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1 Introduction

Spoken language has been one of the central topics of discussion in applied linguistics for decades, and still it seems to remain fresh and current. According to McCarthy (1998:16-17) spoken language was not overlooked in the study of language or in language teaching even before tape-recorded corpora, but the study of written forms of language was certainly more dominant in both fields because of the simple fact that written data was more conveniently available for linguists and applied linguists. Even though there were teaching methodologies that were based on speaking, such as the audio-lingual, McCarthy (1998:18) notes that spoken language remained inferior to the written in most language teaching up until the 1970s. McCarthy (ibid.) explains that the above mentioned methodologies did not advance the use of spoken language since the models of grammar and vocabulary used in their teaching were tied to conventions of written language rather than on how people actually speak.

One example of the features that are common in spoken language but do not appear in written language is self-repair, which has been studied by conversation analysts (see e.g. Schegloff et al. 1977, Klinck 1987, Carroll 2004) and psycholinguists (see e.g. Levelt 1983, Evans 1985, Kormos 1999). It is also the most central concept of this thesis as the objective of this study is to explore the self-repair of non-native speakers. In psycholinguistics self-repair has been studied in connection with speech monitoring, whereas the focus in the conversation analytic self-repair studies has been among other things on participant structure of language classrooms (cf. Klinck 1987), repair organization as a means for constructing understanding in second language conversations (cf. Kurhila 2006) and managing problems in speaking (cf. Seyfeddinipur et al. 2008). This study is not a conversation analytic study, but it is closer to previous conversation analytic research than psycholinguistic research.
Moreover, I have found both approaches useful to my study. From the viewpoint of main interest, this study is in line with the studies of Klinck (ibid.) and Kurhila (ibid.), and especially with Carroll (2004), who argues that restarts in novice turn beginnings should be interpreted as interactional achievements rather than disfluencies stereotypically associated with non-native speakers. In addition, Mauranen (2007:248) notes that like restarts, self-repair (she uses the term *self-rephrasing* which carries the same meaning as self-repair) in general is often labeled as lack of fluency, especially in the speech of non-native speakers (e.g. Biber et al. 1999, The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, and Skehan 2005, Understanding fluency in second language performance). Mauranen (ibid.), however, sees self-repairs as a “means of coping with the exigencies of spoken language”. In line with Mauranen’s (ibid.) view I argue that self-repairs are a normal feature of both native and non-native spoken language, and that most self-repairs are in no connection with the lack of fluency in the sense that the speakers would not be able to express their thoughts correctly and understandably in the language they are speaking.

For practical reasons language teaching is (as is all teaching no matter the subject) almost always strongly connected to testing and assessment. As long as there has been systematic language teaching, there have been some kind of language tests and students have received assessments of their skills or proficiency. As language teaching, testing and assessment have progressed, it has become more important not to have just any kind of tests, and the current trend is on communicative language testing, which concentrates on testing the skills necessary for using language for communicative purposes. In the early 1970s Hymes presented his theory of communicative competence (which implies that knowing a language is not just knowing the grammar, but also knowing how to use it in different communicative contexts) and this started the still ongoing development of communicative language
tests (McNamara 2000:16). Language assessment, which is closely connected to language testing, is relevant to this study since I examine the proficiency assessments that the participants receive as well as their self-repairs. Language assessment can be defined in many ways (for definitions of assessment see section 3.1), but for the purposes of this study I use the term assessment as contrastive to the term testing.

I started exploring the data of this study with a general interest in self-repair as a feature of spoken language, and I wanted to find out what kinds of self-repairs there were and how they were manifested in the data. However, as I had familiarized myself with the theoretical background and prior studies on self-repair, and had studied how the participants of my data repaired their speech, I became more and more interested in the relationship of non-native speakers’ self-repair and fluency, and I did not want to settle for merely observing different forms of self-repairs. Thus, the main aim of this study is to explore both the different forms of self-repairs that EFL speakers make and the relationship between non-native speakers’ self-repairs and fluency.

This study is a part of a research project called HY-talk, which is a project funded by the University of Helsinki. Its focus is on the assessment of spoken language and its main aim is to “improve the reliability of assessment procedures in the Finnish comprehensive and upper secondary schools as well as in institutions of higher learning” (HY-talk website 2009). The project and its data are discussed more closely in connection with presenting the data of the present study (section 4.2).

Chapters 2 and 3 form the theoretical background of this thesis. In chapter 2 I will introduce the concept of self-repair, discuss the problems of the term self-repair, present definitions of fluency and discuss the relation between fluency and self-repair. In chapter 2 I will also present psycholinguists’ categorizations that I used as a basis for my own categorization for the repair types and present the categorizations I compiled for the purposes of this study. In chapter 3 I will present definitions of language
assessment, argument my use of the term and discuss the role of the Common European Framework of Reference (hereafter CEFR) as criteria for language proficiency assessment. In chapter 4 I will present the data and method of this study, in chapter 5 the results and in chapter 6 my interpretation and discussion of the results in relation to the objective and the research questions of this study.
2 Self-repair

Repairs of speech have previously been studied from two different points of view: the conversation analytic and psycholinguistic. These approaches differ from each other in many ways and Hokkanen (2001:143) states that one of the most obvious differences is that conversation analysts are interested in the significance of repairs in the social organization of discourse, whereas psycholinguists are interested in the individual’s mental processes behind the repairs.

Sorjonen (1997:112) explains that conversation analysts do not observe parts of speech that could be considered errors or mistakes; instead they concentrate on cases where the participants of a conversation consider a certain part of speech as troublesome. Schegloff et al. (1977:363) call these parts of speech trouble sources, and they argue that in principle anything can be classified as such, as long as the participants consider that it needs to be repaired. Schegloff (1992:1295) states that repair organization is crucial in maintaining the mutual understanding between the participants, and that repairs are used when there is a breakdown of what he calls intersubjectivity.

According to Sorjonen (1997:113) conversation analysts also consider repair as a process, which possibly leads to finding a solution to the trouble source, and thus, they talk about repair sequences that have a beginning and an end. An essential part of the view of repair as a process is the fact that the repair sequence can be initiated and completed by two different people, namely self and other. Schegloff et al. (1977:361–362) define self and other as “two classes of participants in interactive social organizations – in particular those which characterize the sequential organization of conversation, specifically its turn-taking system.” They note that even though the
expected outcome is usually a successful repair, efforts at repair can sometimes fail.

They give the next example to show this.

C:       C'n you tell me- (1.0) D'you have any records
         → of whether you- whether you- who you sent-
         → Oh(hh) shit.
G:       What'd you say?
C:       I'm having the worst trouble talking.  
         (Schegloff et al. 1977:364)

They use the terms self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair to draw distinctions between repairs initiated by different participants, and they also note that the outcome of the repair sequence (whether it is a successful repair or a failure) can be produced by either self or other. With the next example they show that self-repair can issue from self-initiation.

N:       She was givin me a:ll the people that
         → were go :ne this yea: r I mean this
         → quarter y' // know
J:       Yeah
         (Schegloff et al. 1977:364)

The next example shows that self-repair can issue from other-initiation.

Ken:      Is Al here today?
Dan:      Yeah. (2.0)
Roger:    → He is? hh eh heh
Dan:      → Well he was.
         (Schegloff et al. 1977:364)

They give the next example to illustrate that other-repair can issue from self-initiation.

B:       → He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't
         think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece,
A:       → Dan Watts.  
         (Schegloff et al. 1977:364)
The next example shows that other-repair can issue from other-initiation.

B: Where didju play bæsk//etbaw.
A: (The) gy:m.
B: In the gy:m? 
A: Yea:h. Like grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know
B: Oh::::
A: half the group that we had la:s' term wz there en we jus' playing 
around.
B: → Uh- fooling around.
A: Eh-yeah.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:365)

With the next example they show that failure can issue from self-initiation.

Mike: I never heard it eetheh. (0.7)
Mike: → Awl I her- All I- Awl I ree- all you- all //
Vic: → You knew duh broa//: d.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:365)

And finally, they give the next example to illustrate that failure can issue from
other-initiation.

Roger: It's kinduva- // kinduv weird.
Dan: heh (2.0)
Roger: Whadda you think. (2.0)
Ken: → Hm?
Roger: → Ferget it.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:365)

Since I did not consider other-repairs, the terms that are relevant to this study are self-repair and self-initiated repair. In this study, I also refer to self-repairs with the shorter term repair.

Schegloff et al. (1977:366) state that the initiations of self-initiated repairs appear mainly in three positions, and they give examples to illustrate them. First of these positions is within the turn where the trouble source is found.
Deb: Kin you wait til we get home? We'll be home in five minutes.
Anne: Even less th'n that.
Naomi: But c'd we- c'd I stay up? (0.2)
Naomi: once we get // ho:me,
Marty: For a few minutes,
Deb: Once you get yer nightgown on,

(Schegloff et al. 1977:366)

The second position is in the transition space of the trouble source turn.

L: An' 'en bud all of the doors 'n things were taped up
L: I mean y'know they put up y'know that kinda paper 'r stuff,
J: the brown paper.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:366)

The third position is in the third turn to the trouble source turn.

L: I read a very interesting story today,
M: uhm, what's that.
L: w'll not today, maybe yesterday, aw who knows when, huh, it's called Dragon Stew.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:366)

In this study, I concentrate on self-repairs that have their initiation (as well as their completion) within the trouble source turn.

While conducting this study I was interested in finding out what kinds of repairs the speakers make but I also wanted to see what the relationship of repairs and fluency was. To find answers to both of these questions I incorporated parts of both the psycholinguistic and the conversation analytic approaches into my research design. Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy of repairs, which he created for studying the psycholinguistic aspects of self-repair, provided me with a framework of repair categories that helped me to find out what kinds of repairs the speakers make, whereas the conversation analytic field gave me tools to study the relationship between repairs and fluency.
2.1 Self-repair as a Term

The terminology connected to repairs of speech has been widely discussed in conversation analytic research. Schegloff et al. (1977:362-363) make an important distinction between repair and correction. They see correction as “replacement of an ‘error’ or ‘mistake’ by what is ‘correct’” (Schegloff et al. 1977:363) and describe repair as something which is “neither contingent upon error, nor limited to replacement”. They give examples to illustrate three points, which speak for the importance of a distinction between correction and repair. First of these three points is that some occurrences, for example word searches, do not involve the replacement of one item by another, and thus, cannot be defined as ‘replacements’ or ‘corrections’. To illustrate this they give the next example.

Olive:  → Yihknow Mary uh:::: (0.3) oh:: what was it.
        → Uh:: Th:mpson.

(Schegloff et al. 1977:363)

The second point that Schegloff et al. make is that sometimes a speaker makes a repair but no hearable error, mistake or fault. To show this, they give the next example.

Ken:     → Sure enough ten minutes later the bell r-
        → the doorbell rang ...

(Schegloff et al. 1977:363)

Their third point is that even a hearable error is not always followed by a repair/correction, and they illustrate this point with the next example.

Avon Lady:  → And for ninety-nine cents uh especially in,
               → Rapture, and the Au Coeur which is the newest
               → fragrances, uh that is a very good value.
Customer:    → Uh huh,

(Schegloff et al. 1977:363)
Kurhila (2006:20) interprets the definitions of Schegloff et al. (1977) by stating that they see the terms hierarchically with repair as a more general term and corrections as forming a subgroup of repairs.

Despite the distinction between repairs and corrections, the terminology still seems to indicate that with each repair the original utterances (OU) are somehow mended or made better (Mauranen personal conversation in a seminar 15 Sept 2009). In practice this is usually not the case, since in most of the cases the utterance either is not changed at all, is changed into equally correct/incorrect an utterance or even from correct to incorrect one. For example the repair *she’s the best i just _ i just love her* does not change the OU in any way. In the repair *there’s a _ there are very good american chocolate* the OU is changed, but the outcome is as grammatically incorrect as the OU. The repair *so we go by _ with bus* serves as an example of a repair in which the speaker replaces the grammatically correct OU with an incorrect utterance. In this thesis my intention, however, is not to suggest a better term to replace the term self-repair. I wish only to clarify that I treat this term as including all utterances that are expressed after the OU, whether they are repetitions of the OU, different or somehow changed utterances.

### 2.2 Fluency and Self-repair

Self-repairs have often been labeled as a sign of non-native speakers’ lack of fluency (Mauranen 2007:248). This could be because repairs usually entail a pause of some length in speech, and most definitions of fluency include that there are not many significant pauses in the speech of a fluent speaker. Fillmore (1979, On Fluency, cited in Ziesing 2001:4), for instance, lists "the ability to talk at length with few pauses" as
one of the four skills that a fluent speaker has. The definition given in the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (2002) also mentions this skill phrasing it as an “ability to -- produce continuous speech without causing comprehension difficulties or a breakdown of communication”.

In the assessment scale of fluency used in the HY-talk project (Appendix 1, discussed in detail below in section 4.2.2), the number of pauses seems to have a very significant role. This is quite surprising since the number of pauses does not seem to be the main concern of the linguistic definitions of fluency. Fillmore (1979 cited in Ziesing 2001:4) defines fluency, in addition to talking at length with few pauses, as “the ability to talk in coherent, reasoned, and ‘semantically dense’ sentences, the ability to have appropriate things to say in a wide range of contexts, and the ability -- to be creative and imaginative in -- language use”. The definition in the Longman dictionary (2002) also implies that fluency is more than the ability to speak continuously, as the definition also says fluency to be “the ability to produce written and/ or spoken language with ease -- speak with a good but not necessarily perfect command of intonation, vocabulary and grammar” and the ability to “communicate ideas effectively”. Moreover, as it is subtly implied in the Longman definition, also Ziesing suggests that a fluent speaker does not necessarily need to be perfectly accurate or speak without pauses, grammar mistakes or restarts. He explains this view by saying that if fluency implied that, “even native speakers could not be considered fluent” (Ziesing 2001:4).

In the light of these definitions, it is strange that the HY-talk fluency assessment scale presents pauses (or more specifically the lack of them) as the most central part of fluency, and that the ‘Can Do’ statement of the scale’s highest level of proficiency, C1.1 (for details see Appendix 1), says that the speaker “can communicate fluently, spontaneously and almost effortlessly.” The statement seems to imply that there are no
pauses in the speech of a speaker this proficient, which is in conflict with the definitions of Ziesing and the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. One might interpret that the wording “almost effortlessly” is meant to imply the appearance of few pauses and errors in intonation, vocabulary and grammar, but I do not think that it is clear enough for an assessor to understand since pauses and breaks in speech are so central in the “Can Do” statements of the other levels.

As self-repairs usually entail a pause in speech, the fluency assessment table seems to prompt assessors to react to repairs as disfluencies more than to possible other signs of their lack of fluency. This goes clearly against the views that see self-repairs as a normal feature of spoken language, and that see repairs as something that might help the comprehensibility of the utterance in which they appear.

2.3 Categorization According to Self-repair Types

In this section I will introduce the first categorization used in this study. I will present Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy of self-repair categories that has been widely used in the field of psycholinguistics in section 2.3.1, introduce the additions that researchers have made to Levelt’s taxonomy in section 2.3.2, and finally present the categorization I compiled from them in section 2.3.3.

2.3.1 Levelt’s Taxonomy

Levelt (1983) originally created his taxonomy of self-repair types for L1 research of monitoring and self-repair in the field of psycholinguistics. However, his taxonomy has
been widely used in both L1 and L2 research. I will next present an outline of Levelt’s taxonomy. The explanations of the categories are followed by Levelt’s own examples.

The first of Levelt’s (1983) main categories is called *different repairs* and it includes all the cases in which the speaker is having trouble in conveying information and replaces the OU with a different one.

We gaan rechdoor offe _ We komen binnen via rood, gaan dan rechtdoor
We go *straight on or* _ We come *in* via red, *go then straight on*
nar groen
*to green*
(Levelt 1983:51)

The second main category of Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy is *appropriateness repairs*, which has to do with the manner of expression. It consists of three subcategories. The repairs of the first subcategory, *ambiguity repairs*, correct ambiguous reference.

We beginnen in het midden met _ in het midden van het papier met een
*We start* _ in the middle with _ *in the middle of the paper* *with a*
blauw rondje
*blue disc*
(Levelt 1983:52)

When making a repair of the second subcategory, *appropriate-level repairs*, the speaker changes the message in attempt to specify its informational content.

... meet en blauw vlakje _ een blauw rondje aan de bovenkant
*with a* *blue spot* _ *a blue disc* *at the upper end*
(Levelt 1983:52)

The repairs of the third subcategory, *coherence repairs*, are repairs in which the speaker changes terms into ones that are coherent with previously used terminology.
The third main category in Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy is called *error repairs* and it is also divided into three subcategories. The first of these is called *lexical error repairs*, which are by Levelt’s (1983:53-54) definition corrections of “almost any lexical item, color words, direction terms, prepositions, articles, etc.”

The second subcategory is called *syntactic error repairs*, which are changes in the syntactic construction.

The third subcategory of error repairs is called *phonetic error repairs*, and it stands for repairs that are changes in the pronunciation of the utterance.

The fourth of Levelt’s (1983) main categories is *covert repairs*, which consists of cases where there is either an interruption accompanied by an editing term or the repeat of a word or a phrase.
The assumption is that an interruption or repetition in these cases indicates that the speaker repairs his/her utterance even before s/he expresses it. This category is a significant one even though nothing is audibly changed when a covert repair is made. For example in Levelt’s (1983:55) data there are 236 instances of covert repairs, which is 25% of all repairs. Levelt (ibid) also presents a category called rest category, which consists of repairs that are “so completely confused that they defy any systematic categorization”.

2.3.2 Bredart and Kormos’ Additions to Levelt’s Taxonomy

Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy was originally designed for L1 research, and therefore a number of researchers (e.g. Brédart 1991, van Hest 1996 and Kormos 1998) have made additions into the original taxonomy to make it more suitable for analysis of repairs in L2 research. Many of the mentioned additions would require recall data from the speakers. Because the Hy-talk data that I used in this study is not specifically collected for self-repair research, recall data has not been collected from the speakers. Moreover, the objective of my research is merely to observe the types and the number of repairs and not to study the monitoring process as many studies in the field of psychology have done. Thus, in this section I present only the categories that I incorporated in my own categorization presented below in section 2.3.3. The explanations of the categories are followed by Bredart and Kormos’ examples.
Brédart (1991, cited in Kormos 1999) adds a subcategory into Levelt’s (1983) main category of appropriate level repairs. Brédart’s subcategory is called repairs for good language, in which the OU is changed to match the rules of “good” or socially appropriate language.

C’est qu’un con _ un idiot pardon.  
*He is nothing but a damn fool _ an idiot sorry*  
(Brédart 1991:127)

Kormos (1998) adds three subcategories into Levelt’s (1983) main category of different repairs. The first of these is called ordering error repairs, and it stands for repairs in which the communicative message remains the same, but the wording is changed.

Uhm well there’s a big dining table for forty person. And then we’ve also got er well it’s _ well the dining table occupies half of the room.  
(Kormos 1998:54)

The name of the second subcategory is inappropriate information repairs, and in these repairs the message is slightly changed into a more appropriate one considering the surrounding elements.

you have to _ we have to make a contract  
(Kormos 1998:54)

The third subcategory of different repairs is called message replacement repairs, and it includes the repairs in which the intended message is given up completely.

we have some er er v- _ maybe you have vegetarians in your group  
(Kormos 1998:55)
Kormos (1998) also adds a main category called *rephrasing repairs*, in which a lexical item is changed but the content of the message remains unaltered.

\[\text{we will er reflect er to you in another letter _ we will answer you}\]

(Kormos 1998:63)

This differs from lexical error repairs, where the speaker sees the original lexical item as incorrect. The speaker makes a rephrasing repair when s/he is not certain about the correctness or appropriateness of the OU, and this type of repair is, thus, a sign of the speaker’s competence problems, whereas error repairs are merely lapses of performance.

2.3.3 The Categorization Used in This Thesis

In my analysis, to observe the different types of repairs, I used a categorization based on Levelt’s (1983) taxonomy. In my categorization I also have some additions made by Brédart (1991) and Kormos (1998) that I presented above in section 2.3.2. In addition, I include a category, presented by Evans (1985:367), called *postponement*. It consists of repairs in which the speaker interrupts the utterance to add situational or other information before continuing or repeating the OU. Evans points out that postponement is also Chafe’s (1980, The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative) terminology.

In describing an accident one girl said “And they thought _ there was pig's blood in it _ and they thought that there was somebody hurt. But it was the pig.”

(Evans 1985:367)
The categorization used in this study, with examples from the HY-talk data, is presented in Table 1. The examples are further presented in their context in Appendix 2 according to the numbering below.

**Table 1: Categorization of This Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of repair</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>different repairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordering error repairs</td>
<td>1. in my family there is _ i have mum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inappropriate information repairs</td>
<td>2. so the music is the _ has a pretty big role in it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message replacement repairs</td>
<td>3. we can _ when do you want to have this picnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>appropriateness repairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguity repairs</td>
<td>4. it’s _ this chocolate is made only in our country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate-level repairs</td>
<td>5. it’s a small town _ a bit smaller town than Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherence repairs</td>
<td>6. i own them almost all records _ albums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>repairs for good language</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repairs for good language</td>
<td>7. we can sleep long and _ sleep late and eat slowly breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>error repairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical error repairs</td>
<td>8. and my mom forty eight _ forty nine years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactic error repairs</td>
<td>9. i spend the summer with them by _ at the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic error repairs</td>
<td>10. when sh- someone’s in the shower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>covert repairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. i was _ i was in espoo’s school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rephrasing repairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. i come i get used to everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>postponement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. but i have to _ when it it’s like monday and when we have school _ i have to wake in six o’clock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have now presented the first categorization used in this study, and in the next section I will introduce another categorization with a different point of view to self-repair.

2.4 Categorization in Relation to Correctness of Self-repairs

I also created a second categorization, with which I studied the grammatical, lexical and phonetic correctness of the repairs in the data. It would also be interesting to study the functional correctness of self-repairs, to find out why the speakers make the repairs when the OU seems to be perfectly correct. However, since this kind of analysis would require recall data from the speakers, and the data of this study does not include it, I cannot study the functional correctness of the repairs.

As the term self-repair seems to indicate that the OU is being repaired, supposedly to a better, more correct form, I was interested in finding out how many of the repairs actually led to a more correct form than the OU. I also used this categorization to get information on the relationship between self-repair and fluency.

In this categorization there are five categories. The first one I named changes from incorrect to correct, and it covers all the repairs where the OU is grammatically, syntactically or lexically incorrect, and the repaired utterance is correct. The second category is called changes from incorrect to incorrect, and it consists of repairs where the OU is incorrect and it is replaced with another incorrect utterance. The third category I named changes from correct to incorrect, and it consists of repairs where the grammatically, syntactically and lexically correct OU is replaced with an incorrect utterance.
The fourth category I call *changes from correct to correct*, and it contains repairs where the correct OU is replaced with another correct utterance. Although this category seems to be quite straightforward, in some cases it is difficult to interpret whether or not the OU in fact would be correct had the speaker not made the repair and had s/he continued the utterance in the form that s/he first had in mind. Example number 14 (see Appendix 2 for the context of the example) below shows that in this kind of cases the OU is not correct in reference to the utterance that comes after the repair.

14. you’re gonna _ I’m gonna introduce you to them

However, the OU, *you’re gonna*, is perfectly correct right until the repair, and if it were followed by a different utterance, say for instance, *meet them*, it would be correct in reference to the utterance following it as well. The fact that the speaker decides to make the repair does not automatically mean that s/he considers the OU incorrect, or that s/he does not know how to continue the utterance in an appropriate way. As an observer I do not know what the speaker would have said if s/he had not decided to make the repair, and thus, I only interpret the OU in reference to the utterance before it. This means that I interpret the OU to be correct even if it is not correct in reference to the utterance after the repair.

As repetitions are not changes, I could not incorporate them into the second and fourth category, and even though I could put repetitions into the these categories by changing their names, I consider it more revealing if it is shown in the results which repairs were changes from correct to correct or incorrect forms and which were repetitions of the OU. Thus, I created the fifth category, called *repetitions*. The repairs of this category are namely exact repetitions of the OU.
3 Language Assessment and CEFR

In this chapter I will discuss language assessment and the role of CEFR as criteria of language proficiency assessment. In section 3.1 I will give a definition of assessment and after that, in section 3.2 I will introduce CEFR in detail and discuss its problems as a descriptive system aiming towards comparison between systems at an international level.

3.1 What Is Assessment?

Clapham (1997: 14) presents the three common uses of the term assessment. It can be used as a superordinate term, in which case it covers all forms of evaluation, but also interchangeably with the term testing, or as a contrastive term to it, with the difference that tests are conducted for large groups and assessment is carried out on one-to-one basis. In this study I use the term in the third meaning mentioned, i.e. as contrastive to the term testing, as the data that I used was collected in spoken language testing situations, and the assessments of the speakers’ proficiencies are the end product of the tests.

The traditional view of test theory is that assessment should be valid and reliable, that is, it should concentrate on the essential things of the skill tested and it should be possible to reproduce with the same result. Huhta (1997: 41) states that assessment is always an important part of a test situation but reliable assessment is not the only factor that affects the quality of the results. To have well argued definitions of the skills tested, clear criteria of assessment and tasks suitable for testing are just as important.
The assessment conducted by the teacher has been the most used form of assessment but that does not mean that it is the only form. In the learning process of an individual, also other forms of assessment such as self-assessment and peer assessment are important. However, because the data includes only the assessments of language experts, it is the only form of assessment discussed in this study.

3.2 CEFR in Language Assessment

The Council of Europe (2001) defines the objective of The Common European Framework of Reference as follows:

--- [CEFR] provides a basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks etc. across Europe. It defines levels of proficiency with which the learners’ progress can be measured at each stage of learning and on a life-long basis. (Council of Europe 2001:1)

CEFR is an attempt to create objective criteria for describing language proficiency in Europe, which will help recognize qualifications obtained in different learning contexts. The common criteria will make different degrees comparable and thus aid European mobility. The general aim of CEFR, defined by the Council of Europe (2001:2), is “to achieve greater unity among its members” and to pursue this aim “by the adoption of common action in the cultural field”. CEFR, providing means to improve language teaching and learning in Europe, has been created to serve this aim (Council of Europe, 2001:1–2).

The basis of CEFR is a system of six common reference levels which are called: Breakthrough (A1), Waystage (A2), Threshold (B1), Vantage (B2), Effective Operational Proficiency (C1) and Mastery (C2) (Council of Europe 2001:23). CEFR
provides its users with scales that include descriptors built of different ‘Can Do’ statements for each reference level and for various dimensions of language proficiency. The dimensions used in the data of this study, and thus, relevant to it have to do with spoken language proficiency. They are presented in detail in chapter 4.2.2.

The aim of CEFR as a descriptive system aiming towards comparison between systems at an international level is respectable, but it also has its problems. It is not easy to compare entirely different systems explicitly. Figueras et al. (2005: 271) discuss the problem with CEFR’s ‘Can Do’ statements noticing the fact that they are to be understood as abstract categories, which cannot be observed from an individual’s behavior. This means that there is always room for interpretation in assessment based on the ‘Can Do’ statements. Therefore, Figueras et al. (2005: 271) call for a procedure which allows the raters to assign the individuals to the described levels of proficiency corresponding to the levels described in the CEFR.

If one can develop such a procedure, and the procedure is followed in a skilful and professional way, then one automatically has a valid answer to the concisely formulated and frequently quoted core question in language testing attributed to Charles Alderson: ‘How can I be sure that your B1 [in country A for language L with test X] is my B1 [in country B for language M using test Y]?’. This follows from the simple logical rule that (a) and (b) are equivalent to each other if they are both equivalent to a third term (c). The CEFR is intended to play the role of (c). (Figueras et al. 2005: 271)

Figueras et al. (ibid.) continue by stating that even though the rule is simple, the terms of the comparison are not. Since the ‘Can Do’ statements of CEFR are abstract, the individual interpretation of the subject of assessment is always present in the assessment situation. The knowledge of languages, especially if it is seen as communicative competence, is not something one can measure from the individual’s
behavior without interpreting it. This results in differences between the assessments conducted by different teachers, which is also visible in the data of the HY-talk project.

Now that I have presented the theoretical framework of this study, I will move on to present my research design.
4 Research Design

In this chapter I will present the data and the method of this study. First I will present my research questions after which in section 4.2 I will introduce the HY-talk data which I used in this study, and finally, in section 4.3 I will explain the method of this study.

4.1 Research Questions

The objective of this study is to find out how EFL speakers repair their speech and to examine the relationship of self-repair and fluency. To do that I intend to answer the following research questions:

1. What kinds of self-repairs do Finnish upper secondary school students make in EFL spoken language?
2. What differences are there in the self-repair types and their number between speakers who are assessed to have higher or lower proficiency?
3. How does the relationship of fluency and self-repair appear in the data?

Before moving on to explain the method of this study and to present my results, I will introduce the HY-talk research project and its data in detail.
4.2 HY-talk Research Project

The data of my study is provided by the HY-talk research project (HY-talk website 2009) which I briefly introduced in the first chapter. The HY-talk research project is funded by the University of Helsinki, and it was initiated in order to improve the reliability of language assessment procedures in the Finnish comprehensive and upper secondary schools and in institutions of higher learning.

The HY-talk data consists of speech samples of comprehensive school pupils (7th grade) and upper secondary school students (1st year) in English, Swedish and German (for a detailed discussion of the participants included in this study, see section 4.2.4), and of the proficiency assessments that were given to each participant. The speech samples were collected in spoken language testing situations that were specifically designed for the HY-talk project and held in one comprehensive school and two upper secondary schools in the Helsinki metropolitan area in late 2007. In the speech samples the participants work in pairs to complete four different instructed speaking exercises, which are presented in section 4.2.1.

As the project aims to improve the assessment procedures in Finnish schools, several language experts assessed the speakers’ proficiency according to the assessment scales compiled for the purposes of the project and the assessments were documented as a part of the project data. The assessment scales are presented and discussed in section 4.2.2, and the assessors along with the assessment procedure are introduced in section 4.2.3.

All the speech samples of the HY-talk data were recorded in both audio and video format, and then afterwards transcribed. The transcripts were produced by multiple members of the HY-talk project staff, and each transcript was rechecked by another member. As mentioned above, the samples were also assessed according to the
HY-talk assessment scales of proficiency. At my disposal I had the audio material, the transcripts and the speaker proficiency assessments of the English data.

4.2.1 Test Tasks

The HY-talk data is based on spoken language tests that were specifically developed for this project. The test tasks designed for the upper secondary school students are presented in Appendix 3. The content matter of the tests for comprehensive school level and upper secondary school level was slightly different (the discussions of exercise 2 were of different length and about different subjects i.e. shorter and easier for the comprehensive school level), but both tests had the same structure. Since the tests were very similar and I only studied the data of the upper secondary school students, from now on I will only refer to the test tasks designed for the upper secondary school level.

In the testing situations, the participants worked in self-selected pairs. Before the test the pairs were given the test tasks (in the exact form as they are in Appendix 3), and they had 20 minutes to familiarize themselves with the Finnish instructions for the tasks and to plan what they were going to say. The tests were organized and recorded by two HY-talk staff members, and they started all the testing situations with some small talk in English with the participants to warm them up before the actual testing. If needed, the test organizers also provided the participants with further oral instructions in English.

Since the samples were collected in a spoken language testing situation this data is not ideal for studying the speakers’ self-repairs. As the participants knew beforehand that they were going to take a test and that their speech would be recorded, some of
them might have been nervous about the situation, and usually nervousness increases hesitation, mistakes etc. However, all the participants seemed to be quite relaxed and preoccupied by completing the exercises.

The original test that was designed for the HY-talk project consists of three parts (tasks 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix 3), and the fourth task was designed separately and used only in the English tests. The first three tasks form an entity with a theme of a distant relative (Nico or Anna), who does not understand Finnish, coming to visit the participants for the summer. Task 1 is a monologue. The participants were instructed to act as if they were making an introductory video for Nico or Anna and they were given a list of things that they were to include in their video presentation. Task 2 has two parts (2.1 and 2.2), both of which are short discussions. In task 2.1 the participants were instructed to choose who plays the part of Nico/Anna and who plays the host. In task 2.2 they were asked to switch roles. The participants were provided with a framework for the discussions where the speaking turns and their contents were assigned beforehand. Task 3 is also a discussion, but it is less structured than task 2. In task 3 the participants were asked to plan a trip to a destination of their choice near their home. They were given a list of things that they were to come to agreement over.

Task 4 is an open, free discussion on the topic of reality television, and the task contains a short text about the scandals that the reality television show Big Brother has caused all over the world. The participants were instructed to first read the text and then discuss reality television with their partner. The participants did not have to discuss Big Brother if they did not wish to do so, but most of them did.
4.2.2 HY-talk Assessment Scales

The HY-talk assessment scales are based on CEFR descriptors of spoken language proficiency. In the HY-talk assessments the speakers were assessed on six different dimensions of spoken language, namely pronunciation (ääntäminen), range (puheen laajuus), accuracy (kielen oikeellisuus), fluency (sujuvuus), task performance (tehtävän suorittaminen), and interaction (vuorovaikutus). The HY-talk assessment scales (see Appendix 1), except for the interaction assessment scale, were compiled of the ‘Can Do’ statements of CEFR spoken language proficiency descriptors that appear in the Finnish National Core Curricula (Finnish National Board of Education/ FNBE website 2010). The descriptors used in the HY-talk assessment scales appear in Appendix 2 of the Finnish National Core Curricula (ibid.), the Language Proficiency Scale, under the heading speaking (puhuminen).

The HY-talk assessment scale of interaction was taken directly from CEFR (2010:86–87) since descriptors concerning interaction are not included in the Finnish National Core Curricula. The interaction assessment scale is a compilation of three different scales called taking the floor, co-operating and asking for clarification, and was only used in the assessment of the English data. The interaction assessment scale also differs from the other scales in the number of the proficiency levels that are featured in the scale. While the others were modeled after the FNBE division of levels A1–B2 into sublevels such as A1.1, A1.2 etc. (FNBE website 2010), the levels of the interaction assessment scale were copied from CEFR. Thus, the interaction assessment scale only has six levels whereas the other scales have 10.

Since I studied the relationship between self-repair and fluency, the assessment scale most relevant to this study is the fourth scale presented in Appendix 1, the fluency assessment scale. In section 2.2 I discussed the pause-centered view of fluency
that the scale seems to imply, and I will discuss the assessment of fluency further in the next section, in which I present the assessment procedure of the HY-talk project.

4.2.3 Assessment Procedure

The main objective of the HY-talk research project is to improve the reliability of language assessment procedures used in Finnish schools and institutions. To achieve this goal, the speech samples were assessed by several language experts in the spring of 2008. The test performances of the English language data were assessed separately by five experts of English. All the assessors had experience of teaching English.

The assessors gathered to watch the video recordings of the test performances but they did not give joint assessments of the speakers’ proficiency. While watching the recordings, each of them assessed the speakers’ proficiency individually using the HY-talk assessment scales introduced above in section 4.2.2. Moreover, in the English data, instead of giving an overall assessment of the speakers’ proficiency, the assessors gave separate assessments in relation to the six dimensions of spoken language, introduced in section 4.2.2, for different tasks (1–4). In other words, each assessor gave each speaker all in all 24 assessments in relation to the dimensions of spoken language, six assessments per each of the four tasks. After giving the assessments separately, the assessors had a chance to discuss and reflect on issues of the assessment process, but they did not change their assessments during or after the discussion. The arrangement of separate assessments provides a possibility to investigate if the assessments differ from each other even though they are assessments of the same exact speech samples.

On behalf of the HY-talk project, the separate assessments of each assessor were used to calculate the mean average of the assessments of each assessor to each speaker.
In the analysis of this study I made use of these mean averages and I also used the separate fluency assessments of four participants whose repairs I had chosen to examine more closely. Since the assessors did not make overall assessments of the speakers’ fluency I had to work with the separate fluency assessments that were given for the different tasks. This proved somewhat challenging, since there were four tasks, and in some cases the assessors had given the same speaker one assessment (e.g. A2.2) for two tasks, and another (e.g. B1.1) for the other two tasks. It was very unclear what the assessors thought of the speakers’ overall fluency, since the descriptors of the levels that I gave as examples are quite different as A2.2 states that the speaker’s “speech is sometimes fluent but different types of breaks are very evident,” whereas B1.1 states that the speaker “can keep up intelligible speech even if pauses and hesitation occur in longer sequences” (FNBE website 2010). To avoid lengthy explanations in the results chapter I used the mean averages of each assessor’s assessments, and rounded the assessments up in the above mentioned unclear cases.

4.2.4 Participants

In this study I only used the HY-talk English data of upper secondary school students. This data consists of 20 samples, and as there are two participants in each sample, there are all in all 40 participants in the data that I used. The participants were all volunteers, and they knew about the test beforehand. At the time of data collection they were 1st year students in upper secondary school and they had all studied English as A-language (first foreign language). In the data it is not stated if the participants have started studying English in their first, second or third year of comprehensive school, but the Finnish National Core Curriculum has the same objectives for all pupils of A-language
English regardless of when they start their English studies. This way, even if some participants have studied English a year or two longer than the others, it theoretically does not make them more advanced than the others. In real life it obviously is not that straightforward, and in addition to that, natural talent, motivation and teaching affect the students’ proficiency as well.

In addition to studying the overall distribution of repairs I examined the repairs of four individual participants more closely in order to compare their repair distribution. I chose these participants because they were assessed to be either the most or the least proficient speakers of all the participants in the data that I used. The native language of all four participants was Finnish, and they reported Finnish as the only language used at their homes, with the exception of Speaker 2, who also reported that sign language was used at his home. Speaker 1 was female and Speakers 2–4 were males. The average proficiency assessment and the average fluency assessment of Speakers 1 and 2 was B2.2, whereas Speakers 3 and 4 were given the average proficiency assessment of A2.2 and the average fluency assessment B1.1. I will discuss their individual assessments in detail in section 5.2.

4.3 Method

In this section I will explain how I analyzed the data of this study. I started by investigating the transcripts and the audio data to locate all the self-repairs that the speakers make. Then I analyzed the repairs by using the categorization of repair types and the categorization related to correctness (presented in chapter 2). Since I did not have recall data from the participants at my disposal, the results (especially those of the second categorization) are highly dependent on my interpretation. In some cases it was
impossible to determine from the data if the speakers make repairs because they consider their OU incorrect or unsuitable for the context or if they for whatever other reason just decide to use another utterance to convey their message. Thus, the results of the second categorization are a representation of the grammatical, lexical and phonetic correctness of the original utterances and the repairs. After placing the repairs into the different categories I counted the number of repairs in each category of the two categorizations. Then I proceeded to count the categories’ percentages of the total number of repairs in the data.

Next I examined the mean averages of the proficiency assessments given to the participants. I selected two individual participants who were assessed to be the most proficient of all the speakers and two who were assessed to be the least proficient. Then I separated the repairs of these participants and counted them and their percentages individually, according to the categorizations. When I had the data organized into different categories I compared the repairs of the selected participants to each other in order to find out how the repair distribution of the more and less proficient speakers would differ. After that I examined the fluency assessments that the selected participants were given to learn about the relationship of fluency and self-repair.

I have now presented the research design of this study and I will move on to present my results.
5 Results

In this chapter I will present the results of this study. I will first introduce the overall distribution of the repairs in section 5.1 and after that, in section 5.2, I will have a closer look at the repair distribution of four individual participants.

5.1 Overall Results

In the data of this study there are a total of 1154 repairs. Figure 1 shows the distribution of repairs sorted by the main categories I presented in section 2.3.3. In the figure the categories are presented in the order in which the categories were first introduced, whereas in the running text I present them from largest to smallest. I also give examples of the different categories, and the examples can be found in their respective contexts in Appendix 2 according to the numbering below.

Figure 1 displays the overall distribution of self-repair types.

Figure 1: The Distribution of Self-repairs According to Repair Types

- different repairs 15.9%
- appropriateness repairs 6.4%
- error repairs 23.1%
- covert repairs 47.7%
- rephrasing repairs 2.0%
- postponement 4.9%
As Figure 1 shows, covert repairs are the most frequently made repairs, and they cover almost half (550) of all the repairs. Example 15 shows that covert repairs are mostly just repetitions of an utterance.

15. i think _ i think we should ask siiri and liisa

About one fifth (267) of the repairs are error repairs. Error repairs consist of repairs in vocabulary, syntax and phonology, and example 16 is a syntactic error repair where the speaker repairs the syntactic construction of his/her utterance.

16. so what you do _ what did you like about the movie

The third largest main category is different repairs with one sixth (183) of all the repairs. This category consists of repairs in which the speaker considers the OU incorrect or inappropriate to express what s/he has in mind, and s/he starts over with a different utterance. Example 17 shows a case where the speaker changes his/her way of explaining his/her living situation.

17. i have _ we live in er Vantaa

The rest of the main categories are considerably smaller than the ones presented above. Only about 6% (74) of the repairs are appropriateness repairs. In example 18 the speaker makes his/her utterance more appropriate by clearing the referent of his/her utterance by changing the word it to the utterance the first one.

18. i think it was _ the first one was still the better than the third one

A slightly smaller main category than appropriateness repairs is postponement with almost 5% (57) of all the repairs. Postponements are repairs where the speaker interrupts his/her speech to add some situational or other information before moving on
with the utterance. Example 19 shows how the speaker adds that *dad* also usually lives in the room before explaining that the parents have changed rooms because of the house guest.

19. usually my mum lives here but _ and dad of course _ but they changed the room because of you

The smallest main category with only 2% (23) of all the repairs is rephrasing repairs. A rephrasing repair is made when the speaker is not certain about the correctness or appropriateness of the OU, and in example 20 the speaker starts with the passive *you’d* but changes it to *they’d* when speaking about two sisters who first met each other in the Big Brother television show.

20. yeah you’d _ they’d just have to stay in the house

The context (see Appendix 2) shows that the speaker first talks about the matter using the passive *you*, and then once refers to the sisters with the pronoun *I*, immediately changing it to *they*, which implies that s/he considers the use of *I* erroneous. After his/her turn the other speaker uses the passive *you*, and it seems that the first speaker in his/her next turn gets a little confused and is not quite sure if s/he should use the passive *you* like the other speaker just did or if s/he should refer to the sisters as *them* as s/he did earlier. These kinds of repairs are infrequent in this data, presumably because it is impossible to know *why* the speakers make repairs unless one has access to recall data or the context clearly suggests that the speaker is uncertain.

Figure 2 displays the subcategories of different repairs, appropriateness repairs and error repairs in relation to the other main categories.
First in Figure 2, color coded with different shades of blue, are the subcategories of different repairs: d1 repairs (ordering error repairs 26), d2 repairs (inappropriate information repairs 20) and d3 repairs (message replacement repairs 137). Below the subcategories of different repairs in Figure 2, color coded with different shades of red are the subcategories of appropriateness repairs: a1 repairs (ambiguity repairs 34), a2 repairs (appropriate-level repairs 31) a3 repairs (coherence repairs 2) and a4 repairs (repairs for good language 7). Next in Figure 2, color coded with different shades of green are the subcategories of error repairs: e1 repairs (lexical error repairs 70), e2 repairs (syntactic error repairs 111) and e3 repairs (phonetic error repairs 86).

The subcategories make the distribution of the repairs and the differences between them clear, but since many of the subcategories are quite marginal I did not see it relevant to make more use of them in my analysis, and thus, I do not refer to the subcategories in the discussion of the results below in chapter 6.
Figure 3 shows the distribution of the repairs in relation to correctness. Similar to Figure 1, in Figure 3 the categories are presented in the order of their first appearance in chapter 2.4, whereas in the running text I present them from largest to smallest. I exemplify the categories with samples from my data, and the context of the examples can be found in Appendix 2 according to the numbering below.

Figure 3: The Distribution of Self-repairs in Relation to Correctness of Repairs

Figure 3 shows that the category of repetitions is clearly the largest of the categories in relation to correctness with almost half (550) of all the repairs. As example 21 shows, repetitions are cases where the speaker only repeats the OU.

21. where can _ can i put my bags

Next in size is the category of changes from correct to correct with about one third (358) of the repairs. This category consists of repairs where the OU in its context before the repair is grammatically, lexically and phonetically correct, and replaced with an utterance which is also correct. Example 22 shows a straightforward case where the
repaired utterance is at the end of the sentence where its correctness does not depend on what comes after it. In this example the OU is clearly correct as is the repair.

22. i’d like to see as much a- as i can _ as much as possible

Changes from incorrect to correct cover around one fifth (216) of all the repairs. Example 23 shows how in these kinds of repairs the OU in its context before the repair is grammatically, lexically or phonetically incorrect, and replaced with an utterance which is correct. In this case, the OU gust- is a start of a phonetically incorrect word, and as the speaker realizes this quickly, s/he interrupts the word and starts it over with a different, correct pronunciation.

23. oh it’s it’s just a gust- _ a guestroom

The other two categories were visibly smaller from the above mentioned first three. Changes from incorrect to incorrect consisted of only a little over 1% (16) of the repairs. This category consists of repairs where the OU is grammatically, lexically or phonetically incorrect, and replaced with another incorrect utterance. Example 24 shows how the speaker interrupts the OU to give bor- and instead of changing it to to give birth only adds the word baby into the middle of the utterance and repairs the OU with to give baby born.

24. to give bor- to give baby born in the house

The category of changes from correct to incorrect was even smaller with the same percentage as changes from incorrect to incorrect (1%) but with only 14 repairs. As example 25 shows, these kinds of repairs are cases where the OU is correct and it is replaced with an incorrect utterance. In this case the OU it’s is correct even in relation to context after the repair, whereas the repair it is not.
Now that I have presented the overall results I will move on to examine four individual participants’ repair distribution more closely in order to make comparisons between them.

5.2 Comparing the Repairs of Students with Higher and Lower Proficiencies

In this section I will present the self-repair statistics of four individual participants. These participants were chosen as examples because they had been assessed to be either the most or the least proficient of all the participants. The first two speakers (S1 and S2) were assessed to be on the highest proficiency level (in this case B2.2) and the other two speakers (S3 and S4) were assessed to be on the lowest level (in this case A2.2) of all the participants. In addition to their overall proficiency assessment I will present the participants’ fluency assessments before moving on to present their repairs. Figures 4–11 display the distribution of the repairs made by these individual speakers according to repair types and in relation to correctness, and they are constructed identically to Figures 1 and 3 above. Also similarly to section 5.1, I present the categories in the running text from largest to smallest.

Speaker 1 receives the overall proficiency assessment B2.2 from all five assessors. Her average fluency assessment is also B2.2, as two assessors give her the assessment C.1.1 and the other three give her B2.2. She is the participant with the smallest number of self-repairs. She only repairs her speech 14 times.

Figure 4 displays the distribution of her repair types.
As Figure 4 shows, the largest category in her repair distribution is covert repairs with half (7) of her repairs, and the second largest is the category of error repairs with three repairs. She also makes 2 different repairs and 2 postponements, but she does not make any appropriateness repairs or rephrasing repairs.

The distribution of her repairs in relation to correctness is displayed in Figure 5.
As Figure 5 shows, Speaker 1 does not make any repairs from incorrect to correct or from incorrect to incorrect. Her repairs are divided in half as 7 of her repairs are changes from correct to correct and the other 7 are repetitions. This kind of division is not present in any other participant’s repairs, and it could be related to the small number of her repairs.

Speaker 2 receives more varied assessments than Speaker 1. One of the assessors gives him the assessment C1.1, three of them give him B2.2, and one gives him B2.1. The average level of proficiency of the assessments is B2.2. Although his overall proficiency assessments differ from the assessments of Speaker 1, he receives similar fluency assessments as she does. His average fluency assessment is also B2.2 and he receives the assessment C1.1 from two assessors and the assessment B2.2 from three assessors. The curious thing about this is that as only one of the assessors gives both Speakers 1 and 2 the assessment B2.2, the other four assessors disagree. Two of them assess Speaker 1 as being less fluent than Speaker 2 and two of them assess Speaker 1 as being more fluent than Speaker 2. The number of repairs that Speaker 2 makes is 30.

The distribution of his repair types is displayed in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: The Distribution of Self-repairs Made by Speaker 2 According to Repair Type](image)
Figure 6 shows that the two largest categories in his repairs, with one third (10) of all his repairs each, are error repairs and covert repairs. The other categories are visibly smaller, as only slightly over one tenth (4) of his repairs are postponements, one tenth (3) are different repairs, around 6% (2) are rephrasing repairs and he only makes one appropriateness repair.

Figure 7 displays his repair distribution in relation to correctness.

As figure 7 shows, Speaker 2 has a more varied distribution of repairs in relation to correctness than Speaker 1 even though they are assessed to be equally proficient speakers. The largest category, with a little over one third (12) of his repairs, is repairs from correct to correct. One third (10) of his repairs are repetitions, whereas about one fourth (7) are repairs from incorrect to correct. He also makes one repair from correct to incorrect.

Speaker 3 also receives varying proficiency assessments, as two of the assessors see him as being on the proficiency level B1.1 and three of them assess him as being on
level A2.2. His average proficiency level is A2.2. The fluency assessments of Speaker 3 are the most varied of all the four participants. He receives the fluency assessment A2.2 from one, B1.1 from two, B1.2 from one and B2.1 from one assessor, thus receiving the average fluency assessment B1.1. He repairs his speech 36 times.

His distribution of repair types is displayed in Figure 8.

As Figure 8 shows, the largest category in the distribution of his repairs is covert repairs, with one third (12) of his repairs, and the second largest category, with only one repair less than the largest one (11), is different repairs. Error repairs cover about one fifth (8) of his repairs, whereas appropriateness repairs and rephrasing repairs cover only about 6% (2) of his repairs each, and the smallest category, postponement, consists of only one repair.

Figure 9 displays the repair distribution of Speaker 3 in relation to correctness.
Figure 9: The Distribution of Self-repairs Made by Speaker 3 in Relation to Correctness of Repairs

Figure 9 bears a remarkable resemblance to Figure 7 (the distribution of repairs of Speaker 2 in relation to correctness), as it shows that the two largest categories, repairs from correct to correct with a little less than half (15) of his repairs and repetitions with roughly one third (13), form three quarters of all the repairs Speaker 3 makes, just as they do with Speaker 2, who is assessed to be quite a lot more proficient than Speaker 3. The number of repairs from incorrect to correct of Speaker 3, however, is smaller in comparison to that of Speaker 2, covering about one tenth (4) of his repairs. In addition to that, Speaker 3 makes more repairs from correct to incorrect than Speaker 2, as slightly under one tenth (3) of his repairs are these kinds of repairs. He also makes one repair from incorrect to incorrect.

The proficiency assessments that Speaker 4 receives are similar to the ones of Speaker 3. Two of the assessors also see Speaker 4 as being on the proficiency level B1.1, and the other three assess him as being on level A2.2. This case is similar to the case of the fluency assessments of Speakers 1 and 2. Only one of the assessors sees both Speakers 3 and 4 as being on level A2.2 and the other four assessors disagree.
Two of them assess Speaker 3 as being *less* proficient than Speaker 4 and two of them assess Speaker 3 as being *more* proficient than Speaker 4. The fluency assessments of speaker 4 are fairly uniform as only one assessor gives him the fluency assessment A2.2 and the other four give him B1.1. The number of the repairs that Speaker 4 makes is 40.

Figure 10 displays his repair type distribution.

![Figure 10: The Distribution of Self-repairs Made by Speaker 4 According to Repair Type](image)

Figure 10 shows that the largest category of the repairs made by Speaker 4 is, similarly to Speakers 1, 2 and 3, covert repairs with slightly less than half (17) of his repairs. The second and third largest categories of different repairs and error repairs cover about one fifth (9 and 8) of his repairs each. One tenth (4) of his repairs are postponements, and about 5% (2) are appropriateness repairs.

His distribution of repairs in relation to correctness is displayed in Figure 11.
Similarly to Figures 7 and 9, also Figure 11 shows a clear pattern where the two largest categories, repetitions with almost half (18) of the repairs made by Speaker 4 and repairs from correct to correct with about one third (12) of them, cover three quarters of all his repairs. About one sixth of his repairs are repairs from incorrect to correct, and both repairs from incorrect to incorrect and repairs from correct to correct cover 5% (2) of his repairs each.

I have now presented the results of this study and in the next chapter I will discuss my findings in the light of the objective and the research questions of this study.
6 Discussion

As the results of this study indicate, there are a fair number of different self-repair types represented in the speech of non-native speakers. While some types of repairs are more common than others, all the types of Levelt’s taxonomy (and the added types of Kormos, Bredart and Evans) are present in the data of this study. Clearly the most common repair type in my data is covert repairs. Error repairs and different repairs are also quite common, although visibly fewer than covert repairs, and these three most common types form five sixths of all the repairs. This shows that the other three repair types (appropriateness repairs, postponements and rephrasing repairs) are significantly less common in the data of this study.

I studied the participants’ self-repairs in relation to correctness in order to find out how often the repairs actually make the utterances better as the term seems to suggest. The results show that in most of the cases the repair in fact does not make the OU better. As repetitions and changes from correct to correct cover more than three fourths of all the repairs and changes from incorrect to incorrect and from correct to incorrect cover about 3% of the repairs together, less than one fifth of the repairs in the data of this study leads to an utterance which is grammatically, lexically or phonetically more correct than the OU. As mentioned above in section 2.4 it would have been interesting to study the functional correctness of the repairs as well. With the help of recall data it might have been possible to understand why so many of the repairs were repetitions and changes from correct to correct.

Repairs of speech usually appear with breaks or pauses of different lengths, and perhaps because of this self-repairs are often seen as disfluencies, particularly in connection with the speech of non-native speakers. Some self-repairs of non-native speakers surely signal a certain lack of fluency but there are a number of things in the
data of this study that imply that most repairs are in no connection with the speakers’ fluency. Both the the distribution of repair types and the distribution of repairs in relation to correctness imply to some extent that repairs are not necessarily connected to the lack of the speakers’ fluency. However, the fact that most repairs are not disfluencies is most evident in the comparison of the repairs of students with higher and lower proficiency.

The overall results of this study show that around one half of the repairs that the speakers make are covert repairs which are mere repetitions of the original utterances. Covert repairs can be caused by word searches, which are somewhat related to proficiency, since recalling words is more difficult for a non-native speaker than for a native speaker. However, one must remember that L1 speakers also do word searches, and usually their fluency has nothing to do with it, and in many cases the same applies to non-native speakers as well. Another thing that can cause covert repairs is the overall style of speaking of a person. Some people pause or repeat their words more often than others, some constantly repeat their words even when they use their native language, and when it is evident that they do not have any speaking disorder, this repeating of words cannot be seen as related to the speakers’ fluency.

All different repairs cannot be labeled as disfluencies either since at least a part of them can be caused by the fact that some people are more impulsive speakers than others in the sense that they start speaking before they have finished formulating their thoughts. Thus, when the impulsive speaker thinks of a way to express his/her thoughts in a better way, s/he has already started to express it in the first way that came to mind and then interrupts his/her speech and starts over with a different utterance.

Error repairs are mostly repairs of different slips of the tongue and they are also common in the speech of native speakers (see e.g. Levelt 1983). They are not likely to be in any connection with the speakers’ fluency because they are mostly just
corrections of words, syntactic structures or phonetic elements and they rarely cause a breakdown in communication.

The distribution of repairs in relation to correctness also indicates that most of the repairs cannot be interpreted as disfluencies. As the vast majority of the repairs are repetitions and changes from correct to correct, it seems that the speakers do not have problems in conveying their message both correctly and understandably. Moreover, the fact that about one fifth of the repairs are changes from incorrect to correct, as opposed to the 3% portion of the changes from correct/incorrect to incorrect, speaks more of proficiency than the lack of it since the speakers are able to correct their incorrect utterances.

According to my findings, the fluency of non-native speakers is not directly connected to the number of their repairs. Not only are repairs present in the speech of the students assessed to be more fluent than most but these fluent speakers can make as many repairs as less fluent speakers without receiving a lower fluency assessment. As I pointed out in section 2.2, it seems that the fluency assessment scale used in the HY-talk project prompts the assessors to react to repairs as disfluencies. However, it does not seem to affect the HY-talk assessors this way. While comparing the individual participants’ number of repairs I found that the number of the repairs made by Speakers 1 and 2 differs significantly as Speaker 1 only makes 14 repairs and Speaker 2 makes 30 repairs. These speakers are assessed to be equally fluent (on average B2.2) and thus the difference in the number of their repairs only shows that people are different. Even though a fluent non-native speaker may speak making only few repairs, another speaker just as fluent as the first person may repair his/her speech a lot more. Moreover, Speaker 3 makes 36 repairs and Speaker 4 makes 40 repairs, and these numbers are a lot closer to the number of Speaker 2 than the numbers of Speakers 1 and 2 are to each other. As Speakers 3 and 4 are assessed to be less fluent (on average
B1.1) than Speaker 2, it is obvious that the mere number of repairs is not a clear indicator of the speakers’ fluency.

There are clear similarities as well as differences in the distribution of the individual speakers’ repairs. The most obvious similarity in the repair type distribution of the individual participants is that the largest category in all the cases is the category of covert repairs. They cover exactly one half of the repairs of Speaker 1, one third of the repairs of Speakers 2 and 3, and about two fifths of the repairs of speaker 4. As stated above, this implies that a great number of their repairs can be caused by word searches or a personal style of speaking, neither of which is directly linked to their fluency.

There is a slight difference in the distribution of different repairs and error repairs between the speakers of higher and lower proficiency. The speakers of higher proficiency make more error repairs than different repairs, whereas the speakers of lower proficiency make more different repairs than error repairs. This difference could be linked to the speakers’ fluency since it would be logical that the more fluent speakers would more often correct their slips of the tongue than make different repairs and the less fluent speakers would feel the need to start over their utterances more often than to make error repairs. However, because the number of their repairs is not very large, and in some cases the difference between the two categories is only one repair, it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions about this.

While comparing the individual participants’ distribution of repairs in relation to correctness I found a significant similarity between Speakers 2, 3 and 4. As I pointed out in section 5.2 the repair distribution in relation to correctness of Speakers 2, 3 and 4 all show a similar pattern where the categories of repetitions and changes from correct to correct cover about three quarters of all their repairs. The repair distribution of Speaker 1 is different from the others, but it also presents repetitions and changes from
correct to correct as the most common repairs. This implies that the speakers with lower proficiency as well as the speakers with higher proficiency are perfectly capable of communicating their message correctly most of the time.
7 Conclusion

With this study I wanted to explore the self-repairs that EFL speakers make. I found that all the repair types of my categorization are present in the data, and that covert repairs, different repairs and error repairs are the most common types. In addition to studying the self-repairs as such, the aim of this study was to examine the relationship between non-native speakers’ fluency and self-repair. My main argument was that self-repair is a normal feature of spoken language, and that most non-native speakers’ self-repairs are not disfluencies although they are commonly labeled as such. I recognize that some self-repairs made by non-native speakers do signal their lack of fluency but my findings indicate that most repairs do not.

Language assessment is central to the HY-talk research project and with this thesis I wanted to make my contribution towards achieving the aim of the project, which is to improve assessment procedures in the Finnish schools. I find the assessment scale of fluency misleading as it seems to prompt the assessors to react to self-repairs as disfluencies. Experienced assessors such as the HY-talk assessors are not affected by the pause-centered descriptors of the scale, but nevertheless the scale is misleading and does not equally measure all the things that different definitions of fluency include. It is important that the Finnish National Core Curricula include guidelines for assessment but the current descriptors still need refining in order to become practical.

Further research is still needed to study the relationship of self-repair and fluency. An extensive comparison between the self-repairs of native and non-native speakers might be especially helpful in understanding this relationship. In addition to that it would be useful to study the functional correctness of self-repair to understand why repairs from correct to correct are made when it is apparent that the OU is
perfectly correct and suitable to the context before the repair. Also the applicability of
the FNBE Language Profiency Scales needs to be studied further for the assessment
procedures to be truly improved in practice.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: CEFR Assessment Tables Used in HY-talk

Puhumisen ops-asteikko: Ääntäminen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>Kielitaidon alkeiden hallinta *</th>
<th>Ääntäminen voi aiheuttaa suuria ymmärtämisongelmia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä alkeiskielitaito       *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen voi aiheuttaa usein ymmärtämisongelmia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Toimiva alkeiskielitaito         *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen voi joskus tuottaa ymmärtämisongelmia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Peruskielitaidon alkuvihe        *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen on ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on hyvin ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä voi koitua satunnaisia ymmärtämisongelmia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä peruskielitaito        *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen on ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä esiintyy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Toimiva peruskielitaito          *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen on selvästi ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on joskus ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä esiintyy jonkin verran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>Sujuva peruskielitaito           *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen on hyvin ymmärrettävää, vaikka intonaatio ja painotus eivät ole aivan kohdekielen mukaisia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Itsenäisen kielitaidon perustaso *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen ja intonaatio ovat selkeitä ja luontevia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>Toimiva itsenäinen kielitaito    *</td>
<td>Ääntäminen ja intonaatio ovat hyvin selkeitä ja luontevia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taitavan kielitaidon perustaso   *</td>
<td>Osaa vaihdella intonaatiota ja sijoittaa lausepainot oikein ilmaistakseen kaikkein hienoimpiakin merkitysvivaihteita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>Kielitaidon alkeiden hallinta</td>
<td>* Osaa hyvin suppean perussanaston ja joitakin opeteltuja vakioilmaisuja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa hyvin suppean perussanaston, joitakin tilannesidonnaisia ilmaisuja ja peruskieliopin aineksia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>Toimiva alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa rajallisen joukon lyhyitä, ulkoa opeteltuja ilmauksia, keskeisintä sanastoa ja perustason lauserakenteita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>Peruskieli-taidon alku vaihe</td>
<td>* Osaa helposti ennakoitavan perussanaston ja monia keskeisimpiä rakenteita (kuten menneen ajan muoto ja konjunktioita).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä peruskielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa kohtalaisen hyvin tavallisen, jokapäiväisen sanaston ja jonkin verran idiomaattisia ilmaisuja. Osaa useita yksinkertaisia ja myös joitakin vaativampia rakenteita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>Toimiva peruskieli-taito</td>
<td>* Osaa käyttää melko laajaa jokapäiväistä sanastoa ja joitakin yleisiä fraaseja ja idiomeja. Käyttää useita erilaisia rakenteita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B1.2</td>
<td>Sujuva peruskielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa käyttää kohtalaisen laajaa sanastoa ja tavallisia idiomeja. Käyttää myös monenlaisia rakenteita ja mutkikkaitakin lauseita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>Itsenäisen kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Osaa käyttää monipuolisesti kielen rakenteita ja laajahkoa sanastoa mukaan lukien idiomattinen ja käsitteellinen sanasto. Osoittaa kasvavaa taitoa reagoida sopivasti tilanteen asettamiin muoto-vaatimuksiin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B2.2</td>
<td>Toimiva itsenäinen kielitaito</td>
<td>* Hallitsee laajasti kielelliset keinot ilmaista konkreetteja ja käsitteellisiä, tuttuja ja tuntemattomia aiheita varmasti, selkeästi ja tilanteen vaatimaa muodollisuusastetta noudattaen. Kielelliset syyt rajoittavat ilmaisua erittäin harvoin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C1.1</td>
<td>Taitavan kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Sanasto ja rakenteisto ovat hyvin laajat ja rajoittavat ilmaisua erittäin harvoin. Osaa ilmaista itseään varmasti, selkeästi ja kohteliaasti tilanteen vaatimalla tavalla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Puhumisen ops-asteikko: Oikeakielisyys

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>Kielitaidon alkeiden hallinta</td>
<td>* Puhuja ei kykene vapaaseen tuotokseen, mutta hänen hallitsemansa harvat kaavamaiset ilmaisut voivat olla melko virheettömiä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Alkeellisessakin vapaassa puheessa esiintyy hyvin paljon kaikenlaisia virheitä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>Toimiva alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Alkeellisessakin puheessa esiintyy paljon peruskielioppivirheitä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>Peruskieli-taidon alkuvaihe</td>
<td>* Hallitsee kaikkein yksinkertaisimman kielipin alkeellisessä vapaassa puheessa, mutta virheitä esiintyy yhä paljon perusrakenteissakin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä peruskieli-taito</td>
<td>* Laajemmassa vapaassa puheessa esiintyy paljon virheitä perusasioissa (esim. verbien aikamuodoissa) ja ne voivat joskus haitata ymmärrettävyyttä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>Toimiva peruskieli-taito</td>
<td>* Laajemmassa vapaassa puheessa kielioppivirheet ovat tavallisia (esim. artikelit ja päätteet puuttuvat), mutta ne haittaavat harvoin ymmärrettävyyttä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B1.2</td>
<td>Sujuva peruskieli-taito</td>
<td>* Kielioppivirheitä esiintyy jonkin verran, mutta ne haittaavat harvoin laajempaa viestintää.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>Itsenäisen kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Kieliopin hallinta on melko hyvä, eivätä satunnaiset virheet yleensä haittaa ymmärrettävyyttä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B2.2</td>
<td>Toimiva itsenäinen kielitaito</td>
<td>* Kieliopin hallinta on hyvä. Usein puhuja korjaa virheensä itse, eivätä virheet haittaa ymmärrettävyyttä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C1.1</td>
<td>Taitavan kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Kieliopin hallinta on hyvä. Satunnaiset virheet eivät hankaloita ymmärtämistä, ja puhuja osaa korjata ne itse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>Kielitaidon alkeiden hallinta</td>
<td>* Puheessa voi olla paljon pitkiä taukoja, toistojaa ja katkoksia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Puheessa on taukoja ja muita katkoksia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>Toimiva alkeiskielitaito</td>
<td>* Kaikkein tutuimmat jaksot sujuvat, muualla tauot ja katkokset ovat hyvin ilmeisiä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>Peruskielitaidon alkuvaihe</td>
<td>* Tuottaa sujuvasti joitakin tuttuja jaksoja, mutta puheessa on paljon hyvin ilmeisiä taukoja ja väärää aloituksv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>Kehittyvä peruskielitaito</td>
<td>* Puhe on välillä sujuvaa, mutta erilaiset katkokset ovat hyvin ilmeisiä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>Toimiva peruskielitaito</td>
<td>* Pitää yllä ymmärrettävää puhetta, vaikka pitemmissä puhejaksoissa esiintyy taukoja ja epäröintiä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B1.2</td>
<td>Sujuva peruskielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa ilmaista itseään suhteellisen vaivattomasti. Vaikka taukoja ja katkoksia esiintyy, puhe jatkuu ja viesti välittyy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>Itsenäisen kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Pystyy tuottamaan puhejaksoja melko tasaiseen tahtiiin, ja puheessa on vain harvoin pitempiä taukoja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B2.2</td>
<td>Toimiva itsenäinen kielitaito</td>
<td>* Osaa viestää spontaanisti, usein hyvinkin sujuvasti ja vaivattomasti satunnaisista epäröinneistä huolimatta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C1.1</td>
<td>Taitavan kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Osaa viestää sujuvasti, spontaanisti ja lähes vaivattomasti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puhumisen ops-asteikko: Teemat, tekstit ja tarkoitukset (Tehtävän suorittaminen)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1.1 Kielitaidon alkeiden hallinta</td>
<td>* Osaa vastata häntä koskeviin yksinkertaisiin kysymyksiin lyhyin lausein. Vuorovaikutus on puhekumppanin varassa, ja puhuja turvautuu ehkä äidinkieleen tai eleisiin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1.2 Kehittyvä alkeiskielitalaito</td>
<td>* Osaa viestää suppeasti joitakin välittömää tarpeita ja kysyä ja vastata henkilökohtaisia perustietoja käsittelevissä vuoropuheluissa. Tarvitsee usein puhekumppanin apua.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A1.3 Toimiva alkeiskielitalaito</td>
<td>* Osaa kertoa lyhyesti itsestään ja lähipiiristään. Selviyyty kaikkein yksinkertaisimmista vuoropuheluista ja palvelutilanteista. Tarvitsee joskus puhekumppanin apua.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A2.1 Peruskielitalaidon alku vaihe</td>
<td>* Osaa kuvata lähipiirään muutamin lyhyin lausein. Selviyyty yksinkertaisista sosiaalisista kohtaamisista ja tavallisimmista palvelutilanteista. Osaa aloittaa ja lopettaa lyhyen vuoropuhelun, mutta kykenee harvoin ylläpitämään pitempiä keskustelua.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A2.2 Kehittyvä peruskielitalaito</td>
<td>* Osaa esittää pienen, luettelomaisen kuvauksen lähipiiristään ja sen jokapäiväisiä päätä puolusta. Pystyy osallistumaan rutiniinomaisiin keskusteluihin omista tai itselleen tärkeistä asioista. Voi tarvita apua keskusteluissa ja vältellä joitakin aihepiirejä.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B2.2 Toimiva itsenäinen kielitalaito</td>
<td>* Osaa pitää valmistellun esityksen monenlaissa yleisistäkin aiheista. Pystyy tehokkaaseen sosiaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen ja ryhmien ja sosiaalisten tapahtumien vaikutteista huvittavasti tai ärsyttävästi. Kielellinen ilmaisu ei aina ole täysin tyylikkästi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C1.1 Taitavan kielitaidon perustaso</td>
<td>* Osaa pitää pitkällön, valmistellun esityksen monenlaista yleisistäkin aiheista. Pystyy tehokkaaseen sosiaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen ja ryhmien ja sosiaalisten tapahtumien vaikutteista huvittavasti tai ärsyttävästi. Kielellinen ilmaisu ei aina ole täysin tyylikkästi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HY-Talk: Vuorovaikutustaidot**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td>Pystyy kysymään ja vastaamaan yksinkertaisiin henkilökohtaisiin kysymyksiin. Osaa viestiä yksinkertaisella tavalla, mutta kommunikaatio on täysin toiston, uudelleenmuotoilun ja korjausten varassa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td>Pystyy aloittamaan, ylläpitämään ja lopettamaan yksinkertaisen, pitkähkönsä kasvokkain käytävän keskustelun aiheista, jotka ovat tuttuja tai henkilökohtaisesti kiinnostavia. Pystyy toistamaan osittain sen, mitä joku toinen on sanonut vahvistakseen, että asia on ymmärretty. Pystyy pyytämään tarkennusta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1</strong></td>
<td>Hallitsee laajan viestintärepertoarin niin, että pystyy sopivaa ilmaisua käyttämällä kytkeään omat puheenvuoronsa taitavasti muiden puheenvuoroihin halutessaan ottaa puheenvuoron tai pitää sen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2</strong></td>
<td>Pystyy viestimään helposti ja taitavasti käyttää vaivattomasti eisanalysia ja intonaation perustuvia vihjeitä. Pystyy sovittamaan oman panoksensa yhteiseen keskusteluun ja ottamaan täysin luonte vasti puheenvuoroja.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Examples in Context

The transcripts of the HY-talk data were made with the following guidelines:

- Everything (except the exceptions below) written in small letters
- Spelling: British English rules
- Speakers are marked with tags and numbered, i.e. <S1>, <S2> etc.
  - Utterance begins: <S1>
  - Utterance ends: </S1>
  - Unidentified speaker: <SU>
  - Uncertain speaker identification: <SU-1>
  - Several simultaneous speakers (usually laughter or sth): <SS>
- Uncertain transcription (replace “text” with what you hear): (text)
- unintelligible speech: (xx)
- Laughter: @@
- Spoken laughing: @text@
- Pauses
  - Brief pause while speaking 2-3 sec.: ,
  - Pause 3-4 sec.: .
  - Pause 5 sec. or longer, rounded up to the nearest sec.: <P: 05>
- Overlapping speech (approximate, shown to the nearest word, words not split by overlap tags): [text]
- Backchannelling (during another speaker’s turn):
  - <S1> this is an example <S2> mhm </S2> you know </S1>
  - at least: okay, mhm-hm, mhm, uh-huh, uh-uh, yeah
- Hesitations
  - /öö/ → er
  - /(ö)m/ → erm
  - /aal/ (surprise) → ah
- Unfinished utterances: unfinis-
- Numbers as numbers: 10,000, 1932, 16, except those smaller than 10 (two or three, the second time, etc.)
- Names of participants: <NAME S1>
- Nonsense words: <SIC> text </SIC>
- Capital letters in all well-known expressions such as: TV, AM/PM, EU, USA
- Otherwise spelling out a word or acronym as letters: T-U-C, V-W
- Reading aloud: <READING> text </READING>
- Switching into another language than English: <FOREIGN> text </FOREIGN>
- Other events that affect the interpretation or comprehension of what is being said:
  - <WHISPERING>
  - <BACKGROUND NOISE>
- Coughing, sighing, gasping, etc., if the speaker coughs etc. while speaking and this affects the situation or flow of speech (but NOT if other participants cough or sneeze, etc.):
  - <COUGH>
  - <GASP>
  - <SIGH>
1. <S2> cool erm erm hello nico i’m i’m NAME S2> erm @er@ and i live in finland so you er probably know that erm er er yeah erm i erm @@ yeah er i have five erm er well yeah no really yeah @@ er i’m 16 years old now and erm in my family there is _ i have mum NAME > and er dad NAME and i have er a brother and sister (and) er my brother is now 23 years old and my sister is now 21 years old -- </S2> 

2. <S1> [okay okay @@] well er er well i guess that the titanic was more more more mhm interesting and there were so many things to happen in that movie so the simpsons movie weren’t so interesting <S2> mhm mhm </S2> when i when i see when i tried to see those movies together </S1> <S2> okay , and the <S1> [so what] </S1> [music] of movie it wasn’t so good [but it was a] <S1> [well i think] it was funny </S1> it was a cartoon so </S2> <S1> so the music is the _ has a pretty big role in it because [there’s] </S1> <S2> [i don’t] think so </S2> <S1> yes it does </S1> <S2> n- i don’t think so what about finnish music what finnish music is good or what do you like </S2> 

3. <S2> so what would you like to do over here [do] </S2> <S3> [er] i would like er to go to a picnic </S3> <S2> ah then we could go to kaivopuisto in helsinki </S2> <S3> yeah that sounds nice </S3> <S2> yeah it’s a big park and what do you think erm do you want lot of people and friends with us or </S2> <S3> er i would like that because i want to get to know er local people </S3> <S2> ok well i’ll call my friends we can _ when do you want to have this picnic </S2> <S3> yeah er can we go by bus it would be exciting </S3> <S2> yeah sure it’s er erm it’s good that er distance is that big that is good to take a bus-bus </S3> <S2> ok </S3> erm i could call my friends so we’ll go tomorrow already </S2> <S3> yeah that sounds good </S3> 

4. <S2> so yeah well that’s good because i like to sleep a lot too </S1> good </S1> so , erm i have a chocolate box for you and for your family </S1> [nice] </S1> [because] this chocolate box is is erm is a very special thing in our country </S1> [okay] </S1> [and] it’s _ this chocolate is made only in our country </S1> [oh my god] </S1> [so i] have that and i have also little candies so i hope you like them </S2> <S1> i love chocolate and candies </S1> <S2> okay good i love too </S2> <S1> i’m gonna eat them soon </S2> good </S2> i know it </S1>
5. alright so now you can continue from where you [left] off </S1>
<S3> [so] we had some problems there and i live in espoo and it’s a small town _ a bit smaller town than helsinki it’s very near to capital of finland helsinki and we live in a quite small house it’s not a big house but it’s not tiny or anything and it has it’s there’s enough space for you to come there -- </S3>

6. yes , but if i could say what is good music in here finland i say the bands eppu normaali and stra- stratovarius they are very great </S1>
<S2> oh i have never heard of them </S2>
<S1> y- yes but i could play some songs (to them) i own them almost all records _ [albums] </S1>
<S2> [oh yes] well hey hey we’ve got to go look how much clock is </S2>
<S1> yes the bus is coming right over there , [<FINNISH> (joo) ] </S1>

7. er ok er when do you wake up in the morning </S3>
<S2> well erm you don’t have to wake up earlier than you don’t want to just you can sleep so long as you want to </S2>
<S3> ok that sounds nice </S3>
<S2> yeah and actually we can do what we want cause my mom er is a- in work so we can sleep long and _ sleep late and eat slowly breakfast </S2>
<S3> er i bought you er candies from my home country and also this plate </S3>
<S2> oh thanks oh i love those candies maltesers oh er my friend bought me maltesers when er he was in jersey oh i’m loving them actually i’m sorry that my brother is not home he likes them too </S2>

8. hi i’m <NAME S3> i’m 16 years old and i have a sister and i and we live with our mother and father my sister’s also sixteen we are twins and my father is 54 years old and my mom 48 _ 49 years old er we all speak english and little swedish and me and my sister have studied french and she speaks little german and i speak er few a litter very little italian er what languages do you speak and have you studied any language and how long </S3>

9. -- er my best friends are my classmates every- everybody of them is my best friend and i spend the summer with them by _ at the sea we swam a lot and played beach football and things like that , er . er if when you come to finland i’m i’m going to introduce your you to er the finnish sauna thank you and next <S2>
10. <S3> have you watched big brother </S3> 
<S2> eh a couple of episodes but not so much i couldn’t watch it it was terrible @@ 
</S2> 
<S3> well i hadn’t never watched the- that program and when this season started well 
there was a friend of mine so er well er a person i know and i needed to watch what 
that program is about <S2> yeah [@] </S2> [and I] watched one erm one episode 
and i was so shocked about that i just turned the TV off and i never watched big brother 
again [so i just] </S3> 
<S2> [yeah @@] it’s quite bad and absurd because er the episode i watched they were 
like erm building something with (xx) erm domino like pieces and er when sh- _ 
someone’s in the shower they would er the camera was on like seriously 24/7 and it 
was uh i would never want to go on a show like that [it were] terrible </S2> 

11. <S2> -- erm er oh my school i go in etelä-tapiola it’s like west tapiola school erm it’s 
really nice er i like it erm er i guess it’s pretty s- er pretty good school or how would i 
say it erm i was _ i was in espoo’s school and people er i i think they weren’t that 
(maturated) or how do you say it they were like (er) didn’t think much about school 
they were like we just wanna have fun and yeah i like it here people are really 
motivated and yeah -- </S2> 

12. <S1> <COUGH> hello my name is <NAME S1> and i’m sixteen year old , my family 
had two sister- little sisters and mom and dad er sisters' names are arzu and almira and 
my parents name are mira and ilari . er they like to. play football always with me cause 
we like football like every- every time <P: 09> er we got apartment and it's big . and i 
go live in vantaa ylästö it's rich place @@ and i go to martinlaakso’s lukio it's good 
place to study and in free times i play football with my friends and do everything like i 
study so much . er i think everybody are my best friends because i come _ i get used to 
everybody so it's good thing . er last summer i played my friends a lot of football and 
they could swim on the lakes . and i if someone comes to us i promise to take them to 
lapland to see the santa claus thank you </S1> 

13. <S1> okay erm so when do you wake up in the morning i mean do you like wake up at 
six A-M and go hiking or something </S1> 
<S2> @@ i like er i hate mornings early mornings ugh er but i have to _ when it it’s 
like monday and when we have school _ i have to wake in six o’clock so it’s 
[horrible but] <S1> [(oh xx)] </S1> yeah but in in (the) weekends (xx) <S1> you sleep 
</S1> yeah [i sleep a lot] </S2> 
<S2> [yeah great] because i sleep a lot too <S2> @@ </S2> erm i brought you actually 
something there’s a t-shirt and then some sweets for your whole family this is for you 
this t-shirt [it says] <S2> [oh thank you] </S2> love new york so it’s a [little cliche] 
</S1> 
<S2> [oh i’ve always wanted] something like this i’ve never been in in (the) USA 
before i’m i’m not sure if i can ever go there mhm but i will wear this always [i love 
this] <S1> [@] </S1> thank you </S2> 
<S1> oh you’re welcome </S1>
14. -- i go to etelä-tapiola upper secondary school and it’s a very nice place indeed and our teachers are fun and you you probably gonna visit it or see it at least when you come , i spend my free time my friends who are most of them are a bit younger of f- than me and you’re you’re gonna _ i’m gonna introduce you to them too er my best friend is probably sami who has lived um near me quite a long time since we were little boys and er last summer we by the way did a lot of sports and played football in court and everything er and i promise that when you come to finland we are going to visit sauna you are gonna enjoy it very much and thank you and we’ll see you soon </S3>

15. <S1> yeah let’s make a trip <S2> [yes yes] </S2> [to linnamäki] </S1> <S2> [linnamäki] and i think if we go on saturday <S1> [yeah that’s good] </S1> [i think that’s yeah] </S2> <S1> because it will be open so late and <S2> [yeah] </S2> [and it will open early] </S1> <S2> [yeah] and and if we if we go there very early in the morning so there’s it’ it’s not so crowded then </S2> <S1> yes like 11 or [it’s good] </S1> <S2> [yeah 11] is good </S2> <S1> and let’s leave outside the school because we know how to get here </S2> [yeah so we yeah] </S2> [so it’s easier] </S1> <S2> yeah we can continue our trip there </S1> yeah </S1> and i think _ i think we should ask siiri and liisa if they <S1> [yes] </S1> [would] like to come also with us </S2> <S1> yeah that would be fun </S1> <S2> yes <COUGH> so erm do you think should we go on bus or on train </S2> <S1> i think we should take a train <S2> [a train cause it’s maybe faster] </S2> [yeah it’s faster] </S1>

16. <S1> @@ , erm so what you do _ what did you like about the movie </S1> <S2> oh the simpsons movie i i loved it oh i’m i’m a huge fan of simpsons and i i did like the movie <S1> [oh that’s] </S1> [how about you] </S2> <S1> well erm it wasn’t actually my my fa- i didn’t like that so much but it was okay i don’t i don’t feel er any any special feelings for that movie </S1> <S2> okay it was quite different than south park movie because in south park movie they sweats a lot and it’s kind of funny but it was very different </S2> <S1> well i haven’t seen that maybe i should look @at it@ [someday] </S1>

17. <S1> okay well hi i’m <NAME> and er i’m 16 years old i have in my family mum dad and my little brother he is 14 i speak english and finnish of course and so do my dad and little brother but my mother speaks only finnish , well anna er what languages do you speak , or what kind of family do you have , er have you any pets i have a dog , i have _ we live in er vantaa i- in ylästö in a big house and i think it’s okay there’s many similar houses in there also i’m in martinlaakso <FOREIGN> lukio </FOREIGN> and that’s a quite big (er t- than er) it’s <FOREIGN> lukio </FOREIGN> is like a high school but er different little different -- </S1>
18.
<S2> yeah erm well what about er have you seen the first one first pirates [of the caribbean] </S2>
<S1> [yeah] i’ve seen all of them [they’re really great] </S1>
<S2> [yeah] i have too er well but i think it was _ the first one was still the better than the [(third one)] </S2>
<S1> [yeah it] it’s always like that <S2> yeah </S2> the first ones [are always (xx) (better)] <S2> [(xx) , yeah yeah] </S2> well i think well pirates of the caribbean movies are really great but then i also like you know i like actually animated movies too <S2> yeah cool </S2> (it’s really fun) look at like madagascar [(xx) they’re really funny you know] <S2> [yeah i like too] yeah </S2> some people think they’re just for children </S1>

19.
<S2> oh what a , what a big room and so nice and er i like yellow , </S2>
<S1> oh well usually my mum lives here but _ and dad of course _ but they changed the room because of you they love the yellow colour </S1>
<S2> ah where can i put my bags </S2>
<S1> there you see behind that bed , and you can (put) your beauty box (on the) bathroom </S1>

20.
<S1> well that’s weird two sisters that met in BB house that would be so weird i’ve i wouldn’t want that to happen to me [the because i] <S2> [erm i wouldn’t either] </S2> i would want to keep it private and think about it on my own and like how i’m gonna deal with it </S1>
<S2> yeah i think so too it’s a huge deal </S2>
<S1> yeah and you can’t like when you’re in the house you just need to , talk with your sister something but you can’t go to talk t- to your parents or ask what has happened or why why i don’t why they don’t know each other and </S1>
<S2> <FOREIGN> niin </FOREIGN> why didn’t they told you </S2>
<S1> yeah you’d _ they’d just have to stay in the house and i don’t know it’s it would feel probably really weird </S1>
<S2> , yeah </S2>

21.
<S2> oh what a , what a big room and so nice and er i like yellow , </S2>
<S1> oh well usually my mum lives here but and dad of course but they changed the room because of you they love the yellow colour </S1>
<S2> ah where can _ can i put my bags </S2>
<S1> there you see behind that bed , and you can (put) your beauty box (on the) bathroom </S1>
<S2> okay er when do you usually wake up mo- at in the mornings </S2>
<S1> er well usually on mondays and to fridays we wake up at seven o’clock because we have school but when it’s now it’s holidays summer we well at nine o’clock but not earlier than that </S1>
22. 
<S2> erm yes i think that we could go to suomenlinna it’s really interesting if you are interested in finland’s his- in his- in the history of finland </S2> 
<S3> yeah sure that sounds great </S3> 
<S2> erm do you want that i invite my friends too </S2> 
<S3> that would be nice i’d like to meet them </S3> 
<S2> well i’ll call some later and ask if they want to come </S2> 
<S3> okay </S3> 
<S2> erm i think that that tr- the way to suomenlinna it’s not very long but we have to ta- we have to go by train and a boat to this island and maybe we ca- we have to walk a bit also </S2> 
<S3> a boat that’s cool i’d like to see as much a- as i can _ as much as possible what do you want to see </S3> 
<S2> well in suomenlinna there are , er all kind of museum and i’m interested in that i have visited there earlier but i was about ten years old so i don’t remember very much </S2> 
<S3> okay </S3> 

23. 
<S1> yeah so i’m anna okay what a lovely room who who owned this before </S1> 
<S2> oh it’s it’s just a gust- _ a guestroom erm it’s just for guests </S2> 
<S1> er where can i put my stuff </S1> 
<S2> er there are space on the closet for your clothes and your (xx) you can put your personal hygiene products to the bathroom </S2> 
<S1> oh ha- what time we’re waking up and what are we going to do together </S1> 
<S2> er i guess we’re going to wake up around nine o’clock and then we’re just maybe going to plan what we are going to do today </S2> 

24. 
<S1> mm i don’t also think i don’t like big brother i think it’s ridiculous idea and i don’t find it interesting to watch people just , bouncing around drunken and doing stupid things and i just think it’s waste of time and the birth of a big brother baby live on TV i think(s) that’s really stupid because it it’s just not good idea </S1> 
<S2> that’s an emergency situation and i don’t think that’s very ah [sensible to do that in the] </S2> 
<S1> [i should i think that the] mother has been taken to the hospital rather than to give born- _ to give baby born in the house </S1> 
<S2> live cameras [that’s just] </S2> 
<S1> [yeah] </S1> 
<S2> blah @@ weird [@@] </S2> 

25. 
<S1> erm my name is <NAME S1> and er i have a big family i have a mother father and two sisters and a brother and erm i speak english and i have now er er i i study now also germany and er swedish and my family is erm pretty international my mom comes from france and my father comes from germany and er they we all speak those languages and erm so what languages do you speak erm , i live here in vantaa and i have a pretty small house but it’s _ it pretty cute and homey and er so what kind of house do you have erm my school my school is actually not that big i guess i erm actua- actually i have two schools but i go to the erm to the first one most of the time -- </S1>
Appendix 3: HY-talk Test Tasks

Puhetehtävät

Valmistelu 20 min + suoritus 20 min

Suorita seuraavat puhetehtävät parisii kanssa. Tutustukaa niihin ensin 20 minuutin ajan. Älkää käyttäkö apuvälineitä (sanakirjoja tms.). Muistiinpanoja voit tehdä, mutta niitä ei saa lukea suoritustilanteessa. Kukin tehtävä vie korkeintaan viisi minuuttia.

Aluksi käydään lyhyt vapaa keskustelu "syntyperäisen" puhujan kanssa.

Tehtävä 1. Esittelyvideo

Saat kesävieraaksi etäisen sukulaisnuoren (nimeltään Nico tai Anna), jonka perhe on muuttanut kohdekieliseen maahan kauan sitten, eivätkä lapset enää osaa suomea. Toimitat hänelle ensin lyhyen videokatkelman, jossa esittelet perheesi ja itsesi (sen, mitä sanot, ei tarvitse olla totta).

- Tervehdi.
- Esittele perheesi ja itsesi (nimet, iät, mitä kieliä kukin puhuu, mistä pitää tai mitä harrastaa).
- Kysy, mitä kieliä Nico/Anna puhuu ja paria muuta asiaa.
- Kerro, missä asutte ja millainen asunto teillä on.
- Kerro koulustasi.
- Kerro, miten viettät vapaa-aikaasi.
- Mainitse, ketkä ovat parhaat ystäväsi.
- Kerro, mitä teit heidän kanssaan viime kesänä.
- Lupaa jotakin Nicolle/Annalle, kun hän tulee Suomeen.
- Päätä esityksesi kohteliaasti.

Tehtävä 2. Arkitilanteita

Keskustelee parisii kanssa mahdollisimman luontevasti. Ilmaise vuorosanojen asiasisältö kohdekielellelää. Älä käänny, vaan yritä saada itsesi ymmärtelyksi omin sanoin. Jos et tiedä jotain, älä juutu vaikeaan kohtaan vaan jatka eteenpäin ja puhu mahdollisimman paljon.

Nico/Anna viipyyy luonaisi kuukauden, jonka aikana käytyte seuraavat kaksi keskustelua (numerot 2.1 ja 2.2). Vaihtakaa vuoroja niin, että kumpikin teistä on toisessa tilanteessa oma itsensä (S=sinä) ja toisessa vieraan (Nico/Anna) roolissa. Sopikaa roolijako ennen kuin alatte puhua.
2.1. Majoittuminen

N/A: Kommentoi kohteliaasti huonetta, jonka olet saanut käyttöösi.
S: Kerro kuka siinä yleensä asuu ja missä tämä henkilö nyt on.
N/A: Kysy, mihin voit laittaa tavarasi.
S: Vastaa, että kaapissa on tilaa vaatteille ja että peseytymisvälineet voi viedä kylpyhuoneeseen.
N/A: Kysy, mihin aikaan perheessä herätään amulla.
S: Vastaa ja kerro muutenkin päiväohjelmasta kesäaikaan.
N/A: Ojenna ja esittele kaksi tuliaisia, jotka olet tuonut perheelle. Kerro myös, miksi valitsit ne.
S: Kiiittele tuliaisista ja kerro, mitä aiotte tehdä niillä.

2.2 Keskustelua matkalla elokuvista kotiin

S: Kysy, mitä vieraasi pitä elokuvasta (mainitse elokuvan nimi).
N/A: Kerro mielipiteesi ja tiedustele toisen mielipidettä elokuvasta.
S: Vastaa kysymyksen ja kuvaila tunnetilaasi elokuvan jälkeen.
N/A: Vertaa elokuvaa johonkin toiseen näkemäsi elokuvaan ja perustele näkemyksesi.
S: Mainitse, mikä muu elokuva on tehnyt sinuun vaikutuksen ja miksi.
N/A: Kerro mielipiteesi elokuvan musiikista ja kysy jotain suomalaisesta musiikista.
S: Vastaa kysymyksen ja suosittele toiselle jotain suomalaista musiikia.
N/A: Äkkiä huomaat jotakin, joka yllättää sinut (mainitse mitä) ja kehotat toista kiirehtimään.
S: Reagoi tilanteeseen rauhoittavasti.

Tehtävä 3. Retkipäivästä sopiminen

Suunnittelette yhdessä retkeä johonkin suosittuun paikkaan kotiseudullasi. Sopikaa yhdessä seuraavista asioista:
• mihin retki tehdään, mihin aikaan ja mistä lähdetään
• keitä lähteet mukaan
• miten pitkä matka on ja miten se tehdään (kävellen/bussilla/pyörillä)
• mitä kumpkin haluaa tehdä ja nähdä
• missä syödään ja mitä
• miten paljon rahaa otetaan mukaan ja mihin sitä kuluu
• milloin palataan takaisin
• mitä pitää muistaa / mitä ei saa unohtaa
Tehtävä 4: Discussion

Read this and then go on to discuss reality TV with your pair.

Globetrotting controversy - BB scandals from around the world!

Sex on screen may have been okay in Holland in the first ever show, but it caused an outrage in Portugal, and the offending couple were thrown out of the house before an official investigation began (they subsequently got married).

Other countries have even weaker stomachs when it comes to on-screen behaviour. In Thailand the government considered shutting down the first series when two contestants became friendly; holding hands, hugging and cuddling on the sofa.

Viewers in the Netherlands accepted sex, but even they have limits. Authorities were not prepared to allow a pregnant housemate to give birth on screen last year.

Meanwhile, it was in Denmark that the first contestant actually became pregnant while on the show, not something that would have been allowed in the Middle East version of BB - which despite separate living quarters for men and women was abandoned due to mass protests in Bahrain at 'offensive' content.

Britain has pushed a few boundaries of its own – they’ve had the first gay winner (Brian Dowling) and the first transsexual winner (Nadia Almada). Although nudity and racism-related drama of the Celebrity BB earlier this year have caused some controversy in the press, they’ve yet to erupt in public protest, as seen in Germany, France and Greece.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP 5 BB-scandals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The first pregnancy that began in the BB-house (Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revealed only after the mother was evicted from the BB-house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The birth of a BB-baby live on TV (Holland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only the mother’s face was shown on camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BB-family drama (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sisters not aware of the existence of each other, met as contestants in the BB-house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>