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1. Research question
- 3 groups: Native, Near-Native and Late Signers
- Several linguistic criteria involved in (Dis)Fluency ⇒ Different behaviour according to language background?

2. Background
- Impact of a delayed L1 Acquisition at the level of Proficiency and Comprehension (Maybery 1991)
- Lack of studies at the level of Fluency and Production

3. Theoretical framework
- Componential approach of (Dis)Fluency (Götz, 2013)
  - Combination of measurable markers (fluencemes)
  - Not only interruptions of the flow of speech, hesitations
  - But also strategies to manage the discourse

4. Methodology
- 3.1) Data selection on extra-linguistic criteria
  - 4 min/signer of unprepared semi-interactive discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deaf signsers of LSFB</th>
<th>4 Native</th>
<th>4 Near-Native</th>
<th>4 Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents status</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of LSFB acquisition</td>
<td>From birth</td>
<td>Before 6</td>
<td>After 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>With Deafs</td>
<td>With Deafs</td>
<td>With Hearings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2) Annotation of linguistic criteria in ELAN
- Markers of (dis)fluency (fluencemes):
  - Palm-ups
  - Stops of the hands between signs
  - Word search gestures
  - Truncations
  - Gaze directions
  - Co-occurring non-manuals

4.3) Data analysis in Excel and SPSS
- Speed and use of both hands
- Frequency and Ratio of fluencemes
- Mean comparison and correlation

5. Results
- Different articulation strategies
  - Track: activation of one or two hands

6. Summary
- No distinction in the frequency of linguistic criteria involved in (Dis)Fluency between signers with different language background ⇒ That is for palm-ups, stops between signs, word search gestures, and floating gazes
- Except for rate of articulation: Native Signers (LSFB from birth) faster versus Near-Native/Late Signers (delayed LSFB) slower ⇒ And therefore, for the number of hands involved and the number of addressed/spatialized gazes (positive correlation p<0.05)

7. Discussion
- Relative impact of L1 delayed acquisition on Production and Fluency
- Acquisition of some markers of (dis)fluency locked in time
- Acquisition of some other markers of (dis)fluency achieved at any time

8. Further issues
- Holds of hands
- Repeated signs
- Phonological economy (Parisot & Villeneuve 2007) • Combinations of fluencemes • Functions of fluencemes • Additional signers
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Proficiency and Comprehension (Mayberry 1991)

That is for palm

Two hands One hand

Neutral On the body Crossed

Waving Back Clapping Rubbing Flying index

Signs articulated with one hand

Gaze directions (Meurant 2008)

Addressed Spatialized_1 Spatialized_2 Floating

Why?

No influence of above fluencemes
No influence of break time

Maybe different articulation strategies

⇒ Track: activation of one or two hands