

## *An Analysis of the Eleventh Grade Students' Monitor Use in Speaking Performance based on Krashen's (1982) Monitor Hypothesis at SMAN 4 Jember*

**Moh. Rofid Fikroni, Musli Ariani, Sugeng Ariyanto**

**Language and Arts Education Study Program, The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jember University  
E-mail: moh\_rofid@yahoo.com**

### **Abstract**

*Speaking is one of the skills in English that is mostly done in daily activities. In speaking, it was believed that there is a mental device inside human's mind that has function to monitor his/her utterances. The purpose of this research was to investigate and classify the students' monitor performance of SMAN 4 Jember in their speaking. The research design was Descriptive Research. The area of this research was chosen purposively. Meanwhile, the research respondents were chosen by using proportional random sampling method. The data were collected by using, interview, speaking test, questionnaire, and documentation. The result of this research revealed that 71,88% of research respondents were classified as monitor over-user, 21,88% of them were classified as monitor optimal-user, and 6,25% of them were classified as monitor under-user. It indicated that most of eleventh grade students at SMAN 4 Jember over used their monitor in speaking English.*

**Keywords:** *Students' Speaking Performance, Monitor Hypothesis, Individual Variation of Monitor, Descriptive Research.*

### **Introduction**

Speaking is considered to be the important skill because speaking is one of the skills in English that is mostly used in daily activities. People tend to use speaking rather than other skills to convey their ideas or opinions in daily interaction. For example, the interaction between the teacher and the students in teaching and learning activities. However, in foreign language classroom, the students are not exposed to produce the language orally. Due to this fact, there will be many problems faced by the teacher.

On the other hand, the main objective to master the language, English in particular, has become to be able to communicate using the language. The students' mastery of speaking skill has become the main goal in learning English as a second language or foreign language. Furthermore, Richard (2008:19) says that the learners will assess their success in language learning and how effective they use or speak English by looking at how they have improved their speaking skill.

Speaking refers to the ability of the learners to produce the language in oral form (spoken language). Because of this reason, speaking is considered to be a productive skill that is believed taking place in students' mind. The mental device itself is gained from learning process that has function as an editor to what he/she says (Krashen, 1982:15). This mental device is called monitor. The ability of the students to learn something will enable them to use their monitor, or in other words the acquired knowledge

which is gained through the process of learning will be monitored. This hypothesis is called as *Monitor Hypothesis*.

Since students will have their own capability in learning something, the use of monitor itself will be varied based on their capability. There are three variations, namely: Monitor Over-users, Monitor Under-users, and Monitor Optimal-users [6]. (1) Monitor over-users refer to the learners when they over use their monitor. In this case, they will speak hesitantly and often concerned to what they are about to say. (2) Monitor under-users refer to the learners when they have not learned, or they prefer not to choose to use their knowledge even the condition allows it. (3) Monitor optimal-users refer to the learners when they use their knowledge appropriately and does not interfere their communication. However, there is possibility that optimal-users will neglect the use of grammar in their communication in order not to interfere their utterances. Usually, in written form, they will do their best to make any appropriate correction so that it can make their output become as accurate as possible.

Thus, based on the above rationale and problems, this article was intended to investigate and describe the eleventh grade students' monitor performance in their speaking at SMAN 4 Jember.

In speaking, the speakers are required to not only say something, but they also need to understand the message from whom they talk to in order to give an appropriate respond at the same time. It means that the most important

thing in speaking is a matter of how to make such successful interaction. Thornburry (2005:8) states that speaking is a speech production that becomes a part of daily activities which involve interaction. This interaction leads to an activity called conversation. Nolasco (1997), as cited in Junaidi (2011:10), adds speaking ability is a matter of conversation, not fluent speaking. In this case it will need such a process of understanding and giving feedback activities between the speaker and the hearer. So, the effectiveness of speaking is determined on the successfulness of interaction which is done by the speaker and the hearer who understand each other.

One of the most important aspects in speaking is the communicative aspect. The communicative aspect of speaking will concern about the language use in social life in which will be related to the communicative competence. Communicative competence refers to the competence to communicate (Bagaric and Djigunovic, 2007:94). Louma (2004:97) suggests that it will highlight about the use of language for communication. The success of reaching the goal of social interaction will depend on the large extent of ability in communicative competence (Rickheit and Strohner, 2008:15). Canale and Swain (1980:27) The communicative competence will be at least consisting of three components such as grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence (communication strategies).

The first component of communicative competence is the grammatical competence. Canale and Swain (1980:29) defines grammatical competence is the type of competence in which will focus on the use of lexical items, morphology rules, syntax, semantics, and along with the aspect of phonology (pronunciation). In this particular competence, the aspect of grammar and vocabulary will be the indicators to assess the students' speaking performance. Grammar is one of the important elements in speaking in relation to form a speech. According to Ur (1988:4), grammar can be defined as the rule of how to combine and construct words into larger units in aspect of meaning. Moreover, vocabulary is considered to be one of language components of English besides grammar and pronunciation in which it plays such an important role in gaining communicative goal in speaking. Wilkins as cited in Thornburry (2002:13) says that someone might not have an ability to speak anything if he does not have any vocabularies.

Communicative competence also involves social and cultural aspect that are essential in relation to the ability to understand and deliver linguistic forms (Troike, 2003:18). One of the components of communicative competence that has something to do with these aspects is *sociolinguistic competence*. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to use the language based on socio cultural context in relation to the contextual factors such as topic, role of participants, setting and norms of interaction (Canale and Swain, 1980:30). In the discussion of sociolinguistic competence, Canale (1983), as cited in Murcia et al. (1995:7), defines sociolinguistic competence into two

competence: sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence. Discourse competence is the mastery of the rules in which having role in combining forms and meanings as one meaningful unit in the spoken or written form (Bagaric and Djigunovic, 2007:97). In this particular competence, the aspect of discourse management and pronunciation will be the indicators to assess students' speaking performance. Thornburry (2005:127-128) defines discourse management mainly concern about the ability of the students in constructing sentences and producing utterances comprehensively to convey their opinions or ideas. Meanwhile, pronunciation refers to the sound of speech which consists of some features, such as individual sounds, pitch, volume, speed, pausing, stress, and intonation (Louma, 2004:11). Hewings (2004:3) also said that pronunciation is the combination of main components of speech.

The last component of communicative competence is strategic competence. Strategic competence refers to the mastery of verbal and non-verbal strategies to overcome difficulties in communication breakdowns to enhance the effectiveness of communication by paraphrasing, gestures, and varying intonation, speed or rhythm (Canale and Swain, 1980:30). In this particular competence, the aspect of interactive will be the indicator to assess students' speaking performance. Thornburry (2005:129) defines interactive communication as the ability of the students to initiate and responding appropriately at the speed and necessary rhythm about the message being delivered and to complete the task asked .

In relation to the second language acquisition (SLA), there are five basic hypotheses namely: The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, The Natural Order Hypothesis, The Input Hypothesis, The Affective Filter Hypothesis, and The Monitor Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982:9). In this study, monitor hypothesis will be used to analyze students' speaking performance. This particular hypothesis is chosen because it responsible to the students language productions, both in spoken or written forms.

Monitor hypothesis mainly relates to the learning-acquisition hypothesis. Learning has the role to make changes in the form of utterance, after is has been "produced" by the acquired system. This process is called as *Monitor Hypothesis*. Foreign language performers will use their monitor based on how they make use of their acquired competence. Krashen (1981:12) says that some performers might use their conscious knowledge of the target language whenever possible, some others Monitor users might, in fact, be so concerned with language production to make it suitable to their conscious rules that fluency would be seriously considered. And the other Monitor users are those who almost never monitor their output.

The first variation is monitor over-users. Monitor over-users refer to people who attempt to monitor all the time, performers who are constantly checking their output with their conscious knowledge of the language production (Krashen, 1982:19). The second variation in relation to the



variation of the use of monitor is monitor under-user. Monitor under-users refer to performers who have not acquired, or if they have acquired competence, they prefer not to use their conscious knowledge, even when conditions allow it (Krashen, 1982:19). The last variation of the use of monitor is optimal monitor users. Optimal monitor users refer to performers who use the Monitor when it is appropriate and when it does not interfere with communication. Many optimal users do not use grammar in ordinary conversation, where it might interfere (Krashen, 1982:20).

## Research Method

In this study, the descriptive research was applied in this research design because the objective of the research was to investigate and describe the eleventh grade students' monitor performance in their speaking at SMAN 4 Jember.

The area of this research was SMAN 4 Jember in the 2014/2015 academic year. This school was chosen purposively because of some reasons such as: this kind of research had never been conducted in this school, the English teacher allowed the researcher to conduct the research in the eleventh grade students, the head master gave permission to the researcher to conduct the research.

The subjects of this research were the eleventh grade students of SMAN 4 Jember. Proportional random sampling method was used in this research because all of the classes in the eleventh grade was homogenous, so that the researcher was able to take sample from each class as the representative. The researcher decided to take 10% of the population from each class.

In collecting the data, the researcher used four methods such as interview, speaking test, questionnaire, and documentation. The interview was done to the English teacher and the research respondents. The data gained from the English teacher was used to give background knowledge to the researcher related to the students' speaking performance in classroom. Meanwhile, the data gained from the research respondents was used to support the result from the questionnaire. The speaking test was administered to measure the students' speaking performance. The result of the questionnaire was used to classify the students' monitor performance in their speaking. Moreover, the result of the documentation was used to determine the research respondents.

## Research Result

The result of the speaking test showed that there were 22 students got score in the range of 2-2.9 in which it got the highest percentage with 68,75% from the total number of the students who were selected as research respondents. Meanwhile there were 6 students (18,75%) got score in the range of 3-3.9, there were 3 students (9,38%) got score in the range of 1-1.9, and there was only 1 student (0%) got score in the range of 4-5. So, based on this result, there is indication that most of the students were classified as

monitor over-user and under-user.

Meanwhile, the result of the questionnaire showed that most of the research respondents were categorized as monitor over user. This is based on the data in which it was shown that the percentage of the students who were classified as monitor over-users was 71,88%. Besides the percentage of the students who were classified as monitor optimal-user was 21,88%, and there were only 6,25% of them who were classified as monitor under-user. Based on this result, it can be concluded that most of the students over used their monitor, they were not confident in saying something in English, they were hesitant when they were about to say something, and they were also try to repeat their utterances most of the time.

From the result of the interview, the research respondents revealed some information in relation to their characteristics in using their monitor. For instance, one of the students said that she would try to repeat her utterances because she did not want to make a mistake that would make her felt ashamed. This particular characteristic matched up very well with the characteristics of monitor over-user. Besides there was a student who claimed that he would make some repetition to what he said because he realized that someone whom he talked to was confused to his speech. Another student said that she would repeat her utterances most of the time because she was confused and did not know what to say next. These particular characteristics were shown that most of the students were classified as monitor over-user.

## Discussion

The result of the speaking test showed that 68,75% of the research respondents (22 students) got score in the range of 2-2.9. Meanwhile 18,75% of them (6 students) got score in the range of 3-3.9, 9,38% of them (3 students) got score in the range of 1-1.9, and there was 1 student (3,13%) who got score in the range of 4-5. it can be concluded that most of the students were in difficult to use simple grammatical form properly, make use of their vocabularies appropriately, give proper responses when having a conversation, pronounce words properly, and maintain as well as develop the topic of the conversation itself. Because of this reason, it was important to the students to be used to using language in daily activities. As what Troike (2006:166) suggests that the students need to be exposed to the speaking activities in real life situation when they are used to interact with the society. This was important because the students need to be fluent enough to face the demands of communicative activities, not only inside the classroom but also outside the classroom (Parrish, 2004:100). Besides the result also showed that the students were struggling in pronouncing words in English. This finding in line with Yule's (2010:188) statement that second language learners seem to be easier to learn about vocabulary and grammar rather than pronunciation.

According to the result of the speaking test in which it showed that most of the students were able to get score in

the range of 2-2.9, the students were not really able to say something appropriately based on four aspects (grammar-vocabulary, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication), the result of the questionnaire and the interview also showed that most of them were categorized as monitor over user. This is based on the data in which it was shown that the percentage of the students who were classified as monitor over-users in the aspect of discourse management was 49,48%, in the aspect of pronunciation was 47,39%, in the aspect of interactive communication was 44,79%. Meanwhile, the percentage of the students in the aspect of grammar-vocabulary was 60,71%. It can be concluded that the students still found themselves in difficult to say something in English, they were in doubt about their speaking skill, they tried to correct their utterances most of the time, they tried to repeat their utterances, and they were not confident enough in saying something in English. This research findings showed that even though a student was able to get a good score in English, it did not necessarily mean that he/she was categorized as monitor optimal-user. This was because monitor performance was a matter of students' characteristics and it was mainly related to their routine especially in relation to the use of English itself.

So, based on the data analysis, in which the researcher combined the result of the speaking test, the questionnaire, as well as the interview, it was revealed that there were 23 students (71,88%) who were classified as monitor over-user, there were 7 students (21,88%) who were classified as monitor optimal-user, and there were 2 students (6,25%) who were classified as monitor under-user. So, since more than half of the research respondents were classified as monitor over-user, it can be concluded that most of the eleventh grade students of SMAN 4 Jember over used their monitor in their speaking.

### Conclusion and Suggestion

According to the research findings, the eleventh grade students of SMAN 4 Jember were classified as Monitor Over-users. It means that they over used their monitor in their speaking. This is based on the findings that showed the percentage of the number of the students that were classified as monitor over-users were 71,88%. Meanwhile, 21,88% of them were classified as monitor optimal-users, and there were only 6,25% of them who were classified as monitor under-users.

Thus, the above percentage (71,88%) of the number of the students showed that most of the students at SMAN 4 Jember found difficulties to say something in English. They over thought their grammar, they were not confident in saying something in English, they were hesitant whenever they were about to say something, and they tried to repeat and correct their utterances because they were not sure whether they were correct or not.

Based on the research result, these suggestions are given to the following people:

- The English Teacher  
It is highly recommended to the teacher to provide appropriate atmosphere in the class room in which the teacher should provide communicative environment that require the students to produce the language, both in written and oral form. This particular environment will make the students become accustomed to using English, so that they will develop their English by their own way.
- The Students  
It is suggested to the students to be much more familiar with English, by mean using the language, especially in speaking. By doing this, the students will accustomed to using the language and they will not be hesitant in saying something in English.
- The Other Researchers  
The result of this research hopefully will give better understanding to other researchers about the topic of the students' monitor performance and make this research as the consideration in conducting similar topic in different field. It is highly suggested to them to just only focus in investigating the students' monitor performance in particular class to limit the topic and save much more time so that they can be more focus in analyzing the students' ability in using their monitor.

### References

- [1] Bagarić, Vesna. – Jelena M. Djigunović. 2007. "Defining Communicative Competence". *Metodika*. 8 (1): 94-103. (<http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/42651>) (date of access: 02 February. 2015).
- [2] Canale, Michael. – Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". *Applied Linguistics*. 1 (1): 1-47. ([http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Merrill\\_Swain/publication/31260438\\_THEORETICAL\\_BASES\\_OF\\_COMMUNICATIVE\\_APPROACHES\\_TO\\_SECOND\\_LANGUAGE\\_TEACHING\\_AND\\_TESTING/links/0c960516b1dadad753000000.pdf](http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Merrill_Swain/publication/31260438_THEORETICAL_BASES_OF_COMMUNICATIVE_APPROACHES_TO_SECOND_LANGUAGE_TEACHING_AND_TESTING/links/0c960516b1dadad753000000.pdf)) (date of access: 02 February. 2015)
- [3] Hewings, Martin. 2004. *Pronunciation Practice Activities: A resource book for teaching English pronunciation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Junaidi. 2011. *Using Critical Debate Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Ability*. Unpublished Thesis. Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University. (<http://eprints.uns.ac.id/7577/1/197660911201111011.pdf>) (date of access: 04 February. 2015)
- [5] Krashen, D. Stephen. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. California: Pergamon Press Inc.

- [6] Krashen, D. Stephen. 1982. *Principle and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press Inc.
- [7] Louma, Sari. 2009. *Assessing Speaking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Murcia, M. Celce. – Zoltan Dornyei. – Sarah Thurrell. 1995. “Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specification”. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 6 (2): 5-35.
- [9] Parrish, Betty. 2004. *Teaching Adult ESL: A practical introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- [10] Richards, C. Jack. 2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Rickheit, Gert. - Hans Strohner. (ed) 2008. *Handbook of Communication Competence*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- [12] Thornbury, Scott. (ed) 2002. *How to Teach Vocabulary*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- [13] Thornbury, Scott. (ed) 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. England : Pearson Education Limited.
- [14] Troike, M. Saville. 2003. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. England: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [15] Troike, M. Saville. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Ur, Penny. 1988. *Grammar Practice Activities: A Practical Guide For Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Yule, George. (eds) 2010. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

