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The overt teaching of the Monitor, or conscious rule awareness, to native Spanish-speaking ESL students was examined to note possible benefits to the students' oral English production.

Native Spanish-speaking students of English (the experimental group) were taught an awareness of their ability to self-correct their spoken English. They were then compared to another group of native Spanish-speaking ESL students (the control group) in four areas: Ilyin Oral Interview score, total words produced, errors produced, and interference errors produced.

The results of the study lend support to the theory that overt Monitor teaching could be beneficial to native Spanish-speaking students of English. The experimental group showed a significant gain in Ilyin scores and a significant reduction in the number of errors produced.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A central problem in teaching a second language is an understanding of the learning process. Current research shows that a second language learner may acquire knowledge about the target language in the absence of explicit tutelage and may, as a result, be able to use the language creatively. However, he must also learn the rules of the language in order to be able to use it correctly.

Learning a second language can be compared to learning to play a new game. One can watch the game and even participate in it and still not be a really good player even though he may have 'acquired' a knowledge of what the players are doing. A good player must learn the rules of the game.

The learning process, then, involves two areas: acquisition, which is an intuitive process, and rule awareness, which is a conscious process. One explanation of this duality as it applies to learning a second language was presented by Stephen Krashen as the Monitor Model theory. His theory suggests that adult second language learning takes place on two planes: an implicit one in which the learner acquires knowledge internally
about a language and an explicit one in which the learner consciously learns rules about a language.

While there has been research on Monitor Model theory, there are still many unanswered questions about it, especially in the area concerning the teaching of the use of the Monitor. These types of questions could be addressed by use of experimental situations that would provide empirical evidence.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed by this study is whether or not the overt teaching of the Monitor on under-users of that facility will enhance their use of that facility.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to determine the effectiveness of the active teaching of the ability to Monitor on the grammaticality of the spoken language of an experimental group. The experimental group consists of volunteer native Spanish-speaking students of English as a second language (ESL) at the intermediate and advanced levels.

Null Hypothesis

The overt teaching of the Monitoring process to native Spanish-speaking ESL students will have no effect on the grammaticality of the students' spoken language ability as determined by the Ilyin Oral Interview (Ilyin, 1976).
Significance of The Study

The proposed study will focus on the Monitor Model theory and how it relates to the teaching of ESL. Since adult second language learners appear to internalize a second language on two levels, an implicit or acquired level and an explicit or learned level, it would be of value to a teacher of ESL to understand this process. The ESL teacher could then take advantage of this knowledge and teach the students to develop their conscious ability to Monitor the native speech of others and to self-correct their own non-native speech.

This study will be significant in that it should
1. Explore whether students who are normally under-users of the Monitor will improve in the grammaticality of their non-native speech after an overt teaching of Monitor use;
2. Provide teachers with insights into another aspect of teaching ESL.

Limitations

This study will be subject to the limitations recognized in oral interviews and to the availability of volunteer native Spanish speakers at the intermediate and advanced levels at the Intensive English Language Institute at North Texas State University. It will also be limited to the study of grammatical correctness in speaking.
Definition of Terms

The following terms will have restricted meaning and are thus defined for this study:

1. Acquired language: natural communication with little conscious attention to form
2. Adult: post-pubescent
3. Competence: one's underlying knowledge of a language
4. Critical period: a biologically determined period of life when language can be acquired most easily and after which language is increasingly difficult to acquire
5. ESL: English as a second language
6. Integrative motivation: motivation to learn a second language which involves the learner's desire to become a part of the society and culture of that second language
7. Interference: previously acquired or learned material obstructing the learning of new material, specifically, the interfering effects of the native language on the second language
8. LAD: language acquisition device (innate predisposition for language)
9. L₁: a native language
10. L₂: a second or non-native language
11. Learned language: adult language consciously learned either in a classroom situation or by self-study
12. Monitoring:* the altering of an acquired second language by the intrusion of consciously learned rules

13. Morpheme: the minimal meaningful unit in a language

14. Over-user: one who uses his knowledge of the rules of a second language to self-correct to the point of stifling creativity

15. Performance: overt, observable language

16. Performer: one who is using a second language verbally to accomplish given tasks

17. Prestige language: a language judged by the learner to be of high social status

18. Target language: the language being learned

19. Under-user: one who does not fully use his knowledge of the rules of a second language to self-correct.

*Capitalized "M" on "Monitor" refers to consciously learned second language rules rather than to monitoring done by native speakers on their acquired speech.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The existence of the Monitor was first posited by Labov (1970).* He suggested that prestige languages learned at an adult level are kept by the speaker through self-monitoring and may fall away when the speaker is tired or distracted or unable to hear himself. This learned pattern gives way in favor of the acquired language.

The Monitor Model as a proclaimed theory was presented as a paper to the Linguistic Society of America by Stephen Krashen in 1975. Krashen proposed it as a theory of second language development. According to Krashen, adult second language learners internalize language rules in two different ways: an implicit way known as acquisition and an explicit way known as conscious learning.

Acquisition of a second language by an adult is very similar to the way children learn a first or second language. It is also the way adults learn a second language in a non-classroom or informal environment. It involves interaction or natural communication with little concern for

*The documentation style of this study conforms to the guidelines of the Linguistic Society of America.
form and more concern with conveying and understanding messages. "The Monitor Model theory claims that performance in L2 is based on acquired knowledge (on language acquired implicitly)" (Valdman, 1978:89). Acquisition leads to skills that are automated for the most part. After acquisition, execution of the second language requires a minimum of attention. Language acquisition appears to occur in common stages in a universal way (Dulay and Burt, 1974b). As the acquirer progresses, each step brings him closer to the native speaker's set of rules.

Conscious learning is a result of either formal instruction or self-study and normally takes place in the classroom. Formal learning includes error correction and isolation of rules that are not usually present in the acquisition of language. Unlike the acquired system, the learned system has no invariant order of learning. This type of learning mainly provides for storage of separate items and ingredients of subtasks, whose retrieval from long term memory is a complex process (Sajavaara, 1978).

The Monitor Model theory claims that conscious learning is available to the performer only as a Monitor (Krashen, 1979). Utterances are initiated by the acquired system while conscious learning may by used only to alter the output of the acquired system either before or after the utterance is produced. The use of the Monitor has the
effect of improving accuracy. According to the Monitor Model theory, acquisition is possible without previous learning, and learning is possible without necessarily leading to acquisition (Krashen, 1979).

There are two constraints on Monitor use: time and focus on form (Krashen, 1981a). In normal speaking, performers may not have enough time to apply consciously learned rules to their speech; even if there is sufficient time, a performer must be focused on form or correct grammatical utterances in order to use the conscious rules or Monitor.

Since Krashen's introduction of the Monitor Model theory, there has been much research on and examination of the theory. Several major aspects of the theory, important research regarding the theory, and relevant implications for teaching English as a second language will now be examined.

Language Aptitude

The Monitor Model helps interpret language aptitude, or the ability to learn and use a second language. Aptitude may be directly related to conscious learning. It can be divided into three areas: grammatical sensitivity, inductive ability, and phonetic coding (Carroll, 1973). Grammatical sensitivity, or the ability to demonstrate a 'feel' for the grammaticality of some aspect of grammar in a second language without ever having known a conscious rule
can be determined by requiring subjects to pick out the word or phrase in one sentence which most closely matches a capitalized word in the following sentence. This does not require explicit knowledge of grammatical terms but rather a conscious awareness of language and grammar (Carroll, 1973). Inductive ability, or the ability to examine language material and notice and identify patterns, correspondences, and relationships which involve meaning or grammatical form, also appears to involve conscious learning because the goal of inductive exercises is the discovery of a set of rules by a problem-solving approach. Phonetic coding ability, or the ability to identify and store new language sounds in long term memory, is also highly related to overall success in learning a foreign language. This ability can be demonstrated by presenting a person with a string of two or three auditory nonsense syllables, distracting him for ten seconds, and then having him repeat the syllables. His ability to do this is related to his success in learning a foreign language (Carroll, 1973).

Scores on aptitude tests show a relationship to performance in test situations when use of the Monitor is allowed and "when conscious learning has been stressed in the classroom" (Krashen, 1978b:9). This relationship is evident in several ways. Correlations of aptitude test scores with grades in foreign language classes are usually
high (Pimsleur, 1966). Also, language aptitude appears to be of major importance in learning second language skills through direct instruction (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Finally, aptitude scores correlate reliably with self-reports of conscious monitoring (Krashen, 1978b).

Language Attitude

While tests of general language aptitude and intelligence are good predictors of achievement, learning aptitude and intelligence in second language proficiency are quite separate from attitudes and motivation (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Aptitude, which plays a part in conscious learning, appears to play a minor role in real acquisition (Krashen, 1981b). Furthermore, aptitude is not directly related to attitude, which does play an important role in acquisition (Krashen, 1981b).

Second language attitude refers to the acquirer's orientations toward speakers of the target language as well as to personality factors. As noted above, it seems to be the case that "such factors relate directly to acquisition and only indirectly to conscious learning" (Krashen, 1981b:9). The right attitudinal factors, the presence of integrative motivation, and optimal self-confidence encourage useful input and allow the acquirer to use this input for acquisition (Krashen, 1981b).
Personality factors relating to self-confidence, such as positive self-image, low anxiety, and empathy, also relate to second language proficiency and more directly to acquisition (Krashen, 1978b). The major barriers to acquisition are the affective barriers of anxiety, stress, and low self-esteem (Krashen, 1981a). These barriers keep acquisition from taking place efficiently. The positive personality factors, as with proper attitude and integrative motivation, increase communicative competence by enhancing acquisition.

If the direct relationship between attitudinal factors and language acquisition does exist and if the major goal in language teaching is development of communicative ability, it appears that attitudinal and motivational factors are more important than aptitudinal factors because conscious learning (Monitor) makes a much smaller contribution to communicative ability than does acquisition.

Individual Variation

The Monitor Model predicts at least one aspect of individual variation in adult second language performance. The model predicts that performance will vary according to the degree conscious monitoring is used (Krashen, 1981b). (Note that Monitoring via a learned system as used in Monitor Model theory differs from monitoring used in normal language to tell native speakers when they have erred in their acquired language.) Performance errors of the
acquired system are guided by universal principles; Monitoring of errors, though, will reflect each learner's differences (Krashen, 1980b). Some people seem not to use a conscious grammar (Monitor) at all while others use it to the extent of stifling creativity in communication. The optimal user, however, will use error correction when necessary but will not let it get in the way of creative communication. Before case studies of Monitor users are noted, some general characteristics of successful Monitor users should be stated:

1. Successful Monitor users edit their second language output when it does not interfere with communication.

2. This editing results in variable performance in that we see different types and amounts of errors under different conditions. Monitoring generally improves accuracy levels, and when attention is on form, we no longer see the same natural difficulty order of children.

3. Good Monitor users show an overt concern with correct language and regard un-Monitored speech and writing as careless (Krashen, 1978a:177).

The Over-User

The Monitor over-user Monitors all the time and as a result exhibits little language fluency. This type of user may do well on a discrete point test but be unable to communicate adequately in the second language.

The over-user is noted in a case study by Stafford and Covitt (1976). A Finnish speaker who knew many of the rules
of English but who was often unable to communicate in speech was studied. While her written language was quite accurate, she spoke very little because she tried to remember and use grammar rules before speaking. She generally did not trust her intuitions about English syntax, but instead relied on conscious rules.

According to Gardner (1976), it is possible that the over-user, because of a feeling of self-consciousness and vulnerability, may have a fear of making what he perceives to be an error. This feeling may be retained from the end of the "critical period" (Carroll, 1973:7) for language acquisition during adolescence, when feelings of anxiety and low self-esteem are prevalent.

The Under-User

At the other extreme are adult second language learners who do not seem to use the Monitor to any extent, even when conditions permit. The personality of the under-user of the Monitor appears to be very outgoing and uninhibited. The under-user is not embarrassed by making mistakes and is in contrast to the self-conscious introverted personality of the over-user.

A case study of the under-user was made by Cohen and Robbins (1976). They studied a man named Hung, a native Mandarin speaker, who came to the United States at the age of ten and did not receive formal training in English. For
the most part Hung was unable to self-correct his own errors in spoken or written English and did not have a conscious knowledge of the rules he had broken. When he did correct, he did so by 'feel,' reflecting reliance on his acquired competence only.

The Optimal User

A case study by Krashen and Pon (1978a) illustrates some points of optimal Monitor users. The subject P, in her forties, was a native speaker of Chinese, who had begun to learn English at the age of twenty when she came to the United States. Krashen and Pon studied her everyday language production, recording her errors over a three-week period. When the subject was confronted with her errors in speech, she was able to recognize them and give the correct form. She was also capable of describing the rules that were broken. Her written English revealed almost no errors. Upon considering her self-correcting behavior, the investigators came to the following conclusion:

P thus illustrates the general characteristics of the successful Monitor user . . . . She is able to communicate well in both Monitor-free and edited situations, applying the Monitor when it is appropriate to focus on form. Her performance is variable, in that she makes some errors in un-Monitored speech, while her written output is quite close to the native speaker's norm. In a sense, she is able to achieve the illusion of the native speaker's syntactic level of performance by efficient, accurate Monitoring (Krashen, 1978a:178).
The optimal Monitor user is able to Monitor when it is appropriate, when there is time, and when it does not interfere with communication. Such language learners use the conscious grammar only as a supplement to fill gaps in their acquired competence when such Monitoring does not get in the way of communication.

First Language Influence

The Monitor Model also helps explain first language interference according to Krashen's theory. Performers fall back on their first language when they have not acquired a relevant structure in the second language (Newmark, 1972). This hypothesis of interference predicts two phenomena. First, structures that second language learners "acquire earliest and easiest may also be those that show first language influence" (Krashen, 1978b:13). For example, the word order of L2 may be learned early, but the language learner will quickly revert to his native word order when unsure about the new language. Second, first language interference is most prevalent in acquisition-poor environments, such as the foreign language classroom. Such interference is rare in natural second language acquisition. For example, children acquiring a second language naturally go through a period of active listening in "which their speech is prefabricated rather than
creative . . . and may correspond to the adult use of first language as a filler" (Krashen, 1978b:13). The recent success of methods that require active listening before speech in adult L2 learning situations also supports this view. Meaningful intake allows acquisition to occur, yet production of non-native speech before sufficient acquisition is built up results in reliance on the surface structure of L1 (Krashen, 1978b).

First language influence is also seen when performance without acquired competence is accomplished by inserting L2 vocabulary into L1 surface structure. In this case the Monitor may be used to make alterations where first and second language surface structures differ. However, this is not an efficient way to learn and produce a second language because it is limited and can go only as far as the user's conscious grammar will take it (Krashen, 1978b).

Child and Adult Differences

Child-adult differences in attainment of a second language can also be examined by use of the Monitor Model theory. Certain tests of English as a second language yield a natural difficulty order for both adults and children learning English as their second language. In Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974), an identical difficulty order for eight grammatical morphemes in English was found both for adults and for children.
Aptitude and attitude may also be noted in regard to child-adult comparisons in second language learning. Aptitude may have a weaker relationship to child second language proficiency than to adult because aptitude relates directly to conscious learning, which is less important in children. Attitudinal factors, though, appear to be related equally both to adult and child second language acquisition (Gardner and Lambert, 1972).

Child Language Learning

Child utterances often seem to function as instrumental acts designed to accomplish effects in other people (Brown and Hanlon, 1970). Much of a child's speech consists of prepackaged routines incorporated from adult speech without being internally analyzed (Wagner-Gough and Hatch, 1975). Up to the age at which children begin to use formal operations, explicit explanations about rules of grammar are not effective in helping them acquire a language. However, "if a child is allowed the necessary input during what is known as the 'critical period' (Carroll, 1973:7), complete competence in the target language appears to be inevitable" (Krashen, 1976:163).

While acquisition by children appears to be the same grammatically as for adults, the acquisition of native-like pronunciation is peculiar to pre-pubescent children (Krashen, Long, and Scarcella, 1979). Seliger, Krashen, and
Ladefoged (1975) studied children who arrived in a new country at nine years of age or younger and lived in the country several years. The subjects were judged to have native accent after the several years spent in the new country. Since dialects acquired after puberty are less stable, they never achieve the automatic response level of language acquired before puberty, and maintenance of such post-pubescent language skills requires constant self-monitoring (Seliger, Krashen, and Ladefoged, 1975).

**Adult Language Learning**

Most adults need formal environments in addition to exposure to primary linguistic data if they are to improve in second language learning, yet adult learners may be both aided and inhibited by prior learning in their native country depending on the competence of their teachers (Seliger, Krashen, and Ladefoged, 1975).

Recent studies (Bailey, Madden, and Krashen, 1974) indicate that errors made by adults in second language learning are to a large extent common to learners with different mother tongues and are analyzable as incorrect hypotheses about the target language. Despite differences in adult learners in the amount of instruction, exposure to English, and mother tongue, as noted previously (Bailey, Madden, and Krashen, 1974), the relative difficulty of grammatical morphemes appears constant.
Adults may never achieve the level of performance attained by first language learners or even of children learning a second language and may need presentation of rules and error detection and correction, which is unnecessary for a child. However, results of studies indicate that they process linguistic data in ways similar to younger learners (Bailey, Madden, and Krashen, 1974). Moreover, adults proceeding through the "early stages of syntax and morphology develop competence faster than children if time and exposure are constant" (Krashen, Long, and Scarcella, 1979:573).

Morpheme Acquisition Research

Morpheme acquisition studies for adult second language learning are helpful in showing when performers appeal to conscious learning and when they do not. Dulay and Burt (1974a) studied child second language acquisition and found that while child second language morpheme acquisition order was different from child first language morpheme acquisition order, there were definite similarities among child second language acquirers. And, as noted in an earlier section, Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974) found that regardless of their L1, adult second language learners also showed an order of grammatical morpheme acquisition similar to that of child second language learners.
An experiment by Krashen (1976) showed no difference in acquisition of grammatical structures between students of different linguistic backgrounds. The tests used (Bilingual Syntax Measure and SLOPE) tapped only the acquired system in adults because sufficient time was not allowed for Monitor use. This study explains the similarity across acquirers of different languages because similar principles govern acquisition. When extra time was allowed, though, and the consciously learned grammar was used as a Monitor, there was less similarity between different ages and different linguistic backgrounds.

Larsen-Freeman (1975) also studied the natural order of second language morpheme acquisition of adults. She used grammar-type pencil and paper tests. Her results did not show a natural order of acquisition, probably because the test allowed intrusion of the consciously learned grammar (Monitor). As Farhady (1980) has noted, only when performance is Monitor-free is the difficulty order of grammatical morphemes similar in all second language learners.

Krashen, Butler, Birnbaum, and Robertson (1978) also attempted to examine morpheme acquisition order in adult second language learners. In their study, ESL students were asked to write compositions under two conditions: they were to write in a specified time period, and they were to edit
their work. They found a natural order in both conditions with only little evidence of the use of the Monitor in the edited condition. It appeared that the students were more concerned with communication when writing than with form, even when asked to correct their work. The effect of several variables on the difficulty order of English grammatical structures for adult second language learners was investigated by Janet Kayfetz Fuller (1978). She included in her study the number of languages known previously, the native language, the test type, and the test sequence. The results indicated that the order and accuracy of the English structures tested were constant regardless of the variables examined. She concluded that the Monitor can be brought out only under certain conditions not allowed for in her experiment and that extreme discrete point tests may be required to expose the Monitor. Her studies also allowed her to observe the importance of natural language acquisition and the limits of conscious language learning.

The ability of adults to acquire grammatical morphemes (as opposed to learning them) was studied by Braine (1977). In his study, subjects listened to and repeated sentences in a meaningless language. After exposure, students were able to discriminate grammatical and anomalous sentences with much accuracy even though many could not state the grammatical principle involved. In those cases, acquisition—not learning—was occurring.
Results of morpheme acquisition studies, then, show that morpheme order, which appears to be similar across cultures when acquisition is occurring, can be influenced by conscious learning (Monitor), and the order itself may vary when such a learned system intrudes.

Implications for Language Teaching

The main contribution of formal language instruction is in the area where the LAD is weakened in puberty. Studies by Krashen and Seliger (1975) show a strong relationship between more study and adult second language proficiency; therefore, the classroom appears to be of great benefit to the adult learner and of little benefit to the child learner, who learns better in a natural linguistic environment. Up to the age at which children begin to use formal operations, explicit explanations about rules of grammar are not effective in helping them acquire a language (Krashen, 1981b).

Formal language classes provide the best opportunity for adult acquisition because they can be tuned to the student's level of ability. According to Krashen (1981b), the ideal environment for second language acquisition should provide the learner with meaningful language intake and should contain only enough new data so that the creative construction process continues to be stimulated.
Instruction is related to second language proficiency in adults, while exposure to the second language in informal environments is not (Bailey, Madden, and Krashen, 1974). The most effective instruction, according to Krashen (1979), is that which follows the observed order of difficulty. Krashen also stresses the importance of input in instruction. His input hypothesis states that "language acquisition (not learning) occurs when the acquirer understands input language. Speaking aids language acquisition indirectly by encouraging understandable input" (Krashen, 1979:164). Krashen suggests that speaking too early may be detrimental to language teaching since it may force speakers to resort to L1 communication strategies, and these strategies may be continued to be used later. Unless plans and programs necessary for speech are acquired, the planning device will have to resort to learned items, which require more processing and time (Krashen, 1979).

The Monitor Model theory claims that explicit language learning does not lead directly to proficiency and communicative competence; however, "explicit language learning plays an important role in those activities where there is sufficient time to Monitor the acquired system and where the form of the message must be attended to" (Valdman, 1978:90). Such activities are exemplified by writing and prepared speeches.
While correct speech is important in foreign language classrooms, the overuse of the Monitor impedes fluency in L2. Overcorrection by teachers, which can lead to overuse of the Monitor, should be avoided (Valdman, 1978).

Valdman (1978) also indicates that explicit language learning plays an important role in the acquisition of vocabulary and proper pronunciation. These two areas are particularly important because understanding of messages in L2 can be aided by the early internalization of vocabulary as well as by awareness of proper pronunciation.

The learning situation itself can aid second language acquisition. A natural learning situation with problems and simulations that require students to communicate spontaneously in the target language should be emphasized. Instructional materials should be presented in a communicative way and at certain levels of complexity in order to match the learner's ability (Schevill and Stone, 1980). Also, teachers must provide the learner with the kind of material that will most readily allow him to make use of whatever inductive ability he may have. Teachers need to foster

... awareness of grammatical and semantic rules at a conceptual level because internalization of those rules probably operates best when the learner has an opportunity to analyze and perceive for himself the operation of those rules (Carroll, 1973:11).
Krashen's Monitor Model provides an explanation for the absence of a direct relationship between drills (and other activities involving conscious attention to grammatical structures) and communicative ability. The reason, according to Monitor Model theory, that pattern drills fail to lead to a significant level of communicative ability is that they lead to learning rather than acquisition. Even though "the Monitor Model reduces the number of grammatically deviant utterances . . . it may also have an inhibitory effect on communicative ability" (Valdman, 1978:80).

The Monitor Model, with its distinction between acquisition and learning, can point to several goals in the classroom. Activities should be identified as either promoting language acquisition or language learning. Explicit language learning, while not directly transferable to proficiency in $L_2$, plays an important role mainly in writing. Where communicative competence is the primary goal, those activities promoting acquisition should be used. "Activities and speech modification that lead to greater comprehension are highly desirable since comprehended speech facilitates appropriate input for acquisition" (Valdman, 1978:107).

Conclusion

The Monitor Model indicates that language acquisition will take place if language is used for meaningful
communication with the right attitudinal factors and if there is enough input in contexts that are communicatively meaningful for the learner (Sajavaara, 1978). The use of the Monitor also explains individual variation in performance since second language learners with highly developed Monitors can outperform their acquired competence with the use of the Monitor. Since intake is possible only through understanding, the main tasks of the teacher are to bring in communicatively meaningful material and to encourage proper use of the Monitor (Krashen, 1976).

Even though, as Labov (1970) noted, the overt corrections supplied by the classroom can never be as regular and as far reaching as the unconscious efforts of the acquired system, work on the Monitor Model makes it possible for us to make language teaching objectives more sensible, to concentrate on teachable language skills, and to encourage optimal use of the Monitor.

While there has been research on Monitor Model theory, there are still unanswered questions. For example, can the ESL student be made aware of the Monitor and its benefits for correct communication in the target language? More specifically, can the under-user of the Monitor be instructed in such a way as to encourage better use of the Monitor?

In order to answer questions such as these, research on specific Monitor Model instruction should be undertaken and the results examined.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHOD

Experimental Design

A classical experimental design was used. An experimental and a control group were formed, and both groups were given a pretest. A treatment was administered to the experimental group only. After the treatment period, both the control and experimental groups were given a post-test.

Description of Conditions and Participants

The subjects for the study were from the Intensive English Language Institute (IELI) at North Texas State University, a school in which students receive intensive English instruction at all levels of proficiency. The students attend classes in a four-hour block each day from 8:30 to 12:30 or from 1:00 to 5:00. They attend these classes five days a week for sixteen weeks a semester. Students attending IELI have scored below 500 on the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and are considered pre-academic students.

Native Spanish speakers from levels three, four, and five (level one being lowest and level five being highest)
were asked to volunteer for an experimental language study. Ten students volunteered for the original meeting during which individual interviews (the pretest) were conducted. While all of the students were willing to be involved in the experimental group, logistical considerations prevented some of them from being available when needed. Thus schedule flexibility was the main factor in the assignment of students to the experimental or control groups. Each group was comprised of five students.

The experimental group consisted of three female and two male students ranging in age from eighteen to twenty-four. There were three students from level three, one from level four, and one from level five. The native countries represented were as follows: one from Peru, one from Panama, and three from Columbia. (See Table 3.1.)

The control group consisted of one female and four male students ranging in age from seventeen to thirty-one. There was one student from level three, two from level four, and two from level five. The native countries represented were as follows: one from Guatemala, one from Peru, one from Columbia, and two from Mexico. Table 3.1 shows the complete demographic data for both groups.

Testing Instrument and Administration

The pretest and posttest used was the *Ilyin Oral Interview* (Ilyin, 1976). The *Ilyin* consists of fifty
TABLE 3.1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Native Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

questions designed for non-native speakers of English and is used as a placement test or diagnostic test of English proficiency.

There are two equivalent forms of the interview (named BILL and TOM) each with fifty similar items. The
determination as to which test is used depends on which day of the week the test is given. Two points are given for each item, making a total possible score of one hundred. The items progress from simpler to more difficult.

Reliability figures on the interview using the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 range from .86 to .98. Validity studies have been done correlating a candidate's scores on the interview with rankings of teachers' and students' opinions of the candidates' abilities. Rank Order Difference and Pearson Product Moment correlations ranged from .31 to .77. Correlations with other measures of aural proficiency show relationships ranging from .56 to .80 (Ilyin, 1976).

When the non-native interviewee is at an intermediate level or above in his English language ability, a shortened form of the interview consisting of thirty items can be used. Because the subjects for this study were at least at an intermediate level, the shortened form was used throughout.

The students were interviewed privately by the researcher, and a separate cassette recording was made for each student's pretest and posttest responses. The recorded responses were then transcribed and were used as a basis for the analysis of the errors. Results were also scored in keeping with the Ilyin Oral Interview scoring form.
The pretest (requiring approximately thirty minutes per person) was administered individually between November 1 and November 5, 1982. The students were then divided into experimental and control groups, and the treatment was administered to the experimental group. The posttest interviews were administered between December 9 and December 13, 1982.

Treatment

Overview of Treatment

The experimental group met for six thirty minute sessions after their regular four-hour block at IELI from November 8 through November 19, 1982. They met on a Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday for each of the two weeks at the IELI at North Texas State University.

The control group did not have this extra three hours of instruction; however, the amount of additional time spent with the experimental group was very small compared to the total time (320 hours) spent in English instruction at the IELI.

During each of the sessions, written and spoken dialogues were used to demonstrate Monitor use. Mimeographed copies of each dialogue were given to the students for examination and discussion.

Treatment Materials

The dialogues used for the treatment were based on typical interference errors of Spanish speakers learning
English. These errors were selected with the assistance of a bilingual ESL teacher. See appendix H for a complete list of the errors that were used.

Hypothetical situations were incorporated into dialogues in order to demonstrate Monitor use. The dialogues were designed in such a way that a native English speaker gave the model for a non-native Spanish speaker to Monitor. In some dialogues, the non-native speaker uses his Monitor and self-corrects while in others he does not Monitor or self-correct. The students were asked to identify Monitor use by the non-native speaker in each dialogue.

Several typical Spanish errors were included in each dialogue. Table 3.2 shows the occurrence of these errors in each of the dialogues used during the treatment sessions.

**Treatment Procedure**

During the first session, an explanation of the Monitor was given (Appendix A). After a group discussion of the Monitor, the students were given a simple dialogue (Appendix B) to read. The students were to try to determine whether the non-native speaker in the dialogue was actually Monitoring or not. A discussion of the dialogue followed. At the end of the session, the students were asked to try during the next few days to Monitor consciously the speech of native speakers in normal conversations with them and to try to self-correct their own speech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogues</th>
<th>Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>used NO for DO NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>used WILL for WOULD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>used PEOPLE IS for PEOPLE ARE: used TO MAKE for TO DO; used LOOKING THE for LOOKING AT THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>used TOO for VERY; omitted ARTICLE: omitted SUBJECT; used LOOK THE for LOOK FOR THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>used NO for NOT; used WILL for WOULD: used NO for DO NOT; omitted ARTICLE; used TOO for VERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>omitted ARTICLE; omitted SUBJECT: omitted AUXILIARY; used MAYBE for MIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>used NO for DO NOT; omitted SUBJECT omitted ARTICLE; used WILL for WOULD; used MAYBE for MIGHT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second session began with a review of the Monitor and a short discussion of the experiences of the students regarding their Monitor use since the last session. The next dialogue in the sequence (Appendix C) was given to the students, and the students were asked to discover the use (or lack thereof) of the Monitor by the non-native speaker in the dialogue. The students did this quickly and easily, so the next two dialogues (Appendix C) were read aloud without the students being able to see them in written form. The students found the oral dialogues to be very difficult to analyze. They tried to indicate many errors that were not present.

Since the students had trouble with the oral dialogues during the previous session, the third session began with a review of previous errors noted and an explanation of new errors that would occur in the dialogues for this session. Three dialogues were presented and discussed (Appendix D). Again, the first dialogue was given to the students in written form, and the second and third dialogues were presented orally. As before, the students could recognize Monitor use easily in the written dialogues but had trouble when the material was presented orally.

The fourth session was begun with a new approach to help the students overcome their feelings of "too much, too soon." First, a review page (Appendix H) of all the errors which were covered or would be covered was given to the
students and explained. Then the students were told that the dialogues would cover only three or four errors each session. Also because the students seemed to need to see the errors before comprehending them, all the dialogues for this session (Appendix E) were given to the students in written form first, and then the students were asked to listen to the same dialogues to hear the errors and discern Monitor use.

The fifth session was much better than the previous four had been. Again, as in session four, all the dialogues for this session (Appendix F) were presented in written form first, and then the students were asked to listen to each one to hear the errors and Monitor use.

The sixth and final session began with a review of error types used in the previous dialogues. Then two dialogues (Appendix G) were presented as in sessions four and five--written first, then oral. Again the students seemed to do these very easily and felt very confident about them. Because the students seemed confident of detecting Monitor use at this point, the third dialogue was presented orally first to see if by this time the students could recognize errors and Monitor use by listening only. Although they did better than they had when this oral approach was tried in earlier sessions, they still had great difficulty handling the exercises in this manner.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to ascertain whether or not the overt teaching of the Monitor has any effect on the oral grammatical accuracy of native Spanish speaking students of English, an experimental group of Spanish speaking ESL students is compared to a control group of the same type of students. The two groups are examined in four areas: Ilyin Oral Interview scores (Ilyin, 1976), total words produced, number of errors produced, and interference errors produced. The data were analyzed on a NAS-5000 computer using the SPSS program.

Ilyin Oral Interview Scores

The descriptive statistics for the pretest and posttest using the Ilyin scores are shown in Table 4.1. The experimental group's pretest mean score of 31.8 compared to its posttest mean score of 41.6 shows an increase of 9.8 points while the control group's pretest mean score of 35.0 declined to 34.6, a loss of .4 of a point. The standard deviation in the analysis shows 5.7 for the experimental group's pretest compared to 2.8 for that group's posttest. This decrease indicates a merging of the understanding of the whole group. The control
group's scores show no such decline in standard deviation. The control group's pretest standard deviation of 3.3, compared to a posttest standard deviation of 3.5, indicates a closer range within the control group than was evident in the experimental group at the beginning but virtually no change in the control group by the posttest period.

**TABLE 4.1**

**ILYIN ORAL INTERVIEW SCORES: PRETEST AND POSTTEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>39-46</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.2, the Ilyin gain scores for both the experimental and control groups are shown. The mean for the experimental group shows a gain of 9.8 points while the control group's mean shows a loss of .4 of a point. Thus the two groups show a difference in this area of 10.2 points. The standard deviation of 6.0 in the experimental group is .7 of a point higher than the 5.3 standard deviation for the control group.
In Table 4.3, the difference in the gain scores between the experimental and control groups for the Ilyin Oral Interview is shown. As was seen in Table 4.2, the experimental group shows a gain of 9.8 points, and the control group shows a loss of .4 of a point. This gain is analyzed further in this table by showing a two-tailed probability of 0.02. This analysis indicates a significant

*Significant at <.05.
gain in the experimental group's Ilyin score when compared to the Ilyin score gain of the control group.

It is important to look not only at analyses of gain scores between the two groups, but also at analyses within each group. Table 4.4 shows these analyses. The

**TABLE 4.4**

INDIVIDUAL GROUP GAINS FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST ON ILYIN ORAL INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2 Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at <.05.

The experimental group's posttest mean score of 41.6 shows a gain of 9.8 points over the pretest mean score of 31.8. According to the two-tail probability score of .02, the gain within the experimental group from pretest to posttest is statistically significant. With a loss of .4 of a point between the control group pretest and control group posttest, there is, of course, no significant gain within this group.
Total Words Produced

Increased word production was not an area of emphasis in the Monitor Model experiment, yet it is an important area to analyze because it can relate to the number of errors produced. A statistical description of the total number of words produced by each group on the pretest and posttest is given in Table 4.5.

| TABLE 4.5 |
| TOTAL WORDS PRODUCED: PRETEST AND POSTTEST |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>138-247</td>
<td>2008.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>237.4</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>205-278</td>
<td>726.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>161-211</td>
<td>426.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>243.8</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>198-295</td>
<td>1390.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experimental group's pretest mean number of words of 203.8 rises 33.6 words to a posttest total of 237.4. The control group's total words begin at a lower point than the experimental group's, 182.0 compared to 203.8, yet both rise to about the same level by the posttest, 237.4 compared to 243.8.

The standard deviation of the experimental group declines, once again indicating a greater degree of
homogeneity within the group. The standard deviation of the control group rises, however, indicating more disparity within this group in this area.

The gain in the number of words produced by each group is also examined (see Table 4.6). Both groups show a gain in the number of words produced from pretest to posttest, a phenomenon which should be expected since each group was in an intensive English program at the time of the experiment. This area is examined, though, to see if any noticeable change occurred and to aid in interpretation of the total number of errors produced.

An analysis of the gain in total number of words produced by each group is also made. See Table 4.7. In this analysis the control group's gain is greater than the experimental group's gain, but the two-tail probability of 0.28 indicates that this gain is not statistically significant. Also, as was noted before, the smaller
### TABLE 4.7

**COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN GAIN OF TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS PRODUCED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>46.22</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation of the experimental group indicates a smaller range within this group and thus a similar level of productive capacity.

Following an analysis of the comparative gains between the two groups, an analysis of the gains in word production within each group is made. Table 4.8 examines this aspect.

### TABLE 4.8

**INDIVIDUAL GROUP GAINS FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST ON TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS PRODUCED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>237.4</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>243.8</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at <.05.*
of word production. Each group gains in total number of words produced. The gain within the experimental group approaches statistical significance at .06; on the other hand, the gain of the control group is statistically significant at .04. The difference is minimal and warrants no further analysis.

Number of Errors Produced

The main emphasis of the experiment was that fewer errors in spoken English be made. An analysis of the errors made by both groups is shown in the following tables. The first, Table 4.9, gives a statistical description of the total errors produced by each group on the pretest and posttest. Because both groups' total word production increases, one would expect the number of errors to increase also, which happened with the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>26-51</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>21-33</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>30-43</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>32-51</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(34.4 compared to 39.2). However, the experimental group's pretest mean of 37.4 errors compared to 26.4 on the posttest shows an average decline of 11.0 errors, an unexpected, yet desired result.

As has been evident in previous analyses, the standard deviation rises for the control group yet declines for the experimental group. A more common level of understanding in reducing errors appears to have occurred for the experimental group.

The gain scores* for each group regarding errors produced is statistically described in Table 4.10.

**TABLE 4.10**

GAIN* IN ERRORS PRODUCED: PRETEST TO POSTTEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>0 - 26</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>+ 4.8</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>+17 - 3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A gain score is shown as a reduction in errors.

The experimental group shows a mean loss from pretest to posttest of 11.0 errors. This indicates positive results.

*Since the total number of errors is being analyzed, a gain score is shown as a reduction in errors, the desired result.
from the experimental situation. The control group shows a negative gain; that is, it produced an average of 4.8 more errors at posttest than at pretest. The standard deviation in this analysis is slightly higher for the experimental group than for the control group. This is evident in the range for each group. The range for the experimental group is from 0 to 26 fewer errors while the range for the control group is from 17 more to 3 fewer errors.

While it is important to note the gain scores of each group, it is also important to examine the difference between each group in the gain scores of errors produced. This difference is analyzed in Table 4.11. The two-tail

TABLE 4.11

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN GAIN* OF ERRORS PRODUCED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A gain score is shown as a reduction in errors.

**Significant at <.05.

probability of .02 indicates that the loss made by the experimental group in producing errors is statistically significant.
Even though the gain of the experimental group in reducing errors over that of the control group is significant, the gain within each group must also be analyzed for significance. Table 4.12 does this.

**TABLE 4.12**

**INDIVIDUAL GROUP GAINS* FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST IN TOTAL ERRORS PRODUCED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A gain score is shown as a reduction in errors.

The experimental group's loss in errors produced from the pretest to the posttest is not statistically significant at the .05 level, but it is very close at .07. The control group's gain in errors produced from pretest to posttest is not significant at .22.

In this analysis also, the experimental group's standard deviation goes down 4.57 points while the control group's standard deviation rises 3.77 points. Again, this indicates a merging of understanding in the experimental group at the time of the posttest.
In an examination of total error production, an analysis of the errors produced by each group within each testing situation would be helpful. Table 4.13 looks at the error production of each group in first the pretest situation and then in the posttest situation. The differences are then analyzed for statistical significance.

**TABLE 4.13**

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GROUPS IN TOTAL ERRORS PRODUCED WITHIN PRETEST AND POSTEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at <.05.

In comparing the errors produced by the experimental and control groups within both the pretest and posttest mode, we can see that the control group has 3.0 fewer errors on the pretest than did the experimental group, a difference which is not statistically significant. On the posttest, however, the experimental group has 12.6 fewer errors than the control group, a difference which is statistically significant.
The standard deviation for the control group is 3.91 points smaller than the experimental group on the pretest indicating a centralizing of understanding for this group at that time. By the posttest period, however, the experimental group's standard deviation drops 4.56 points while the control group's standard deviation rises 3.77 points. The experimental group shows a merging of their level of understanding of grammaticality by the posttest period.

Interference Errors Produced

The experiment on overt Monitor teaching concentrated on oral error reduction in general, but it also emphasized recognition and reduction of errors caused by interference from the native language. The next three tables analyze this area.

TABLE 4.14

INTERFERENCE ERRORS PRODUCED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>15-37</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 gives a statistical description of interference errors on both pretest and posttest for both the experimental and control groups. The interference errors drop from 19.6 on the pretest to 15.8 on the posttest for the experimental group, yet these types of errors rise for the control group from 18.6 pretest interference errors to 23.8 posttest errors, an increase of 5.20. The standard deviation also drops for the experimental group and rises for the control group, reflecting a more common understanding of these kinds of errors within the experimental group.

Table 4.15 examines the gains made by each group from the pretest to the posttest. Neither gain score is statistically significant as noted by the two-tail

**TABLE 4.15**

INDIVIDUAL GROUP GAINS* FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST ON INTERFERENCE ERRORS PRODUCED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A gain score is shown as a reduction in errors.
probabilities which are both more than .05. The standard deviation should be noted again in this area in that it decreases for the experimental group yet increases for the control group.

The final analysis of interference errors concerns the difference between the two groups on each type of test. Table 4.16 analyzes this difference. The experimental group's pretest interference error mean is 19.6, only 1 point above the control group's mean of 18.6. On the posttest, however, the experimental group's 15.8 is 8 points below that of the control group's 23.8. This reduction in interference errors by the experimental group is not statistically significant; however, the smaller value indicates a larger difference between the two groups at the posttest and lends support to the idea that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>STANDARD ERROR</th>
<th>T-VALUE</th>
<th>2-TAIL Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
overt teaching of the Monitor did have some effect on the experimental group in this area.

The standard deviations are also of interest in this analysis. The experimental group pretest standard deviation of 6.73 is higher than the control group standard deviation of 1.34. At the time of the posttest, though, the experimental group's standard deviation falls to 3.03, but the control group's standard deviation rises to 8.93. These findings once again point out evidence of a greater level of common understanding within the experimental group.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Results

The Monitor Model theory analyzes the learning process on two planes: acquisition, an intuitive process, and rule awareness, a conscious process. This theory could have greater pragmatic applications if its specific role in second language learning were more deeply explored.

In order to examine the rule awareness aspect of the theory empirically, a classical experimental design was used examining the overt teaching of the Monitoring facility to non-native speakers of English. A pretest was given to both a control group and an experimental group of native Spanish speaking adult students studying English. The experimental group was taught about the theory of optimal Monitor use and was given practice, via written and spoken dialogues, emphasizing Monitor use. The control group had no such instruction. Six weeks after the pretest, a posttest was given to both groups. The results of both tests were analyzed for significance.

The findings seem to indicate that the overt teaching of the Monitor, in which the students are guided to self-correct consciously, may be beneficial to the teaching of English as a second language.
This study also lends tentative support to the theory that both interlingual and intralingual error production can be decreased in the speech of ESL students by the use of the Monitor, that is, the application of consciously learned rules.

While the active use of the Monitor can have a stifling effect on the creativity of the speaker if it is over-used, the results of this study indicate that the effect appears to be minimal and is offset by a significant reduction in grammatical errors.

Teaching Implications

This research provides some support for the concept that the overt teaching of the Monitor could prove to be an effective means of aiding ESL students in improving the grammaticality of their spoken English. The ESL teacher could aid the students in becoming aware of native speech patterns in the natural language of their environment. The teacher could emphasize the application of rules learned in classroom situations to this awareness of native speech and encourage students to self-correct their own speech.

It seems possible that this emphasis on the Monitor could be accomplished in a small amount of time since significant results were obtained from empirical evidence gleaned from an experiment involving only three hours of
instruction. Perhaps this Monitoring concept could be incorporated into the beginning instruction for an ESL class and then re-emphasized occasionally throughout the course of study.

This Monitoring concept might also be beneficial in teaching an awareness of the written grammaticality of English. Since there is usually more time to self-correct when one is using the written language, Monitor awareness and application might lead to improvement in written as well as in spoken English.

The overt teaching of the Monitor has potential as a valuable tool in the teaching of ESL. While it is not a total approach, it could be one important aspect of an ESL program.

Recommendations for Future Research

Several areas of the Monitor Model theory could be of interest to future researchers. The areas noted here apply to the Monitor Model theory and its practical applications to the ESL classroom.

More research could be undertaken on the overt teaching of the Monitor Model and its effect on different under-users. For example, noting the effect of Monitoring on under-users with different linguistic backgrounds could give insight into the teaching of students from different language backgrounds. Also noting various personality
types as they relate to under-use of the Monitor could be of interest.

While this research has dealt principally with the under-use of the Monitoring facility, more research could be undertaken on the over-use of this facility. As has been noted earlier, over-use can lead to a stifling of language creativity. Because of this phenomenon, over-use can be an area of importance to the ESL teacher or researcher.

The research of this study dealt with students at the intermediate and advanced levels. It might also be of value to incorporate explicit Monitoring instruction as soon as possible with beginning ESL students. This too is an area which could prove fruitful for future research.

The effect of the overt teaching of the Monitor on writing skills as well as on speaking skills could be examined. It would be of interest to see if the under-user could apply his knowledge of the Monitor to self-correct his written English.

Finally, while this study examined the effects of overt Monitor teaching over a short period of time (one month), the long-term effects would also be of interest. It would be particularly beneficial to note the retention and effectiveness of the awareness and use of this facility after three months, six months, or a year.
CONCLUSION

The overt teaching of the Monitor, including explanation and practice, could be a valuable tool for the ESL teacher. It appears that when students understand and use this facility optimally, they can become aware of the correct language of native speakers, apply their own consciously learned rules and improve the grammaticality of their spoken English. Therefore, the teaching of the use of the Monitor may be important to every ESL program.
APPENDIX A
SESSION I - INTRODUCTION

When we write or speak a non-native language, we must be aware of our own speech and writing and also that of native speakers. We must become aware of our mistakes and must correct them ourselves. When we were children, we did this easily. We might have said something incorrectly, but when we heard an adult repeat the same idea in a correct way, we were able to learn and say the sentence correctly ourselves the next time we used it. For example, a young child might be with his mother when this dialogue occurs:

Mother: Do you want a cookie?
Child: Yes, me want a cookie.
Mother: I'm hungry. I want a cookie too.
Mother: Now I am thirsty and I want a drink of water. Do you want a drink of water too?
Child: Yes, I want a drink of water.

As adults learning a second language, we must also learn to use this ability to correct ourselves, also known as "Monitoring." We must tune in to native speakers and really listen to the way they construct their sentences. Then when we speak, we must use this Monitor and correct ourselves both in our speaking and writing.

Let me give you an example of a person who is Monitoring the speech of another person:

Sam: Some friends and I went to California last summer for two weeks. Do you like to travel?
Juan: Yes, I like to travel by car, but I no like to travel by airplane.

Sam: Oh, I don't like to fly either. I sometimes get airsick.

Juan: I don't like to fly because I am afraid of a crash. I do like to see new places though.

Sam: Would you like to join my friends and me on a trip this summer?

Juan: Yes, but only if you will be traveling by car! Do you see where Juan was using his Monitor and realized when Sam said, "I don't" instead of "I no" that he had made a mistake and corrected himself in the next sentence?

Now let's look at an example of a person who is not using his Monitor:

John: Maria, did you go to the concert last night?

Maria: No, I no go.

John: Why didn't you go?

Maria: I no go because I had to study for a test.

Do you see here that Maria made a mistake? Did John say his sentence correctly? When Maria answered for the second time, did she realize that she had used the negative in a different and incorrect way from John? If Maria had used her Monitor, what should she have answered the second time using John's second question as a model?
SESSION I EXERCISE

Written Exercise

Rebecca: Hello, Susanna, would you like to go with me to the Union Building for lunch?

Susanna: Yes, I will like to go with you.

Rebecca: Good, I'll meet you at 11:30 beside the flagpole.

Susanna: OK, I will see you there.
SESSION II EXERCISES

Written Exercise

1. Bob: Hello, Pedro, How are you today?
   Pedro: I'm fine, thank you. Did you finish your homework for our math class?
   Bob: No, I didn't have time to do my homework.
   Pedro: I didn't have time to make my homework either.
   Bob: Maybe we could do it together today.
   Pedro: I'm sorry, Bob, but I have to go to work now. Maybe we could make the homework together tonight.
   Bob: Okay, I'll call you later.

Oral Exercises

1. Elena: Have you gone to your class in the new building yet?
   Susan: Yes, it is such a lovely building—all clean and modern. Have you seen it?
   Elena: Oh, yes, I was looking the building yesterday when I drove down the street.
Susan: When you were looking at the new building, did you notice the pretty stones on the front?

Elena: Oh, I saw the pretty stones when I first look the building. Now I want to go inside to see how pretty it is also.

Mary: Where are you going on your vacation this summer?

Juan: I plan to join the University Travel Club and go to Canada with them.

Mary: How many people are going on the trip?

Juan: About twenty people.

Mary: That should be a nice group. Will you be gone longer than a month?

Juan: No, we won't be gone that long. We'll only be gone two weeks. The people in the club is not interested in a very long trip.

Mary: Are the people interested in taking a second trip to California later in the summer?

Juan: I don't know. I will ask at the next meeting to see if the people is interested in that trip.

Mary: Okay, I'll talk to you next week about it.
SESSION III EXERCISES

Written Exercise

1. John: Did you know that Paco has been sick?
   Maria: Yes, I heard that he missed all of his classes last week.
   John: I have an idea. Maybe we could call him to see if we could help.
   Maria: That's a good idea. He always makes good marks on his work, and am sure that he would like someone to get his assignments from his teachers so he could study at home.
   John: I'll call him today.
   Maria: Good, then you can tell me if I can help too.

Oral Exercises

(On telephone)

II. John: Hello, Paco. I heard you were very sick.
   Paco: Yes, I have been too sick all week.
   John: Maria and I wondered if we could help you by getting assignments from your teachers and bringing them to you.
Paco: That would be too good.
John: Okay, I'll talk to your teachers today and bring your work to you tonight.

(Later)

III. John: Hello, Paco. I brought all your assignments.
Paco: Thank you. Did you also bring the book which we were supposed to read?
John: I looked for the book, but I couldn't find it.
Paco: Did you look the book in the teacher's special library.
John: Oh, no. I didn't look for the book there. I'll get it tomorrow and bring it to you.
Paco: You'll have to go to the teacher and get a special card before you look the book again.
John: Is that in order to be sure everyone gets a chance to read the book.
Paco: Yes, that's to be sure that no one keeps the book too long.
APPENDIX E
SESSION IV EXERCISES

Written Exercises

1. Betty: Do you plan to take part in the International Festival next week?
   Isabel: Oh, yes, I always bring my handmade jewelry and paintings to the festival. Are you coming?
   Betty: Yes, but I'm not bringing any pieces of jewelry or paintings. I do plan to bring some delicious pastry though.
   Isabel: Oh, that will be good. I no bring food because I no cook very well.
   Betty: Will you be setting up your artwork in a booth?
   Isabel: Yes, booth is provided. There will be large one for the food too.
   Betty: I'm looking forward to seeing your beautiful jewelry.
   Isabel: And I want to taste your delicious food!

(later at festival)

II. Betty: Hello, Isabel. Are these your beautiful jewelry and paintings?
Isabel: Yes, would you like to buy something?
Betty: Let me look at what you've made. I would like to buy a necklace for my mother.
Isabel: Here is a pretty one.
Betty: Yes, she likes large silver medallions very much!
Isabel: If she like this kind, how about this beautiful bracelet too?
Betty: Oh, I like them both. I think I will buy both of them for her. Let's go to the food booth and eat some of the different foods. I'm very hungry.
Isabel: I'm too hungry also. Let's go!

III. Bob: Are you going to the free movie tonight?
Alfredo: Yes, I heard that it was going to be a good one.
Bob: Would you like to go with me?
Alfredo: Yes, I will like to go with you.
Bob: Good. Maybe John and Paco would like to go with us too.
Alfredo: Yes, they maybe will like to go.
Bob: I'll call and ask them. If they can go, I'll pick you up at 7:00, and then we'll drive over to get them.
Alfredo: Okay. I'll see you at 7:00.
SESSION V EXERCISES

Written Exercises

1. David: Do you plan to enter the University next year?
   Alvaro: Yes, next year I plan to enter University.
   David: Have you taken the TOEFL yet?
   Alvaro: No, but I plan to take it next month.
   David: Have you done some studying for the examination?
   Alvaro: Yes, I do my homework every night, and then I study for TOEFL.
   David: I hope you have good luck on the TOEFL.
   Alvaro: Thank-you. I hope so too.

II. Scott: Have you been to any of the cultural programs this year?
   Jose: Yes, and all the programs have seemed excellent to me. Have you been to any of the programs?
   Scott: Yes, this year's series is better than last year's. My friend gives me tickets sometimes, so I have been to several programs. I liked the musical comedy the best. Which one did you like the best?
Jose: I liked the musical comedy too, but I liked the variety show better.
Scott: What did you think about the last program--the ballet?
Jose: The ballerina was very beautiful!
Scott: Yes, and she danced very well.
Jose: Are you going to next program?
Scott: Yes, it's an opera. I enjoy going to the opera.
Jose: Maybe see you there.

III. Bob: Have you seen John today?
Paco: No, John is talking to his teacher about the test he took yesterday.
Bob: Oh, did John think he did well on the test?
Paco: No, he's afraid that he did not pass it.
Bob: If John did not pass the test, what would he have to do?
Paco: He have to take the test again in two weeks.
Bob: Do you know what he might have done differently in preparing for the test?
Paco: He maybe studied earlier in the week instead of waiting until the last day.
SESSION VI EXERCISES

Written Exercises

1. Joseph: What time do you arrive at school?
   Enrique: I arrive at 9:00 a.m. for my first class.
   Joseph: Do you have to get up early? I don't like to get up early.
   Enrique: I no like to get up early either, but I have to in order to be on time for my first class.
   Joseph: Do you live near the school?
   Enrique: I live 1/2 mile from the school.
   Joseph: Do you walk to school? My friend, David, lives near school, and he walks to school.
   Enrique: My friend, Pablo, walks to school, but I ride my bicycle.
   Joseph: Oh, is Pablo your roommate?
   Enrique: Yes, is my roommate.
   Joseph: He is in my computer class. It is a very difficult class.
   Enrique: Yes, is very difficult.
   Joseph: But it is also very interesting, and we are learning a lot.
   Enrique: I'd better hurry to my next class. I'll see you later.
II. Neil: What kinds of entertainment do you enjoy?
Pablo: My favorite kinds of entertainment are radio and TV, but I also like sports. I go to almost all of the football and baseball games.

Neil: Do you go to the movies? There was a good picture at the theater last night, and I enjoyed seeing it very much.
Pablo: I like the movies, but I prefer to watch TV. The morning and afternoon programs don't interest me, but like the programs in the evening.

Neil: Do you listen to symphony music on the radio?
Pablo: I like classical music, but like dance music better.

Neil: Since you enjoy sports, do you like to play tennis? Tennis is one of my favorite sports.
Pablo: I like to play tennis also.

Neil: Would you like to play tennis with me on Friday?
Pablo: Yes, I will like to play tennis with you on Friday.

Neil: Good, I'll meet you at the courts at 3:00 o'clock.
Pablo: Okay. Then perhaps will like to go with me to the football game this evening.
III. Craig: We're going on a picnic tomorrow. Will you be able to join us? It should be a better day than last Friday when it rained.

Angelica: Where are you going for picnic?

Craig: We're going to the lake. Near the lake is a very beautiful spot for a picnic. It is very grassy there.

Angelica: I like lake better than river. I'll go with you.

Craig: Good. Paul said that we could go in his car. We will pick you up at 3:30.

Angelica: Should bring anything?

Craig: Yes, some lemonade and potato chips would be nice.

Angelica: Okay, I will be ready at 3:30. When will we return?

Craig: We will probably stay until dark and then sit around a campfire and talk and sing songs. We should be home by 10:00 P.M. Of course, if it rains, we might cancel the picnic.

Angelica: Yes, you maybe cancel it like you did last Friday.
Craig: Yes, but we'll plan to go again next week if we have to cancel it this week.

Angelica: Okay, I'll see you tomorrow.
APPENDIX H
REVIEW

1. Model  
   I don't like to fly on airplanes.  
   No Monitor Use  
   I no like to fly on airplanes.

2. Model  
   Would you like to go with me?  
   No Monitor Use  
   Yes, I will like to go with you.

3. Model  
   I didn't have time to do my homework.  
   No Monitor Use  
   I didn't have time to make my homework.

4. Model  
   I looked at the building.  
   No Monitor Use  
   I looked the building.

5. Model  
   I looked for the book.  
   No Monitor Use  
   I looked the book.

6. Model  
   Are the people interested in taking a trip?  
   No Monitor Use  
   The people is interested in taking a trip.

7. Model  
   He has been very sick.  
   No Monitor Use  
   He has been too sick.

8. Model  
   I went to the program. (I read a book, or I read a good one.)  
   No Monitor Use  
   I like program. (I saw book, or I read good one).
9. Model
   I will be there

No Monitor Use
   Will go with you.

10. Model
    They might cancel the baseball game.

No Monitor Use
    Maybe they cancel the baseball game.
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