Understanding second language fluency development: Comparisons with first language speech and with listener perceptions
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Introduction

Well, in my own life I'd break it up in stages, when I had a difficult youth. Uh my father wasn't in the house, I've written about this, you know there were times where I've experimented with drugs, and I drank, yeah in my teenage years, what I trace this to is a certain selfishness on my part, I was so obsessed with me, and the reasons that I might be dissatisfied, that I couldn't focus on other people. And I think the process for me of growing up was to recognize that it's not about me, it's about ...

It's absolutely, but look, you know, the uh when I find myself taking the wrong step, I think a lot of the times it's because I'm trying to protect myself, instead of trying to do God's work. And and and so that I think is my own failure.

Barack Obama (August, 2008); Saddleback Presidential Forum
Overview

- Hesitation phenomena in speech
  - Overview
  - In L2 speech
- Crosslinguistic Corpus of Hesitation Phenomena
  - Description
  - Results
- L2 Developmental Trajectory (relative to L1)
- Hearer perception of fluency (relative to trajectory)
- Accessing the CCHP
Fluency

• **Scope of fluency**
  - Broad: speak a language proficiently
  - Narrow: speak smoothly with minimal but natural hesitation

• **Segalowitz (2010): levels of fluency**
  - Cognitive fluency: ease of mental preparation
  - Utterance fluency: smoothness of articulation
  - Perceptual fluency: hearer's view of smoothness

• **De Jong et al (2012) investigated relationship between cognitive fluency and utterance fluency.**
  - L2 speech rate related to cognitive fluency
  - L2 Silent pause duration only weakly related
Observations of fluency: Hesitation phenomena

- **Filled pauses**
  - *uh/um* (English)
  - *e-to/ano-* (Japanese)

- **Silent pauses**
  - Longer than 0.3-1.0sec

- **Self-corrections (repairs)**
  - Sequence that repairs a preceding sequence
  - *Look at the blue the red one over there.*

- **False starts**
  - Beginning of utterance that is abandoned
  - *Do you I disagree with that.*

- **Lengthenings**
  - Prolongation of one or more syllables
  - *I'll take the blue and the red ones.*

- **Repeats/Restarts**
  - Repetition of a sequence of words
  - *I I I I think that's a good idea.*

- **Speech rate**
  - By word, by syllable, with/without pauses
  - *(Cucchiarini et al 2010)*

(Original references:
- Goldman-Eisler 1961,
- Levelt 1983, 1989,
- Maclay and Osgood 1959,
- Rochester 1973, inter alia)
Hesitation phenomena in L2 production

Hesitation phenomena in L2 production

- As a whole, work has been quite comprehensive.
- However, individual works are limited in that many do not take individual variation into account (cf., de Leeuw 2007).
- Gradually, more studies are including L1 observations.
  - Derwing et al (2009) and Cox and Baker-Smemoe (2012) observed that both speech rate and pause rate in L1 and L2 production are correlated.
  - De Jong et al (2015) found measures of L2 articulation rate were more meaningful when “corrected” for L1 speech patterns.
- The current research is part of a project designed to contribute to greater understanding of the relationship between L1 hesitation patterns and L2 hesitation patterns.
Research questions

- What is the relationship between hesitation patterns in L1 and L2 speech?
- What is the developmental trajectory of the use of hesitation phenomena in L2?
- What is the relationship between hesitation patterns in L2 speech and hearer's perception of fluency?
Crosslinguistic Corpus of Hesitation Phenomena (CCHP)

- Participants: L2 learners of varying proficiency levels
- Elicitation tasks
  - Spontaneous speech: picture description, topic narrative
  - Reading aloud
  - Performed in both L1 and L2
Crosslinguistic Corpus of Hesitation Phenomena (CCHP)

- Demographic information: age, gender, L2 proficiency (standardized test scores, experience abroad, self-assessment)
- Annotation
  - Transcripts, HP, word & pause intervals
  - Two annotators, one checker

<UTTERANCE>
<T>in</T>
<T>America</T>
<T FILLED-PAUSE="yes">uh</T>
<T>there's</T>
<T>a</T>
<T FILLED-PAUSE="yes">uh</T>
<T>very</T>
<T>famous</T>
<T FILLED-PAUSE="yes">uh</T>
<T>and</T>
<T>loved</T>
<T FILLED-PAUSE="yes">uh</T>
<T>basketball</T>
<T FILLED-PAUSE="yes">uh</T>
<T>which</T>
<T>is</T>
<T>called</T>
<T>NBA</T>
<T>National</T>
<T>Basketball</T>
<T>Association</T>
<T>I</T>
<T>think</T>
</UTTERANCE>
CCHP Results: Basic Statistics

- Participants: 36 Japanese L1 / English L2 speakers
- Full corpus
  - 62,632 words
  - 11 hrs, 31 min
- Spontaneous speech
  - 40,296 words
  - 8 hrs, 43 min
- Read speech
  - 22,336 words
  - 2 hr, 48 min
- Transcriber agreement
  - 91.5%
- 15,837 silent pauses
- 3,516 filled pauses
- 1,689 self-corrections
- 518 repeats
CCHP Results: Analysis

- Used spontaneous speech data only.
- Computed rates of speech, silent pauses, filled pauses, repeats, and self-corrections for each recording.
- Performed repeated measures ANOVA
  - (between) L2 Proficiency as numerical variable, estimated from test scores, experience abroad, self-assessment
  - (within) Language as categorical variable: Japanese, English
- Used $\alpha = 0.05$ for significance testing (marked with $\star$).
Consistent with Derwing et al (2009) and Cox and Baker-Smemoe (2012)
CCHP Results: Silent Pauses

Silent Pause Rate

Silent Pause Duration

CCHP Results: Filled Pauses
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FP Rate (per 100 words)
CCHP Results: Self-corrections

Self-correction Rate

Repair Rate (per 100 words)

L2 Proficiency

English
Japanese
CCHP Results: Repeats

Repeats are uncommon in Japanese (Fox et al 1996)
Developmental Trajectory

To-do:
- Filled pause duration
- Lengthenings
- Repair type distribution
- Structural distribution
- Syllable counts
CCHP Results: Hesitation Index

Where “essence” is what the speaker intended to say.

\[
\text{Hesitation Index} = 1 - \frac{\text{Number of essence words}}{\text{Number of spoken words}}
\]
L1-L2 Utterance Flu. vs. Perceptual Flu.

- **Aim:**
  - Review findings of L1 vs. L2 comparison of utterance fluency.
  - Examine which utterance fluency characteristics correlate with perceptions of fluency by hearers.

- **L1-L2 utterance fluency factors measured with praat script (Quené et al 2011)**

- **Perceptual fluency**
  - Fluency ratings (1=low ... 9=high) obtained via Amazon Mechanical Turk
  - Obtained fluency ratings on 7 30-second clips of L2 speech from all corpus participants.
  - Used attention checks and background monitoring of audio player activity to check that instructions were followed.
Utterance Fluency vs. Perceptual Fluency

**Articulation rate (sylls/sec)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>2.1831</td>
<td>1.0524</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation rate</td>
<td>1.0268</td>
<td>0.2997</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Log) mean silent pause duration</td>
<td>-0.6138</td>
<td>0.0861</td>
<td>-7.130</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R² = 0.4638; F(2,67) = 30.84, p<0.001
L1-L2 Utterance Flu. vs. L2 Perceptual Flu.

L2 Silent pause rate
L2 Articulation rate
L2 Silent pause duration

Corresponding L1 measure
low correlation
mid correlation
high correlation

Fluency evaluations
low predictor
mid predictor
high predictor

Speculations:
• not articulation rate in general, but lengthenings?
• silence threshold?

The one factor that seems indicative of L2 development is not perceived by evaluators.

Perception of L2 fluency is driven by factor(s) related to L1 speech behavior.
Future Work with CCHP

- Deeper annotation
  - Syntactic structure
  - Part-of-speech information
  - Syllable and phoneme intervals
  - (F1,F2) measurements

- More speakers

- More L1-L2 combinations
  - Taiwan Chinese L1 – English L2
  - English L1 – French L2
  - English L1 – Spanish L2
  - Korean L1 – English L2
Summary

• Recent studies of L2 speech performance are taking L1 speech performance more and more into account.
• The Crosslinguistic Corpus of Hesitation Phenomena allows us to account for L1 factors in the study of L2 speech patterns.
• Results show that for utterance fluency, silent pause and filled pause rate indicate learners' L2 proficiency.
  – Other L2 hesitation phenomena correlate with those of L1.
• Fluency raters, however, seem to rely on speech rate and mean pause duration instead.
CCHP Public Corpus

- Assembling a public version of the Crosslinguistic Corpus of Hesitation Phenomena is ongoing.
- When complete, audio files and annotated transcripts will be available for free download.
- Some files are already available for download: http://www.filledpause.com/chp/cchp
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