2016) finds out that 95% of the students consider there is a speaking improvement after undergoing some learning activities. Krashen obtains the term “learning” to be referred to conscious knowledge of the L2, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them (as cited in Gass, 2001).

Considering that English is studied as a foreign language and rarely used in the educational system in Indonesia, the researcher was encouraged to conduct a second language learning study in Micro Teaching class which focuses on monitor hypotheses to see how conscious learning is performed by English teacher candidates. Baskara (2015) points out that “A teacher’s professional research goal is to continue to find ways to help students improve their second language acquisition skills.” Therefore, Micro Teaching students have to consider the importance of having well-prepared skills as has been stated by Andrews (2003) who comments that Micro Teaching students must consider the ‘qualifications’ (subject-matter-knowledge and language proficiency) of being an English teacher (p. 82). Considering this fact, the pre-service teachers’ spoken English, both classroom language and language they use to explain the materials, will be the focus as it shows individual differences in using English.

Asril (2013) states that teacher candidates are those who are prepared by the Education Faculty to be future teachers (p. 44). English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) as a part of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education in Sanata Dharma University provides the teacher trainers a course called Micro Teaching to prepare professional future teachers who master English, develop their sense of teaching, and facilitate their needs. Iswandari (2017) explains that “Micro Teaching is specifically aimed to facilitate students to implement some theories of teaching in the previous semesters into practice in the small scope of class-based practicum before they have their teaching practice in real school contexts”. As pre-service teachers, Micro Teaching students are trained to develop their English mastery to perform better. They need to learn how to construct good and correct English sentences both in spoken and written form (Iswandari, 2017). Since this study emphasizes students' spoken language, their speaking will be the focus.

In this study, the researcher has two research questions that are in the same discipline of study which is linguistics that is focusing on Second Language Acquisition. Kalebic (2005) on the research of the development of foreign language teacher preparation finds fourteen competencies that are needed by language teachers. One of them is mastering linguistics competence (as cited in Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009).

In detail, the two research problems are raised to know the differences of individual variations together with the principal conditions in Krashen’s monitor hypothesis. Krashen’s study on monitor hypothesis shows that individuals perform their L2 learning differently and it may be caused and influenced by some factors. Considering the important role of teachers in L2 learning in Indonesia, it is crucial to know how well they make use of their learned system (monitoring process) to support their L2 performances in the classroom. Two

research problems were formulated in this study, namely: First, what individual variations are shown by students in the Micro Teaching class? Second, to what extent do Micro teaching students regard the three principal conditions in the monitor hypothesis?

Acquisition-Learning Distinction

Second language acquisition is a study of how an individual is capable to use different languages from one's first language. In second language acquisition, there are five main hypotheses. Those are input, acquisition-learning, natural order, monitor, and affective filter hypotheses. Among those hypotheses, Krashen (1982) mentions that the most fundamental hypothesis is acquisition and learning. These processes are also known as independent systems in which the performers independently get the second language whether through an "acquired system" or "learned system".

Both acquired and learned systems serve different functions. The acquired system is mostly done by subconscious knowledge used by the performers (Krashen, 1982, p.10). This is quite the same as how children develop their second language. The acquired system aims to make sure that the performers can communicate well using the SL. The acquisition process comes as a result of natural communication where it points out the meaning as the main focus (Ellis 1985, p. 261). The result of this process is also subconscious.

The learned system, on the other hand, is said to be done consciously where the performers are aware of what they are learning. According to Krashen (2013), not only do we try to learn but also we know we are learning (p.1). Kounin and Krashen (1978) explain that L2 learners get their explicit knowledge about the rules of the language through their conscious learning (p. 206). Nevertheless, McDonald and Kasula (2005) conclude that by having conscious learning in which the rules are considered as the most important thing, a speaker tends to disrupt their L2 fluency.

Moreover, both acquired and learned systems serve their function. "During a performance in a second language, what is acquired and what is learned are used in very specific ways: acquisition to initiate utterances in L2; and learning to edit or monitor before or after the utterance so the speaker self-corrects" (McDonald & Kasula, 2005).

Monitor Hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition

Krashen (1982) formulates five hypotheses concerning Second Language Acquisition which are Input, Acquisition/Learning, Monitor, Natural Order, and Affective Filter Hypothesis. This research is concerning on Monitor hypotheses. Monitor Hypothesis emphasizes learned knowledge since it provides a conscious check on what the speaker is saying. Krashen (1981) argues that the performers perform conscious learning only as a 'monitor'. Different from the acquired system in which the subconscious process is working, the learned system gains knowledge about a particular language through a conscious understanding of the rules of the language (Cook, 1993). "Monitoring process uses learned knowledge as a quality check on speech originating from acquired language" (p. 52). In other words, the monitor can work before or after we produce the L2 (self-correction). Krashen (1982) draws a diagram to show the relationship:

According to this hypothesis, as it has been emphasized by Krashen (1983), the monitoring process relates to the acquired system.

When we produce utterance in a second language, the utterance is “initiated” by the acquired system and our conscious learning only comes into play later. We can thus use the Monitor to make changes in our utterances only after the utterance has been generated by the acquired system (p. 30).

He adds that the monitoring process may come after the utterance has been produced and it is called self-repair. It is not responsible for fluency; checking the output of the acquired system (p. 30).

Individual Variations

In the monitor hypothesis, the Cook (1993) states that learners’ personality which varies into three, takes place in the monitoring process; learning acts as a ‘monitor’. Furthermore, Masciantonio (1988) enlightens the three types of L2 learners to ease them to be known.

...there are monitor over-users who are constantly checking their output with their knowledge of grammar rules and forms, monitor under-users who are uninfluenced by error correction, and optimal monitor users use their learned competence to supplement their acquired competence (p. 54)

Monitor Over-Users

According to Krashen (1981), monitor over-users are likely to use their conscious grammar all the time when they use the second language. Furthermore, he explains over-users typically have hesitations and usually correct themselves in the middle of the utterance. Krashen (2014) considers the over- users to be introverts and perfectionists. They tend to be overcareful and over-concern with the correctness of the rules in their speaking.

Krashen (1983, p. 44) points out that there may be two things that cause the overuse of the monitor. “Over-use may derive from learning without acquisition which means a performer who has only had formal exposure to a second language in grammar-based classes may have very little acquisition to rely on”. The second cause is related to the performer’s personality. Over-users are those who have acquired some grammatical rules but have no faith in their acquired competence. This kind of performers is said to speak very little because the user tries to remember and/or apply the rules before speaking. Below is the example of the way over-users perform in speaking.

“Everyone has aaaahh I mean has aaaa right to ummm choose what they wants, sorry, what e what they want to do.”

Over-users usually speak hesitantly and it is shown by the pause fillers and self- corrections they use. In the example we have aaaahh and ummm and some grammatical errors are fixed in the middle of the speaking.

Monitor Under-Users

Krashen (1981) states that the monitor under-user does not seem to rely on conscious grammar or does not seem to use a monitor at all even when conditions encourage it. This is a condition in which the performers depend only on the acquired system. He adds, “The under-user typically judges grammatically “by feel”, that is, he uses his subconsciously acquired system, rather than a conscious grammar” (p.16). Under-users depend only on the way it sounds. Such performers do not do self-correction and they just use their feeling to be correct. Krashen categorizes those performers as extroverts. The example below shows how this kind of performer speaks using English as their second language.

“I go to the hospital yesterday and seeing my old friends. She look gorgeous as I cannot recognize her.”

Monitor under-users are rarely or even never being aware of the grammar or rules of the language they speak.

Optimal Monitor User

Optimal monitor users are said to use ‘monitor’ appropriately. Krashen (1981) emphasizes that “Successful monitor users edit their second language output when it does not interfere with communication.” It is also supported by Masciantonio (1988) who confirms that such a performer uses their learned competence to supplement the acquired competence. McLaughlin (1978) adds “A successful monitor user is one who is capable, given enough time, of correcting errors in spoken language with great accuracy.” Somehow in a normal conversation where communication becomes the focus and the time is not enough, these performers will not excessively focus on the grammar rules to perform (Krashen, 1983, p. 45). After all, optimal monitor users are likely to self-correct when mistakes occur in their second language speech and speak without any hesitation. Below is the example of an optimal monitor user.

“Making a good plan give, gives a good impact on the process of what we are going to do.”

It is seen from the example that the correction comes directly and the performer does not seem to have any hesitation while speaking.

Principal Conditions

Krashen (1982) suggests that the monitoring process can be used by the performers only when three conditions occur. These conditions are necessary but somehow a performer might not fully use his conscious grammar even when these three conditions are met. Those conditions are as follows:

Time

Performers need to have sufficient time to think about and use the grammar rules consciously and effectively. Krashen (1982) notes that when people have a normal conversation, they will not pay much attention to time; to think and use

the grammar rules. This happens mostly in a society of non-native speakers. When time precludes the monitoring process, errors may occur in L2 learners' performances (McLaughlin, 1978, p. 135). For most second language learners, time gives them chances to think; what, and how to say something, without feeling like being out of time.

Focus on form

Dulay & Burt (1978) says that every performer must also be focused on the form to make sure the correctness (as cited in Krashen, 1982). Gass (2001, p. 200) adds "A learner must be paying attention to how we are saying something, not just to what we are saying." For some performers, it is very difficult to deal with what and how we are saying at the same time. Krashen (1982, p. 16) additionally explains that "The over-use of form in conversation can lead to trouble, i.e. a hesitant style of talking and inattention to what the conversational partner is saying."

Know the rule

To apply a rule, one has to know well what it is. A second language learner is expected to know the grammar of the language learned. Gass (2001) states that one should have an appropriate learned system to apply the competence of the rules. It is supported by Krashen (1981) who argues that this is a very formidable requirement in which the performers need to have a correct mental representation of the rule to apply it correctly. By knowing the rule of the L2, someone can keep the talk accurately and more able to communicate naturally.

This study is conducted based on some theories to support the researcher in answering the two research problems namely 1) Which individual variations are shown by students in Micro Teaching class? and 2) To what extent do Micro teaching students regard the three principal conditions in monitor hypothesis?

Among all the theories that have been reviewed, the researcher takes the theory of monitor hypothesis proposed by Krashen (1982) to answer the two research questions proposed in this research. Krashen's individual variations classification was taken to answer the first research question, and his three types of principal conditions to answer the second problem. Krashen's theory is selected since his study gives a large impact on all areas of second language research and teaching.

Method

This research is conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The first research problem was answered qualitatively and the second research problem was done quantitatively.

Qualitative research is an approach that enables researchers to examine people's experience in detail by using non-numerical data such as in-depth interviews, focus group discussion, observation, content analysis, visual method, and life histories or biographies (Hennink & Bailey, 2011). Furthermore, Merriam (1988) points out that "Qualitative research focuses more on the process that occurs as well as the product or outcome" (as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 199). Because of that, the researcher did qualitative research to understand a particular

context, in this case about how the learned system is shown through the speaking performance to identify the individual variation of each participant.

There were three types of instruments used by the researcher in answering the first research problem. Those are video observation sheets, questionnaires, and interviews. The observation was done to 19 Micro Teaching students' teaching performances. In this study, the researcher gathered the observational notes by conducting the observation as a complete observer. Creswell (2003, p. 186) mentions one of the advantages of using observation is the researcher can record the information needed as it is revealed.

Document analysis was applied since Bowen (2009) indicates that it is a document that is going to be interpreted by the researcher based on the issue discussed. In this research, the public record was used to support the result of the observation in which some utterances of the participants were noted.

The quantitative method is also used to strengthen the hypothesis of this research which is each of the participants performs different kinds of individual variations during their performances. "Quantitative method typically begins with data collection based on a hypothesis or theory and it is followed with the application and descriptive or inferential statistics" (Leedy, 1993). The second research problem dealt with the questionnaire. The questionnaire itself was designed by reviewing some related theories that emphasize the principal conditions in second language learning. The questionnaire was used to determine students' awareness of the principal conditions in the monitoring process.

The questionnaire is an effective and efficient data collection to gain more information about aspects discussed (Hopkins, 2008). The researcher presented the questionnaire in a form of a Likert scale which consisted of six statements on a scale of 1 - 4.

The setting of this research was in the Micro Teaching laboratory. It took 4 weeks to observe Micro Teaching students class A batch 2015. The data was collected from 25 minutes of teaching practice for each student in the Micro Teaching laboratory of Sanata Dharma University.

The participants of this research were 18 sixth semester students in Micro Teaching class A batch 2015. There were 17 female and 2 male students and they use English in the classroom. The students' 25 minutes of teaching practice was chosen to make sure that the participants have enough time to speak.

As a step to gather the data, the researcher did an observation to see into what kind of individual variation a participant is included. Some characteristics taken from the theory of the three principal conditions were used as the points to be observed. While observing, the participants' utterances that indicated the characteristics of a particular type of users were transcribed. The video recordings of 25-minute teaching practice were taken, as the transcription, along with the questionnaire and interview to be the rough data. The videos had already been taken by the Sanata Dharma laboratory's staff. To ease the data gathering process, the researcher used table 3.2 as the observation sheet to answer the first research problem. To make sure that the observation was reliable, the researcher made the blueprint of the observation that contains the characteristics of the three types of individual variations. Please refer to appendix 1 for the blueprint. The aspects observed were further developed in the observation sheet to ease the researcher to figure out the characteristics shown by each participant.

To answer the second research problem about principal conditions that affect 19 micro teaching students' monitoring performances, questionnaires and interviews were used to gather the data. Therefore, they were asked to answer the questions.

According to Griffie (2012), a questionnaire can be seen as a form of data collection consisted of several questions related to the topic discussed in research (p. 136). The researcher was able to gather the data from a small number of participants by using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was presented using closed-ended questions and the Likert scale was used as the option for the participants to choose. Numbers started from 1 to 4, were used to measure the degree of agreements since Lodico et al. (2006, p. 107) argue that it makes the participants choose one of the agreement scales that presented their response the most. In this case, the agreements consisted of "strongly disagree (1)", "disagree (2)", "agree (3)", and "strongly agree (4)".

To strengthen the results and as a follow up to the questionnaire, an interview was conducted. In-person interviews were applied since it was done face-to-face between the researcher and the interviewee as has been mentioned by Johnson and Christensen (2012, p. 198). The researcher employed an interview to clarify some underlying statements in the questionnaire that were considered as crucial statements to be asked further. Six students were taken to be interviewed. They were asked since the researcher observed their teaching performances through the videos and considered that they were indicated to be in a particular group of individual variations and their answers to the questionnaire were needed to be clarified. The researcher used the same theories as had been mentioned in the blueprint of the questionnaire because they emphasized the same points that needed to be clarified using an interview. Table 3.1 below presents the lists of the questions.

Table 1. Questions of the Interview

No	Questions
1.	While dealing with time, sometimes which one do you think is more important; focus on what you are saying or how you are saying an English sentence?
2.	How intense do you hesitate while speaking? Why?
3.	What do you think about your English competence?

To answer the first research problem, the researcher used some steps to analyze the data that were observed from the videos. First, the researcher watched and listened to 19 videos several times. The researcher checked the characteristics shown by the participants as had been listed in the observation sheet. Moreover, the researcher determined to which group each participant would be by looking at the result of the observation. After that, every participant's utterances that indicated the observed characteristics were listed. The utterances were used to support the reason why a participant is put into a particular type of user.

To get the answer to the second research question which was done through a questionnaire, the researcher presented the result in a form of percentage for each statement. The percentage was found by using the formula below:

$$\frac{\sum x}{\sum n} \times 100\%$$

$$\sum x$$

$\sum x$ = the total number of the participants based on the degree of agreement.

$\sum n$ = the total number of participants.

The percentage of data from the questionnaire would be reported descriptively in the findings.

Finally, the researcher analyzed the result of the interview. First of all, the researcher made a transcript of the interview. Then, the researcher tried to summarize the participants' answers to get the main point of each question delivered to them. Here, the researcher translated the conversation since the interview was done in Bahasa Indonesia. English was not used to avoid misunderstanding and the participants were more comfortable speaking in Bahasa Indonesia. Indeed, the summarized data was used to strengthen and clarify the result of the questionnaire; the interview would be discussed along with the result of the questionnaire.

There were some steps in conducting this research. First of all, was formulating the research problems. The researcher focused on two problems which were individual variations and principal conditions that influenced the monitoring process of the performers. Then, the researcher looked for and selected some theories related to the topic. After that, the researcher asked for permission to get the video recording from the Micro Teaching laboratory. Next, the researcher watched the videos. After watching the videos, the researcher made the transcript based on the time and how the participants corrected their sentences and then classified them of individual variations as seen in Table 3.1.

To answer the second research problem about principal conditions in the monitor hypothesis, the researcher had prepared some statements and questions in the form of a questionnaire and interview. Then, the blueprint of both questionnaire and interview were made. After that, some sheets of the questionnaire were distributed to 19 students of Micro Teaching class A batch 2015. Some of them were asked to do an interview. "The researcher conducted an interview because the researcher wished to obtain more detailed and thorough information on a topic that might be gleaned from a questionnaire" (Adams & Cox, 2008, p. 21). Therefore, the results of the interview were used to clarify some statements of the questionnaire. Then, the researcher discussed the findings and concluded these two research questions to be reported.

Findings and Discussion

Individual Variation in Micro Teaching Class Based on Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis Theory

This section is to answer the first research problem which is individual variations in Micro Teaching Class A. Every participant is described and categorized into a particular kind of user based on the characteristics they show during 25 minutes of their teaching performances. Some of the participants share the same characteristics and those participants are found to be in the same group. The researcher grouped the participants based on the observation sheet's result. Some utterances that indicated the characteristics were also taken to be the examples of certain cases raised in this chapter. Table 4.1 below is used to cover the bigger picture of the results of the individual variations based on the observation.

Table 4.1. Findings on Types of Individual Variations in Micro Teaching Class A

Individual Variations	Participants																	
	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Monitor Over-users	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Monitor Under-users	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Optimal Monitor Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4.1 shows that only two types of individual variations are found in Micro Teaching class A. Those are monitor over-users and monitor under-users. An optimal monitor user is not found because none of the participants shows characteristics that can be said as an optimal user. The characteristics shown by the participants are presented using table 4.2 as follows.

Table 4.2. Characteristics of the Participants in Micro Teaching Class

Participants	Aspects observed				
	Speak fluently	Tend to speak slowly	Hesitate while speaking	Make grammar mistakes	Do Self-correction
T1	✓	-	-	✓	-
T2	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
T3	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T4	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T5	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T6	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
T7	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T9	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T10	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
T11	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T12	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
T13	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
T14	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T15	-	✓	✓		-
T16	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T17	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T18	-	✓	✓	✓	-
T19	-	✓	✓	✓	-

The participants are grouped into a particular type based on the characteristics they show during the performances. Many of them share almost the same characteristics, although those, somehow, appeared against the basic characteristics of the type of users they are included into.

Monitor Under-Users

Monitor under users is those who are not paying much attention to how they are saying something but more on which one they feel right. Since this kind of performers does not attempt to their monitor process, in this case, whether checking or editing, they tend to speak fluently but somehow with poor grammar.

The researcher found out that from 19 participants, only one that could be categorized as a monitor under-user. The participant was T1. She is grouped into this kind of user because of the two characteristics below.

1) The participant spoke fluently but did not pay attention to accuracy. In this case, many grammatical errors and ineffective sentences were uttered by the participants. Most of the grammar mistakes are about the subject and verb agreement. The following are the examples:

*There is a lot of students absent today.
So can you guess what have we aaaa to do today?
Has anyone get?
Grammatical mistakes*

*Introduction is aaaa just not for introduce yourself, but you can introduce your friend to another your friends that haven't know your friend.
In Indonesia we have so many friend and aaaa when we want to aaa introduce our friend or to make friend, make your friend to another your friend.*

Unclear sentences

2). One of the characteristics of under users is not to be influenced by error correction. The participant did not seem to do a self-correction at all while speaking whether it is about the grammar or pronunciation.

In some cases, although the participant used fillers that indicate the hesitant style, the researcher keeps grouping this participant into under-users by considering the fluency and the number of hesitation which is not many.

The researcher concludes that although this under-user participant is an English department student who learns English mostly through a conscious learning process, she did not seem to rely on her conscious knowledge but tended to use the acquired system-- by feeling the correctness-- while speaking.

Monitor Over-Users

In this study, the researcher found that out of 19 students in Micro Teaching Class A, 18 of them are monitor over-users. Monitor over-users are said to use the monitoring process all the time, so the performers tend to speak hesitantly. It is also said that because of thinking too much about the correctness, they have difficulty to speak in real fluency. L2 learners usually have different characteristics in performing their L2 learning. In this study, almost all participants that belong to this group share quite the same characteristics. The researcher elaborates on the main characteristics of monitor over-users shown by each participant as presented as follows.

Lack of fluency

One of the characteristics of monitor over-users is that the performers check their L2 output all the time. This is one reason why those performers have a lack of fluency since they are so concerned with the correctness (Khrasen & Terrel,

1983, p. 44). Out of 18 participants who are put together into this group, it was found that only T8, T9, and T13 who spoke quite fluently. The rest were considered not to have real fluency while speaking and even some of them were seen to speak very slowly. They spoke quite slowly whether to make sure that they could produce correct utterances or they were not sure about what they were saying.

Although they had quite great fluency, the researcher kept categorizing T8, T9, and T13 into over-users considering other characteristics that indicate over- users and are opposite to the other types. They were found to make some grammatical mistakes and rarely did self-correction. Thus, they can be grouped neither to optimal monitor users nor monitor under users.

Hesitant style of talking

Based on the observation, all 18 participants hesitate while speaking. Over-users are said to use their conscious grammar rules of the target language to produce an output that somehow triggers them to hesitate (Khrasen & Terrel, 1983, p. 44). In this study, the participants who are included in this group showed a hesitant style through the use of fillers and pauses while speaking. Almost all the participants produced pause fillers and long silent pauses whether between words or sentences. In this study, it was found that the numbers of using pauses were more dominant rather than the fillers. The following are some examples taken from T2 and T5 that show the hesitant style of talking through the pause fillers.

T2: Today eeemm I want aaa I want to ask you. Who is not aaaa coming to our class?

T5: We will aaa do it here aaa maybe you can do it aaaa just five-minute aaaa but if we...if we..if we don't have enough time we will bring it home, okay?

In both cases above, the participants used the fillers eeemm and aaaa to show the carefulness while talking.

In some cases performed by some participants, the hesitation is also shown by repeating words in a sentence. This case rarely happened during the participants' performances. Only T3 and T12 were observed to repeat words while talking. The others chose to use pauses so they would not interfere with the communication too much. The examples can be seen as follow.

T3: Do you know..do you know... what..what is it? What am I...what am I trying to say when I say good morning, how are you, how do you do?What...what am I doing?

T12: Okay. Aaaaa how..how...how was your day?

Overall, the hesitation that occurred during all the participants' performances showed the monitoring process worked.

Self-correction while speaking

Krashen (1981) confirms that “Over-users will typically self-correct “by the rule”, that is, when correcting errors, they will often be consciously aware of the mistakes and can fix them” (p. 16). Based on the observation results, not all participants did correct their mistakes while talking. Nevertheless, T2, T8, and T12 were seen to self-correct. These three participants cannot be said to self-correct successfully because not all mistakes were fixed. The corrections were only made once or twice. The cases below show how the participants (T2, T8, and T12) self-corrected while speaking.

T2: So, what greet? Oh sorry, greetings they use?

T8: I'll back to you later. Oh ya back to you later. I'm so sorry.

T12: So I ask your aaaa permission to aaaa give emm to borrow ehhh to lend me a pen.

During their 25-minute performances, the researcher found other characteristics performed by some participants that do not fit the characteristics of over-users. Most of the participants did not correct grammatical errors they made and some of them were likely to switch the language in the middle of talking. These characteristics came against the main characteristics of over-users. Many of the grammatical errors were identified to be subject and verb agreement and forming interrogative sentences. All the participants made these mistakes.

From all the participants, T2 and T5 showed a different characteristic in which they sometimes switched the language into L1 in the middle of talking. This was done because the participants seemed confused about how to say a sentence completely using English as the target language. Considering these findings, in this research, the researcher considers all the 18 participants have not completely shown characteristics of monitor over-users.

How Micro Teaching Students Regard the Three Principal Conditions in Monitor Hypothesis

Principal conditions in the monitor hypothesis are considered as a whole supporting package to use the monitor process. Those conditions are having sufficient time to think, knowing the rule of the language, and focusing on the correctness of the utterances. Krashen (1982) points out that time, however, might not be sufficient but necessary. The other two conditions are said to be very formidable requirements since one defines another.

To answer the second research question about how students regard the principal conditions, the researcher distributed a questionnaire in a form of closed-ended statements to 19 Micro Teaching students class A batch 2015 and interviewed six of them. The result of the questionnaire is presented by using Table 4.3 and described along with the result of the interview.

Table 4.3. Principal Conditions in Micro Teaching Class

No	Statements	The Degree of Agreement							
		SD	%	D	%	A	%	S A	%
1	I need enough time to think and speak English correctly.	0	0	5	26	10	53	4	21
2	Even though I have enough time, sometimes I focus more on what I am saying not how I am saying it.	1	5	1	5	14	74	3	16
3	While speaking, I become more accurate when I pay attention to the form of the language.	2	11	1	5	12	63	4	21
4	I make a hesitant style of talking when I focus on the rules of the language.	2	11	0	0	12	63	5	26
5	To be able to speak well, knowing English grammar is important.	0	0	3	16	8	42	8	42
6	I can learn English grammar presented to me completely and successfully without making any	7	37	9	47	2	11	1	5

s.

As has been explained in the previous chapter, according to Krashen, there are three main specific conditions that enable the “monitor” to perform well. They are having enough time, focusing on the form of thinking about the correctness, and knowing the rule of the language. Table 4.3 presents the total number and the percentage of the participants’ responses towards the principal conditions proposed by Krashen.

The first two statements emphasize the importance of time in speaking. The result of the first statement shows that 14 participants (74%) who choose A (agree) and SA (Strongly Agree) in total, have the same deal that time is an important thing to be counted. Having sufficient time to think helps the participants to make use of their conscious knowledge. Nevertheless, five participants (26%) do not agree if having enough time can influence the correctness of their utterances. In this case,

the participants might consider the role of having good grammar is the main point in measuring the correctness of a sentence.

Further, the disagreement is proved by the second statement which is still talking about time. 90 % of the participants, 74% A and 16% SA, confess that while speaking, the meaning is more important rather than the grammar although



we are given enough time. Two of the participants who were involved in the interview pointed out their thought regarding this case. Both of them are over-users. They emphasized their thought on how time influenced their speaking performance as shown as follow.

[T4]: *Having much time to speak is important. However, when I speak, I prefer to focus on what I am saying. As long as the message is delivered successfully, I do not think the grammar is really counted here. So, the meaning is the priority.*

[T6]: *In my opinion, focusing more on the meaning is better. I don't think about the grammar in the first place. The most important thing is they understand what I am saying and that is all what I need.*

Although most of the interviewees preferred to focus on the meaning, two of them still thought that how to say something did matter in speaking. It is very surprising to have one of these two participants to consider grammar is more important than meaning since in this study the participant is grouped into the under-monitor user. She admitted her bad English but still considered this case as something she must focus on while speaking. This answer bellow is how she regarded the importance of focusing on the form.

[T3]: *I will focus on how to say something because to say English sentence well is important although I do not have good grammar. I am anELESP student, so grammar really matters for me.*

The statement of T3 can be referred to as another study done by Stafford and Covitt's (1978). In their study, one under-user, "I", felt that people need to have conscious rules to speak correctly. Covitt adds that "Under-users often feel that grammar is the key to every language" (as cited in Krashen, 1983, p. 45).

The third case is about focusing on the correctness of utterances. Since Krashen stresses that accuracy is a cause of a learned system, focusing on correctness, in here, refers to conscious knowledge. 21% of the participants are found to choose A (Agree) and 63% choose SA (Strongly Agree). It can be concluded that 84% in total are pro that L2 learners will be more accurate when they pay attention to the form or correctness of the language. Meanwhile, 16% of the participants disagree that accuracy can be measured by focusing on the correctness of the utterances.

The reason why some of the participants disagree to deal with correctness or form of the language can be seen in the fourth statement. Almost all the participants agree that focusing on the correctness somehow can cause hesitations and it will disturb the communication. Based on the questionnaire result, 17 participants or 89% admit that hesitation will occur if the focus is on the rules of the language. One of the participants gave her thoughts on this.

[T5]: *I usually hesitate while speaking because I focus more on how I say something and I am afraid whether I make mistakes while speaking or not, moreover when I am running out of time.*

The answer to the first interview question might be another supporting idea in which the participants are likely to point out the meaning rather than how it is said. Only two participants or 11% of them disagree and are confident enough with their learned competence. It is shown through an interview result below.

[T4]: *I rarely do hesitation. I will hesitate only if the listeners seem not to understand what I am saying. The hesitation comes if I just want to simply my sentence but just once or twice. I also need much time to think so that I can minimize hesitation.*

The last two statements deal with the participants' grammar competence. As one of the prerequisite matters to be an English teacher and as one of the main principals in the monitoring process proposed by Krashen, knowing the rules of English is important. In statement number five, there are 84% or 16 participants consider English grammar mastery is a crucial matter as one result of the learning process. Only three participants or 16% disagree. Again, these participants may put the meaning as the point, not the grammar.

To master English as a second language, the learners, in this case, the participants should have an appropriate learned system but Krashen argues this statement. Krashen (1983, p. 31) sees that in learning grammar even the best students fail to learn everything presented to them. It is proved from the result of the last statement in which 84% of the participants disagree that they can learn English grammar presented to them completely and successfully without making any mistakes. Out of six participants who had been interviewed, five of them acknowledge themselves not to have really good English proficiency. Three of them regarded that they had standard English proficiency while the other two considered that they had low English proficiency. Those two participants were T2 and T3. T2 is said to be an over-user who spoke very slow and very little. Based on the observation, this participant avoided answering all the questions given to him. Meanwhile, T3 is considered as an under-user. She admitted that she was not good at remembering rules or the grammar of English.

[T2]: *Honestly, my English competence is not really good. I cannot use English properly although grammar is really important.*

[T3]: *My English proficiency is still poor moreover when I have to speak. Not only because of nervousness but also I don't know grammar. That's the main problem.*

Only one of the six participants thinks she has good English proficiency and based on the result of the observation, this participant is one of the over-users who have only a few grammatical mistakes.

[T4]: *I can say I have good English proficiency. I am confident enough with my English competence.*

The results both from the questionnaire and interview bring the researcher to an idea that L2 learners consider that having sufficient time to think and knowing English rules as the basic term in learning English are significant matters.

Meanwhile, the participants prefer not to focus on the correctness while speaking but the meaning or the message they want to deliver.

Conclusion

This research studies about individual variations found in 19 Micro Teaching Class A students' teaching performances. Based on the findings discussed in chapter IV, out of three kinds of individual variations proposed by Krashen in monitor hypothesis, only two occur in Micro Teaching Class A. Those two are monitor under-users and monitor over-users. Meanwhile, none of the participants shows an indication of optimal monitor users. From 19 participants in total, 18 of them are found to be monitor over-users, and only one of them that can be grouped into monitor under-user.

The observation results show that the over-users are likely to speak slowly, do hesitations in the form of fillers and pauses, but rarely do self-corrections. The other group, which is monitor under-user, does not show too many hesitations, yet grammatical mistakes were made without any correction.

The second conclusion is drawn based on the result of the questionnaire and interview. Krashen proposes three principal conditions that can support the monitoring process which is having sufficient time, focusing on form, and knowing the rules of the language. Since all the participants who were asked to do the interview were from different kinds of users and they shared different characteristics, the three principal conditions needed to be clarified. Out of these three conditions, only two conditions that the participants think are playing roles in their performances. Those two conditions are having sufficient time and knowing the rules of the language. The participants do not focus on form when they have to do an 'unprepared' speech like what they did in Micro Teaching class. The most important thing for them is the meaning or message is delivered and understandable. Meanwhile, having enough time was considered important but did not give a large impact on their performance.

This study can be beneficial for the educational field and linguistic research since it studies the monitor hypothesis; kinds of second language users and principal conditions. As one of the branches of linguistics, Second Language Acquisition that covers the underlying topic of this study which is monitor hypothesis, English department students can be encouraged to gain more knowledge about second language learning. The other researchers may take this study to be compared or continued in researching the same field.

References

- Adams, A. & Cox, A. (2008). Questionnaires, in-depth interviews and focusgroups. Retrieved from http://oro.open.ac.uk/11909/1/9780521870122c02_p17-34.pdf
- Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 81-95.
- Asril, Z. (2013). *Micro teaching*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Baskara, F.X.R. (2015). Facilitating second language acquisition through digital storytelling. *Journal of language and literature*, 15(2), 148-152.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40.



- Brown, J. D., and Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Creswell, John. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed). London: Sage Publication.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. M. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd ed). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Griffiee, D. T., (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods: Design and data*. Berkeley: TESL-EJ Publication.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. London: Sage Publication.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2008). Choosing and fine-tuning a design for your study. *Sportscience*, 12, 12-21.
- Iswandari, Y. A. (2017). Revealing pre-service foreign language teachers' imagined professional identity in reflective journals. *Language and Language Teaching Journal (LLT)*, 20(1), 59-67.
- Johnson, B., and Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational research 4th ed.: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. London: Sage Publication.
- Kounin, T.E. & Krashen, S.D. (1978). Approaching native speaker proficiency from two different directions. In C.H. Blatchford and J. Schachter (Eds.), *TESOL '78: EFL policies, programs, practices* (86-104). Washington: TESOL.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principal and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (2013). *Second language acquisition: Theory, applications, and some conjectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (2014). Stephen Khrasen's theory of second language acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>.
- Leedy, P. D. (1993). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lelita, Y. V. (2016). A Study on students' learning strategies and self-efficacy in speaking I class in ELESF of Sanata Dharma University. *Language and Language Teaching Journal (LLT)*, 19(1), 61-70.
- Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.
- Masciantonio, R. (1988). Stephen Krashen and the classical languages. *The classical journal*, 84(1), 53-56.



- McDonald, R. & Kasule, D. (2005). The monitor hypothesis and English teachers in Botswana: Problems, varieties, and implications for language teacher education. *Language, culture and curriculum*, 18(2), 188-200.
- McLaughlin, B. (1978). The monitor model: Some methodological considerations. *Language learning*, 28, 309-332.
- Patton, M. O. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- Shishavan, H. B. & Sadeghi, K. (2009). Characteristics of effective English language teachers as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/4462/3803>.
- Zafar, M. (2009). Monitoring the 'monitor': A critique of Krashen's five hypotheses. *The Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 2(4), 139-146.

