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ABSTRACT

Janu, Gregoriana Nobilio Pasia. (2018). Individual Variation in Monitor Hypothesis of Micro Teaching Students of Sanata Dharma University. Yogyakarta: English Language Education Study Program, Department of Language and Arts Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Sanata Dharma University.

The researcher analyzed individual variations in monitor hypothesis found in Micro Teaching Class and principal conditions experienced by the participants in their monitoring process. The aims of this study were to find out 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 in his theory about Second Language Acquisition.

There were two research problems discussed in this study: (1) What individual variations are shown by students in Micro Teaching class? (2) To what extent do Micro teaching students regard the three principal conditions in monitor hypothesis? In order to answer those research questions, the researcher applied theory by Krashen (1982) on Second Language and Second Language Learning.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. The qualitative method of data collection was participant observation. 19 Micro Teaching students’ videos were recorded to be observed to answer the first research problem. Quantitative method was applied through questionnaire to answer the second research problem. An interview was also done to support the result of the questionnaire.

The researcher found out that out of three types of monitor users, only two occurred in Micro Teaching Class A. Those were monitor under-users, who are not aware of the conscious checking, and monitor over-users, who seem to consciously check their L2 output. Moreover, having sufficient time and knowing the rules of the language were seen to be experienced by the participants in their monitoring process.

Keywords: Individual variations, principal conditions, Micro Teaching class.
ABSTRAK


Penelitian ini menganalisa tipe-tipe pengguna bahasa dalam hipotesis monitor di kelas Micro Teaching dan tiga kondisi pokok yang dirasa dapat mempengaruhi proses monitor para partisipan. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah mengetahui tipe-tipe pengguna bahasa dalam menggunakan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa kedua dan mengetahui kondisi yang dapat mempengaruhi partisipan dalam proses monitor seperti yang sudah dikemukakan oleh Krashen dalam teorinya mengenai pemerolehan bahasa kedua.


Dari tiga tipe pengguna bahasa, dua diantaranya, yakni pengguna yang selalu memonitor ucapannya dan pengguna yang sama sekali tidak melakukan proses monitor, terindikasi muncul selama proses penelitian. Sedangkan berkaitan dengan kondisi pokok yang mempengaruhi partisipan peneliti hanya menemukan dua dari tiga kondisi yang dijabarkan Krashen. Dua kondisi tersebut yakni memiliki waktu yang cukup dan mengetahui aturan dari bahasa yang dipelajari. Kesimpulan ini didapat dari hasil kuisioner di mana sebagian besar partisipan memilih opsi setuju dan sangat setuju dan juga didukung oleh hasil wawancara.

Kata kunci: Individual variations, principal conditions, Micro Teaching class.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It will be an honor for me to express my deepest love and gratitude to all people who have struggled with me along my way to finish my study in Sanata Dharma University. First of all, I would like to thank Jesus Christ and Mother Mary for all the blessing, love and guidance given to me.

My big thanks go to my thesis advisor, Drs. Barli Bram, M.Ed., Ph.D., for his guidance to help me finish my thesis. He has kindly given me supports, advice, and suggestions in finishing this thesis. I particularly appreciate his patience and detailed grammar correction. I also would like to express my gratitude to Ibu Monica Ella Harendita, M.Ed for giving me a permission to take data from her Micro Teaching class.

My endless warm thanks are expressed to all my lecturers in ELESP who kindly and patiently take care of me during my study in Sanata Dharma University. They have given me much more than learning experience as teachers and friends.

I acknowledge my warm gratitude to my amazing and beloved family; Papa, Mama, and Etak for the prayers, words and supports. I want to send my love to all my friends, especially Crazy Family, who have been struggling together with me and cheering me up for years.
Finally, I want to express my greatest sincerity to people who made this thesis possible. May God always bless them.

Gregoriana Nobilio Pasia Janu
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TITLE PAGE ................................................................................................................... i
APPROVAL PAGES ........................................................................................................ ii
DEDICATION PAGE ...................................................................................................... iv
STATEMENT OF WORK’S ORIGINAL .................................................................. v
PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI ................................................ vi
ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................... vii
ABSTRAK ................................................................................................................ viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ......................................................................................... ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS .......................................................................................... xi
LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................... xiv
LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................... xv

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A. Research Background ......................................................................................... 1
B. Research Problems .............................................................................................. 4
C. Problem Limitations ............................................................................................ 4
D. Research Objectives ............................................................................................ 5
E. Research Benefits ................................................................................................ 5
F. Definition of Terms .............................................................................................. 6
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Description................................................................. 9
   1. Acquisition-Learning Distinction.............................................. 9

   2. Monitor Hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition............. 11

   3. Individual Variations............................................................... 12
      a. The Monitor Over-Users................................................... 12
      b. The Monitor Under-Users............................................... 13
      c. The Optimal Monitor Users......................................... 14

   4. Principal Conditions............................................................... 14
      a. Time.............................................................................. 16
      b. Focus on Form................................................................ 16
      c. Know the Rule.............................................................. 16

B. Theoretical Framework............................................................... 17

CHAPTER III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Method........................................................................ 18

B. Research Setting......................................................................... 20

C. Research Participants................................................................... 20

D. Research Instruments and Data Gathering Techniques............... 20
   1. Video of Micro Teaching Students Batch 2015.................... 20

   2. Questionnaire...................................................................... 20

   3. Interview.............................................................................. 21

E. Data Analysis Techniques.......................................................... 23

F. Research Procedure.................................................................... 25
CHAPTER IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Individual Variations in Micro Teaching Class........................................ 27
   1. The Monitor Under User............................................................ 29
   2. The Monitor Over-Users............................................................ 31
B. Micro Teaching Students Regard the Three Principal Conditions in Monitor Hypothesis................................................................. 35

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions....................................................................................... 42
B. Implications....................................................................................... 43
C. Recommendations............................................................................. 44

REFERENCES.......................................................................................... 46
APPENDICES............................................................................................ 49
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Acquisition and Learning in Second Language Production ............. 11

Figure 2.2 Individual Variation in Monitor Use.............................................. 15
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Observation Sheet of Types of Individual Variation in Micro Teaching Class A ................................................................. 21
Table 3.2 Template of the Questionnaire ................................................................................................................................. 22
Table 3.3 Questions of the Interview ........................................................................................................................................ 23
Table 3.4 Types of Individual Variations ................................................................................................................................... 24
Table 4.1 Findings on Types of Individual Variations in Micro Teaching Class A ............................................................................ 28
Table 4.2 Characteristics of the Participants in Micro Teaching Class .......................................................................................... 28
Table 4.3 Principal Conditions in Micro Teaching Class ............................................................................................................. 36
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an introductory part. It provides the research background, research problems, problem limitations, research objectives, research benefits, and definition of terms.

A. Research Background

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 subconscious (acquisition process) and conscious learning (learning process) to deal with a second language and groups these two into what is called as “Monitor Theory”. In Indonesia itself, English is developed as a second language, mostly through educational platforms meaning 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 acquired system is an implicit process, 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 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 a 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 educational system in Indonesia, the researcher was encouraged to conduct a second language learning study in Micro Teaching class which focuses on monitor hypothesis 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 Education Faculty to be future teachers (p. 44). English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) as a part of 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 really 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 schools 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 research of the development of foreign language teacher preparation finds fourteen competences 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 classroom.
B. Research Problems

There are two research problems conducted by the researcher to be the focus of this study. Those are:

1. Which individual variations are shown by students in Micro Teaching class?
2. To what extent do Micro teaching students regard the three principal conditions in monitor hypothesis?

C. Problem Limitations

Although this research was prepared carefully, the researcher is still aware of the limitations. Firstly, it took four weeks to observe one cycle teaching practice of a Micro Teaching class. Since the speaking performance was seen, it would be better if the observation was done in a longer time and took more than one cycle.

Second, this research took small group of participants. There were only 19 participants that were observed and it might not represent the whole students who took Micro Teaching class.

Third, the researcher used observation sheet, questionnaire, and interview to know what kinds of second language users the participants are and the principal conditions of individual variations. They seem not to provide enough evidences of the characteristics of the individual variation shown by the students in their speaking performances during teaching practice.

Krashen’s theories on Monitor Hypothesis are used to analyze each research problems which are raised in this research. There must be some related
study done by another researcher that can support this study but has not been included.

D. Research Objectives

The first research problem is aimed to get individual variations in Micro Teaching class and the second research problem aims to regard kinds of principal conditions that affect students’ monitoring process based on the theory of Krashen. The results of this research are expected to show the individual variations and principal conditions in monitoring process as a form of L2 learning process in Micro Teaching class.

E. Research Benefits

1. Micro Teaching Students

Since this study is conducted to ELESP students, especially in Micro Teaching class, the researcher wants to share the knowledge related to Krashen’s Monitor Hypothesis to enrich the students’ understanding about Second Language Acquisition especially L2 learning. This research is hopefully helping the students know what kinds of individual variations they are included into to make them aware of factors that might influence their learning process in their teaching performances in classroom. Furthermore, they can improve their English proficiency and develop what they have done well in their teaching later on.
2. **English Language Education Study Program**

   This research is expected to help ELESP to be more aware of the students’ individual variations in performing their L2 learning especially in Micro Teaching Class which is formed to prepare the students to teach in real schools. It is also expected that this research will give a contribution to fulfill the students’ needs related to the principal conditions they should have in their learning process. Finally, hopefully this research can give a contribution to English lecturers to teach linguistics or another subjects related to Second Language Acquisition.

3. **Further Research**

   Hopefully, this study can be a reference for those who want to do a research related to the topic discussed which are individual variations in monitor hypothesis and its principal conditions.

F. **Definition of Terms**

   The researcher would like to define some terms related to the topic of this research which are:

1. **Language Learning and Language Acquisition**

   Gass (2001) emphasizes that “The acquisition system generates utterances because in producing language, learners focus on meaning, not on form. The learned system serves as an “inspector” of the acquired system. It checks to ensure the correctness of the utterance against the knowledge in the learned system”.
Regarding English as a second language in Indonesia, the process of developing English is mostly done through learning not acquiring.

2. Individual Variations

Krashen (1982) considers that individuals have some variations in performing an L2 and it can be counted as a differential use of the conscious learning. Furthermore, he groups L2 learners into three basic types of performers; monitor under-users, monitor over-users, and optimal monitor users. In this research, Micro Teaching students’ individual variations are analyzed through their teaching performances.

3. Principal Conditions

Krashen (1982) states that second language performers can use conscious learning only when three conditions appear. Those conditions are having enough time, focusing on form or correctness, and knowing the rule.

4. Micro Teaching

Micro teaching has been described as a “System of controlled practice that makes it possible to concentrate on specified teaching behavior and to practice teaching under controlled conditions” (Alen & Eve, 1968). Stanford University (1967) proposes three aims of micro teaching; (1) as an introductory teaching and practice experiences, (2) as a vehicle to monitor under controlled conditions in teaching, (3) as an in-service training instrument for experienced teachers. English
Language Department facilitates the students through micro teaching course to enhance students’ awareness to control and evaluate their teaching performances that have been recorded.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter contains theories related to the research. There are two parts provided in this chapter, namely theoretical description and theoretical framework. Theoretical description provides some supporting theories to do this research. Meanwhile, theoretical Framework provides the theories used by the researcher to answer the research questions.

A. Theoretical Description

Theoretical description consists of four parts which are theories on (1) Acquisition-Learning Distinction, (2) Monitor Hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition, (3) Individual Variations, and (4) Principal Conditions.

1. 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-leaning, 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”.

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
Both acquired and learned systems serve different functions. 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. Acquired system aims to make sure that the performers can communicate well using the SL. Acquisition process comes as a result of natural communication where it points out the meaning as the main the focus (Ellis 1985, p. 261). The result of this process is also subconscious.

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 the 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 a conscious learning in which the rules are considered as the most important thing, a speaker tends to disrupt their own L2 fluency.

Moreover, both acquired and learned systems serve their own function. “During 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).
1. **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 the conscious learning only as a ‘monitor’.

Different from acquired system in which subconscious process is working, learnt system gains knowledge about a particular language through conscious understanding of the rules of the language (Cook, 1993). “Monitoring process uses learnt knowledge as a quality check on speech originating from acquired language” (p. 52). In other words, monitor can work before or after we produce the L2 (self-correction). Krashen (1982) draws a diagram to show the relationship:

![Diagram showing Acquisition and Learning in Second Language Production](image)

**Figure 2.1. Acquisition and Learning in Second Language Production**
(Source: Krashen 1982, p. 16)
According to this hypothesis as it has been emphasized by Krashen (1983), monitoring process relates to acquired system.

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

3. Individual Variations

In monitor hypothesis, the Cook (1993) states that learners’ personality which varies into three, takes place in 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)

a. Monitor Over-Users

According to Krashen (1981), the 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 over careful and over concern with correctness of the rules in their speaking.

Krashen (1983, p. 44) points out that there may be two things 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 have aaaaah 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 aaaaah and ummm and some grammatical errors are fixed in the middle of the speaking.

b. 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 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.

e. 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 Mascianonio (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 normal conversation where communication becomes the focus and the time is not enough, these performers will not be 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 optimal monitor user.

"Making a good plan give, gives a good impact to 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.

Briefly, the following table summarizes the three types of Monitor users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor user</th>
<th>Spoken style</th>
<th>Uses conscious rules?</th>
<th>Personality type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimal</td>
<td>-Hesitant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuser</td>
<td>+Hesitant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Self-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underuser</td>
<td>-Hesitant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2 Individual variation in Monitor use (adapted from Krashen, 1981, p. 18)

4. Principal Conditions

Krashen (1982) suggests that 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:

a. 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 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.

b. Focus on form

Dulay & Burt (1978) says that every performer must also be focused on 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.”
c. **Know the rule**

In order 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 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.

**B. Theoretical Framework**

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 extend 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) in order 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 in all areas of second language research and teaching.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the method that is used to conduct this study. This section consists of six parts which are the research method, research setting, research participant, research instruments and data gathering techniques, data analysis technique, and research procedure.

A. Research 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 interview, 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 a qualitative research in order to understand a particular context, in this case about how 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 sheet, questionnaire, and interview. An 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, public record was used to support the result of the observation in which some utterances of the participants were noted.

Quantitative method is also used to strengthen the hypothesis of this research which is each of the participant 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 application and descriptive or inferential statistics” (Leedy, 1993). The second research problem dealt with 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 towards the principal conditions in monitoring process.

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 Likert scale which consisted of six statements in a scale of 1 - 4.
B. Research Setting

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

C. Research Participant

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 classroom. The students’ 25 minutes teaching practice was chosen to make sure that the participants have enough time to speak.

D. Research Instruments and Data Gathering Techniques

1. Video Observation of Micro Teaching Students’ Batch 2015

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 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 participants. The following is presented the observation sheet used by the researcher in grouping the participants.

Table 3.1 Observation Sheet of Types of Individual Variations in Micro Teaching Class A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Aspects observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak fluently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

In order to answer the second research problem about principal conditions that affect 19 micro teaching students’ monitoring performances, questionnaire and interview were used to gather the data. Therefore, they were asked to answer the questions.

2. Questionnaire

According to Griffie (2012), questionnaire can be seen as a form of data collection consisted of several questions related to the topic discussed in a research (p. 136). The researcher was able to gather the data from a small number
of participants by using questionnaire. The questionnaire was presented using closed-ended questions and 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)”. Please refer to the appendix 2 to see the blueprint of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was served by using the following table as the template. For the complete questionnaire, please refer to appendix two on page 50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Interview

To strengthen the results and as a follow up to the questionnaire, an interview was conducted. In-person interviews was 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 underlie 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 of 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 bellow presents the lists of the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How intense do you hesitate while speaking? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What do you think about your English competence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Data Analysis Techniques

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 for 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. The researcher classified the result of the first research problem by using Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4 Types of Individual Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Over-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Under-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Monitor Users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[
\frac{\sum x}{\sum n} \times 100 \%
\]

\(\sum x\) = the total number of the participants based on the degree of agreement.
\(\sum n\) = the total number of the participants.
The percentage 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 the 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.

F. Research Procedure

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 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 into groups of individual variations as seen in Table 3.1.
To answer the second research problem about principal conditions in monitor hypothesis, the researcher had prepared some statements and questions in the form of 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 made the conclusion of these two research questions to be reported.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the answers of the research problems are discussed as stated in previous chapter. The research problems are: (1) Which individual variations are shown by students in Micro Teaching class? (2) To what extent do Micro teaching students regard three principal conditions in monitor hypothesis? Those two questions will be answered and discussed by using observation sheet, questionnaire, and interview that have been collected.

A. 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 users 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 | T 1 | T 2 | T 3 | T 4 | T 5 | T 6 | T 7 | T 8 | T 9 | T 10 | T 11 | T 12 | T 13 | T 14 | T 15 | T 16 | T 17 | T 18 | T 19 |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Monitor Over-users    | -   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +    | +    | +    | +    | +    | +    | +    | +    |
| Monitor Under-users   | +   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Optimal Monitor Users | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |

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

Table 4.2 Characteristics of the Participants in Micro Teaching Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Aspects observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak fluently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

1. Monitor Under-Users

Monitor under users are 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 do not really attempt to their monitor process, in this case whether checking or editing, they tend to speak fluent but somehow with a 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 the 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 the hesitation which is not many.
The researcher concludes that although this under-user participant is an English department student who learns English mostly through conscious learning process, she did not seem to really rely on her conscious knowledge but tended to use the acquired system—by feeling the correctness—while speaking.

2. 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 a 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 the main characteristics of monitor over-users shown by each participant as presented as follow.

1) 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 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 a 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 cannot be grouped neither to optimal monitor users nor monitor under users.

2) 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 into 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.
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 that 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.

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

\[ T12 \quad : \quad Okay.\ Aaaaa\ how..how...how\ was\ your\ day? \]

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

3) Self-correction while speaking

Krashen (1981) confirms that “Over-users will typically self-correct “by rule”, that is, when correcting errors, they will often be consciously aware of the mistakes and are able to 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 laters. Oh ya back to you later. I’m so sorry.
T12 : So I ask your aaaa permission to aaaa give emm to borrow eehh to lend me a pen.

The first two examples show that the corrections occur directly, while in the last case the participant used fillers to fix and choose an appropriate word. Another case of self-correction found in this research was shown by T2 and T6. They did correct their utterances but the corrections were still wrong. It can be seen from the examples presented below.

T2 : Class, has... have anyone here know “to the loo”?
I have written.... I have write a pretty good aaa instruction there.
T6 : Everyone, how to pronounce...how to speak ‘a’ in English?

During their 25-minute performances, the researcher found another characteristics performed by the 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 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.

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

Principal conditions in 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.

In order 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
conducted an interview to 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>The Degree of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I need enough time to think and speak in English correctly.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Even though I have enough time, sometimes I focus more on what I am saying not how I am saying it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>While speaking, I become more accurate when I pay attention to the form of the language.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I make a hesitant style of talking when I focus on the rules of the language.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To be able to speak well, knowing English grammar is really important.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can learn English grammar presented to me completely and successfully without making any mistakes.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 or 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 a 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 under-monitor user. She admitted her bad English but still considered this case as something she must focus on while speaking. This answer below 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 an ELESP student, so grammar really matters for me.*

The statement of T3 can be referred to 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 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 thought 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 of 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 the hesitation.*

The last two statements deal with the participants’ grammar competence. As one of the prerequisite matter to be an English teacher and as one of the main principal in monitoring process proposed by Krashen, knowing the rules of English is really important. In statement number five, there are 84% or 16
participants consider English grammar mastery is a crucial matter as one result of 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 a 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 to answer 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 think she has a good English proficiency and based on the result of the observation, this participant is one of the over-users users who has only few grammatical mistakes.

[T4]: *I can say I have a 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.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After presenting and analyzing the result of the research, the researcher draws the conclusion and some recommendations. The purposes are to give a brief and clear description about the result that has been described in the previous chapter and to recommend some ideas that can be used related to the topic discussed.

A. Conclusions

Individual variations give a picture on how second language learners perform their conscious learning of a second language. Also, the learners might be aware of the characteristics they have based on which variation a learner is included into.

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 the 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 are 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 kind 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 really 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 in their performance.

B. Implications

This study can be beneficial for educational field and linguistic research since it studies about monitor hypothesis; kinds of second language users and principal conditions. As one of the branch of linguistics, Second Language Acquisition that covers the 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 conducting a research in the same field.

C. Recommendations

Hence, the researcher would like to give some recommendations to English Language Department, future teachers, and further researchers.

1. English Language Department

The researcher would like to suggest and emphasize one thing that the researcher thinks is good to be kept and done while taking care of English Language Education Study Program students learning. Since English is the second language learned by the ELESP students, different types of users may appear. While dealing with video observation, the researcher found that none of the participants is successfully controlling and minimizing their mistakes in speaking. By looking at the characteristics shown by the students while performing, the lecturers can provide a meaningful feedback to deal with their limitations. This is not only for Micro Teaching class but also the other classes as well.

2. English Language Education Study Program Students

Since this study is focusing on Individual variations, the researcher suggests the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students to prepare themselves earlier. It is because as English teachers, it is very important to
know how well the English proficiency is developed and how to train the learned system. Although it is true that while speaking the meaning is more important but it does not mean that we can be careless of the rules or grammars of the L2. ELESP students need to practice and make mistakes a lot to train themselves to make sure that they will perform better in the future.

3. **Further Researchers**

Future researchers might continue this research to gain deeper information or even to perfect the findings gathered and discussed in this research. Since the focus of this research is on individual variations in monitor hypothesis and principal conditions that might influence the participants in Micro Teaching class, further researchers may continue or conduct another new studies about the topic discussed. Since none of participants is found to be optimal monitor users, further research might question things that cause it or how they make use of their learned and acquired system in their way to develop English as a second language. Future researchers also can find how principal conditions proposed by Krashen affect students’ L2 learning.
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Appendix 1

The blueprint of the Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects Observed</th>
<th>Underlying Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Krashen (1983) explains that L2 learners can speak fluently as optimal users or under-users. The difference is on how the monitoring process works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hesitation style</td>
<td>Hesitation style will occur if the users rely on their conscious knowledge too much and are over-concerned with the correctness (Krashen, 1983, p. 44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Self-correction</td>
<td>Self-correction occurs in optimal monitor users, over-users, and under users’ performances. The optimal users and over-users do the self-correction based on their conscious knowledge of the language, while the under-users’ do it “by the way it sounds”. (Krashen, 1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2

#### The Blueprint of Principal Conditions questionnaire

(Closed-ended questions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Underlying theories</th>
<th>Aspects of Investigation</th>
<th>Total Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I need enough time to think and speak in English correctly.</td>
<td>In order to think about and use conscious rules effectively, a second language performer needs to have sufficient time (Krashen, 1982:16)</td>
<td>Sufficient Time in Performing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Even though I have enough time, sometimes I focus more on what I am saying not how I am saying it.</td>
<td>Even when we have time, we may be so involved in what we are saying that we do not attend to how we are saying it (Krashen, 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>While speaking, I become more accurate when I pay attention to the form of the language.</td>
<td>When performers focus on form they can increase accuracy in un-acquired but learned parts of Grammar (Krashen, 1982:101)</td>
<td>Focusing on Correctness of the Utterances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I make a hesitant style of talking when I focus on the rules of the language.</td>
<td>The over-use of rules in conversation can lead to trouble, i.e. a hesitant style of talking and inattention to what the conversational partner is saying (Krashen, 1982:16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To be able to speak well, knowing English grammar is really important.</td>
<td>Gass (2001) states that one should have an appropriate learned system to apply the competence of the rules.</td>
<td>Knowing the Rules of the Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I can learn English grammar presented to me completely and successfully without making any mistakes.</td>
<td>Linguists readily admit that they have only been able to describe a subset, a fragment, of English grammar. We can assume that even the best students fail to learn everything presented to them (Krashen, 1983:31).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 3**

**The Blueprint of the Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Underlying theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Even when we have time, we may be so involved in what we are saying that we do not attend to how we are saying it (Krashen, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How intense do you hesitate while speaking? Why?</td>
<td>The over-use of rules in conversation can lead to trouble, i.e. a hesitant style of talking and inattention to what the conversational partner is saying (Krashen, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What do you think about your English competence?</td>
<td>Gass (2001) states that one should have an appropriate learned system to apply the competence of the rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4

**Observation Sheet of 19 Micro Teaching Students Class A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Aspects observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak fluently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- A few hesitations were found.
- Some utterances were unclear.
- Many grammar mistakes were found.

| T2           | -                | ✓                  | ✓                      | ✓                    | ✓                 |

**Notes:**
- There were pauses between words and sentences.
- Some grammatical mistakes were found.
- She switched language while speaking.
- She corrected her mistakes once or twice.

| T3           | -                | ✓                  | ✓                      | ✓                    | -                 |

**Notes:**
- Pauses were used to find appropriate words.
- He was likely to repeat words (indicate the hesitation)
- There were some grammatical mistakes without correction.

| T4           | -                | ✓                  | ✓                      | ✓                    | -                 |

**Notes:**
- She had long pauses between sentences.
- Grammatical errors were found.
- She corrected sentence that was already correct.

| T5           | -                | ✓                  | ✓                      | ✓                    | -                 |

**Notes:**
- She spoke very little.
- Some grammatical mistakes were found.
- There was no self-correction.
- The pauses were long.
- L1 was used quite often in the middle of utterances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corrections were made but did not sound right. (How to pronounce…how to speak…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammatical mistakes were made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spoke very slowly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammatical mistakes were found without any corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T8</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She spoke fluent but still made a few grammatical mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The grammar was good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-correction did occur but not all utterances were fixed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pauses were rarely found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T9</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The grammar was good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was no self-correction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She spoke quite fluent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T10</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hesitation style was shown from the fillers and pauses. Those occurred because of unprepared answers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammatical errors were found without any corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some uncleared sentences were uttered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She was likely to use short sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T11</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speak very slow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pauses were found between words and sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T12</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fillers were used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- She was likely to repeat words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammatical mistakes were found without corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- She spoke very fast and fluent but still made a few grammatical mistakes without corrections.
- Sometimes she used fillers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T14</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- He spoke very slow and hesitate almost all the time.
- Only short sentences occurred during his performances.
- There are a lot of silent pauses.
- He avoided answering students’ questions because he was not able to answer it using English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T15</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Fillers and pauses were found between words and sentences.
- There was no self-correction found during her performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T16</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- She spoke very slow with long pauses.
- Fillers were used.
- Grammatical mistakes without any corrections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T17</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Some grammatical mistakes were made without corrections.
- Fillers were rarely used.
- She paused mostly between sentences but not all the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T18</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The hesitation was shown from the pauses she made.
- Some grammatical mistakes were made.
- She spoke quite fluent at the beginning but started to slow down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T19</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Fillers were used almost all the time.
- Many grammatical mistakes were made and there was no correction.
- She used ineffective sentence.
Appendix 5

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear friends,

The following questionnaire is prepared as an instrument to get a data for a research about kinds of individual variations in monitor hypothesis found in Micro Teaching class of Sanata Dharma University. Your answers will be kept confidentially; therefore your sincerity is really hoped.

Please put a tick (√) to the degree of agreement that fits you better. Thank you very much for your cooperation and willingness to fill out this questionnaire.

Name: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I need enough time to think and speak in English correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Even though I have enough time, sometimes I focus more on what I am saying not how I am saying it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>While speaking, I become more accurate when I pay attention to the form of the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I make a hesitant style of talking when I focus on the rules of the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To be able to speak well, knowing English grammar is really important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I can learn English grammar presented to me completely and successfully without making any mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Micro Teaching Students’ Interview Transcript

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?


(Of course I would prefer to focus on what I am saying rather than how it is said. If we were not given enough time, we will not have time to think so we just point out the point. Thus, the meaning is more important rather than the grammar.)

T2: Saya akan mendahulukan apa yang ingin saya katakan. Bahasa Inggris bukanlah bahasa kita, jadi untuk menggunakan bahasa Inggris itu sendiri agak susah. Saya harus menerjemahkan bahasanya atau berpikir tentang grammarnya sebelum bicara dan itu akan membuang banyak waktu.

(I think what I am going to say is more important. English is not our language so to use it, for me, it is quite difficult. I have to translate or think the grammar of the language and it will waste my time.)
T3: Saya akan lebih memilih untuk fokus dengan bagaimana cara saya menyampaikan sesuatu. Bagi saya, menggunakan bahasa Inggris dengan baik itu penting, apalagi sebagai seorang yang belajar bahasa Inggris. Walaupun kenyataannya kemampuan grammar saya sangat kurang, saya akan lebih memilih untuk fokus kepada grammarnya.

(I will focus on how to say something because to say English sentence well is important although I do not have good grammar. Because I am an ELESP student, grammar really matters for me.)


(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.)

T5: Karena sebenarnya saya tidak begitu memahami grammar, jadi saya lebih memilih untuk fokus dengan apa yang ingin saya sampaikan.

(Actually I do not understand about grammar, so I prefer to focus on the meaning.)

T6: Akan lebih baik bagi saya untuk mementingkan pesan yang akan saya sampaikan dari pada grammar-nya. Asalkan lawan bicara
saya mengerti apa yang saya maksudkan, grammar tidak begitu penting bagi saya.
(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.)

2. How intense do you hesitate while speaking? Why?


(It depends. If I do not understand what I am going to say, I will hesitate many times. Somehow, it makes me difficult develop my idea. If I can handle the topic, I do not think I will make any hesitations.)


(It depends. If it is like doing an impromptu speech and the topic fits me, I will perform better although there might be some hesitation.)
T3: During my experience in Micro Teaching class, I do hesitate a lot because I feel I am running out of time. I am also not ready to answer difficult questions from the students.

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 the hesitation.

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.
T6: Saya sangat sering berbicara dengan terbata-bata apalagi kalau harus berbicara bahasa Inggris. Belum lagi jika saya khawatir anak-anaknya tidak mengerti penjelasan saya atau grammar saya yang banyak salah membuat mereka bingung.

(I often do hesitation while speaking, moreover when it is in English. I usually think whether or not the students understand what I am saying or my grammar confuses them.)

3. What do you think about your English competence?

T1: Menurut saya, kemampuan bahasa Inggris saya biasa-biasa saja. Saya masih belajar di sini, jadi banyak hal yang harus saya pelajari agar mampu mengatasi kesulitan saya dalam belajar bahasa Inggris seperti pronunciation yang masih sangat kurang.

(I think my English is not too good and not too bad. I am still learning and there are a lot of things I must learn in order to deal with my difficulties in learning English like my pronunciation that sounds so Javanese.)

T2: Jujur saja, kemampuan bahasa Inggris saya tidak bagus. Saya tidak bisa menggunakan bahasa Inggris dengan baik walaupun grammar itu saya rasa sangat penting.

(Honestly, my English competence is not really good. I cannot use English properly although grammar is really important.)
T3: Kemampuan saya masih sangat kurang apalagi speaking skill-nya. Selain karena gugup, saya tidak paham soal grammar. Itu yang saya pikir adalah masalah utamanya.

(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.)


(I can say I have a good English proficiency. I am confident enough with my English competence.)

T5: Kemampuan saya pas-pasan. Saya tidak sebagus Shinta dan tidak terlalu buruk juga.

(I think it is so so. I am not good as Shinta but not too bad also. It’s standard.)

T6: Menurut saya kemampuann saya biasa-bisa saja. Tidak dibilang bagus tapi juga tidak terlalu buruk.

(I think it is not too good or bad.)