Available Online: https://journals.researchsynergypress.com/index.php/jefltr
Journal of English as A Foreign Language Teaching and Research (JEFLTR)
ISSN 2776-4524 (Online) | 2776-4184 (Print)
Volume 2 Number 2 (2022): 1-20

Perception in Krashen's Monitor Utilization and the Learners' English-Speaking Performance

Lovely Jean C. Caratiquit[1], Kevin D. Caratiquit[2], Mark John M. Tamanu[3]
[1,2] Lal-lo National High School, Division of Cagayan, Department of Education Philippines
[3] Cagayan State University - Aparri Campus, Philippines

Abstract

Speaking of oral communication has frequently been labeled unfavorable to people because it requires confidence and courage. Thus, it appears to be one of the most challenging learning skills, requiring practice and exposure. This study aimed to investigate the relationship between Senior High School learners' level of performance in spoken discourse and their dominant monitor performance. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design with 156 respondents selected through stratified random sampling. Recognizing and understanding Senior High School students' monitor performance was expected to motivate teachers to address the root cause of the problem, resulting in more proficient and communicative second language use. The findings disclosed that monitoring performance is crucial in determining the level of performance of learners in spoken discourse. A firm grasp of the English language, including its grammar and vocabulary components, effective discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication, are critical components in developing learners' speaking abilities. Additionally, this study revealed that those enrolled in the academic track are proficient at communicating, which explains why most are labeled optimal monitor users. In this regard, they use their information appropriately to strike a balance between self-correction and fluency, ensuring that error repair does not become a barrier to communication. Future recommendations were also discussed in this paper.

Keywords: Krashen'*s monitor hypothesis, monitor performance, speaking performance, ESL*

INTRODUCTION

Learning a language helps learners achieve their goals by allowing them to comprehend other facets of knowledge. The first step is learning to recognize and understand meaning through language. This helps learners connect with their environment and understand how to deal with it. Writing, reading, listening, and speaking are necessary for effective language learning.

Moreover, speaking is a language skill primarily used in everyday activities in English. Individuals can express their ideas, opinions, and points of view through speaking (Abrar et al., 2018). Additionally, speaking is viewed as the primary objective of English as foreign and second language education. The learners' English development is assessed by their ability to speak the language. Because it is a productive ability, students must develop the language independently. In connection with this, Krashen proposes a theory he calls the monitor hypothesis, which pertains to the oral and written production of language-by-language learners. The monitor hypothesis asserts that learning's primary purpose in second language acquisition is to edit or monitor the acquired system's language use and to start generating yet- unacquired grammatical forms. According to this

Corresponding author
Lovely Jean C. Caratiquit, lovelyjean.concejero@deped.gov.ph
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31098/jefltr.v2i2.937 Research Synergy Foundation

theory, language learners must possess a mental mechanism that can function as editors for their spoken and written language development. The learners' vocal production is under the control of this cerebral apparatus (Jegerski,2021).

A second language student might utilize the acquired norms to "monitor" or correct his language before or immediately after language output. This monitoring involves self-correction based on already learned language principles and is entirely distinct from monitoring during language acquisition. Self-correction is related to improved L2 performance (Vercellotti & McCormick, 2021), although second language (L2) learners vary in their capacity to self-correct, according to the study.

The learners' ability to learn something will allow them to operate their monitor, or, to put it another way, the knowledge gained through the learning process will be tracked (Xiang et al., 2022). Each learner will have their own aptitude for learning specific information, particularly when learning a language. It's possible that some of them are great achievers while others are underachievers (Lippi-Green, 2021). This is the most important factor in terms of how they properly learn about a particular topic and pick up the language.

As a result, the learners will be able to use this tool to fix their errors through the learning process that involves understanding the grammatical rules (Alzouwain & Lincoln, 2018; Fitria, 2021). It should be mentioned, nevertheless, that the utilization of this monitor will depend on the student's proficiency with it. Depending on their capacity, monitors will be used in a variety of ways (McDonald & Kasule, 2005). Therefore, it is very important for the instructor to be able to employ a specific technique (Caratiquit & Caratiquit, 2022) and approach while teaching grammar to the students after they detect the learners' monitor performance (Garbati & Mady, 2015).

Furthermore, the Grade 11 students in the new K to 12 Education Program are expected to already be in the learning phase and not merely 'acquiring' the language (Caratiquit & Pablo, 2021; Caratiquit, 2022). However, as the teacher-researcher noted, most students have reservations about the oral use of the English language, and their Mean Percentage Score in English was quite low. As a result, the study on measuring student performance will include a component analysis that will help teachers understand why students in ESL classes find speaking in public intimidating.

In this study, the level of performance of the learners in spoken discourse, along with grammar and vocabulary, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication, are carefully considered. Although grammatical proficiency does not always translate into fluency, it frequently can. When students are conscious of grammar, they can regularly check their language use while writing and, to a lesser extent, when speaking and make improvements.

The skill of managing a conversation's subjects and turns while resolving any communication issues is referred to as discourse management (Keysan, 2022). People must keep their own contributions under control while considering their discussion partner's stated and implicit replies, intents, and knowledge throughout discourses (Raju & Joshith, 2018; Leong, & Ahmadi, 2017).

Thus, this study investigated the monitoring performance of Senior High School Learners in their spoken discourse and speaking performance. It was believed that identifying and understanding the monitor performance of Senior High School learners will encourage teachers to attack the real problem in the pedagogy, thus resulting in more proficient and communicative use of the second language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Theory of Monitor

The theory of monitoring was derived from the five theories within Second Language Acquisition theories on which Krashen bases his natural approach pedagogy. These five hypotheses are the acquisition hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis. The monitor hypothesis mainly relates to the learning-acquisition hypothesis.

According to Rofid (2015), every student will have the aptitude and capability to gain specific knowledge, especially regarding language learning. There is a chance that some are great achievers and others are underachievers. This is the most fundamental and one of the most significant parts of how humans acquire proper knowledge about a subject while simultaneously learning a language. Students would develop a second language through a combination of language education and natural language acquisition, according to Krashen's (1982) hypothesis. He asserts that acquisition is responsible for learners' fluency in a second language and is the factor that initiates their utterances in that language, whereas learning serves only one function, which is to act as a monitor or editor. The goal of education is to change the way speech seems after it has been "generated" by a taught system. The Monitor Hypothesis refers to the strategy mentioned above. In other words, a second language student can "monitor" or correct his language before or after it has been produced by using the principles he has learned (Kurniawati, 2021). Krashen claims that the acquired and learned systems develop in quite different ways. His viewpoint holds that the only element responsible for language acquisition progress is "comprehensible input." When second language learners are exposed to both understandable and relevant language, they develop their language skills.

Language learning, in contrast, takes place in a completely different way. They learn a language's norms, patterns, and conventions more quickly when they are studied formally (explicit learning). Because of this, there is a direct connection between language learning and grammatical competence. Krashen is also confident that learning can only be converted into acquisition through a complex procedure. This is only possible if second language learners carefully monitor their language output and give grammatically accurate and understandable input. This self-generated input is one because it adds to the amount required for the learning process to take place (Krashen, 1982). As a result, both the acquired and the taught systems play a role in how language develops. The learned system will monitor during this process, while the acquired system will oversee starting language production.

The Monitor hypothesis explores the relationship between learning and acquisition and how the latter influences the former (Kurniawati, 2021). Monitoring demonstrates the implementation of the acquired grammar. According to Krashen, the acquisition system starts utterances, but the learning system acts as a "monitor" or "editor." When three specific conditions are met, the "monitor" performs the functions of planning, editing, and correcting. This includes having sufficient time, focusing on the form or correctness, and understanding the rule. (Krashen, 1982).

Krashen contends that language learners' usage of "monitors" varies depending on the individual. He makes a distinction between students who constantly use the "monitor" (over-

users), students who have not mastered the material or who prefer not to utilize their conscious knowledge (under-users), and students who use the "monitor" appropriately (optimal users).

Individual Variation of Monitor Use

Not every student has the opportunity to pick up the language. Learners are far more exposed to explicit learning, focusing on language rules while teaching and learning foreign languages. In order to construct the language, they will mostly rely on their learned system, which in this instance is linked to their grammatical proficiency. The way a foreign language learner uses their taught system will determine how they use their monitor. According to Krashen (1981), as cited by Fikroni (2018), three types of monitor users may be distinguished: monitor under-users, over-users, and optimal users.

Monitor Over-users

Excessive monitor use is the first condition. According to Krashen (1982), people who constantly try to monitor are known as monitor over-users or performers who continuously compare their output to their conscious comprehension of language creation. Additionally, he asserts that this particular group of performers tends to speak cautiously, self-corrects repeatedly mid-sentence, and is so fixated on perfection that they cannot communicate effectively.

For instance, grammar usage is one of two possible explanations for high monitor utilization. First, an over-user may lack sufficient proficiency in creating words, mainly spoken discourse. They may have fallen victim to a learning approach that primarily stresses the grammar component, leaving them unable to get meaningful language experience and compelled to rely on the learning process alone. A different possibility could include personality. These excessive language users have had the opportunity to acquire a second language and may have done so substantially. Individuals lack confidence in this new system and only feel secure while consulting their monitor.

Monitor Under-users

Monitor under-users is the second variation in how the monitor is used. Krashen (1982) defined monitor under-users as performers who have not mastered the system or, if they have, choose to forego using their conscious knowledge even when the conditions allow it. Typically, these performers are unaffected by error correction, only rely on their learned system, and self-correct based on their feeling of correctness (e.g., "that sounds right"). Some under-users of grammar give conscious grammar "lip service," according to Krashen (1981). Their subject believed that "grammar is the key to every language" and that speaking "correctly" necessitates conscious standards. The issue did not apply many aware standards in speech or writing. The under-user may live in a location where the target language is spoken or be exposed to frequent use of the second language in his nation, according to Krashen (1981).

Optimal Monitor Users

Optimal monitor users are the final type of monitor used. Krashen (1982) defined optimal monitor users as performers who utilize the monitor only when necessary and do not obstruct dialogue. In informal communication, where language could get in the way, many optimal users

avoid using it. However, optimal users can often make any necessary modifications to increase the accuracy of their output in writing and prepare speech when they have the time.

Therefore, Optimal Monitor users can complement their acquired system with their learned design. Krashen (1982) states, "Some optimal users who have not fully acquired their second language, who make slight and infrequent errors in speaking, can employ their conscious grammar so effectively that they can frequently create the appearance of being native writers." This does not necessarily imply that conscious learning can only result in imperfect acquisition. Some unlearned rules will be teachable, while others will not be. The optimal user can bridge the gap in conscious learning, but not entirely.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study generally aimed to determine the relationship between the monitor performance in spoken discourse and the level of performance in the spoken discourse of the Senior High School Learners of a secondary school in Cagayan, Philippines.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the learners' perception towards their monitor performance along the following categories?
    1.1. Optimal monitor user
    1.2. Monitor over-user
    1.3. Monitor under-user
2. What is the dominant monitor performance of the learners?
3. What is the level of performance of the SHS learners along with spoken discourse along with the following components?
    3.1. Grammar and vocabulary
    3.2. Discourse management
    3.3. Pronunciation
    3.4. Interactive communication
4. Is there a significant relationship between the spoken discourse performance of the learners and their dominant monitor performance?

RESEARCH METHOD

The descriptive-correlational method was used in this study. It aims to characterize, explain, and interpret current conditions, i.e., "what is." Descriptive research is used to describe various facets of a phenomenon. It describes the sample population's characteristics and behavior. A survey method in the form of questionnaires was used in the study. This study described and analyzed learners' monitor performance in spoken discourse.

On the other hand, the study was also anchored on the principles of correlational research. Correlational research was the basis of the teacher-researcher in exploring relationships between the dominant monitor performance of the learners and their profile and relationships between the speaking performance level of the learners and their profile and monitor performance.

The data were analyzed descriptively and inferentially using Jamovi Statistical Software. Frequency counts, ranks, percentages, weighted mean, and standard deviation will be used to analyze the students' demographic profiles. After ensuring that the data are normal and homogeneous, parametric tests like the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient test will be used to determine the relationship between the various variables at a 0.05 level of significance. Otherwise, the non-parametric test equivalents will be used if the parameters are not met.

Locale, Respondents, and Sampling Procedure

This study was conducted at a secondary school in Cagayan, Philippines. The study investigated the monitoring performance of Senior High School learners from different strands of the Academic Track. Among the strands were STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics), ABM (Accountancy, Business, and Management), and HUMSS (Humanities and Social Sciences. There are 226 learners of the Academic Track, and they were selected through stratified random sampling. The sample size was calculated using the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator. The distribution of samples used a proportionate stratified technique. The sample size for each stratum is proportional to its population. This type of stratified random sample is frequently a more accurate statistic since it provides a better picture of the entire population (Bhardwaj,2019). Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents.

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

Strand	Population	Sample (N=156)
STEM	79	47
ABM	69	41
HUMSS	114	68
TOTAL	262	156

Data Gathering Procedures

Written permission was sought from the office of the principal of Lal-lo National High School to obtain the full cooperation of the respondents. When it was granted, the teacher-researcher arranged appointments with the students' advisers to allow her to gather data.

The questionnaires and the checklist were conducted online through Google forms since face-to-face interaction with the learners are not allowed and were given during the testing day. Beforehand, learners were briefed on the purpose of the questionnaires and how the questionnaires would be accomplished. Analysis of the questionnaire followed.

The participants took an online speaking test through Google Meet to gauge their fluency. The teacher-teacher-researcher used an evaluation matrix. The students' speaking test was examined using an analytical scoring system that necessitates a separate score for each component. The teacher-researcher recorded the students' speaking abilities concerning the speaking test analysis. The teacher-researcher explained that this exam had nothing to do with students' speaking grades in class and would not influence their English grades to put students at ease and lessen their anxiety about being videotaped. The respondents were matched up for the speaking test.

Data Gathering Instrument

The study's primary data-gathering instrument is a three-part survey questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire is for determining the demographic profile of the learners. The second part is for the learner's monitor performance, wherein a modified questionnaire will be used. Entries in the questionnaire will be based on the study of Rofid (2015) and the definitions and characteristics of the three-monitor performance. In this study, the teacher-researcher directs discourse management, grammar, vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation as

indicators to assess learners' monitor performance. Twenty-one statements were equally divided into three monitor performance categories. For optimal monitor users, items numbered 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14, while items numbered 1, 3, 5, 9, 16, 21, and 19 are for monitor over-users. Items 2, 7, 10, 15, 17, 18, and 20 suit the monitor under-users. The respondents checked the box on the appropriate column for each statement corresponding to their perceptions. The highest score among the three determined the monitor performance of the respondents.

To ensure the reliability of the instrument and results, Cronbach's Alpha Test was performed. It is a test of the internal consistency of a set of items or how closely connected they are to one another as a group. It is regarded as a gauge of the stability of the scale (Caratiquit & Caratiquit, 2022; Caratiquit, 2022). It is evident in Table 1 and Table 2 that the adapted instrument employed in this paper is reliable and valid. Thus, it is acceptable for hypothesis testing.

Table 2. Scale Reliability Results

	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Monitor Over-User	7	0.749
Monitor Under-User	7	0.715
Optimal Monitor User	7	0.783

On the other hand, the speaking examination was derived from the speaking test performed in the Rofid (2015). Face validity was carried out to assess the accuracy of the adapted speaking performance criteria. An English expert was consulted to validate whether the instrument appears to measure what it is intended to measure. This kind of validity is concerned with whether a measure initially appears to be pertinent and appropriate for the performance it is evaluating.

There were five topics available for selection on the speaking exam. The students choose one to construct a straightforward dialogue. These five topics were ones that the students were already familiar with. On this occasion, students engaged in discourse in pairs. They have one minute to prepare and two to three minutes to deliver the dialogue. Using a scoring guide, the teacher-researcher with another language teacher assessed the performance of the speaker. The scoring guide included five-band scores to indicate the speaking abilities of the learners.

The score guides highlighted the criteria for evaluating learners' spoken communication skills. The emphasis of the first section was on grammar and vocabulary. It emphasized the pupils' ability to construct grammatically correct sentences with the right language. The second component was discourse management, which pertains to the learners' capacity to communicate their views or information and use cohesive techniques. In addition, it assessed the performance of the students in relation to the occurrence of reluctance in utterance production. The next consideration was pronunciation. It evaluated the pronunciation skills of the students as well as their use of stress, intonation, and articulation. The fourth evaluable factor was the interactivity of communication. This characteristic pertains to the learners' ability to initiate and maintain interaction. In addition, it measured how the students themselves negotiated and developed the encounter.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Perception of the Learners towards their Monitor Performance

Optimal monitor user

The respondents' perceptions of their monitor performance and optimal monitor users' indicators were discussed in Table 3. Indicator 1 "Pay attention to grammar when doing interaction in English." has a descriptive value of likely with weighted mean (wm=3.86); Indicator 2 "Use other relevant terms to express what was meant when interlocutor does not understand what was said," likely and (wm=3.74); Indicator 3 "Try to correct every expression in English that is less precise," likely and (wm=3.69); Indicator 4 "When interacting in English, there is no difficulty using vocabulary right," likely and (wm=3.54); Indicator 5 "When responding to other people's expression in English, there is no doubt in what was said," likely and (wm=3.50); Indicator 6 "Able to pronounce a word in English with the right intonation," likely and (wm=3.44).

On the other hand, Indicator 7, "Pay attention to aspects of intonation and word stress when saying a word in English," has a descriptive value of somewhat likely and (wm=3.25). The monitor performance of the SHS learners, along with optimal monitor user indicators, have an overall mean of 3.57 with a descriptive value of likely to be optimal monitor user.

The learners' perception of their monitor performance and optimal monitor users' indicators implies that they pay more attention to grammar when interacting in English. The majority of research on language rules and spoken language indicates that grammar is essential in speaking fluently.

In English, linguistic knowledge scrutinizes and identifies the language's structural aspects and elements. These capabilities address morphological, phonological, semantic, and syntactic concerns. The grammatical points that comprise the language's structure are the communication's building blocks.

Before a person can speak, a variety of factors and components in his or her mind must be formed. To begin, it is necessary to match the sounds to create different words. Second, these words must be integrated to create phrases, clauses, and sentences with a particular meaning. As an outcome of these facts, communicating in a foreign language without knowledge of its grammar is nearly impossible. (Kianiparsa & Vali, 2010).

Grammar is critical for second language acquisition. Language learning involves mastering four basic skills: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. So, it's impossible to talk in English correctly without using grammar. Grammar knowledge helps correct errors and improve scripts (Kumar et al., 2015).

Students and teachers perceive grammar differently. English learners think grammar is a rule that helps them make a sentence and communicate with others. They use grammar to convey meaning. But grammar isn't the best way to get a definition.

Therefore, it is evident that the learners are aware of the importance of paying attention to grammar as it will help them better interact with other learners.

Table 3. Monitor performance of the learners along with optimal monitor user indicators

	Indicators	WM	DV
1.	Pay attention to grammar when doing interactions in English	3.86	Likely
2.	Use other relevant terms to express what was meant when the interlocutor does not understand what was said	3.74	Likely
3.	Try to correct every expression in English that are less precise	3.69	Likely
4.	When interacting in English, there is no difficulty using vocabulary right	3.54	Likely

Indicators	WM	DV
5. When responding to other people's expressions in English, there is no doubt in what was said	3.5	Likely
6. Able to pronounce a word in English with the right intonation	3.44	Likely
7. Pay attention to aspects of intonation and word stress when saying a word in English	3.25	Somewhat likely
Overall mean	**3.57**	**Likely to be optimal monitor user**

Legend:

4.20-5.00 >>	*Very likely*	*1.80-2.59 >>*	*Unlikely*
3.40-4.19 >>	*Likely*	*1.00-1.79 >>*	*Very unlikely*
2.60-3.39 >>	*Somewhat likely*		

Monitor over-user

Table 4 shows the respondents' perception of their monitor performance and optimal monitor user indicators. Indicators 1,2,3,4,5 have descriptive value of likely with weighted mean as follows respectively: (wm=3.92), (wm=3.81), (wm=3.56), (wm=3.55), (wm=3.42). Indicators 6 and 7 have a descriptive value of somewhat likely. Indicator 6 has (wm=3.30) and Indicator 7 (wm=3.28).

The monitor performance of the SHS learners along monitor over-user indicators has an overall mean of 3.55 with a descriptive value of likely to be monitor over- user. Regarding learners' perceptions towards their monitor performance along optimal monitor users' indicators, it can be gleaned from the table that they think of grammar before expressing something in English. It was previously discussed the importance of grammar in speaking as many learners pay attention to it when doing interaction in English. However, the majority of the monitor over-users think of grammar before expressing something in English that impedes their interaction with others. They attempt to monitor all the time. Additionally, they lack speaking fluency due to their preoccupation with being grammatically correct.

Igolkina (2021) argues that these language learners are too self-conscious and fixated on accuracy to be able to communicate with any degree of fluency. Among the traits of excessive monitor, users are: They are familiar with several English-language conventions. They are unable to speak to one another.

Table 4. Monitor performance of the learners along with monitor over-user indicators

Indicators	WM	DV
1. Think of grammar before expressing something in English	3.92	Likely
2. Think about how to pronounce the words correctly when speaking in English.	3.81	Likely
3. Find it difficult to use the right vocabulary when expressing something deep in English	3.56	Likely
4. Prefer to wait for the other person to start a conversation because there is no confidence in saying anything in English	3.55	Likely
5. Pay attention to what vocabulary to use when interacting in English.	3.42	Likely
6. Feel insecure and keep quiet when asked to speak in English by someone.	3.30	Somewhat likely

Indicators	WM	DV
7. Have trouble pronouncing a word when interacting with other people in English.	3.28	Somewhat likely
Overall mean	**3.55**	**Likely to be monitor over-user**

Legend:

4.20-5.00 >>	*Very likely*	*1.80-2.59 >>*	*Unlikely*
3.40-4.19 >>	*Likely*	*1.00-1.79 >>*	*Very unlikely*
2.60-3.39 >>	*Somewhat likely*		

Monitor under-user

It is evident in Table 5 that Indicators 1 and 2 have a descriptive value of likely and (wm=3.47) and (wm=3.40), respectively, while Indicators 3,4,5,6, and 7 have a descriptive value of somewhat likely. The weighted means are as follows respectively (wm=3.34), (wm=3.33), (wm=3.31), (wm=3.29), (wm=3.22).

The SHS learners' monitor performance and under-user indicators have an overall mean of 3.34 with a descriptive value of somewhat likely to be monitored under-user. Furthermore, the findings show that in terms of their perception of their monitor performance along monitor under-user, most learners are hesitant to use proper grammar when interacting with others. According to Krashen (1982), monitor under-users do not care about correctness because they have not consciously learned the rules or have chosen to ignore their conscious knowledge of the target language. They value grammar but rarely use it when speaking, even when given a chance. It makes them hesitant to use proper grammar when communicating because they desire not to use their conscious knowledge during the interaction.

Table 5. Monitor performance of the learners along with monitor under-user indicators

Indicators	WM	DV
1. Hesitant to use proper grammar when interacting with other people	3.47	Likely
2. Tend to repeat what was said when interacting in English	3.40	Likely
3. Pronounce a word in English correctly without hesitation	3.34	Somewhat likely
4. Have trouble using the right times of connection when expressing things in interacting using English	3.33	Somewhat likely
5. Feel hesitant when saying a word in English	3.31	Somewhat likely
6. Respond to other people's words in English by using a true expression	3.29	Somewhat likely
7. Feel insecure about saying a word in English	3.22	Somewhat likely
Overall mean	**3.34**	**Somewhat likely to be monitor under-user**

Legend:

4.20-5.00 >>	*Very likely*	*1.80-2.59 >>*	*Unlikely*
3.40-4.19 >>	*Likely*	*1.00-1.79 >>*	*Very unlikely*
2.60-3.39 >>	*Somewhat likely*		

Dominant Monitor Performance of the Learners

Table 6 revealed that most learners were classified as optimal monitor users, with seventy learners or 44.9 percent. Meanwhile, sixty-five or 41.7 percent were classified as monitor over-users, and twenty-one or 13.5 percent were classified as monitor under-users. With these, it can be concluded that most of the learners optimized the use of their monitor wherein they pay attention to grammar when doing interaction in English, used other relevant terms to express what was meant when the interlocutor did not understand what was said, interact in English with no difficulty using vocabulary right, respond to other people's expression in English with no doubt and pronounce a word in English with the correct intonation.

This can be corroborated by the respondents' track enrolled which is the academic track. These learners are academically inclined to speak as they are given numerous speaking activities. This can be supported by their academic performance in English, as discussed in Table 7.

Table 6. Dominant monitor performance of the learners

Monitor Performance Categories	Frequency (N = 156)	Percentage
Optimal Monitor User	70	44.9
Monitor Over-User	65	41.7
Monitor Under-User	21	13.5

Level of Performance of the Learners in Spoken Discourse

Along with grammar and vocabulary

It can be gleaned from Table 7 that 57 or 36.5 percent of the learners are average in their level of performance in spoken discourse along with grammar and vocabulary. Forty-seven or 30.1 percent are high, 39 or 25 percent are very high, and 13 or 8.3 percent are low.

In order to provide an interchange of viewpoints on familiar topics, most learners can attempt complex grammar forms, illustrate reasonable control over simple grammatical structures, and utilize a diverse variety of appropriate vocabulary to do so. As a result, their level of performance in spoken discourse in terms of grammar and vocabulary is considered average. In terms of grammar, most students demonstrated command of subject-verb agreement, the essential aspect of building sentences or utterances. Nonetheless, it was discovered that several students had difficulty employing the correct verb form. For example, "I'm won" must be spelled "I won," "Did you plays?" must be spelled "Did you play," and "What did you sang?" must be spelled "What did you sing?"

Despite some errors, the students were able to apply their vocabulary effectively in vocabulary. For example, the word "inform" in "Did you inform your lost car to the police?" in which it should be replaced by "report." Also, some learners are running out of words of what to say; they use the Filipino language instead of English.

Table 7. Level of performance of the learners in spoken discourse along with grammar and vocabulary

Levels	Frequency (n = 156)	Percentage
Level 5 – Very High *(shows a good degree of control of a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms; uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on a wide range of familiar topics)*	39	25.0
Level 4 – High *(performance shares features of levels 3 and 5)*	47	30.1
Level 3 – Average *(shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms, attempts some complex grammatical forms; uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on familiar topics)*	57	36.5
Level 2 – Low *(performance shares features of levels 1 and 3)*	13	8.3
Level 1 – Very Low *(shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms; uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on familiar topics)*	0	0.0

Along with discourse management

Table 8 exposed 62 or 39.7 percent of the learners are high in their spoken discourse and discourse management performance. Meanwhile, 50 or 32.1 percent of the learners are in the average level; 31 or 19.9 percent are in the very high level; 13 or 8. 3 percent are in the low level.

The findings show that most learners are high in their speaking performance in discourse management, where they can contribute relevantly to the topics discussed using a range of discourse markers and cohesive devices.

Despite some repetition and errors in conjunction usage, it was obvious from the speaking test that most students could deliver appropriate responses when speaking English. For example, "if [if] you can [if you cannot] [if you cannot] utilize mobile phone appropriately, it can [if can] [if can] interrupt the students' studies." In this statement, the speaker intended to correct her previous statement: "If we are unable to utilize our cellphones properly, it can be detrimental to the education of students." However, because she frequently repeated her sentences, her utterance was grammatically incorrect and difficult to comprehend.

There are also learners accustomed to using fillers, especially when they have difficulty organizing their ideas. Fillers such as ahmmm, hmmmm, ehh, ahhh sometimes cause distraction in understanding their message.

Table 8. Level of performance of the learners in spoken discourse along with discourse management

Levels	Frequency (n = 156)	Percentage
Level 5 – Very High *(produces extended stretches of language with very little hesitation; contributions are relevant, and there is a clear organization of ideas; uses a range of cohesive devices and discourse markers.)*	31	19.9
Level 4 – High *(performance shares features of levels 3 and 5)*	62	39.7

Levels	Frequency (n = 156)	Percentage
Level 3 – Average *(produces extended stretches of language despite some hesitation; contributions are relevant, and there is very little repetition; uses a range of cohesive devices)*	50	32.1
Level 2 – Low *(performance shares features of levels 1 and 3)*	13	8.3
Level 1 – Very Low *(produces responses that are extended beyond short phrases, despite hesitation; uses basic cohesive devices)*	0	0.0

Along with pronunciation

Table 9 showed that 55 or 35.3 percent of the learners are high in their spoken discourse and pronunciation performance. Also, 51 or 32.7 percent of the learners are average; 40 or 25.6 percent are very high, and 10 or 6.4 percent are low.

It can be concluded that most learners are high in their level of spoken discourse in the aspect of pronunciation. It was evident that most of the learners' pronunciation was mainly intelligible during the speaking test, and their intonation was generally appropriate. Interestingly, most of them seemed natural to speak in the English language with the correct pronunciation of words and emotions, making their utterances more meaningful and understandable. Also, they showed the use of modulated voice.

Table 9. Level of performance of the learners in spoken discourse along with pronunciation

Levels	Frequency (n = 156)	Percentage
Level 5 – Very High *(is intelligible; intonation is appropriate; sentence and word stress is accurately placed; individuals sounds are articulated clearly)*	40	25.6
Level 4 – High *(performance shares features of levels 3 and 5)*	55	35.3
Level 3 – Average *(is intelligible; intonation is generally appropriate; sentence and word stress are generally articulated clearly)*	51	32.7
Level 2 – Low *(performance shares features of levels 1 and 3)*	10	6.4
Level 1 – Very Low *(is mostly intelligible and has some control of phonological features at both utterance and word levels)*	0	0.0

Along with interactive communication

The level of performance in spoken discourse, along with interactive communication of the learners, was discussed in Table 10. The findings revealed that 52 or 33.3 percent of the learners are at a high level. Forty-nine or 31.4 percent of the learners are at a very high level. Meanwhile, it was shown that 38 or 24.4 percent are at the average level, and 17 or 10.9 percent are at the low level.

It implies that most learners are already at a high level in interactive communication, where they can initiate and respond appropriately during speaking tests.

Table 10. Level of performance of the learners in spoken discourse along with interactive communication

Levels	Frequency (n = 156)	Percentage
Level 5 – Very High *(initiates and responds appropriately by linking contributions to those of other speakers; maintains and develops the interaction and negotiates towards an outcome)*	49	31.4
Level 4 – High *(performance shares features of levels 3 and 5)*	52	33.3
Level 3 – Average *(initiates and responds appropriately; maintains and develops interaction and negotiates towards an outcome with very little support)*	38	24.4
Level 2 – Low *(performance shares features of levels 1 and 3)*	17	10.9
Level 1 – Very Low *(initiates and responds appropriately; keeps the interaction going with very little prompting and support)*	0	0.0

Relationship between the Level of Performance in Spoken Discourse of the Learners and their Dominant Monitor Performance

It can be gleaned from Table 11 that a significant relationship was present between the respondents' level of performance in spoken discourse along with grammar and vocabulary and their dominant monitor performance with a correlation value of 0.330 (p=0.000). As a result, it can be concluded that most learners performed optimally in terms of grammar and vocabulary during their speaking performance. In this area, the students could apply simple grammatical forms, particularly subject-verb agreement. They had a substantial language, which gave them confidence when communicating in English. In addition, most of them displayed a grasp of both simple and complicated grammatical structures. Moreover, these students could easily express their views or viewpoints using various vocabulary.

It is also shown that there was a significant relationship between the level of performance in spoken discourse and discourse management and dominant monitor performance, with a correlation value of 0.182 (p=0.023). This finding revealed that most learners were classified as optimal monitor users in discourse management. Most would say something or respond properly rather than remain silent. They do not find it difficult to use the correct expression to express their ideas or opinions and use accurate, cohesive devices and discourse markers while having the conversation.

Also, their level of performance in spoken discourse and pronunciation has been found to be correlated to their dominant monitor performance with a correlation value of 0.240 (p=0.003). In articulation, most learners were classified as optimal monitor users, meaning they correctly pronounced words. They were confident in pronouncing certain words in English, which resulted in better conversion. Sihombing (2014) asserts that students must master pronunciation to speak generally with native speakers. They should also focus on their accent to help them communicate better. Also, both teachers and students should be aware that mastering pronunciation is also one of the factors influencing students' ability to speak. For this reason, teachers must focus on teaching speaking without neglecting pronunciation. Teachers must focus on pronunciation comprehension to make students more comfortable speaking.

Moreover, a correlation coefficient of 0.356 (p=0.000) indicated a significant association between the level of performance in spoken conversation and interactive communication and the performance of the dominant monitor. In interactive communication, most students were deemed

optimal monitor users. It indicates that the majority initiate and respond effectively, connecting their contributions to the speakers. In addition, they could maintain and expand the interaction and negotiate towards a resolution.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that learners who are optimal monitor users tend to have a higher level of performance in spoken discourse.

Table 11. Correlation test results between the level of performance in spoken discourse and their dominant monitor performance

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
**Dominant Monitor Performance*			
Level Of Performance in Spoken Discourse			
Grammar And Vocabulary	0.330	0.000	**Significant**
Discourse Management	0.182	0.023	**Significant**
Pronunciation	0.240	0.003	**Significant**
Interactive Communication	0.356	0.000	**Significant**

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data gathered, the study concludes that monitoring performance plays a vital role in the level of performance in the learners' spoken discourse. Good command of the English language and the components of grammar and vocabulary, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication, are essential to improving learners' speaking skills.

This study also unveiled that those learners enrolled in the academic strands are good at communicating, which is why most of them are classified as optimal monitor users. They use their information appropriately, which enables them to maintain a balance between self-correction and fluency, which means that error repair does not impede communication.

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

As to the monitor performance, the performance was limited to the three, as stated by Krashen. It only dealt with the monitor performance in speaking. It would not in any way deal with monitoring performance in other skills. The monitor performance served as a basis for pedagogical strategies to improve learners' English speaking performance levels.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the teacher-researcher strongly recommends the following:

1. English language teachers should be more aware of the learners' characteristics, especially concerning the use of their monitors. Furthermore, the teachers should identify the needs of the learners considering their monitored performance and provide appropriate support by incorporating various pedagogical strategies that help learners improve their English academic skills.
2. It is highly recommended that teachers create a conducive environment in virtual classrooms. Teachers should create a communicative environment in which students are required to produce the language orally. This environment will accustom them to English usage, allowing them to develop their language skills independently.
3. Teachers should adjust their lessons to accommodate learners with difficulty speaking and ensure that their daily lesson plans include support and reinforcement activities. Virtual classroom activities that help students improve their ability to express themselves are a critical component of language instruction. Additionally, learners should be consistently

assigned speaking activities while teachers assess and guide them as their speaking performance improves. The optimal monitor user can act as a knowledgeable guide for other learners.

4. Additionally, language teachers should model proper English language usage by demonstrating the grammar and vocabulary components, discourse management, pronunciation, and interactive communication.
5. It is suggested that learners become much more familiar with English by actively using it, particularly speaking. This way, the learners will become accustomed to using the language and will be less hesitant to express themselves in English.
6. To learners who are monitor over-users, a positive approach is necessary. Provide them with rewards and recognition and enhance their interest in learning the language by instilling the value of English learning. Create an environment that is conducive to learning. These learners must be constantly acknowledged to maintain their motivation and self-confidence. They should approach English with an open mind, fearless of ridicule, in order to learn exponentially.
7. The school shall consider implementing programs and activities that provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their speaking performance.
8. Maintain a nondiscriminatory learning environment for all students. Always maintain a child-friendly and non-threatening classroom free of bullying and intellectual discrimination. Due to the heterogeneity of learners in public schools, students who have difficulty communicating are vulnerable to academic bullying, and their inability to communicate may be the source of such discriminatory behaviors from their classmates. Language teachers must establish a system among students to avoid academic bullying, such as empathizing with mistakes rather than laughing at them, reinforcing positive attitudes rather than discriminating against them, and providing opportunities for both groups to promote helpful behavior rather than putting those who are incapable down.
9. Parents should be involved in the learning process, especially for the monitor over-users and under-users. After identifying the monitor performance of these learners, the language teacher should devise a series of at-home activities to be supervised by the parents or any able family member according to the level of mastery manifested. Parents are also encouraged to implement various activities with their children to foster their children's English development and realize the importance of language exposure for developing English.
10. The teacher should also consider the following conditions that need to be achieved for the monitor to be handy. When three conditions are met, including time, attention to form, and knowledge of the rule, the monitor can be utilized and is quite effective (Krashen,1982).
    a. Time. Learners of a second language require sufficient time to recall and use their prior information communicatively; they must intentionally consider the rules they have acquired. There must be adequate time to think or use grammar correctly.
    b. Focus on form. Not only the meaning we wish to express but also how we communicate must be taken into consideration. Some faults were prevalent in vulgar expressions used by trainees. The speaker should also consider the form.
    c. Know the rule. Learners of a second language must comprehend the rules of the target language to communicate successfully in a comprehensible, comprehensible, and straightforward manner.
11. For future teacher-researchers, it is highly suggested to focus on other grade levels or SHS tracks in investigating the learners' monitor performance to analyze their ability to use their monitor.

REFERENCES

Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyrafi, F., Makmur, M., & Marzulina, L. (2018). "If our English isn't a language, what is it?" Indonesian EFL Student Teachers' Challenges Speaking English. The Qualitative Report, 23(1), 129-145. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.

Alzouwain, & Lincoln. (2018). Positioning of ESL Saudi women and challenges they face while learning English in the United States. Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v18i1.531

Bhardwaj, P. (2019). Types of sampling in research. *Journal of the Practice of Cardiovascular Sciences*, *5*(3), 157.

Caratiquit, K. (2021). Web-based School Information and Publication System: A Developmental Study. *Global Education and Social Sciences Journal*, *1*(3).

Caratiquit, K. (2022). YouTube Videos as Supplementary Materials to Enhance Computer Troubleshooting and Repair Techniques for Senior High School Students in the Philippines. *International Journal of Social Learning (IJSL)*, *2*(3), 297-307.

Caratiquit, K., & Caratiquit, L. J. (2022). Uncovering teacher's situation amidst the pandemic: Teacher's coping mechanisms, initiatives, constraints, and challenges encountered. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, *8*(3), 288-298.

Caratiquit, K., & Pablo, R. (2021). Exploring the practices of secondary school teachers in preparing for classroom observation amidst the new normal of education. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education, 1*(4), 281-296. https://doi.org/10.35912/jshe.v1i4.721

Caratiquit, L. J. & Caratiquit, K. (2022). Influence of Technical Support on Technology Acceptance Model to Examine the Project PAIR E-Learning System in Distance Learning Modality. *Participatory Educational Research, 9* (5), 467-485 . DOI: 10.17275/per.22.124.9.5

Caratiquit, K. D. (2022). Mediating effects of protective factors on COVID-19 anxiety and academic performance of K to 12 Filipino learners: A PLS-SEM analysis with WarpPLS. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education*, *2*(3), 225-243. https://doi.org/10.35912/jshe.v2i3.972

Fikroni, Moh. R. (2018). Grammatical Competence within L2 Communication: Language Production, Monitor Hypothesis, and Focus on Forms Instruction. *Pancaran Pendidikan*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.25037/pancaran.v7i1.140

Fitria, T. N. (2021). Grammarly as AI-powered English writing assistant: Students' alternative for writing English. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *5*(1), 65-78.

Garbati, J. F., & Mady, C. J. (2015). Oral skill development in second languages: A review in search of best practices. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5(9), 1763. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0509.01

Igolkina N. (2021). Learners Typology: Language Acquirers Vs Language Learners. *Focus on Language Education and Research*, *2*(2), 23-28.

Jegerski, J. (2021). Krashen and second language processing. *Foreign Language Annals*, *54*(2), 318-323.

Keysan, İ. A. (2020). *A study on the phonological awareness skills of young learners of English in an EFL context* (Master's thesis, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Kianiparsa & Vali. (2010). The effect of grammar learning on speaking ability of EFL learners. ELTWeekly. https://eltweekly.com/2010/03/53-research-paper-the-effect-of-grammar-learning-on-speaking-ability-of-efl-learners-by-parnaz-kianiparsa-and-sara-vali/

Krashen. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. https://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf

Kumar, B., Kumar, P., & Sagar, N. (2015). Role of Grammar in English Language Learning. International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities, 3(10), 186-190.

https://ijellh.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/20.-B.-Pavan-kumar-paper-final.pdf?cec7d6

Kurniawati, N. (2021). Understanding Krashen Hypothesis of Second Language Acquisition: A Case Study of A Polyglot. *IJLECR-International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*, *7*(1), 83-89.

Leong, L., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. International Journal of Research in English Education, 2(1), 34-41. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34

Lippi-Green, R. (2021). That' s Not My Language: The Struggle to (Re) Define African American English. In *Language Ideologies* (pp. 230-247). Routledge.

McDonald, R., & Kasule, D. (2005). The monitor hypothesis and English teachers in Botswana: Problems, varieties and implications for language teacher education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *18*(2), 188-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310508668741

Raju, N., & Joshith, V. P. (2018). Krashen's theory of second language acquisition: A practical approach for English language classrooms. *International Journal of Innovative Knowledge Concepts*, *6*(12), 179-184.

Rofid. (2015). An Analysis of the Eleventh Grade Students' Monitor Use in Speaking Performance Based on Krashen's (1982) Monitor Hypothesis at SMAN 4 Jember [Master's thesis]. http://repository.unej.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/65507/110210401010_Moh.%20Rofid%20Fikroni_may.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Sihombing. (2014). The Second International Conference on Education and Language. https://artikel.ubl.ac.id/index.php/icel/article/download/312/851

Vercellotti, M. L., & McCormick, D. E. (2021). Constructing Analytic Rubrics for Assessing Open-Ended Tasks in the Language Classroom. *TESL-EJ*, *24*(4), n4.

Xiang, X., Yuan, R., & Yu, B. (2022). Implementing assessment as learning in the L2 writing classroom: a Chinese case. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(5), 727-741.

APPENDIX
Speaking Performance Criteria

Components	Score	Criteria
Grammar and Vocabulary	5	Shows a good degree of control of a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms. Uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on a wide range of familiar topics.
	4	*Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5*
	3	Shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms, attempts some complex grammatical forms. Uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on familiar topics.
	2	*Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3*
	1	Shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms. Uses a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on familiar topics.
Discourse Management	5	Produces extended stretches of language with very little hesitation. Contributions are relevant, and there is a clear organization of ideas. Uses a range of cohesive devices and discourse markers.
	4	*Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5*
	3	Produces extended stretches of language despite some hesitation. Contributions are relevant, and there is very little repetition. Uses a range of cohesive devices.
	2	*Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3*
	1	Produces responses that are extended beyond short phrases, despite hesitation. Uses basic cohesive devices.
Pronunciation	5	Is intelligible. Intonation is appropriate. Sentence and word stress are accurately placed. Individual sounds are articulated clearly.
	4	*Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5*
	3	Is intelligible. Intonation is generally appropriate. Sentence and word stress are generally articulated clearly.
	2	*Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3*
	1	Is mostly intelligible and has some control of phonological features at both utterance and word levels.
Interactive Communication	5	Initiates and responds appropriately, linking contributions to those of other speakers. Maintains and develops the interaction and negotiates towards an outcome.

Components	Score	Criteria
	4	*Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5*
	3	Initiates and responds appropriately. Maintains and develops interaction and negotiates towards an outcome with very little support.
	2	*Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3*
	1	Initiates and responds appropriately. Keeps the interaction going with very little prompting and support.