

Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Bakalářská práce

Daniela Šnýdrová

**Occurrence of speech disfluencies in teacher English of native Czech speakers and
native English speakers**

Výskyt řečových dysfluencí v učitelské angličtině rodilých mluvčích českého jazyka a
anglického jazyka

Praha, 2024

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Tomáš Gráf, Ph.D

Poděkování

Chtěla bych poděkovat vedoucímu práce, PhDr. Tomášovi Gráfovi, Ph.D, za ochotu a vstřícnost při konzultacích, pozitivní přístup, pomoc a cenné rady při zpracování této bakalářské práce. Dále poděkování patří mým blízkým, kteří mě podporovali během celého studia.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to identify speech disfluencies interfering in the fluent flow of speech in teacher language, and find out, whether there are particular differences in frequency and type of disfluencies between two speaker groups while carrying out a picture-description narrative task. The disfluencies are identified in the English Teacher Corpus on the sample of 25 native Czech speakers and 15 native English speakers. The theoretical part describes the concept of fluency and the three disfluency types: repetitions, false starts and self-corrections, and their function. In total, 283 instances of disfluencies were identified. After comparing the native and non-native speakers, it was proven that the frequency of disfluencies was significantly higher in non-native speakers, and so was the frequency of repetitions, which points to the connection between fluency and proficiency. This thesis serves to shed light on the issue of teacher language and its fluency and points out the impact of a higher complexity of a task on the speaker's fluency.

Keywords: fluency, disfluencies, teacher language, native and non-native English, repetitions, false starts, self-corrections

Abstrakt

Cílem této práce je identifikovat v učitelském jazyce řečové dysfluence, které zasahují do plynulého toku řeči, a zjistit, zda se mezi dvěma skupinami mluvčích vyskytují rozdíly v četnosti a typu dysfluencí při vyprávění na základě obrázků. Dysfluence jsou identifikovány v korpusu učitelské angličtiny na vzorku 25 rodilých mluvčích českého jazyka a 15 rodilých mluvčích anglického jazyka. Teoretická část popisuje koncept plynulosti a tři typy dysfluencí: opakování, planné začátky a opravy, a jejich funkci. Dohromady bylo identifikováno 283 případů dysfluencí. Po porovnání rodilých a nerodilých mluvčích se dokázalo, že frekvence dysfluencí značně převažovala u nerodilých mluvčích, stejně tak značně převažovala frekvence opakování, což ukazuje na spojitost mezi plynulostí a jazykovou úrovní. Tato práce slouží k nastínění problematiky učitelského jazyka a jeho plynulosti a poukazuje na dopad zvýšené komplexity úkolu na plynulost mluvčího.

Klíčová slova: plynulost, dysfluence, učitelský jazyk, angličtina rodilých a nerodilých mluvčích, opakování, planné začátky, opravy

Table of contents

List of tables	6
List of abbreviations	7
1. Introduction	8
2. Theoretical part	10
2.1. Fluency and disfluency	10
2.1.1. Disfluencies and their nature.....	10
2.1.2. Fluency and proficiency	11
2.2. Disfluency types	12
2.2.1. Repetitions	12
2.2.2. Self-corrections	14
2.2.3. False starts.....	15
2.3. Literature review	18
2.3.1. Task structure	18
2.3.2. Repetitions	18
2.3.3. Self-corrections and false starts	20
2.3.4. Disfluencies in different language environments.....	22
3. Analysis.....	23
3.1. The English Teacher Corpus.....	23
3.2. Data	24
3.3. Method	24
3.4. Results.....	27
3.4.1. Numbers and percentages of the three disfluencies	27
3.4.2. Individual disfluency types	29
3.4.3. Relative frequencies	33
4. Discussion	37
5. Conclusion.....	39
References	41
Resumé	44

List of tables

Table 1. Number of disfluencies	28
Table 2. Percentage of disfluencies	28
Table 3. Results of the log-likelihood test for the comparison of frequencies of the disfluencies in the two corpora	28
Table 4. Repetition types in the two speaker groups	29
Table 5. Self-correction types in the two speaker groups	29
Table 6. False start types in the two speaker groups	30
Table 7. Relative frequencies and absolute frequencies of repetitions, false starts, self-corrections and all disfluencies in Czech speakers	34
Table 8. Relative frequencies and absolute frequencies of repetitions, false starts, self-corrections and all disfluencies in native speakers	35

List of abbreviations

ETC	English Teacher Corpus
FS	False start
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LINDSEI	Louvain International Database of Spoken English Language
phw	Per hundred words
R	Repetition
SC	Self-correction

1. Introduction

As I am a Czech native speaker studying an English and French teaching programme and hopefully a future teacher, I am interested in teacher language and the impact it has on teacher performance. I have asked myself this question: if we were to look at teacher English of natives and non-natives, would there be significant differences in the frequency and type of disfluency? If so, what does it tell us about the English that's taught in schools? For my thesis, I have decided to compare two groups of speakers, who are all English teachers at Czech high schools, thus teaching students who are typically 15 to 18/19 years of age and preparing for the Maturita examination. The teacher groups differ in their relationship to the English language. One group consists of Czech non-native speakers of English, the other group are native speakers of English. The material that is going to be studied was obtained while co-creating the English Teacher Corpus, which contains 40 samples of teacher language retrieved during recorded interviews.

Fluency is a concept that is sometimes hard to define due to its ambiguous meaning. There are many aspects that contribute to the definition of fluency, such as temporal variables, formulaic language, global variables or performance phenomena. If fluency means intelligibility, effectiveness and comprehensibility (Götz, 2013), then disfluency, on the other hand, is something that interrupts the natural and smooth flow of speech. As distinguished by Williams (2022), disfluencies are often divided into repairs and hesitations. Perceptions of disfluencies also vary, some viewing it as unwanted interruptions of speech that expose the deficiencies of language skill, some appreciating it as tools that are necessary for keeping speech fluent, exhibiting willingness to improve proficiency and manifesting an awareness of one's mistakes.

When fluency is evaluated, it is not particularly hard to distinguish the disfluency rate of the less-advanced speakers from the native ones. However, difficulty arises once the goal is the comparison of highly advanced learners and native speakers, when intelligibility and comprehensibility is anticipated, and this approach to fluency is no longer applicable. In general, it is easier to distinguish between lower-proficiency speakers and higher-proficiency speakers, but as the differences in proficiency become less radical, the harder it is to assess fluency. It is then necessary to take into consideration the areas where even proficient learners demonstrate differences in performance compared to native speakers, which is the case of my respondents. In this situation, the traditional perspective on fluency that is equated with

mastery of language and native-like performance, as specified by Chambers (1997) might be useful as a point of comparison. Fluency variables help expose the deviances from the native-like performance (Götz, 2013). If it is true that speaker fluency is influenced by proficiency, it can be expected that the non-native Czech speakers produce a significantly higher number of disfluencies.

The thesis aims to find out, whether in teacher English, there are significant differences between the two speaker groups, specifically if there is a significant increase of disfluencies in one of the groups. To assess this, I have evaluated the 40 samples of the obtained data with the use of a statistical test, while using the p-value to determine the relevance of the results. In addition, I have also taken into consideration if any of the disfluency types is more frequent, and what is the reason for this inequality. I believe that my thesis will contribute to a better awareness in the area of fluency in teacher English. The English Teacher Corpus is also a unique project that I am convinced will positively influence future research.

While there is extensive data on student English, teacher English is usually overlooked while carrying out linguistic research and collecting data. I am convinced that increased interest in teacher language can be beneficial for both the teacher community and the public, as it can make everyone more aware of this often-ignored topic. Teacher English has a great impact on the students because teachers serve as models for proficiency and are often the subjects of imitation, but also because effective communication is a necessary aspect of a language classroom. The results of my research might also highlight more important topics, such as proficiency in teacher English and its manifestations. If the case is that a higher occurrence of disfluencies is directly related to non-native speech, it might lead to considering some strategies of how to support teachers, so that they are able to keep in touch with the language and not lose their ability to communicate efficiently with time. After finishing university education, many teachers stop being sufficiently surrounded by English which leads to them being less challenged. This is a normal occurrence, but it can stop them from improving while their fluency and proficiency may decrease over time. If more research is done in the area of teacher language, it might provide more support for practising teachers.

2. Theoretical part

2.1. Fluency and disfluency

Every learner whose aim is to master a foreign language knows how challenging it can be to obtain a high-level proficiency and achieve fluency in the four crucial language skills: speaking, writing, reading, and listening. The mastery of these skills depends on many factors, such as environment, learner type and other variables. The speaking skill is often regarded as a very strong indicator of overall language proficiency and confidence of a speaker. It leaves a lasting impression and ensures effective communication. During speaking, many irregularities come into play that are often viewed as interruptions of the normal flow of speech. Those irregularities are labelled as disfluencies. In spontaneous natural speech, fluency is often characterised as a ‘rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language,’ as described by Lennon (2000). This understanding of fluency, describing it as clear, smooth and effective flow of speech without any unnecessary interruptions, suggests that the term disfluency is something that enters the speech and disrupts the natural flow and speed of it, thus making it less clear and efficient.

2.1.1. Disfluencies and their nature

Disfluencies exist due to tensions between planning and production and are generally classified as hesitations (silent pauses, filled pauses, prolongations, repetitions) and repairs (self-corrections, false starts) (Williams, 2022). However, it is important to take into consideration the ‘social dimension of fluency,’ where fluency is considered more broadly. This approach to fluency understands it as an ability to be comprehensible to the listener, keep a conversation going or manage interactions without serious difficulty (Tavakoli and Wright, 2020). These two perspectives on fluency impact the way disfluencies are treated in spontaneous speech. The approach to these non-pathological disorders of articulation often suggests that disfluencies are speech occurrences that should be eliminated and avoided because they make speech less fluent. That can make people perceive it in a negative way. But is that really the case? Is a disfluency something unacceptable for a person who wants to communicate clearly, efficiently and in a refined manner?

It could be said that this disapproving approach to disfluencies, which are often understood as unwanted irregularities in the speech that cause discomfort for both the speaker and the listener, is problematic. Disfluency itself is a relatively recent construct due to a previous lack of interest in this subject. The concern for fluency first appeared in the last

century and it was not until the mid-twentieth century that it became a subject of empirical study. It is also important to distinguish between disfluent speech in physiological conditions and mundane occurrence of disfluencies in the non-pathological sense. This differentiation helps contextualize the evolution of research interest in disfluency and underscores the importance of understanding its various manifestations. To this day, disfluency continues to be a relatively specialized field of study (Williams, 2022).

Williams believes that disfluencies may be understood as rhetorical strategies that are not necessarily negative, but rather serve an important purpose in spontaneous speech. It is often a process of how the speaker adapts and reacts to their environment and the surrounding norms. One of the functions of pauses, prolongations and repetitions is to provide more time in the planning process as the speaker reflects on how to continue the utterance and express themselves efficiently. The interruptions not only ensure that the conversation keeps going and the flow of speech is preserved, thus contributing to fluency, but they can be useful to the listener because they may reveal the personal identity of the speaker or some psychological factors. Repairs, on the other hand, reveal a lot about the speaker's proficiency and linguistic awareness. The use of self-corrections exhibits a good knowledge of the language, its system and rules and shows the ability to realize one's mistake and subsequently correct it. Similarly, false starts manifest the capability to reflect on one's linguistic abilities and start anew due to a problem source without any obvious need for revision that could possibly be identified by the listener (Williams, 2022)

2.1.2. Fluency and proficiency

Even though lack of fluency in speech and increased frequency of disfluencies might be often associated with beginners or less advanced speakers, it is not a rule. Quite logically, disfluencies are linked to proficiency, but there are other reasons why speech becomes less fluent. Apart from flaws in linguistic processing, fluency is often affected by cognitive factors, such as fatigue or distraction. A significant cause of disruption is also the psychological state of an individual as many emotional responses like anxiety, nervousness or excitement can all negatively influence speech and cause temporary disfluencies. In addition, a higher occurrence of disfluency does not necessarily equal low proficiency. An advanced speaker that uses idioms, colloquial forms and complex grammatical sentences might produce more disfluencies than a speaker with less knowledge and experience, so in consequence, the frequency of disfluencies does not always accurately reflect the speakers' language proficiency levels. Speech interruption is not something that's exclusively found in the speech

of non-native speakers. On the contrary, disfluencies are frequently occurring in native speakers while they are using their mother tongue, although high proficiency is certain with this type of speaker.

There is, however, a relationship between proficiency and disfluency types. As per Williams (2022), certain types of disfluencies decrease with increased proficiency. This is the case for silent pauses, repetitions, and self-corrections, which are produced more by lower-proficiency learners. Shorter pause duration and the absence of pauses are associated with high-proficiency speakers. While self-corrections also decrease as proficiency increases, they boost learner's progress, thus contributing to fluency. At the same time, false starts, which are more frequent than self-corrections, have been found to exhibit a negative correlation with proficiency. The role of filled pauses is problematic, as the production of lexical filled pauses can be linked to higher-proficiency speakers, while lower-proficiency speakers prefer non-lexical ones, but at other times it is claimed that filled pauses are the least reliable indicators of fluency. This shows the importance of distinguishing between disfluency types, as they have different connections to L2 proficiency. In my BA thesis, I intend to focus on three types of disfluencies: self-corrections and false starts, classified as repairs, and repetitions, considered to be hesitations.

2.2. Disfluency types

2.2.1. Repetitions

Repetition as a disfluency is seemingly easy to define, but there is not a large number of studies including a formal definition of repetitions and its examples. Initially, it is necessary to exclude both 'intentional repetitions' and 'repetitions for emphasis' from the understanding of repetition as a term standing for a type of disfluency (Williams, 2022:147). Maclay and Osgood (1959) define repetitions as "immediate and identical repeat of spoken material just uttered" that is of variable length and holds no semantic significance. Their corpus consisted of repetitions of single phonemes to multiple-word phrases, and the authors suggest that there is no limit in lexical units as to what a repetition is. However, their research showed that 71% of all the repetitions were of a single word. Similarly, Olynyk (1987) sees it as a recurrence of a word or phrase lacking semantic significance or intensification. While Williams describes repetitions as hesitations, Riegenbach (1991), on the other hand, considers repetitions to be repairs and distinguishes them as "exact and adjacent repeats." Another definition by Engelhardt et al.'s (2010) mentions that repetition can be partial and can appear even after the intervention of a pause, word or a phrase. Overt and modified forms of

repetition focus on reformulation, in which they differ from identical repetitions (Williams, 2022).

According to Maclay and Osgood (1959), repetitions occur in similar positions as pauses and assume the same role of giving the speaker time to choose from various lexical alternatives. In their study, they discovered that 67% of all the repetitions were function words standing before a lexical word or phrase, as opposed to the remaining 33% of lexical word repeats. They also distinguished the four most numerous categories of repetitions: articles, possessive pronouns and numbers being the most numerous category, followed by prepositions, subject personal pronouns and verbs. The dominance of function-word repetition is explained as giving the speakers chance to find the required lexical word to continue the utterance. Levelt's (1983) three-part repair organisation, consisting of a *reparandum* (original utterance,) editing phase and *reparatum* (retracing), shows that a *reparatum* contains no change, but consists simply of a repeat of the *reparandum*. The editing phase is generally marked by a silent pause or possibly a filled pause (Williams, 2022).

There is often ambiguity between repetitions and false starts. Hieke (1981) claims, that those two are a relatively similar phenomena, and he understands some false starts as discontinuous repeats. He distinguishes between prospective repetition that is used to search for words, assuming a planning function, and retrospective repetition that helps to reunite speech segments separated due to hesitations, thus assuming a "bridging function" and promoting continuity. When it comes to highlighting the distinction between repetitions and false starts, he states that what differentiates repetition from false start is the immediacy of the repetition, in which case it is often perceived as more disfluent than a false start. In addition, McAllister et al. (2001) proved that repetitions and false starts are processed differently by listeners.

Repetitions were also perceived as significantly more disfluent in comparison to repairs, specifically due to their immediacy and the identical character of the repeated words (Rossiter, 2009). In his research, Olynyk et al. (1987) found out that repetition, also classified as progressive speech marker, is the second most frequent speech marker in general. They also recognized the similarity of repetition patterns of L1 and L2, hinting at the fact that the repetition patterns of L1 are probably applied to L2. According to the authors, advanced speakers produced greater number of progressive markers that, contrary to regressive markers, place fewer demands on listeners, however, the research by Rossiter (2009) shows that repetitions were considered second most disfluent after pauses. Although repetitions usually

do not stand out for listeners, they are very effective when it comes to listener comprehension (Tree, 1995)

Some examples of a repetition that I obtained from the English Teacher Corpus are those ensuing:

(1) *he (er) stands up and <X> gets gets angry. (CZ007)*

(2) *I can see a man sitting and leaning (eh) on on on a tree (CZ010)*

(3) *but it will probably not be you know the[i:] you know the whole picture (CZ004)*

(4) *and follow all his (er) all his actions (EN004)*

2.2.2. Self-corrections

One of the indicators of development of interlanguage and proficiency are self-corrections. According to the classification by Williams (2022), they belong to the category of repairs along with false starts. Self-corrections differentiate from false starts in how they are perceived by listeners because they monitor an error and negatively impact listener's perception of fluent speech (McRobie, 1993). They reflect the speaker's awareness of a mistake and its subsequent correction or correction attempt aspiring to a standard form. Schegloff et al. (1977) recognise repair in the general sense as a form of socialization in which a non-standard form is replaced by a standard one. However, although the goal of self-correction is correctness, after the correction, the result itself is not always the better and more correct form. In the process of language acquisition there may be a situation where the learner carries out a self-correction on an already correct form, thus making it non-standard, or the corrected term might be incorrect and require another correction. This shows the experimentative nature of this type of repair and its modifying and monitoring role in interlanguage (Williams, 2022).

Self-correction is usually described as an emendation of an error by a corrected form and is initiated by the speaker of the error themselves. As learners internalize the standard of the target language, they monitor their speech and correct their mistakes, however, an error does not always result in a correction (Williams, 2022). When it comes to terminology, there is a division in the use of suitable terms for this phenomenon. Schegloff et al. (1977) understand the words 'correction' and 'repair' as almost synonymous terms, similarly does Levelt (1983) who additionally distinguishes between 'error' and 'inappropriateness', with error-repair being the largest of five repair categories assuming 42% of repair occurrence and appropriateness-repair being second largest. Most error-repairs focus on the trouble source,

thus correcting only the error while maintaining the rest unaltered which makes them less invasive in comparison to appropriateness-repairs. In general, error-repair corresponds to self-correction while appropriateness-repair could be a synonym for false start (Levelt, 1983). For this thesis, I prefer to work with the broader sense of the main term ‘repair’ that is further divided into two subtypes: self-correction and false start as accepted by Williams.

In Levelt’s data (1983) the largest group of correction is lexical correction, highly exceeding the other two types: syntactic and phonetic corrections. According to his research, the correction comprises of three parts. There is a *reparandum* or the trouble source followed by an interruption and an *editing phase* that is accompanied by an editing term or a silent pause. Finally, the last part is *reparatum* also called repair. The *editing phase* is the main position where the monitoring and preparation for the correction takes place, while editing terms buy the speaker time to reflect on the issues and continue the utterance. *Reparatum* is a “comparator for the speaker and an orientation for the listener” (Williams, 2022:185) and for this reason the repetition of function words is often taking place. Kormos (1999) found out in her research that 55% of self-corrections identified on her data did not have any editing term and when they had, they were predominantly filled pauses. Filled pauses do not impose too much restriction on memory, leaving more time for the speaker to accomplish the repair.

In general, self-corrections are frequently associated with a lower proficiency. Second language researchers (e.g. Kormos, 1998; van Hest, 1996; Zeng, 2019) located the intermediate language level as corresponding the most to the highest productions of self-corrections because the learner has a sufficient proficiency needed to know the rules of the grammar and the standard form that the correction is aspiring to, but at the same time, the learner is still having difficulties with insufficient processing (Williams, 2022). Lennon (1990) states that self-corrections are more likely to be viewed as disfluencies when delivered by a lower-proficiency speaker, in comparison to higher-proficiency speakers where this type of disfluency does not attract as much attention. One of the causes for this inequality in perception could be a foreign accent, but also the fact that the basic revisions of phonology and grammar manifested in the form of self-correction are typical of less-advanced speakers. Self-corrections are thus important acquisitional tools that evolve with the increase of proficiency (Williams, 2022). Kormos (2006) also found out that advanced speakers surpass intermediate speakers in well-formedness of repairs.

It is important to differentiate between self-correction and other-correction which is initiated from the exterior. Corrections are often associated with teaching and thus are a

common occurrence in a language classroom where they are frequently initiated by the teacher. The main goal of such other-initiation is drawing the learner's attention to the incorrect term, subsequent correction and the automatization of the standard. It serves as a tool that teachers use to deal with lower-proficiency learners before they acquire a higher language proficiency (Schegloff et al., 1977). Due to this connection between pedagogy and correction, not only does correction occur more frequently in a classroom environment, it is also more challenging to obtain data from outside the classroom in a non-controlled environment (Williams, 2022).

These are some of the examples of self-corrections in the English Teacher Corpus.

(5) he does know he does not know what to do (CZ014)

(6) he will he is getting his hat back (CZ013)

(7) he's scratching the head hat (CZ025)

(8) and then he starts the monkey starts distributing hats (EN008)

2.2.3. False starts

False starts are the type of disfluency that is least likely to be perceived as distracting. Sometimes, false starts are also referred to as “self-initiated self-repairs, recasts, and reformulations” (Williams, 2022:214). Although listener assessment of fluency evaluated false starts as evidence of disfluency, the occurrence was especially low in comparison to other disfluencies. Along with self-corrections, false starts are classified as self-repairs initiated by the speaker himself. It is a complex disfluency that often combines several others. Similarly to self-corrections, false starts offer potential opportunities for language acquisition, as the learner reflects on the trouble area and modifies it. The frequency of false starts is influenced by task and speaker roles, as seen in lower production of false starts in tasks with time constraints, or by the role of the teacher, when learners rely on the teacher to initiate self-correction without testing possible solutions. Another factor reflecting lack of false starts can be social pressure forcing the speaker to economize time and avoid false starts that are generally more time consuming. In learner-learner dialogues without a specified task and fixed structure, speech exhibits higher frequency of false starts (Williams, 2022).

False starts hold an important role in learner's speech and language acquisition and have a significant impact on the listener. They facilitate the speaker's precision of expression and enhance fluency, and at the same time help the listener accommodate and clarify the speaker's message (Williams, 2022). Schegloff et al. (1977) distinguish between ‘corrections’

and ‘repairs,’ claiming that the difference between the two is that ‘repairs’ are initiated without a noticeable error and the reformulation takes place for no apparent reason. Because in the classification proposed by Levelt (1983) and also appropriated by Williams (2022), false starts and self-corrections both assume the category of repair, false start is a repair that differs from self-correction because it contains no evident mistake that would trigger the reformulation. It occurs in a situation where a speaker begins a sentence and consequently abandons it to commence anew or resume in a new direction. Often, the reason for the initiation of a false start is unclear. Levelt (1983) differentiates between error-repairs, that mostly only correct an error, and appropriateness-repairs, that are more likely to be false starts and whose area of transformation is much more extensive.

False starts can have a positive effect on the increase of proficiency due to their nature. They are caused by the speaker’s awareness of an issue and maintain fluency of speech. Their main catalyst is a reflection on a problem utterance that initiates reformulations and alternative solutions. False starts are not only a strategy used by speakers, but they are of significant importance for listeners as well. They hold meaning and are strategic for listeners, although they complicate processing (Williams, 2022). Kormos (2006) claims that the reason for the higher processing demands for listeners is due to the ill-formedness of false starts in lower-proficiency speakers. Van Hest (1996) and Verhoeven (1989) profess a higher frequency of false starts in the speech of beginners and intermediate-level learners, but at the same time, false starts are more perceptible and distracting in higher-proficiency speakers (Révész et al., 2016).

Another term for a false start is regressive speech marker. False starts are then understood as “modifications of previously produced speech that follows an element to be repaired,” (Williams, 2022:218) and they disturb the listener. Fox Tree (2010) describes three types of false starts based on their positions. He distinguishes between a ‘beginning false start’, ‘middle false start’ and a ‘beginning false start introduced by *and*’. He found out that the position of the false start affects listener comprehension. ‘Middle false starts’ and ‘beginning false starts introduced by *and*’ affect listener’s comprehension negatively, while beginning false starts complicate processing much less (Tree, 1995).

Some samples of false starts sourced from the English Teacher Corpus are the following.

(9) *the monkeys are copycat= copycatting him (CZ013)*

- (10) *the monkeys are oh yeah there's a guy (CZ023)*
(11) *can see an older man under a tree (er) the tree there are monkeys (CZ001)*
(12) *a bunch of top hats (em) in ba= baskets (EN001)*

2.3. Literature review

2.3.1. Task structure

As already mentioned, the production of disfluencies is also highly influenced by other external or internal factors, apart from proficiency, such as task structure and the psychological state of the speaker. Those two factors were taken into consideration by Mora et al. (2023), who researched how task complexity influences speaking anxiety and overall fluency. They had forty-two native Spanish speakers carry out two versions of monologic speaking task in English, one of the versions simple and the second one more complex. The fire-chief task was used for the activity, where speakers had to solve an emergency situation by describing directions to the emergency teams based on a picture/plan of a building. The results showed that the speakers exhibited more fluent and comprehensible speech while carrying out the simple version of the task. The intensity and frequency of anxiety for the two versions of the task were influenced by the order in which the speakers proceeded. When they first did the simple task, they found the more complex one to be more difficult and thus were subject to greater anxiety. Interestingly, grammatical and lexical errors were more frequent in the simple task, likely due to the complex task imposing higher attention requirements on the speakers, while pronunciation errors were more frequent in the complex task. Repetitions and self-corrections were much more common in the complex task. Speakers possessing a higher proficiency showed lower anxiety levels and produced fewer disfluencies and errors, proving greater fluency and comprehensibility. The picture-based narrative task used for my thesis can be considered a complex task, thus it can be expected that higher anxiety levels and more disfluencies will occur.

2.3.2. Repetitions

Clark and Wasow (1998) took two corpora: the Switchboard corpus of American telephone conversations, consisting of 2.7 million words, and the London-Lund corpus of British face-to-face conversations, consisting of 170,000 words. The speakers of the first corpus got to choose from a range of topics and spoke for up to ten minutes. They classified whether the repeating element is a function word or a content word. The results showed that function words were repeated more than ten times as frequently as the content words. This is also explained by the fact that function words are much more frequent in general and 37.6%

of them appeared over 1,000 times, while only 0.5% of the content words did. The repeat rate was the highest for pronouns, followed by conjunctions, then determiners, miscellaneous words, prepositions and auxiliaries. Articles are often repeated if a speaker starts a noun phrase but does not complete it. The most frequently repeated pronouns were nominative pronouns and those were repeated more before negative clauses, due to higher complexity. Contractions of a pronoun and a verb were repeated about as frequently as nominative pronouns. The authors also distinguished a type of repeat called near repeat, for example repeating the indefinite article “a” with “an”. Repetitions are more likely to occur when connected to more complex phrases or constructions, such as that articles are more likely to be repeated when at the beginning of a noun phrase that is developed by postmodification or an adjective. Clark’s and Wasow’s proposal is that repetitions’ main goal is to restore continuity. When a disruption, such as a filler, gets larger, more repetitions are produced.

Another study on disfluencies is done by Gráf (2017). His results are particularly relevant to my thesis because the learners are of the same linguistic background as the teachers I interviewed and because both groups have advanced English skills. The goal of the study was to find out, whether the Czech advanced speakers use repetitions in a similar way to native English speakers and other non-native advanced speakers with a different background. In this study, 50 native Czech speakers with an advanced level of English were interviewed, providing almost 13 hours of material. In the interviews, Gráf identified 1,905 instances of repeats. He found out that the most common type of repetition was a one-word single repetition (tagged as <R_1_2>) which formed 1,349 cases of the detected repetitions. Pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, definite articles and contracted forms were the most frequently repeated components. There were only 140 cases of triple repetitions while quadruple repetitions appeared only 8 times and the most frequently repeated elements were observed in a much smaller selection of speakers. Lastly, with multi-word repetitions, there were 370 instances of two-word repeats and 45 instances of three-word repeats. The frequency per hundred words (the repeat rate) is 1.91 repeats phw which equals a repetition once in every 52 words. As the study shows, the most frequent repetition type is one-word repetition, while the most frequently repeated element is a pronoun. Repetitions are most likely to occur at the beginnings of clauses or of nominal/prepositional phrases and can take up to 2.5% of spontaneous speech. Based on a comparison with Biber et al. (1999), the results show that Czech advanced speakers use repetitions similarly to native speakers. This might be due to exposure or L1 strategy transfer. In addition, Gráf points out the fact that the

production of disfluencies can be dependent on several variables, one of them also being the fact that disfluencies are often speaker-specific and their occurrence can be very individual.

Lennon (1990) analysed recordings and transcriptions of a six-picture narrative of four German students speaking English. The results showed that in the speech produced by three of the four learners, there were fewer repetitions (8%, 33%, 63%) in the task made towards the end of their six-month stay in the UK, than at the beginning. This links lower production of repetitions to higher proficiency. One of the speakers produced more repetitions (6%) towards the end of the stay.

2.3.3. Self-corrections and false starts

Gráf and Huang (2018) explored the other two types of disfluencies, namely false starts and self-corrections, in learner and native English. They compared a corpus of native speakers LOCNEC with Czech and Taiwanese learner English subcorpora, both made of 50 15-minute recordings. The Czech advanced speaker corpus is the same one as described in the previous paragraph. There is a difference in the English level of the two groups. While most speakers from the Czech Republic were at a C1 or C2 level, the Taiwanese speakers were in general at a B1 or B2 level. The Czech Corpus comprises of 96,969 tokens, of which 981 are false starts and 426 are self-corrections. The Taiwanese Corpus counts 83,437 tokens, consisting of 2,515 false starts and 591 self-corrections. The LOCNEC is made of 122,214 tokens, of which 926 are identified as false starts and 106 as self-corrections. After comparing the three groups, great differences were found between the various proficiency levels. The Taiwanese speakers, who had the lowest proficiency level out of the three groups, produced the most self-corrections and false starts, with the false starts being highly frequent. The Czech speakers with the higher proficiency produced fewer of them, but in comparison with the native speakers, it was still much more, especially in the count of self-corrections. The results of the study show, that different proficiency levels are reflected in the use of false starts, which were much more frequent in lower-proficiency speakers, while the count of self-corrections is not necessarily a clear indicator of the proficiency level. This can come off as surprising, especially in comparison to the summary done by Williams (2022), which states that false starts exhibited a negative correlation with proficiency, while self-corrections decrease with higher proficiency and are most frequent in speakers with an intermediate level (Kormos, 1998; van Hest, 1996; Zeng, 2019).

Witton-Davies (2010) focuses on how repair influences other fluency measures. He compared 17 Taiwanese university students with a proficiency level possessing an intermediate to advanced level to 8 native English speakers. Both groups were subject to the same task: telling a story based on a set of pictures, similarly to the task I focused on for this thesis, and a discussion. The speakers had 10 minutes to prepare and had to speak for 8-10 minutes. For the Taiwanese students, the same tasks were completed twice, once in the first year of their university studies, and once in their fourth year. The main types of repair that Witton-Davies distinguished are false starts, repetitions (or repeats) and reformulations, which were defined as “false starts followed by something very similar to the previous words” (Witton-Davies, 2010). In my thesis, I personally did not distinguish this type, usually classifying the reformulations under false starts. His definition of grammatical reformulation would probably be what I tagged as self-correction, however, there was no instance of it in this study’s sources. After comparing the native and non-native speakers, there were several differences between the groups. For the non-native speakers, repair was more frequent, involved a higher percentage of words and their speech contained two to four times as many instances of repair as the natives. Repetitions and reformulation were more frequent in slower speech, while false starts did not show a difference in distribution based on speech rate. In general, for natives, more repair equals a faster speech rate, while in comparison for non-native speakers, it correlates with a slower speech rate. Repetitions are common in fluent speech and false starts along with reformulations are more frequently occurring in lower-proficiency speakers. According to the results, repetitions might facilitate fluency due to their function in maintaining speech rate by providing time for the speaker to obtain the required words, while a reformulation does the exact opposite. Frequent reformulations may actually make a speaker come off as less fluent and this applies not only to non-natives but also to native speakers, although that in the category of native speakers, reformulation and self-correcting behaviour are much rarer due to higher proficiency.

Vercellotti (2018) examined four speakers possessing an intermediate level of English with their L1 being Arabic. The speakers continued with the program for three semesters, completing a speech and self-correction task seven times throughout the programme. The task consisted of a four-step computer-aided self-correction task, and a two-minute semi-spontaneous monologue which they subsequently had to transcribe, including any errors that were in the recording. Afterwards, the recording and transcription served for the students to identify any mistakes and suggest corrections. Both correct corrections and incorrect

corrections were included in the study. The author also distinguished between abandoned utterances, during-production corrections and post-production corrections. Abandoned utterances were not particularly frequent. Two of the participants made only very few self-corrections and kept receiving lower marks throughout the study, pointing to the fact that the use of disfluencies is highly speaker-specific and suggesting that error-prone speakers may have problems with producing self-corrections. The third student showed many self-correcting efforts despite lower production of errors, earning higher marks than the other respondents and exhibiting improvements. The last speaker showed a higher production of post-production self-correction with time, possibly thanks to the repetitive nature of the activity and received higher grammar marks over time. Three out of the four speakers produced more form-focused/grammatical self-corrections, greatly exceeding the meaning-focused/lexical ones, with no great difference between during-production and post-production self-corrections. The correlation between the production of self-corrections and the participants' outcomes, as regards their received marks, suggests the connection between the ability to self-correct and identify a mistake and proficiency levels.

2.3.4. Disfluencies in different language environments

Bergmann et al. (2015) studied three groups of speakers: speakers of German as L1 living in Germany, speakers of English as L1 and German as L2 living in Germany and speakers of German as L1 and English as L2 living in America. The participants were told to carry out tasks in German. The tasks consisted of a pen-and-paper cloze test, which showed insignificant differences between L1 and L2 speakers, pointing at the fact that the L2 speakers gained native-like proficiency, and a retelling and an explanation of a silent film. They distinguished three types of hesitations: pauses, repetitions and self-corrections, the last two being of great interest to my thesis. Self-corrections were divided into two parts: Error-repairs (self-corrections) and appropriateness repairs (false starts). The attriters living in America who were the most educated exhibited longer retellings. Lexical diversity was comparable for all three groups, but the speech rate was slower for learners. The highest number of repetitions is produced by the learners, closely followed by the attriters, while the natives living in Germany produced less than half of the repetitions as the speakers with German as L2. Similarly, native speakers living in Germany produced fewer self-corrections than the remaining groups. These results confirm that learners and attriters are generally producing more disfluencies than native speakers who are living in their L1 country. Surprisingly, in

comparison with appropriateness-repairs, more error-repairs were produced by all three of the groups.

Following the results of the above-mentioned studies, I decided to compare their results with my own research focusing on teacher language, attempting to answer the following research questions:

Do disfluencies in teacher English, particularly repetitions, false starts and self-corrections, occur more frequently in advanced non-native speakers with Czech as L1 than in native speakers while carrying out a picture-narrative task?

Is there a particular difference between the frequency of the three types of disfluency and their distribution?

What words are most likely to be repeated?

3. Analysis

3.1. The English Teacher Corpus

To answer my research questions, I used the English Teacher Corpus (ETC). I obtained the necessary data from this corpus, which I also had the opportunity to co-create along with my colleagues from the English teacher programme at Charles University in Prague under the management and supervision of PhDr. Tomáš Gráf Ph.D. from the Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, who also invented and initiated the whole project along with Mgr. Barbora Bulantová and Mgr. Kryštof Buchal. This spoken learner corpus uses native English speakers as a point of comparison. Although similar studies concerning fluency in non-native and native English and studying fluency in learners possessing different levels of proficiency have already been conducted, my scope of interest lies in teacher English, as a reflection of my BA degree in English Language and Literature in Education. The lack of relevant research in the field of English teacher language and, to my knowledge, previous non-existence of a similar project that would be studying the speech of teachers of English as a foreign language outside of the classroom, both served as a motivation for the creation of the ETC Corpus and for further research in this field, which might make this thesis relevant for a deeper understanding of teacher-produced L2.

The corpus itself consists of 25 samples of Czech native speakers and 15 samples of English native speakers, all of them, as the name of the corpus suggests, teachers of English at high schools. In its entirety, the corpus consists of 12.5 hours of recorded and transcribed text,

counting 76,122 tokens for the non-native speakers and 31,898 tokens for the native speakers. The data was obtained through an interview, where along with my colleagues we interviewed the teachers and recorded the audio of the meeting. The interview consisted of five tasks: a monologue based on a topic the teacher chose, a dialogue based on a question chosen by the interviewer, a picture-based narrative task, a text that was read out loud, and the last part was an interview about the profession of a teacher in Czech. The respondents were also asked to fill in a form collecting information about their relationship with English, stays abroad, education or certificates. The audio recordings were then anonymised and transcribed, while the distinction between native and non-native speakers was maintained. The transcription was done with the help of Whisper AI and the data was aligned using EXMARaLDA.

3.2. Data

For my study, I decided to focus mainly on the picture-based narrative task, where the respondents had to describe a sequence of pictures without any previous preparation. The point of the task was not only to describe the pictures, but also to unveil the story that the sequence shows, which allowed me to observe how the respondents dealt with having to use spontaneous speech to coherently speak about a story without previous preparation. The number of tokens in the picture description part of the interview that I was working with is 6,571 for non-native speakers and 2,984 for native speakers.

3.3. Method

It is important to evaluate the types of disfluencies carefully and thoroughly, as sometimes it can be difficult to distinguish between them and determine what type of disfluency is in question. Most frequently, there is an issue concerning whether a particular instance is a false start or a self-correction, as these two can often be mistaken. For that reason, a lot of attention must be paid to a suitable definition of the disfluency and, while assessing the disfluencies, leave no room for misinterpretation. To verify my judgment and check my tags, I asked my colleague who is also evaluating these disfluencies to go through the problematic parts of my work and help me distinguish between them.

In the transcribed interviews, I tagged the disfluencies while differentiating between repetitions, false starts and self-corrections. The tagging system created by Gráf (2017) uses the following tags: R for repetitions, SC for self-corrections and FS for false starts. Another variable taken into consideration was the length of the disfluencies, thus of how many words is each disfluency type composed, for example, whether the repetition was a single word

repetition or whether it included several words. This is marked by numbers corresponding to the quantity of words of which the disfluency consists.

For the assessment of repetitions I was following the definition by Maclay and Osgood (1959), distinguishing repetition as a type of hesitation and an “immediate and identical repeat of spoken material just uttered.”

In repetitions, apart from the R tag, I also used two numeral codes for the taggings. The first number stands for the number of words repeated, the second one for how many times the item occurs. For example, this is a single-word repetition where the word was repeated twice:

(1) *it's a <R_1_2> funny funny mirror-like activity (CZ014)*

The next example shows a phrase of three words that is repeated twice:

(2) *they just make it fall <R_3_2> from the tree from the tree (CZ025)*

I only considered the phenomena to be a disfluency if there was no word with lexical meaning intervening between the repeating phrases. However, I did not measure the empty or filled pauses and did not consider them, as they were not particularly relevant to the aim of my research. This means that repetitions including filled pauses, such as these two, were both accepted as valid examples and representations of a repetition:

(3) *<R_1_2> and (er) and the man seems puzzled (CZ017)*

(4) *<R_2_2> the man yeah the man wakes up (CZ001)*

Later, I also identified the parts of speech that the repetitions consist of to see the difference in frequency of occurrence between function word and lexical word repeats.

For self-corrections, I followed the classification by Williams (2022), who considers self-corrections to be repairs. I generally tagged the disfluency as self-correction only if it was a reaction to an error, which is what sets it apart from false starts. As mentioned already, I used the tag SC along with a numeral that stood for the number of words of which the repair consisted, the error was not reflected in the tag.

Many of the self-corrections were of a grammatical nature, such as these two, where the error is clearly identifiable:

(5) *<SC_2> he's throwned (er) he's thrown down (CZ001)*

(6) *he's surprised and wakes up and <SC_2> see all sees all the monkeys (EN015)*

Another frequent type was a lexical correction, where the speaker mistook the subject of the story and used for example the wrong pronoun, noun, or interchanged singular with plural. In this case, for a clueless reader, there seems to be no actual mistake that needed correcting, but from my point of view, I qualified it as a mistake because I knew from the context that a wrong choice of lexis had been made. Some instances of this are the following:

(7) <SC_3> *once the kids (eh) once the monkeys sees him (CZ024)*

(8) <SC_2> *above them above him there's five monkeys (EN010)*

I also considered faulty corrections to be SC, however, there were few instances of this in the collected data. Below is an example of an incorrect correction:

(9) *looks up < SC_3> at (er) (er) up (er) in at the tree (CZ011)*

For the last type of disfluency that I tagged in the transcription, the false start, I also considered the phenomenon to be a repair. However, I separated it from the self-corrections due to the obvious lack of an error worth correcting, thus the reason for the repair is unclear. In the case of a false start, it is more of a reformulation and recast.

I used the tag FS along with the number standing for the number of words that make up the whole false start. I also distinguished between two types of false starts depending on whether it is an unfinished word or not. The unfinished word was marked with an equals sign. Examples of false starts that are an unfinished word would be these:

(10) *they start to <FS_1> ba= they start to steal (CZ006)*

(11) *the monkeys are <FS_1> copycat= copycatting him (CZ013)*

False starts that consist of a finished word, or several finished words, look like this:

(12) *and <FS_1> he I think he figured out what was going on (CZ004)*

(13) *<FS_3> the man is he finally has a good idea (EN006)*

If the false start consisted of more than one word while one of the words was unfinished, I tagged it in the following manner, considering the entire false start unfinished as well:

(14) *<FS_2> I'm s= I'm reminded of the (EN005)*

Apart from distinguishing between finished and unfinished false starts, I also considered the syntactic position of the disfluencies and therefore distinguished whether they are at the

beginning of a sentence or not, which was, however, not reflected in the tagging. Sometimes, the disfluencies occurred simultaneously in the same place, in which case I marked both.

A contracted form was identified as one unit, but if a contracted form was repeated in the non-contracted version, but it was not interrupted by any element suggesting separation and was of the exactly same meaning and form apart from the repeated part not being contracted, I generally tagged it as a repetition.

(15) <R_2_2> *the man's the man is thinking (EN004)*

But in comparison, the following example was tagged as a false start due to the context and the interjection “oh” suggesting that the speaker realized something and started anew.

(16) <FS_2> *they are oh they're* <FS_1> *m= doing like (CZ023)*

3.4. Results

3.4.1. Numbers and percentages of the three disfluencies

Eventually, there were 283 instances of disfluencies identified altogether, collected from the native and non-native speaker recordings. There is a significant difference in how many disfluencies were obtained through the Czech native speakers, which was 220, and through the English native speakers, which reached a total of 63. However, it is crucial not to forget the difference in the number of respondents between the Czech teacher corpora including 25 respondents and the counterpart composed of native English teachers made of 15 respondents only. The type of the prevailing disfluency differed based on the type of respondents. For the Czech part, it was repetitions that gained the first place, being the most produced disfluency, however, extremely closely followed by false starts. On the other hand, in the English counterpart, it was false starts that preceded repetitions in number, leaving them as the second most frequently produced type. In both situations, it was self-corrections that were ranked as the least produced type out of the three, being significantly fewer. Table 1 below provides an overview of the absolute frequency of these disfluencies in the two corpora. Table 2 below provides the proportional representation of each disfluency type.

	repetitions	self-corrections	false starts
CZ	100	28	92
EN	22	13	28
total	122	41	120

Table 1. *Number of disfluencies*

	repetitions	self-corrections	false starts
CZ	45.5%	12.7%	41.8%
EN	34.9%	20.6%	44.4%
total	43.1%	14.5%	42.4%

Table 2. *Percentage of disfluencies*

To determine whether there are significant differences between the frequency of the disfluencies in the two corpora I used a log-likelihood test.¹ The results are in Table 3.

disfluency type	log-likelihood value (G²)	p-value
repetitions	10.95	p < 0.001
false starts	3.68	p > 0.05
self-corrections	0.00	p > 0.05
all disfluencies	11.28	p < 0.001

Table 3. *Results of the log-likelihood test for the comparison of frequencies of the disfluencies in the two corpora*

The table shows that there are only two significant results of the log-likelihood test, namely for repetitions and all disfluencies together. The result for repetitions ($G^2=10.95$) is significant ($p<0.001$) and so it is for all of the disfluencies in total ($G^2=11.28$, $p<0.001$). The results of false starts and self-corrections are not significant which might be due to the size of the corpus and the small number of instances of these disfluencies. In summary, it is clear that the Czech speakers produce significantly more repetitions and all disfluencies together. As regards self-corrections, these were more frequent in the native speaker corpus, but the result was insignificant. False-starts were more frequent in the Czech speaker corpus, but the results were also insignificant.

¹ <https://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>

3.4.2 Individual disfluency types

The subsequent tables show the individual types of disfluencies and the frequency of their representation in the two corpora

	R_1_2	R_1_3	R_1_4	R_2_2	R_3_2	R_4_2	R_6_2
CZ	67 (67%)	7 (7%)	1 (1%)	19 (19%)	5 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
EN	10 (45.5%)	2 (9.1%)	0 (0%)	6 (27.3%)	2 (9.1%)	2 (9.1%)	0 (0%)

Table 4. Repetition types in the two speaker groups

When it comes to disfluency types, the most frequent type of repetition is a one-word repetition (tagged as R_1_2). In the Czech speaker corpus, there are 67 instances of a one-word repetition out of 100 repetitions in total, which makes it 67% of the entire count. The second most frequent type of repetition is a two-word repetition (tagged as R_2_2), which counts 19 instances and makes up 19% of the total repetitions. In the third place in regard to frequency, there is a one-word triple repetition (tagged as R_1_3) which occurred 7 times in total, making up 7% of all repetitions, while a three-word repetition (tagged as R_3_2) appeared 5 times, taking up 5% of the total count. There are also two other types: a one-word quadruple repetition (tagged as R_1_4) and a six-word repetition (tagged as R_6_2), both of which appear only once. In the native speaker corpus, once again the most numerous category was a one-word repetition, with 10 instances making up 45.5% of the repetitions, followed by 6 cases of two-word repetition standing for 27.3% of the total number, subsequently, there were two instances one-word triple repetition, two instances of three-word repetition and two instances of four-word repetition (tagged as R_4_2), each standing for 9.1% of the total count. In comparison, the Czech speaker corpus contained two repetition types that were not found in the native speaker corpus, those were R_1_4 and R_6_2. On the other hand, the native speaker corpus contained R_4_2, a repetition type not found in the Czech speaker corpus.

	SC_1	SC_2	SC_3	SC_4	SC_5	SC_6
CZ	8 (28.6%)	10 (35.7%)	8 (28.6%)	1 (3.6%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)
EN	0 (0%)	7 (53.8%)	3 (23.1%)	1 (7.7 %)	1 (7.7 %)	1 (7.7 %)

Table 5. Self-correction types in the two speaker groups

The most frequent self-correction type in the Czech speaker corpus is a two-word correction (tagged as SC_2) of which there are 10 specimens making up 35.7% of the total number of self-corrections in this corpus. Closely after this type follows a one-word (tagged as SC_1) and a three-word correction (tagged as SC_3), each consisting of 8 instances and standing for 28.6% of the corpus. Lastly, there is only one four-word (tagged as SC_4) and one five-word correction (tagged as SC_5), each being 3.6%. The native speaker corpus contains 7 two-word corrections which are 53.8 % of the whole count, only 3 three-word corrections that account for 23.1%, and only one four-word correction, five-word correction (tagged as SC_5) and six-word correction (tagged as SC_6). Interestingly enough, after comparing the two corpora, there is not a single one-word correction in the native speaker corpus, although this type is the second most frequent one in the Czech speaker corpus and stands for 28.6% of the total number of self-corrections. The native speaker corpus contains one self-correction consisting of six words, which is not identified in the Czech speaker corpus.

	FS_1	FS_2	FS_3	FS_4	FS_5	FS_7	FS_8	FS_12
CZ	48 (52.2%)	21 (22.8%)	9 (9.8%)	9 (9.8%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
EN	14 (50%)	6 (21.4%)	3 (10.7%)	2 (7.1%)	2 (7.1%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 6. *False start types in the two speaker groups*

The last one of the three disfluencies, a false start, contains 7 types in the Czech speaker corpus. The most frequent type is a one-word false start (tagged as FS_1). There are 48 instances of this type, which equals 52.2% of the total hits. The second most frequent type is a two-word false start (tagged as FS_2) which counts 21 instances and 22.8% of the total number. There are two types that both consist of 9 cases, those are three-word false starts (tagged as FS_3) and four-word false starts (tagged as FS_4), each of these accounting for 9.8%. A five-word false start (tagged as FS_5) appeared only four times, which made it account for 4.3%. Lastly, an eight-word false start (tagged as FS_8) and a twelve-word false start (FS_12) each appeared only once, each making up 1.1% of the total number of this disfluency. In the native speaker corpus, the most frequent false start type was also a one-word false start, similarly to the Czech speaker one. There are 14 instances of this type, in total giving 50% of the total hits. A two-word false start was the second most frequent, also similarly to the Czech speaker group, while it contained 6 instances standing for 21.4%. A

three-word false start appeared only three times, making up 10.7%, while a four-word false start, standing for 7.1%, was recorded only twice, and so was a five-word false start. At last, a seven-word false start has only one occurrence, equalling 3.6% of the total number of false starts in this corpus. The main differences between the two corpora are the false start types, as in the Czech speaker corpora there are in total 7 different types, including an eight-word and a twelve-word false start, which is not recorded in the native speaker corpus, while in the native speaker corpus, there are only 6 false start types. On the other hand, in the native speaker corpus, there is a seven-word false start which is not found in the Czech speaker one.

What is the nature of repetitions and what words are most likely to be repeated? Usually, the most frequently repeated words are pronouns, specifically personal pronouns. This is due to the fact that speakers use them a lot while speaking about themselves. However, I chose the task of picture description, where speakers do not have as many opportunities to use personal pronouns. Because of that, it is also important to highlight the impact of the analysed material and the fact that its topic and content can to a great extent influence the final results. But does the nature of the task influence the most frequently repeated words in my data? In the Czech speaker corpus, the most frequently repeated part of speech is still a pronoun. There are 29 repeated pronouns throughout the picture descriptions, with 16 of them being personal pronouns, 8 being possessive pronouns, and finally only 3 demonstratives and 2 indefinite pronouns. The second most frequently repeated part of speech is the definite article, which was repeated 24 times. Subsequently, there are 17 preposition repetitions, 12 conjunction repetitions, 10 adverb and 10 verb repetitions, 8 noun repetitions, 6 repetitions of contracted forms (he's), 5 repetitions of an adjective, 3 indefinite article repetitions and 3 repetitions of the infinitive particle "to". Only one instance of a determiner was identified in the task. In regard to the repetition types, I compared the one-word repetitions and the multi-word repetitions to see if there is any difference in the distribution of the mentioned parts of speech. The one-word repetition category contained 75 instances, while the multi-word repetition contained only 25 instances. In the category of one-word repetition, there was no noun repetition at all, as all 8 instances were a part of the multi-word repetition. Similarly, there were 10 instances of an adverb being repeated, all of them an element of a one-word repetition and not a single adverb is a part of the multi-word repetition. It is also important to note the high repetition rate of the definite article, while the indefinite article was only repeated three times in total.

In the native speaker corpus, there are 7 pronoun repetitions and 7 verb repetitions, which are the most frequently repeated parts of speech, closely followed by noun repetitions, of which there are 6 instances. There are also 4 repetitions of contracted forms. Conjunctions, definite articles, adverbs and prepositions are each found to be repeated three times. Finally, the part of speech that is only found once in the instances of repetitions is a numeral, indefinite article and infinitive particle “to”. After separating the repetition types into one-word repetitions, containing 12 instances, and multi-word repetitions, which have 10 occurrences, there were as obvious differences between the two categories. The main difference is that no definite article occurred in the one-word repetition and all 3 of them are a part of the multi-word repetition, which also contains most noun repetitions. Multi-word repetitions include indefinite article, definite articles, infinitive particle and conjunctions, all of which are not found between the one-word repetitions. After comparing the native speaker corpus and the Czech speaker corpus, in the latter, the three most frequent types are pronoun repetition, definite article repetition and preposition repetition, while the native speakers produced most pronoun repetitions as well, but simultaneously the same number of verb repetitions, with a noun repetition being ranked third in frequency. Both verb repetitions and noun repetitions were not as frequent in the Czech speakers as they were in the natives, who also produced zero adjective repetitions.

In false starts, I distinguished whether they are finished or unfinished and also in which syntactic position they are, specifically if they are located at the beginning of a sentence or not. After evaluating the false starts in the Czech speaker corpus, out of the 92 instances, 34 were unfinished false starts. This includes single unfinished words, which is the majority of the instances, but also multiple-word unfinished false starts, especially in FS_2, where there are 8 instances of this type, while in FS_3 there is only one. In general, the more words were a part of the false start, the less likely for the false start to be unfinished. In one-word false starts, out of the 48 instances, 25 are unfinished, which is about 52.1%. In two-word false starts, the percentage is 38.1% and in three-word false starts, it is 11%. 52 out of the 92 instances were found at the beginning of a sentence or a clause. Out of the 48 one-word false starts, 21 were at the beginning, which makes it 48.3% of the category.

The native speakers produced in total 12 unfinished false starts out of a total number of 28. In the category of one-word false starts, the unfinished ones occupied 11 instances out of 14, which is 78.6%. There was only one unfinished in the category of two-word false starts, and in the following multi-word types, there was not a single instance of an unfinished word.

There syntactic position of the disfluency type was also significant, as out of the 28 recorded instances, 16 occurred at the beginning of a sentence or clause, which makes it assume 57.1% of the total count. Interestingly, in one-word false starts, only 3 instances were found to stand at the beginning, while in the multi-word types, it was the majority. After comparing the two corpora, in the native speaker one, 78.6% of the one-word false starts are unfinished words and 21.4% are false starts at the beginning of clauses or sentences, while for the Czech speaker corpus, these percentages are 52.1% for unfinished words, and for the latter it is 48.3%. These results are, however, likely to be influenced by the unequal number of respondents of the two corpora.

Lastly, I evaluated the type of self-correction based on whether it is a lexical correction, such as a mistake that is based on the context of the picture description task, or whether it is a grammatical correction, which is noticeable even for a clueless listener. In the Czech speaker corpus, only 8 self-corrections are lexical, the remaining 20 are grammatical. On the other hand, in the native speaker corpus, the lexical corrections preceded the grammatical by 3 instances, as there are only 5 grammatical self-corrections, but 8 lexical ones. This is, as already mentioned, very likely influenced by the insufficient number of respondents and recorded instances, so it is not easy to tell whether this means something in regard to the two speaker groups. However, one would probably expect the native speakers to have better and more internalised grammar skills, thus the higher frequency of lexical corrections.

3.4.3 Relative frequencies

I calculated the relative frequency of disfluencies for each one of the speakers by dividing the number of times a specific disfluency (repetition, self-correction, false start) was produced by the individual by the number of words produced in the picture description task and then I multiplied the count by 100 because the frequency is evaluated per hundred words (phw).

The following tables show the absolute frequency and the relative frequency of disfluencies for each one of the speakers. I classified the speakers into two tables based on their linguistic background, the first table is for the Czech speakers and the second one is for native English speakers. The Czech speaker produced on average about 263 words per task, while the native speaker produced an average of approximately 199 words per task.

	repetition		self-correction		false start		total	
	number	phw	number	phw	number	phw	number	phw
CZ001	4	1.71	2	0.85	4	1.71	10	4.27
CZ002	2	0.99	1	0.49	1	0.49	4	1.97
CZ003	2	1.50	2	1.50	5	3.76	9	6.77
CZ004	4	1.89	1	0.47	1	0.47	6	2.83
CZ005	0	0.00	1	0.49	2	0.98	3	1.47
CZ006	10	4.29	0	0.00	3	1.29	13	5.58
CZ007	4	1.32	0	0.00	5	1.64	9	2.96
CZ008	8	4.37	2	1.09	6	3.28	16	8.74
CZ009	15	3.24	1	0.22	6	1.29	22	4.75
CZ010	7	2.51	0	0.00	5	1.79	12	4.30
CZ011	2	0.71	1	0.36	4	1.42	7	2.49
CZ012	0	0.00	1	0.25	0	0.00	1	0.25
CZ013	5	1.27	5	1.27	8	2.03	18	4.56
CZ014	5	1.28	2	0.51	2	0.51	9	2.29
CZ015	2	0.55	0	0.00	3	0.83	5	1.39
CZ016	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.51	1	0.51
CZ017	7	2.03	0	0.00	9	2.62	16	4.65
CZ018	1	0.56	0	0.00	1	0.56	2	1.12
CZ019	4	2.22	0	0.00	2	1.11	6	3.33
CZ020	2	1.02	1	0.51	4	2.04	7	3.57
CZ021	4	1.18	0	0.00	4	1.18	8	2.37
CZ022	2	1.32	1	0.66	2	1.32	5	3.31
CZ023	2	0.73	1	0.37	9	3.29	12	4.39
CZ024	6	2.49	3	1.24	2	0.83	11	4.56
CZ025	2	1	3	1.5	4	2	9	4.5

Table 7. *Relative frequencies and absolute frequencies of repetitions, false starts, self-corrections and all disfluencies in Czech speakers*

The relative frequencies in Czech speakers range from 0.55 to 4.37 phw for repetitions, from 0.22 to 1.5 phw for self-corrections and from 0.47 to 3.76 phw for false starts. The relative frequencies of all of the three types of disfluencies in total lie between 0.25 and 8.74 phw. Self-corrections were least frequent in occurrence, with only 16 Czech

speakers out of the 25 having produced this type of disfluency, in comparison to repetitions, which were produced by 22 speakers, and false starts, where only one of the respondents never produced a false start while completing the task. In the Czech speaker group, 88% of the speakers produced at least one repetition, 96% produced at least one false start and, in contrast, only 64% of them produced at least one self-correction. The average number and relative frequency of repetition per one speaker is 4 repetitions and the repetition rate of 1.53 phw, for self-correction it is 1.12 self-corrections and the self-correction rate of 0.47 phw and lastly, for false starts, it is 3.68 false starts per speaker and the false start rate of 1.48 phw. In total, an average number of disfluencies per speaker is 8.8 and the average relative frequency is 3.48 phw.

	repetition		self-correction		false start		total	
	number	phw	number	phw	number	phw	number	phw
EN001	3	1.09	3	1.09	6	2.19	12	4.39
EN002	1	0.78	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.78
EN003	0	0.00	1	0.31	1	0.31	2	0.62
EN004	10	3.08	0	0.00	2	0.62	12	3.69
EN005	1	0.51	0	0.00	2	1.02	3	1.53
EN006	0	0.00	2	0.89	4	1.79	6	2.69
EN007	1	0.35	2	0.71	3	1.06	6	2.13
EN008	3	1.63	1	0.54	0	0.00	4	2.17
EN009	0	0.00	1	0.35	7	2.46	8	2.82
EN010	1	0.78	1	0.78	1	0.78	3	2.33
EN011	2	0.87	1	0.43	1	0.43	4	1.74
EN012	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
EN013	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
EN014	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
EN015	0	0.00	1	0.64	1	0.64	2	1.28

Table 8. *Relative frequencies and absolute frequencies of repetitions, false starts, self-corrections and all disfluencies in native speakers*

The relative frequencies of disfluency rates in native speakers range from 0.35 to 3.08 phw for repetitions, from 0.31 to 1.09 phw for self-corrections and from 0.31 to 2.46 for false starts. The total relative frequency of all three types is within the range of 0.62 and 4.39 phw.

In this category, speakers were more likely to produce no disfluency at all during the task. Out of the 15 speakers, only 8 of them produced a repetition, only 9 speakers produced a self-correction and only 10 speakers produced a false start. This shows that only 53.3% of the natives produced a repetition, only 60% produced a self-correction and only 66.7% produced a false start. The average absolute and relative frequencies of each disfluency type are the following: 0.88 repetitions and the repetition rate of 0.36 phw, 0.52 self-corrections and the self-correction rate of 0.23 phw, and 1.12 false starts and the false start rate of 0.45 phw. In total, the average count is 2.52 disfluencies per speaker and the disfluency rate of 1.05 phw per speaker.

To contrast the two groups, 96% of Czech speakers produced at least one false start while 66.7% of native speakers produced one. 88% of Czech speakers produced at least one repetition, in comparison to 53.3% of native speakers. Lastly, 64% of Czech speakers produced at least one self-correction while in the native speaker group it was 60%. Roughly speaking, self-corrections had a closer speaker-instance occurrence for both groups, while the percentage of speakers who produced at least one false start and repetition varied greatly in both groups. In the native speaker group, there are in total 3 speakers who have not produced any of the three disfluency types at all, while in the Czech speaker group, there is not a single speaker who has not produced at least one of these types. The average disfluency rate in total was moving between 0.25 and 8.74 phw for the Czech speakers and between 0.62 and 4.39 phw for the native speakers. This shows greater differences and wider range of frequency on the part of the Czech speakers.

All these differences show a great variety in the production of disfluencies and also highlight the importance of the impact of individuality. Fluency and disfluency is, apart from the impact of proficiency, a speaker-specific variable that is highly dependent on an individual speaker and their capabilities. Rhetorical ability, physical and mental state, rate of speech, habits, linguistic background, all of these factors and many more can influence the results, although they are not directly connected to the speaker's proficiency level. As seen in the obtained data, one speaker can produce 15 repetitions while only producing one self-correction, another speaker can produce 7 false starts while only producing one self-correction and no false start at all, yet another speaker can produce absolutely none of the three disfluency types.

For this reason, it is important to consider the impact of the method that is used in this thesis, which generalises the results. By combining the individual speakers' results and

shaping them into one unit, I am losing the ability to analyse the individual data of each speaker and I am doing it specifically at the expense of the results of the speakers who deviate from the norm, or rather the majority. Unfortunately, I am not able to differentiate between the individual outcomes, thus it is necessary to allow for the fact, that the final results can be highly influenced and modified by these deviations.

4. Discussion

After evaluating the results of the two speaker groups, I found out that the non-native speakers produced significantly more disfluencies in comparison to the native speakers. However, for the non-native speakers, only one disfluency type showed significant results after being compared with the second group, and those were repetitions, with $p < 0.001$. Although false starts were more frequent in the Czech speaker corpus, the difference was insignificant, and so it was for self-corrections which were, however, more frequent in the native speaker corpus, but again, the results were insignificant. This result was likely due to a low number of instances of this type of disfluency in my data and would require broader data to evaluate or disprove its prevalence.

In the Czech speaker corpus, the disfluency type with the highest number of recorded instances was a repetition, while for the native speakers, it was a false start. The most often occurring repetition type was a one-word repetition, for self-corrections, it was a correction consisting of two words, and lastly, false starts were most likely to appear in the form of a one-word false start. Most frequently, the repeated word was a pronoun, while in the native speaker corpus, it was a pronoun and a verb. Unfinished false starts were less frequent than finished false starts in both categories, but one-word false starts were more likely to be unfinished than multiple-word false starts. Czech speakers produced the highest number of grammatical self-corrections, but the native speakers produced more lexical ones.

To compare my results with the mentioned research and studies, I expected the non-native speakers to produce more disfluencies which was eventually confirmed. To elaborate on the link between proficiency and disfluency, as summarized by Williams (2022), what surprised me was that although higher production of self-corrections is generally linked to an intermediate level in speakers, my thesis did not manage to prove or disprove this. But as mentioned already, this is very likely due to an insufficient amount of material. As the results of the comparison between non-native production and native production of false starts are insignificant, and it is not clear if one group or another produced significantly more false

starts, it can be stated that this type of disfluency indeed did exhibit a negative correlation with proficiency. After consulting the research done by Clark and Wasow (1998), my results show similarity in that the most likely repeated words were function words and the most repeated part of speech was a pronoun. In the study by Gráf (2017), he found out that the most common repetition type was a one-word repetition and the most repeated part of speech was a pronoun, and so it was in my data. The average repetition rate of the Czech speakers in my data is 1.53 phw, while in the study by Gráf it is 1.91 phw. In Lennon's (1990) study, after a six-month stay, three out of four students produced fewer repetitions than at the beginning, linking a lower number of repetitions to higher proficiency, which corresponds to my results, where Czech speakers produced significantly more repetitions.

As a result of insignificant outcomes of the comparison of false starts and self-corrections, I was unfortunately unable to see, whether the use of these two disfluency types is comparable to the study by Gráf and Huang (2018). They found out that false starts are much more frequent in lower proficiency speakers, which was not particularly true for my research, but the claim that a self-correction is not necessarily a clear indicator of proficiency could be applied to my results. Bergmann et al. (2015) evaluated the performance of three groups of German speakers, finding out that native speakers living in Germany were least likely to produce disfluencies, while non-native speakers produced a significantly higher number of them, while attriters living in America often ranked closer to non-natives in the number of disfluencies. Although these results agree with my data, a question comes up of whether the respondents in my native speaker group should be considered natives or attriters, and whether in comparison with native speakers living in an English-speaking country, the results could be sharper. It is also interesting to mention the importance of the speaking task while evaluating proficiency, as no great differences were found while the participants of the experiment filled in the tests, but after the speaking exercise, the difference was slightly more noticeable. As Vercellotti (2018) mentions in his study, his non-native speaking subjects with an intermediate English level produced more grammatical self-corrections than lexical ones. Similarly, my results show that grammatical self-corrections were more frequent in non-native speakers, but the lexical ones were more frequent in native speakers. In addition, Vercellotti's study points to the fact that the use of self-corrections can be highly speaker-specific and not every speaker will correct themselves. This is also noticeable in my data when speaker CZ013 produced five self-corrections, but several other non-native speakers produced no self-corrections at all. What surprised me was the frequency of occurrence of

false starts in those last two studies, classified by Vercellotti as abandoned utterances and by Bergmann et al. as appropriateness-repair, which were not very frequent at all or were less frequent than other disfluencies. In my data, false starts were highly frequent and much more frequent than self-corrections.

5. Conclusion

In this thesis, I aimed to find out, whether in teacher English, the non-native speakers produce disfluencies, and their individual types, more frequently than the native speakers. My hypothesis was that non-native speakers do indeed produce more disfluencies in general, based on previous research and the connections between fluency and proficiency. On one hand, it was proven by my thesis that Czech native speakers do produce significantly more disfluencies in general and particularly repetitions, on the other hand, I was not able to get a significant result for self-corrections which are often linked to lower proficiency and false starts. This was likely due to an insufficient amount of data and would require a broader corpus.

In connection with this fact, it is necessary to mention some limitations of my thesis, such as the low number of respondents in both groups, including 40 people in total, and also the uneven number of respondents representing the groups, with only 15 native speakers and 25 non-native speakers. This was obviously taken into consideration through the use of a log-likelihood test. The transcribed text was also relatively short, as it included only the picture-based narrative task, and the individual speakers produced monologues of individual length from 463 to 48 words per task. Lastly, no inspection of the data was carried out by an unbiased second person, meaning that some disfluencies could be potentially tagged as a different type if examined by someone else. Although I reevaluated the data several times, the tagging of some complex disfluencies may be influenced by my personal judgment. I only consulted my tagging of self-corrections with my colleague, as I considered self-corrections and false starts most likely to be exchanged. All of these factors lower the reliability of my research.

What are the implications of my thesis? It is noticeable that the picture-based narration task is relatively challenging for non-native speakers, as it is considered a complex task which requires a high level of concentration. Not only is the speaker asked to describe the pictures, but it is also necessary to narrate the story that the sequence shows, which means that the speaker has to focus on several things at once. If one speaks about a familiar topic, it is much

easier and the speech is much more fluent, but in this situation, the speakers cannot avoid unfamiliar topics by choosing a different one, instead, they have to perform the task and thus potential weaknesses, irregularities and “bad” habits, such as disfluencies, that would otherwise remain hidden, are revealed. The picture-based narrative task is included exactly for that reason – to reveal the differences between native and non-native speakers. What does this finding mean to teachers? That it is indispensable to keep in mind the impact of this task when assigning a similar task to students, or even making it a part of language testing. And if a teacher decides to use it, to be considerate while rating and evaluating students’ performances because their fluency is going to be affected by the higher difficulty and complexity of the task. It can also be a practical tool that helps distinguish between students’ proficiency.

References

- Anthony, Laurence. AntConc. 3.5.8.0, Waseda University, 2019, <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>.
- Bergmann, Ch., Sprenger, S.A. and Schmid, M.S. (2015). The impact of language co-activation on L1 and L2 speech fluency. *Acta Psychologica, Volume 161*, pp. 25-35.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. *Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education ESL*.
- Clark, H. H. and Wasow T. (1998). Repeating Words in Spontaneous Speech. *Cognitive Psychology, vol. 37, no. 3*, pp. 201–42.
- Chambers, F. (1997). What do we mean by fluency? *System 25(4)*, pp. 535–544.
- Engelhardt, P. E., Corley, M., Nigg, J. T., & Ferreira, F. (2010). The role of inhibition in the production of disfluencies. *Memory and Cognition, 38(5)*, pp. 617–628.
- Fox Tree, J. E. F. (1995). The effects of false starts and repetitions on the processing of subsequent words in spontaneous speech. *Journal of Memory and Language, 34(6)*, pp. 709–738.
- Fox Tree, J. E. F. (2010). Discourse markers across speakers and settings. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 4(5)*, pp. 269–281.
- Gráf, T. (2017). Repeats in Advanced Spoken English of Learners with Czech as L1. *AUC Philologica, vol. 2017, no. 3*, pp. 65–78.
- Götz, S. (2013). *Fluency in Native and Nonnative English Speech*. John Benjamins.
- Hieke, A. E. (1981). A content-processing view of hesitation phenomena. *Language and Speech, 24(2)*, pp. 147–160.
- Huang, L. and Gráf, T. (2018). False Starts and Self-Corrections in Learner and Native English.
- Kormos, J. (1998). A new psycholinguistic taxonomy of self-repairs in L2: A qualitative analysis with retrospection. *Even Yearbook, ELITE SEAS Working Papers in Linguistics, 3*, pp. 43–68
- Kormos, J. (1999). Monitoring and self-repair in L2. *Language Learning, 49(2)*, pp. 303–342.

- Kormos, J. (2006). The structure of self-repairs in the speech of Hungarian learners of English. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 53(1), pp. 53–76.
- Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*, 40(3), pp. 387–417.
- Lennon, P. (2000). The lexical element in spoken second language fluency. In H. Riggenbach (Ed.), *Perspectives on Fluency*, pp. 25–42. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, 14, pp. 41–103.
- Log-likelihood and effect size calculator. Lancaster University. UCREL NLP Group. <https://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>
- Maclay, H., & Osgood, C. E. (1959). Hesitation phenomena in spontaneous English speech. *Word*, 15(1), pp. 19–44.
- McAllister, J., Cato-Symonds, S., & Johnson, B. (2001). Listeners' ERP responses to false starts and repetitions in spontaneous speech. In *ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop (ITRW) on Disfluency in Spontaneous Speech*, pp. 65–68. Edinburgh, August. ISCA Archive
- McRobie, K. F. (1993). Perceived fluency: A study of self-correction, speech rate and three foreign accents as components of fluency in English as a Second Language. Ed.D. Dissertation, University of San Francisco.
- Mora, J.C., Mora-Plaza, I. and Bermejo Miranda, G. (2023). Speaking anxiety and task complexity effects on second language speech. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Olynyk, M., d'Anglejan, A., & Sankof, D. (1987). A quantitative and qualitative analysis of speech markers in the native and second language speech of bilinguals. *Applied PsychoLinguistics*, 8(2), pp. 121–136.
- Révész, A., Ekiert, M., & Torgersen, E. N. (2016). The effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on communicative adequacy in oral task performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(6), pp. 828–848.
- Riggenbach, H. (1991). Toward an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversations. *Discourse Processes*, 14(4), pp. 423–441.
- Rossiter, M. J. (2009). Perceptions of L2 fluency by native and non-native speakers of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(3), pp. 395–412.

- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, pp. 361–382.
- Tavakoli, P., and Wright, C. (2020). *Second Language Speech Fluency: From Research to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Hest, E. (1996). Self-repair in L1 and L2 production. *Tilburg University Press*.
- Vercellotti, M. L. and McCormick D. E. (2018). Self-Correction Profiles of L2 English Learners: A Longitudinal Multiple-Case Study. *TESL-EJ*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1– 25.
- Verhoeven, L. T. (1989). Monitoring in children's second language speech. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin (Utrecht)*, 5(2), pp. 141–155.
- Williams, S. (2022). *Disfluency and Proficiency in Second Language Speech Production*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Witton-Davies, G. (2010) The Role of Repair in Oral Fluency and Disfluency. *Selected Papers from the Nineteenth International Symposium on English Teaching, Crane*, pp.119-29.
- Witton-Davies, G. (2010) The Role of Repair in Oral Fluency and Disfluency. *Selected Papers from the Nineteenth International Symposium on English Teaching, Crane*, pp.119-29.
- Zeng, S. (2019). Second language learners' strong preference for self-initiated self-repair: Implications for theory and pedagogy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(3), pp. 541–548.

Resumé

1. Úvod

Cílem této bakalářské práce je porovnat výskyt dysfluencí u rodilých a nerodilých mluvčích v korpusu učitelské angličtiny. Dysfluence v mluveném projevu jsou často vnímány jako negativní prvky a jejich vyšší produkce bývá spojována s nižší jazykovou úrovní. Záměrem práce je zjistit, zda je prokazatelně častější výskyt opakování, oprav a planných začátků u nerodilých mluvčích, kteří mají v tomto případě výrazně pokročilou úroveň anglického jazyka. Přestože bylo publikováno mnoho podobných studií zabývajících se jazykovou plynulostí, srovnávajících rodilé mluvčí s nerodilými a prorovnávajících mluvčí s rozdílnými jazykovými úrovněmi, v tomto oboru je nedostatek prací popisujících učitelskou angličtinu, proto je účelem mé práce mimo jiné i zaplnit tuto mezeru ve výzkumu. Data jsem čerpala z korpusu učitelské angličtiny (ETC), projektu, do kterého jsem i přispěla třemi rozhovory s učiteli anglického jazyka.

2. Teoretická část

Teoretická část se zabývá definicí plynulosti, jejím vnímáním a vztahem mezi produkcí dysfluencí a jazykovou úrovní. Následně detailně popisuje tři druhy dysfluencí a jejich přítomnost v jiných studiích.

V prvních dvou podkapitolách je popisován koncept plynulosti a jeho vztah k jazykové úrovni. Plynulost v řeči je často definována jako rychlý, zřetelný, efektivní a plynulý tok řeči, který neobsahuje zbytečná přerušování. Tato definice naznačuje, že dysfluence jsou nežádoucí jevy, které zpomalují mluvu, snižují efektivitu komunikace a komplikují porozumění. Dysfluence mohou být ale chápány i jako jevy, které naopak udržují mluvu plynulou tím, že poskytují mluvčímu dostatek času na plánování následující promluvy nebo pokračování fráze. Narušení plynulosti řeči se neobjevuje jen v důsledku nižší jazykové schopnosti, ale je ovlivněno i psychickou situací mluvčího, únavou i používáním složitějších frází. Dysfluence jsou běžné i u rodilých mluvčích. Na základě literatury (Williams, 2022) je vyšší výskyt některých dysfluencí, jako jsou například opakování nebo opravy, indikátorem nižší jazykové úrovně. Naopak planné začátky neprojevují přímou spojitost s jazykovou dovedností.

Kapitola 2.2 je rozdělena na tři podkapitoly zabývající se jednotlivými typy dysfluencí. Za opakování jsou nejčastěji považovány repetice stejných ihned po sobě jdoucích

slov, nejčastější typ opakování bývá jednoslovné opakování a nejfrekventovanější jsou opakování gramatických slov, jako jsou například zájmena, členy, číslovky a slovesa. Opravy vlastní řeči jsou reakce mluvčího, který si uvědomí chybu nebo nestandardní formu ve své promluvě a sám ji následně opraví formou standardní. Může se jednat o chybu gramatickou, lexikální, i fonetickou, ale ne všechny opravy jsou vždy správné. Opravy se nejčastěji vyskytují u mluvčích se středně pokročilou úrovní jazyka. Planné začátky se liší od oprav tím, že nejsou iniciovány na základě chyby, ale jedná se spíše o reformulace a nedokončené promluvy.

Kapitola 2.3 a její podkapitoly rozebírají studie zabývající se studii, které byly napsány o problematice disfluencí v jazyce (Mora et al., 2023; Clark and Wasow, 1998; Gráf, 2017; Lennon, 1990; Gráf and Huang, 2018; Witton-Davies, 2010; Vercellotti, 2018; Bergmann et al., 2015). Velká část těchto studií potvrzuje shodu mezi vyšší produkcí dysfluencí a nižší jazykovou úrovní, zároveň některé ze studií vyzdvihují dopad typu úlohy na plynulost a porovnání s jinými jazykovými prostředími. Kapitola je zakončena výzkumnými otázkami.

3. Praktická část

Třetí částí práce je praktická analýza získaných dat. Zdrojem dat je korpus učitelské angličtiny, English Teacher Corpus (ETC), obsahující přepsané rozhovory s 25 rodilými mluvčími českého jazyka a 15 rodilými mluvčími anglického jazyka. Rozhovory byly přepsány s pomocí Whisper AI a data byla organizována s pomocí programu EXMARaLDA. Rozhovor se skládal z pěti částí, ze kterých jsem se zaměřila pouze na úkol vyprávění a popisu podle obrázků. Tento úkol je považován za komplexní a vyžaduje vysokou míru soustředění. V prepisech jsem vyznačila dané dysfluence podle značení používané PhDr. Tomášem Gráfem (2017). Dysfluence byly dále vyhodnocovány pomocí programu AntConc.

Celkově bylo identifikováno 283 výskytů dysfluencí, 220 z nich v korpusu nerodilých mluvčích a 63 v korpusu rodilých mluvčích. Výzkum ukázal, že u nerodilých mluvčích je prokazatelně vyšší výskyt dysfluencí obecně a také prokazatelně vyšší výskyt opakování. U zbylých dvou druhů dysfluencí, oprav a planných začátků, výsledky nebyly shledány prokazatelnými, pravděpodobně i kvůli nedostatečnému rozsahu korpusů. Hypotéza, že nerodilí mluvčí vyprodukují více dysfluencí, se tedy potvrdila. Jednoslovné opakování gramatických slov bylo nejčastějším typem opakování, u oprav vlastní mluvy byly nejčastější opravy o dvou slovech, a planné začátky byly nejčastěji tvořeny pouze jedním slovem.

4. Diskuze

Ve čtvrté části jsou porovnávány výsledky této práce s již zmíněnými studii zabývajícími se dysfluencemi. Výsledky se v některých případech nedaly porovnat vzhledem k nepodstatným výsledkům statistických testů u planných začátků a oprav. Mezi příklady souhlasejících výsledků jsou například: nejvyšší produkce opakování gramatických slov a zájmen, jednoslovných opakování a vyšší úroveň jazyka korespondující s nižší produkcí dysfluencí. Při porovnání se zmíněnými studii zabývajícími se plannými začátky bylo překvapivé, že v některých případech byl výskyt planných začátků výrazně nižší, než výskyt oprav vlastní mluvy, což nekoresponduje s mými výsledky. Mimo to práce také podotýká důležitost úkolů zaměřených na konverzaci, kdy jsou odhaleny nedostatky, které by v psané formě nebyly patrné, podobně vliv komplexity úkolu na rychlost zpracování jazykových výstupů. Z těchto zmíněných důvodů byl vybrán náročnější typ úkolu v podobě vyprávění podle sekvence obrázků.

5. Shrnutí

Mezi omezení této práce patří relativně nízký počet respondentů, nerovnoměrný počet respondentů ve dvou korpusech, kratší rozsah zkoumaného přepisu a individuální délka promluvy vyprodukovaná jednotlivými respondenty. I přes opakovanou kontrolu bylo mé značení dysfluencí překontrolováno nezaujatým pozorovatelem jen v případě oprav vlastní mluvy, je tedy vyšší pravděpodobnost neshody při evaluaci jiným člověkem. Nakonec je nutné zmínit, že produkce dysfluencí je individuální a liší se od jedince k jedinci, některý respondent nevyprodukoval za celou promluvu ani jednu dysfluenci, zatímco jiný vyprodukoval několik od každého typu. Při zobecnění a zprůměrování výsledků přicházíme o možnost vyhodnocovat odchylky u individuálních mluvčích.

Nicméně, má hypotéza se potvrdila, a práce může do budoucna sloužit k rozšíření povědomí o učitelském jazyce a jeho plynulosti. Zároveň je důležité brát v potaz roli složitého úkolu, který má vyšší požadavky na zpracování myšlenek a produkci mluvy. Ve školním prostředí je nezbytné, aby si tuto realitu učitel uvědomoval a bral na ni ohledy v případě zkoušek a evaluací. Čím vyšší je složitost úkolu, tím více se komplikuje plynulost.