# Critical appraisement of Monitor Model

**Adiba Kamal**
Department of English & Modern Languages, North South University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Correspondence: adibaoyshee.06@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5321-4844

**Abstract**
Great linguist Sir Stephen Krashen has developed the most famous second language acquisition theory (SLA) which is also known as the 'Krashen's Monitor Model'. 'Monitor Model' is important to understand the connection between second language acquisition and learning that gets shown in the outcome of the speaker. Krashen's Monitor Model is one of the hypotheses from his second language acquisition theories. Although Krashen is known for his theories on SLA and he is seminal on that, this particular model also applies to first language adoption. The idea of the monitor hypothesis holds some criticism for being inadequate. The 'Monitor Hypothesis' doesn't really go into detail concerning implicit rules or how monitoring functions in them. Krashen did not define in his hypothesis whether adults and children would take the same amount of time to edit their mistakes. Also, there lies a vague perception about monitoring for the people who are physically active but mentally challenged. These are some of the gaps that need to be explained in 'monitor hypotheses'.

**Keywords:** acquisition-learning, monitor model, language acquisition device, practical knowledge, criticism

**Public Interest Statement**
Although Krashen is known for his theories on SLA and he is seminal on that, this particular model also applies to first language adoption. The idea of the monitor hypothesis holds some criticism for being inadequate. The 'Monitor Hypothesis' doesn't really go into detail concerning implicit rules or how monitoring functions in them. Krashen did not define in his hypothesis whether adults and children would take the same amount of time to edit their mistakes. Also, there lies a vague perception about monitoring for the people who are physically active but mentally challenged. These are some of the gaps that this study seeks to interrogate.

**Introduction**

The monitor model is a hypothesis proposed by eminent linguist Sir Steven Krashan, which discusses the fact that how subconsciously we pay attention to the linguistic input we produce and guard whether it is correct or not. It doesn't come from ignorance. It is derived from the mental input that we already have regarding language. We can see the reflection of the 'monitor hypothesis' in our daily life. One of the attributes of language learning is noticing. Our exposure halts us to notice. (Zafar, 2009). Our experience enriches our cognition and that pushes us to notice. The practice of noticing is monitoring. Since 'monitor hypothesis' talks about learning a new language's grammatical rules and editing errors, the usage of monitor varies from one learner to another, with different degrees of accomplishment. Acquisition learning hypothesis is the hypothesis formed by Stephen Krashan which tells us about the fact that language acquisition is completely different from language learning. There are two ways to develop competence in language. Acquiring language from natural surroundings and Develop language by learning.

Acquiring language from natural surroundings, real life communication, family, friends. Acquisition is what children do in their first language. It is an automatic and subconscious process. Acquisition occurs passively and subconsciously through implicit, informal, or natural learning, resulting in implicit knowledge and acquired competence of a language; in other words, to acquire a language is to pick up a language by relying on feelings of correctness rather than conscious knowledge of language rules. Kids have a high value in learning language through this process.

Develop language by learning. It is the formal and more conscious way of learning., under the guidance of a teacher. Learning occurs actively and consciously through explicit or formal learning and instruction, resulting in explicit knowledge about a language; learning results in metalinguistic knowledge and awareness. (Krashen, 1989). It is more like a classroom situation where kids or adults are controlled and forced to learn with the guide of an instructor. Adults pay high value to this as they become more aware and conscious to learn the language, maybe on their own purpose. However, the acquisition-learning hypothesis states that both children and adults acquire language via access to an innate language acquisition device (LAD).

**Objectives**

The study of language structure has educational benefits that high schools and universities may choose to incorporate into their language curriculum. Any gain will depend on the learner's linguistic skills, though. It should also be clear that analyzing the language, defining norms, separating out irregularities, and teaching advanced information about the target language is not language teaching, but "language appreciation" or linguistics, which does not lead to communicative mastery. Only when students are interested in grammar and

the target language is employed as a medium of education, can grammar lead to language acquisition (and competency). When this happens, both teachers and students are satisfied that formal grammar is crucial for second language learning and that the teacher can explain it in the target language so students comprehend. In other words, the teacher's conversation fits the standards for intelligible input, and the classroom may become an acquisition-friendly setting with student participation. The filter is low in terms of explanatory language because students' deliberate efforts are usually on the subject topic, not the medium.A subtle point Both teachers and pupils self-deceive. They think the subject matter, grammar, is responsible for the pupils' growth, but it's the medium, not the message. Any topic they liked would work.

**Monitor Model**

Monitor is a device that is set in our brain that subconsciously captures all the errors that we make while producing utterance and fixes that. Sometimes in a natural communicative situation, when we say something wrong we can catch that immediately and fix that. For example, if someone says 'I hitted' and immediately corrects it saying 'I hit', that means his monitor actively caught the mistake. Monitoring can take place before or after utterance or at the happening. It is the ability to catch the language. To monitor the language, semantics, vocabulary, and grammar knowledge is needed here. What I have studied from Ricardo E. Schutz's write up according to Krashen is that, monitor hypothesis gives the explanation about 'the relationship between acquisition and learning and defines the influence of the latter on the former.' (Schutz, 13) Our acquisition of the language initiates us to produce the utterance and our learned skills shows the practical knowledge of mechanical skills. The learning system works as a monitor or editor here.

**Usage of Monitor Model**

Explicit and implicit knowledge fundamentally notice each other to polish the utterance. Our exposure halts us to notice. There are three kinds of monitor users. They are: under user, over user and optimal user. Someone who uses his intuition to deliver a phrase is known as an under user. He is unconcerned about using the monitor or rectifying his errors. Instead, he relies on his lightning-quick performance at the time. An under user does not use the monitor because he does not have the necessary amount of language input. In other words, we can claim that it stems entirely from a lack of understanding of the language and its principles. An over user, on the other hand, is someone who utilizes the monitor more than he needs. These language learners are so preoccupied with correctness and perfection that they are unable to talk fluently. The speaker's speaking speed is slowed when he or she spends too much time looking at the monitor. It causes the user to become jittery and inflexible. The user concentrates intently on the rules and input he intends to employ. Here, the usage of mental grammar lacks. They may know a lot about the language but cannot communicate with it. Optimal users only utilize the monitor when it is absolutely necessary. They maintain a decent balance between correcting their own words and speaking naturally. As a result, their communication does not slow down. They have a great command of the language. They make use of the monitor adequacy. Often, scholars appear to be the optimal monitor users.

**Input Hypothesis**

The hypothesis defines how a learner acquires a second language. The information hypothesis is the subject of this hypothesis. Here, input refers to information. The 'comprehensible input,' according to Krashen, is 'i+1'. I denote the current level of language acquisition, while '1'

denotes the immediate next level. We can use that as an example of an immediate sequential phrase in language. It is about gaining rather than learning. FRom Krashen's perspective, since it is a sequential process, learning comes within. Something that we can comprehend or understand is referred to as 'comprehensible input'. If there is input but we are unable to grasp it, language is absent. It's a thought-provoking hypothesis. But some scholars think that it's a non-hypothesis since 'i=1' is a problematic term. The learner has to think about what is '1' or what is 'i'. Pushing the learner beyond his comfort zone becomes cognitively challenging. Also, Krashen did not clarify how the input can be a comprehensible output. Everything in the world cannot be comprehensible to everyone.

**Affective Filter Hypothesis**

The 'Affective Filter Hypothesis' is concerned with the non-causal, motivating factors that influence language development. The term "affect" refers to a person's emotional state. The term "effective filter" refers to a motion filter. When a learner's confidence, self-esteem, and motivations are strong but his or her filter is low, language acquisition will be high. Language learning, on the other hand, suffers from low motivation, low self-esteem, and a high filter. It's because using the filter forces the learner to pause and reconsider his words.The rate of acquiring fluency decreases. Filter acts as a mental and emotional roadblock. We can learn successfully when our confidence is high and we are in a good state of mind. We cannot learn effectively if our confidence is poor. However, we can't measure it scientifically, thus it's not causal. To learn something, we need emotion and both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

**Natural Order Hypothesis**

The 'Natural Order Hypothesis' is comparatively the less important one. It says that it is presupposed that there's a natural order to learn a language. We must go through a series of expected stages. Some things are learned more quickly than others. Learning does not happen by accident; it is a natural process. If a toddler says, "Ron beat me," and his mother corrects him, "No, Ron beats me," the toddler's cognition may not be evolved enough to understand subject verb agreement for a third person singular number.

**Critical appraisement of monitor model**

In the study of human language evolution, the phenomena of first language acquisition is considered one of the most mysterious and fascinating. But the distinction between children's capacity to speak a language fluently and adults' inability to do so is a contentious question. There are various theories and ways for learning a second language at this point in time. As a result, Steven Krashen's 'Monitor Theory' theory is formed.

The Monitor Model, developed by Krashen, will be the focus of this paper. Initially, the theory itself will be described, and the ideas that shaped it will be presented in detail. The focus will next be switched to some of the model's hypotheses, such as the acquisition/ learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, and the understandable input hypothesis. Finally, critique of the aforementioned hypothesis will be offered in order to shed some objectivity.

It's important to start with some of the first language acquisition research findings in order to study Krashen's Monitor Theory, as it's widely considered that most of the work on second language acquisition, including Krashen's, is based on concerns from the field of First Language Acquisition. According to Lightbown and Spada (2006, p. 37), Chomsky's work on first language acquisition impacted the Monitor Model notion. Some of Chomsky's work on the acquisition of first languages will be discussed here.

Research by Noam Chomsky, who is often connected with the word innativism, has led to a major shift in the discipline of linguistics. All languages are assumed to be "innate," meaning inborn, and possess universal principles applicable to all languages, hence the name of this theory. Furthermore, these ideas are considered to be the building blocks of universal grammar, which every child has access to (Lightbown and Spada, 2006, p. 15). All of this means that there are characteristics of each language that are comparable to another. It's countered, though, that certain exceptions don't hold true for all languages, and these are known as a language's parameters (Ellis, 1994, p. 43).

The research of Noam Chomsky on first language acquisition contradicts the views of behaviorists on language acquisition, claiming that children do not learn a language through 'habit formation,' but rather through an inborn ability to learn and retain a language subconsciously. This explains why, even in situations where there is insufficient input, children still master the language with grammatical correctness and postulate creativity in that language. The evidence suggests that even in situations when parents speak to their children in reduced language (e.g., using a less advanced vocabulary), use one-word utterances, or even repeat noises made by their children, the youngster learns the language properly and fluently, despite their efforts (De Bot, Lowie and Verspoor, 2005, p. 29). Furthermore, it should be emphasized that some of these sentences are unique to a kid, which means that he or she has not before heard them in their entirety. Chomsky emphasizes the importance of providing children with 'input' in order for them to test the principles and parameters that are embedded in the LAD (language acquisition device), despite the fact that, as he points out, children must be provided with 'input' in order for the learning process to begin (ibid.). Instead of saying this, one example of language offered by a parent will aid in the activation of the LAD responsible for learning and growth in a child.

As a result, several of the concepts discussed above served as the framework for study into Second Language Acquisition. Despite the fact that Steven Krashen, a linguistics expert who has been widely attacked for his theories due to the fact that many of them are believed to be devoid of proof, has undertaken a well-known study, one of these theories is the Monitor Model, which is described below. Although Krashen's work was cited as making a significant contribution to recent language teaching methodologies, such as Communicative Language Teaching, during a time when behaviourist teaching methodologies were losing their credibility, his work was also cited as demonstrating that 'comprehensible input' contributes to learners' progress (Lightbow and Spada, 2006, p. 38). However, the concept of understandable input has come under scrutiny due to the ambiguity of the term comprehensible, which makes it impossible to distinguish between what is accessible to individuals and what is not.

The objective of the paragraphs is to describe Krashen's Monitor Model and to expound on this element in greater detail. 1.1 Introduction Along with it, a variety of concepts and competing points of view will be presented and discussed in detail. Krashen came to this conclusion by considering the assumption that second language learners absorb language in the same way that first language learners do, which led him to believe that humans acquire a language by first comprehending it. In the words of De Bot et al. (2005, p. 35), Krashen believed that "meaningful input and communication within that language" were critical components in obtaining success in language learning. Also against the concept of 'talking about a language,' which he considered to be the study of grammatical principles, was the concept of 'talking about a language' itself.

In the framework of his distinction between "accuracy" and "fluency"-oriented training, Krashen's neglect of grammar in a language can be questioned in particular; but, his

neglect of grammar in a language can be questioned in general. Due to the fact that, according to Krashen, these two characteristics are the result of acquisition rather than education (Krashen, 1989, p. 9). A fluent learner is one who is able to talk in the target language without being grammatically perfect, but an accurate learner is one who exhibits a comprehension of grammar rules and is capable of applying them successfully in both oral and writing communication, to provide an example. However, according to Ur (1991, p. 103), when we teach learners accuracy, we want them to "get the language properly, that is, right sounds, phrases, and sentences," whereas when we teach learners fluency, we want them to "focus on the message," says Ur. Clearly, Ur believes that both correctness and fluency may be learnt in a classroom context, in contrast to Krashen, as demonstrated in the example above.

**Results and discussion**

However, it may be claimed that the process of first language acquisition does not match the process of second language learning. The claim made by Krashen that these two processes are visually similar is therefore debatable. In order to give you an example, Chomsky claims that learners do not have access to UG after a "critical period" (Ellis 1994). Consequently, in terms of accuracy and fluency, it is reasonable to infer that it is not possible to learn these concepts in their entirety. The "logical dilemma of second language acquisition," according to Cook (2003; quoted in Lightbown and Spada, 2006, p. 35), states that learners must have access to UG since they hold more knowledge about a language than the one that could be provided to them in the input.

As a result of these and other considerations, Krashen developed one of his most complex hypotheses, known as the Monitor Model Theory. According to Krashen's Monitor Theory, which was developed in the "late 1970s," it is based on five hypotheses, which are as follows: the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis. The acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis Furthermore, it is a model that seeks to describe the processes of second language acquisition (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 19). Nonetheless, it can be believed that the monitor model is concerned with a variety of issues.

Initial attention is given to student production, and the variability in their performance is investigated, as different learners are believed to use the monitor in a different way. Second, it provides insight into the field of second language education. This may be seen in the Natural Approach, which is a method of implementing it (Krashen and Terell 1983 cited in Barash and James, 1994, p. 8). Third, it emphasizes the value of intelligible input while neglecting to mention the significance of output in the process. Furthermore, it asserts that learning and acquisition are two distinct concepts that are not related (ibid.). These are just a few of the examples that have been provided to demonstrate the wide range of aspects that surround his work.

But the Monitor Model is disputed by several experts, who uniformly assert that, despite the fact that his hypothesis appears sensible, it is devoid of empirical support. Although Krashen's study has been criticized, it should be recognized that his work is valuable and that he "should be given credit for striving to bring together research findings from a number of diverse disciplines" (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 19).

As a result, the distinction between the concepts of acquisition and learning serves as the foundation for the Monitor Theory of learning. However, in order to concentrate on this element, it is necessary to clarify the concepts of acquisition and learning in more detail. Affirmative acquisition, according to Krashen (1989, p. 8), is the process that occurs alongside

children's first language learning and is considered to be subconscious. It means that when children learn a language, they are not aware of the fact that they are learning it and, at the same time, they do not have any prior knowledge of the language. Learning, on the other hand, is defined as a conscious process by which an individual becomes familiar with a language through the use of "rules or grammar" specific to that language (ibid.).

Schmidt (1990, cited in De Bot, 2005, p. 7), on the other hand, maintains that by 'subconscious,' one can understand 'without consciousness.' His explanation continues by pointing out that this phrase may actually refer to someone who has neglected to notice anything, and he provides an example of 'subliminal learning,' in which individuals can pick up a language while they are sleeping. This stance, on the other hand, has been condemned by many, who believe it is inexplicable.

Nonetheless, Krashen asserts in the first of his hypotheses, the acquisition-learning hypothesis, that "adults have two unique and independent means of attaining competence in a second language" (Krashen, 2001). (Krashen 1982 cited in Gregg, 1984, p. 79). It is possible that the terms distinct and independent imply that, from Krashen's perspective, acquisition and learning should be viewed as distinct processes. Another observation is that he appears to prioritize acquisition above learning, with learning being considered a secondary concern. Such a viewpoint is driven by the assumption that an individual's ability to function in a second language is due to acquisition rather than to the things he or she has learned in the first language (ibid.).

The work of Gregg (1984, referenced in McLaughlin, 1987, pp. 21-22) is in opposition to Krashen's learning/acquisition dichotomy, arguing that learning can actually become acquisition in some conditions under some circumstances. In support of his theory, he provides an example of drilling Japanese gerundive forms in which no input is provided, and it is discovered that the learners are able to create these forms in an error-free manner at the conclusion of the drill. For him, the example above illustrates how, in some cases, learning can be changed into acquisition, such as when performing exercises with little or no feedback to enhance performance.

However, the question of how to discern between knowledge that has been acquired and knowledge that has been obtained by an individual continues to be debated in some circles. Despite the fact that Ellis (1994) points out that it is difficult to distinguish between the two categories A learner's performance cannot be determined with certainty since there is no way to ascertain the source of the learner's performance, whether it is acquired from experience or through formal instruction. According to McLaughlin (1987), Krashen also failed to provide a consistent explanation of the terms conscious (learning) and subconscious (unconscious) learning (acquisition). Using the example of Krashen, he points out that the latter merely specified that acquisition can be connected to how learners feel, whereas learning can be based on prior knowledge of a rule. The author feels that this division is unclear since there may be instances in which learners deliver "felt answers" to situations in which they are unable to enunciate the rule that they have previously applied (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 21).

From the standpoint of a teacher, the emphasis placed on the concept of acquisition can be quite aggravating. For example, there may be teachers who wish to educate about a language's grammar and employ formal instruction in their classrooms on one hand. Some teachers, on the other hand, may be eager to incorporate Krashen's ideas into their classrooms, such as the concept of "language rich environment," but may encounter a number of obstacles, such as the lack of appropriate materials and realia, which may be available in real-world situations, which they must overcome (Barasch and James, 1994, p. 10). A teacher's best option is to support an eclectic approach by inferring the best concepts

that correlate with their own teaching views, as this is the most effective strategy.

Specifically, the Monitor idea will be the focus of this paragraph. A monitor is thus analogous to the concept of a device that checks a person's utterances and makes changes if they need to be. Also stated is that this concept is concerned with knowledge that has been acquired rather than knowledge that has been learnt. To paraphrase Krashen's words, "Learning has only one role, and that is that of serving as a monitor or editor" (1982, p. 24). Instead, when someone utters something that is regarded to be acquired information, the monitor (learnt knowledge) analyzes if the utterance that is currently being generated agrees with the utterance that has been previously recorded in the monitor (or vice versa) (Krashen 1982, p. 24). When the procedure is completed, the output of the studied utterance occurs shortly after the process is completed (Cook, 1993, p. 52). As Krashen (1989) points out, the use of monitors restricts the amount of information that can be processed and increases the length of time required to perform activities. Furthermore, Lightbown and Spada (2006, p. 37) point out that the passage of time is the most critical requirement for a monitor to perform properly. During this time, an employee who has grasped the production standards can devote his or her full attention to the task at hand.

The argument advanced by Gregg (1984), who is cited in McLaughlin, is still another intriguing one (1987). In his paper, he argues that the Monitor Hypothesis asserts that "learning" is only available for use in production, not comprehension," and he provides an example from his own personal experience with Japanese to demonstrate how this assertion is false by providing a case study from his own personal experience with Japanese. Gregory claims that in order to comprehend some forms, he "made conscious use of rules that he had learned" and that he "used acquired knowledge and made conscious use of rules that he had learned." Gregory also claims that he "used acquired knowledge and made conscious use of rules that he had learned." To summarize, sometimes people must use the ideas they've learned in new situations in order to completely absorb new knowledge. This is known as contextualization.

However, the extent of the monitor's application can differ from one individual to the next. As a result, there are monitor "over-users," those who strive for perfection in accuracy at the expense of output, and monitor "under-users," individuals who are not concerned with correctness at the expense of output, resulting in sumptuous, yet ungrammatical, output (Skehan, 1989, p. 3). Additionally, according to Ellis (1994), Krashen distinguishes between ideal monitor users, who maintain equilibrium in the factors stated above, and inefficient monitor users. McLaughlin (1989) questions the validity of the distinction between under- and over-users, claiming that these phrases refer to the fact that certain learners vary in their capacity to employ a particular grammatical rule and that providing credit for it to the monitor is imprudent.

Another argument that raises concerns about the monitor's vulnerability is the requirement for time, rule, and form, all of which must be provided in order for the monitor to function properly. Krashen uses the concept of time to illustrate how an individual requires time to arrange a dialogue and check/retrieve it in accordance with norms. The study conducted by Hulstijn and Hulstijn in 1984, which studied the concepts of time and form, found that there was no influence of time on the Monitor and vice versa, despite the fact that time was manipulated. In other words, learners who were given less time and were encouraged to concentrate on form delivered more precise speech. Nonetheless, the identical learners who were given more time and were instructed not to concentrate on form did not differ in their performance (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 25).

According to another criticism of the monitor model hypothesis, speakers do not have

enough time to think about the shape of their speech and adjust (monitor) it in such a detailed manner when speaking in natural situations. If such were the case, our speech would be slowed and appear a little strange due to the large number of intervals (Mitchell and Myles, 2004, p. 46). To summarize, it may be said that the addition of time does not necessarily have an impact on the use of the Monitor. As a result, Krashen himself came to the same conclusion as others (1982 cited in McLaughlin, 1987). Consequently, it might be concluded that the monitor hypothesis is a little ambiguous.

Furthermore, the concept of the Monitor model appears to be at odds with the distinction between acquisition and learning. According to McLaughlin, if the monitor's sole purpose is to evaluate our performance and that is the only way for us to learn, then the monitor has no part in the development of learners' competence (1987, p. 27). Assuming this to be true, the initial acquisition/learning hypothesis appears to be redundant.

The Input Hypothesis, on the other hand, appears to be the most influential of Krashen's hypotheses, as it appears to have had the greatest impact on second language learning studies. As a result, Krashen hypothesizes that in order for individuals to acquire, two conditions must be met: first, there must be comprehensible input, which he defines as the i+1, i.e. "structures that are a little beyond the acquirer's current level," and second, there must be comprehensible input that is "a little beyond the acquirer's current level." Second, there must be a "low or weak level of affective filter" in the environment (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, p. 224). Krashen knows the barrier that prevents an individual from accessing the input through the use of an affective filter. As a result, there is also the issue of significance, which has not been addressed thus far. As a result, when a learner comprehends a message, it is reasonable to conclude that the process of acquisition has begun (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 36). Gregory (1984, p. 97) points out that the structure of Krashen's hypothesis can be divided into four components. As a result, the input hypothesis is concerned with the acquisition of knowledge rather than with learning. Individuals gain due to "comprehensible input, context, or extralinguistic knowledge," according to the second point. Three-fold, the intelligible input will be delivered automatically as soon as the individual grasps the meaning of the phrase. Finally, it is stated that the ability to produce is innate and cannot be taught (ibid.). What Krashen is trying to convey here is that second language learners must first understand the meaning of the words before they can learn to master new information. Second, while language production cannot be coerced by a teacher, it is due to an individual acquisition system that they will begin to produce language at some point. It goes without saying that by asserting this, he is supporting the notion of formal education.

But in the case of intelligible input (i+1), it is difficult to define the I which is expressed as a level of language that learners already possess before a comprehensible input is provided (White, 1987, p. 96). This is due to the fact that teachers may have difficulties recognizing that level. Given that only the learners themselves are aware of their current level of knowledge, according to White (ibid.), making educated guesses about that level may be extremely challenging, if not impossible. Furthermore, Gregg (1984, p. 87) makes a compelling case for the proposition that learners cannot comprehend knowledge that they have not yet acquired; he refers to this as a paradox. Contrary to this, Krashen explains that in order to comprehend something, an individual must rely on the context or knowledge of the world in which it is presented (Krashen 1982 cited in Gregg, 1984). However, the concept of schemata being entrenched in a person appears to be ambiguous, as Krashen does not establish whether this knowledge is taught or gained by the individual.

It may be said that aside from Krashen's innovative approach to accounting for the second language learning process, much of his research lacks sufficient empirical support to

be considered valid. Some of Krashen's hypotheses are in direct conflict with one another, as demonstrated in the presentation. It is readily apparent in the examples of the acquisition/ learning hypothesis and the monitor hypothesis that have been provided. More than that, the concept of comprehensible input presented appears to be unjustifiable and problematic, leaving teachers unsure of the steps they should take in order to improve the effectiveness of their instruction. Lastly, as argued, it can be assumed that Krashen's theory does not prove anything; and stated that it rather brings indecision on the topic of second language learning. As a result of the criticism leveled against Krashen's theory, as given, additional research is required in order to either deny or admit his theory as valid and useful in practice.

**Conclusion**
Coming to the end of the paper, we can say that the monitor is an editor. It edits our grammar. Here grammar is an expansive term that includes grammatical rules, pronunciation, spelling and many other items that can be modified. Famous linguist Stephen Krashen says that, 'improvement comes from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, and not from forcing and correcting production.' Since learning is not a natural process, the more we are learning, we are utilizing our default cognitive capacity. As a result, we are sharpening our monitor to get more polished output. On the other note, we can say that every hypothesis has some right guesses and unanswered questions. As a result, they remain hypotheses rather than theories. One of them is Stephen Krashen's 'monitor model hypothesis'. Despite the fact that the theory has significant limitations and insufficient components, it provides us with a great deal of information. Including the 'monitor model hypothesis', Stephen Krashen has provided us with a few more theories of second language acquisition or SLA. Linguistics majors should conduct research like this. Also, we should explore and research not only our language but also our second language, even foreign languages and come up with new hypotheses. We must serve the world of linguistics with some fascinating concepts from our ends.

**Conflicts of Interest:** There is no conflict, declared.

**Author Bionote**
Adiba Kamal successfully completed B.A in English Linguistics form North South University with First Class. Now, she is preparing herself to pursue MA in Linguistics in UK. Right Now, she is working as an Article Writer/Research in Linguistics. She lives in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

**References**

R.M. Barasch & C.V. James (1994). *Beyond the Monitor Model: Remarks on Current Second Language Acquisition Theory and Practice*. Heinle and Heinle Publishers, Wadsworth.

V. Cook (1993). Linguistics and the Acquisition of Second Languages Macmillan, Basingstoke.

K. De Bot, W. Lowie, & M. Verspoor (2005). Second Language Acquisition: A Comprehensive Resource Guide Routledge, New York

R. Ellis (1997). Language Teaching and Research in Second Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

R. Ellis (1994). Second Language Acquisition Research. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

K.R. Gregg (1984). Occam's Razor and Krashen's Monitor. Journal of Applied Linguistics, Volume 5/2.

S. Krashen (1989). Extensions and Applications of Language Acquisition and Language Education. Prentice Hall International, London.

D. Larsen-Freeman and M.H. Long (1991). An Introduction to Research on Second Language Acquisition. Longman, London.

P.M. Lightbown and N. Spada (2006). The Third Edition of How Languages Are Learned. Longman, Harlow.

B. McLaughlin (1987). Second-Language Learning Theories. Edward Arnold, London.

R. Mitchell and F. Myles (2004). Theories of Second Language Acquisition. Hodder Arnold, New York, 2nd ed.

P. Skehan (1989). Individual Differences in the Acquisition of a Second Language. Routledge, New York.

P. Ur (1991). A Course in Language Teaching: Theory and Practice Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

L. White (1987). Against Comprehensible Input: The Input Hypothesis and Second-Language Competence Development. Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8(2). http://applij.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/8/2/1995

R. Wilson (2000). The following is a synopsis of Stephen Krashen's "Principles and Practice in Second-Language-Acquisition." http://www.languageimpact.com/articles/rw/krashenbk.htm

M. Zafar (2009). Monitoring the 'Monitor': A Critical Examination of Krashen's Five Hypotheses Journal of Linguistics at Dhaka University, 2, 4, 139-146.