

Different Representational Components in Speech Production Planning in Different Languages: Evidence from Slips of the Tongue in Korean and English.

Most speech production planning (hereafter SPP) models have been developed based on data collected from Germanic-language monolingual speakers (Fromkin 1973, Garrett 1984, Levelt 1989, Jaeger 2007). In recent studies looking at monolingual speech errors (hereafter MSOT) made by speakers of non-Germanic languages (Wan 1999, Wells-Jensen 1999, Muansuwan 2000, Kawachi 2002), it has been argued that SPP model needs to be expanded from sets of speech errors in typologically distant languages.

In the present study I compared naturalistically collected two sets of data: 1030 Korean monolingual speech errors (hereafter KMSOTs) made by Korean monolingual speakers to 713 English monolingual speech errors (hereafter EMSOTs) made by English monolingual speakers.

As a result, I found that KMSOTs and EMSOTs were similar in most ways, but the following differences were found: 1) in terms of directionality of errors, the ratio of anticipations to perseverations was different. In EMSOTs, anticipatory errors occurred more than twice as often as perseveratory errors, and the anticipations occurred much more often than in KMSOTs; 2) phonological errors involving vowels occurred more frequently in KMSOTs than in EMSOTs; 3) there were more feature errors in KMSOTs than in EMSOTs due to the fact that most of these errors involved a violation of the voicing feature of an obstruent; 4) in terms of internal syllable structure, the body/coda structure was favored over the onset/rhyme structure in KMSOTs, whereas the onset/rhyme structure was dominantly involved in EMSOTs; 5) the lack of the lexical categories of adjective in KMSOTs affected the number of lexical category errors; 6) a higher proportion of phonologically related words was found in EMSOTs.

Universal factors suggest that one of the most important functions of processing mechanism is to keep the syntagmatic structure of the planned utterance intact, and yet the erroneous utterances usually preserved most of the intended propositional content. These universals seem to be something that the processing components are highly sensitive to regardless of languages.

The differences between errors made in Korean vs. English would be attributed to differences in the language structures stored in the representational components for each of the languages: prominent prosody on new information influences the directionality of errors. New information which receives prosodic prominence in English is most often the sources of errors, and thus it facilitates anticipatory errors, whereas in Korean, there is no prominent prosody on new information, thus anticipations and perseverations would be affected equally in Korean; prosodic errors involving lexical stress only occurred in English, and the fact that vowel carry important information about lexical stress in English could have made vowel errors less common in English than in Korean; for the 6th difference, it may be partially due to prosodic factors which cause phonological similarity between words in English, in particular lexical stress, but not Korean. It may also be related to the lexical representation of morphological structure in derived words, which seems to be a factor in English malapropisms. These findings could be applied to a SPP model in the context of what a SPP model would have to be like to account for these findings.