


An Analysis of Lecturers' Speech Disruption on the Teaching and Learning Process

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i1.1959>

Harpen Silitonga, Kammer Sipayung, *Usman Sidabutar^{abc}

¹²³Universitas HKBP Nommensen, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: usman.sidabutar@uhn.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on speech disruption in lectures speech on the teaching and learning process, particularly in English language education through discourse classroom. The focus of this study is to reveal the types of speech disruption that occurs in discourse classroom and the functions realized in lecturers' speech through language production. The descriptive qualitative method in this study was designed with the aim at finding the types of speech disruption and the function realization of their application functions in discourse classroom. The findings show that repetitions occurred to 28.45% and revisions occurred to 28.45% as the dominant occurrences. Interjections followed 19.82%, silent pauses 12.93%, and filled pauses 10.35%. Segments of lexical, syntactic, semantic, or phonological morphological material occurred to 33% and periods of time when no phonation was performed during spoken discourse were 27%. The dominant occurrences based on the types and functions are cohesively influenced by linguistics proficiency.

Keywords: *Speech Disruption, Silent Pauses, Filled Pauses, Repetition, Interjection, Revision*

Article History:

Received 05th January 2026

Accepted 27th January 2026

Published 29th January 2026



INTRODUCTION

Research on the English language academic setting as an ESL is growing rapidly, particularly in the field of speaking. This is due to the emergence of problems and includes issues related to the quality of students expected to meet the demands of today's developing era. The problem is certainly faced by students and teachers often lead to inconsistency or a lack of confidence in discussing the topics (Wu & Halim, 2024). This is considered to be a problematic phenomenon that is more likely to be faced by students, especially those who aim at fluently speaking English without reducing the meaning conveyed during the teaching and learning process and which is categorized as proficiency as the one of the main requirements in the teaching and learning process having been graduated (Sidabutar & Tampubolon, 2024).

Discourse classroom that focuses on speaking and listening is vividly enacted to an understanding, interpretation and responses which include the ability to give and capture meaning in verbal interactions in a wider social context (Susanto, 2025). Furthermore, constructive academic design and dialogic approaches based on discourse classroom are considered empirically as to have a hierarchy that impacts to the world of teaching, especially for students who want to improve their English language competency. This constructive guide serves as a bridge for students and teachers to encourage them to explore ideas as strategies in ESL speaking that deserve to be justified in a skill that is worthy of being accepted as English in general (Baumgarten, 2016; Cloudia Ho, 2020). The rapid development of the integration of the use in technological involvement is also considered to present a better pattern in an integration of the achievement in learning and teaching English language skills. (Alghaberi, 2019; Lee & Liang, 2012)

Linguistics competency is one of them for managing the use of vocabulary, affixation and grammar, phonology involved in the disciplines carried out as a framework of language proficiency with the integration of the intended conversation context (Lie et al., 2020; Ruiz-

An Analysis of Lecturers' Speech Disruption on the Teaching and Learning Process

Madrid & Valeiras-Jurado, 2020). Similarly, this is a considerable by a speaker's competence to create a relevant context design at the time conveying some messages of ideas (Nouri, 2019). Furthermore, communicating foreign language information to listeners through speech requires communication competency skills that include cohesion, grammar, pronunciation (Kumar, 2021; Sidabutar, 2021)

The challenges in speaking are not limited to the grouping of feedback between authors and readers of scientific papers. The authentic context applied in scientific writing is considered to provide information that contains the quality of the scientific work's meaning (Rastri et al., 2023; Suhirman & Rahayu, 2021). In this case, the context in question can also be a barrier to student competency, generally caused by classroom culture and communication skills. These problematic factors also exist in several aspects, such as psychological, sociocultural, and linguistic factors (Alotumi, 2021; Mahmud, 2019; Wu & Halim, 2024). These three aspects constitute a complex way of organizing the achievements of scientific paper publications.

In line with the design, it was recently discovered that the problems that tend to be experienced by students and even teachers that can cause disruption to ESL language learning activities have really increased in the pronunciation of formal conditions and sentence grammar caused predominantly by semantic production disruption. (Duffley, 2020; No, 2012). In line with this research, Halliday, reviewing speech disruption from the functional systemic linguistics side occurs in language functions (ideational, interpersonal, textual) which are caused by social interaction and context development. With shifts in the selection of meaning and language structure used in these functions, it triggers changes in the meaning that was previously built in a person's cognition.

Researchs of language proficiency in academics envoke a challenge for researchers in exploring and resolving problems. This obstacle is due to communication difficulties reveal their own characteristics based on research findings. Language disfluency is previously focused on children or young people with autism or neurodevelopmental disabilities who were classified as having difficulty grouping words or phrases in speech production or as having impaired fluency (Disfluencies & Young, 2024; Watkins et al., 2018). Speech disfluency evaluation illustrates the need for facility control in improving language proficiency.

However, speech disfluencies are not only classified as individuals but also focus on adults, with the relevance of language proficiency to function and the reduction of filled pauses in speech disorders. (Engelhardt & Markostamou, 2025). In line with this, speech disfluency tends to be experienced by adults who show multimodal distribution in the use of fluency-oriented language literature, such as facilitative gestures at various ages, which stand out more significantly in cases and contexts (Arslan & Göksun, 2022). This perspective reveals that adults are more likely to produce more and fluent language when representing conversation topics and the context of their language cognitive functions through multimodal communication. Therefore, language disfluency also often occurs in adults through filled pauses, so it is considered a speech disruption (Linda, 2019).

Speech disruption in spoken language are often considered merely fluency issues, such as pauses or hesitations during speech delivery. However, these disruption reflect deeper cognitive processes, particularly those related to a person's language skills (Oberfeld et al., 2024; Guo LY, 2008). In the development of language teaching for students, particularly in the area of Specific Language Impairment (SLI), speech disruption can be an indicator of weaknesses in vocabulary and sentence structure. Therefore, speech disruption cannot be viewed as standalone phenomena, but rather as part of the language planning process influenced by linguistic abilities.

Speech disruption are also categorized as a description of the linguistic difficulties a person experiences when using negation and reentrants in speech. (Addlesee & Damonte, n.d.; Meier et al., 2025). Negation in sentences produced in speech impacts the structure and semantics of the sentences a person delivers, thus causing speech disruption. Furthermore, speech disruption are also thought to be influenced by multiple factors, such as sociodemographic and phonetic characteristics among language speakers. (Sassi & Costa,

2018; Chang, 2023). This study found that speech disruption are more frequently triggered by several factors, such as age of arrival and language spoken at home.

Several studies in speech disruption have been conducted, such as (Fabiola, Fernanda, (Frequency of speech disruption) analyzing speech disruption that occurs to someone when delivering a monologue speech. The study focused on how the human brain influences the frequency of oral production or acquisition of neurological stuttering (ANS) which influences what type of speech disruption is found from individuals. There were twenty participants identified in choral and solo oral reading. It was found in this study that speech disruption is more likely to occur in people with neurological disruption. Clearly, that the words delivered by someone identified as having a neurological disruption are characterized by repetition, prolongation, or blocking of sounds or syllables that are not intentional so that they disrupt the rhythm and flow of normal speech. In contrast to the research on speech disruption by (Venkatanarayana et al., 2019) which focused on examining the hypothesis of speech disruption in bilingual Kannada (L1)-English (L2) users using the Delayed Auditory Feedback theory. (DAF). This study found that DAF interference was lower in non-native languages compared to the participants' familiar native languages. The results also revealed that mismatches in sensory consequences make it difficult to transmit corrective speech to the sensorimotor system.

Based on descriptions of several previous studies, it can be concluded that speech disruption is closely related to children's language abilities. Children with SLI exhibit a distinctive pattern of speech disruptions, particularly silent pauses and pre-phrase interruptions, which reflect limitations in language planning. These disruptions do not occur randomly but are directly related to weaknesses in vocabulary and sentence structure. Therefore, speech disruptions can be used as important indicators in assessing children's language abilities. This understanding suggests that speech disruption analysis plays a significant role in linguistic studies and language education, particularly in identifying and understanding specific language disruption.

Speech disruptions can occur during spontaneous speech, including silent pauses and vocal hesitations (Guo LY, 2008; Costa et al., 2023; Kowal, O Connel & Sabin 1975). Pauses in speech with an interval of 250 ms are considered a speech impairment because cognitive function is lower than articulatory function. Therefore, Silent pauses of 250 ms or more are considered to be a sign of linguistic cognitive impairment. Furthermore, vocal hesitation is classified as filled pauses, interjections, repetitions, and revisions. Sentences constructed within a discourse refer to filled pauses in syllable vocalization but are considered nonlexical. The segments found in these vocal hesitations demonstrate that linguistic units can vary depending on the social context of the discourse applied by the speaker, depending on the topic being discussed, both ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Similarly, research by (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013).

Similarly, Systemic Functional Linguistics, from a language perspective, encompasses systems of meaning and other systems, namely systems of form and expression (Hoa & Vui, 2015; Taverniers, 2008). According to them, text is a collection of meanings expressed or encoded in words and structures (Hu, 2023; Kormos et al., 2022). Therefore, this study will discuss the types and functions of speech disruption at the adult level, especially for teachers at the higher education level. This study is expected to have novelty that has not been answered, especially in speech disruption for higher ages and have a significant impact on English language issues.

The focus of this research is speech disruption on the analysis of speech disruption in lecturers in the teaching and learning process at HKBP Nommensen University. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the types of speech disruption and classify the function of realization deployed in speech disruption based on the lecturers' speech of the English learning process in Department of HKBP Nommensen University.

METHOD

Research Design

This research was designed using qualitative descriptive with the aim of finding problems that occur in the phenomenon according to its realization based on the discourse classroom and context (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Researchers also use a directed content analysis approach to identify, validate or expand the theoretical framework conceptually and code according to the recordings obtained. Data collection was carried out descriptively to obtain data that is relational to the research problem. The data source for this research is utterances containing speech disruption from English Education lecturers who teach students in English classes at Nommensen University HKBP Medan.

Place, Time Focus of Research

This research was conducted at HKBP Nommensen University, Medan, focusing on the English Language Education Department of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. The study also focused solely on the speech delivered by selected lecturers with speech disruption. Data collection took place during lectures in September, October, and November 2025.

Data Source

The data source for this study was 835 clauses spoken by selected lecturers during their English class. All sources were transcribed from audio to text and manually verified or retyped in Ms. Word. It was found that 116 clauses that had been transcribed had speech disruption. The transcriptions obtained were recordings that had been collected and transcribed based on speech disruption. The selection of data sources like this was designed according to the relevance of the field of English language education teaching at the higher level of academic.

Research Instruments

The research instruments are in the form of observation, transcription and categorization of data based on the theory that is its construction. The Ms Word software application and the concordance program are supporting instruments in data tracing. Above all, the highest hierarchy of instruments is the quality of the researcher's own language as a step-by-step research process.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted through identification of speech disruptions. Transcribed sentences were grouped by clause and clause scope. Data collection was conducted cumulatively based on the type and function of the speech disruption.

Data Processing Techniques

Data processing consisted of three stages: determining the type of speech disruption, which includes silent pauses and vocal hesitation. In addition to type, speech disruptions were also classified based on their function. The data grouping is presented in a table according to type and function of the realization of speech disruption on the clauses.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis results showed that the language produced by the lecturer experienced disruptions during English teaching process in the discourse classroom encompasses in types and function. The researchers found the type of speech disruption in lecturers' discourse of spoken was 116 occurrences with 28.45 % occurrences as repetition, 28.45 % of revisions, 19.82 % of interjection, 12.93 % occurrences of silent pauses, 10.35 % occurrences of filled pauses.

Based on the functions, the speech disruptions were localized as to integrate the interval of silent based on the time of silent pauses which more than 25 seconds were realized by 27 %, The segment of repetition in part- word, The segment of repetition in whole- word were found as 5 %, The segment of repetition in multi- word were found as 10 %, The segment of repetition in Phrasal- word were found as 4 %, The segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material were found as 33 %, to integrate the conventional words or phrases that do not contribute information to an utterance were found as 23 %. Therefore, the segment

An Analysis of Lecturers' Speech Disruption on the Teaching and Learning Process

of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material were realized as the highest occurrence on the lecturers spoken in the classroom discourse.

Table. 1 Data Sample Based on the Type of Speech Disruption

No	Clauses	Type	Frequency
1	Well, we can see here some examples on the board	Interjection	23
2	We c...check again the pronunciation as in the brackets. Ok?	Repetition as; Part- word	5
3	Try to <i>prac__practice</i> the listening once more		
4	She is opening <i>opening the gates</i>	Repetition as; Whole- word	10
5	Or..or put in the table all the correct sentences		
6	We can see the picture the <i>picture in part One</i>	Repetition as; Multi- word	14
7	Determine the people, the <i>people culture</i> and...		
8	Analyze the text by using transitivity <i>the transitivity</i>	Repetition as; Phrasal- word	4
9	All the topics that we are discussing is a part if <i>linguistic linguistics</i>	Revision Morphological	15
10	They [<i>connect</i>] are relevant with sentences, clauses and etc,	Revision Lexical	8
11	This <i>analyzes</i> (analysis) is focused on the descriptive qualitative.	Revision Phonological	10
12	these material <i>em...em</i> can be classified into some parts...	Pauses as; filled	12
13	Ah..a. it analyzes <i>the</i> discourse correctly		
14	I <i>motivate</i> students all as well as <i>improving</i> their listening ability	Pauses as; Silent	15
15d	They <i>distinguished</i> the draft and the development		
TOTAL			116

Frequency of Process Types of Speech Disruption

The frequency of speech disruption based on the types found in lecturers' speech on learning process can be represented in the table below as follows

Table.2 Frequency and Percentage of Speech Disruption Types in Lecturers Speech

Types	Frequency	Percent (%)
Silent Pauses	15	12.93 %
Repetition	33	28.45 %
Interjection	23	19.82 %
Revision	33	28.45 %
Filled pauses	12	10.35 %
Total	116	100%

The realization of speech disruption based on its type in the discourse of lecturer conversation with students during English learning lectures in the lecture room was found to be 116 occurrences, namely 33 clauses as repetition, 33 clauses of revisions, 23 clauses of interjection, 15 occurrences of clauses in silent pauses, 12 occurrences of clauses in filled pauses. The tendency of speech disruption in lecture discourse is realized naturally which may occur due to several causes. This can be detailed by the linguistic functions experienced by the

lecturer and the conditions of the incident in the room which may also be considered as one of the causes.

The Function of Speech Disruption in Lecturers' Discourse Spoken

The results of the analysis show that the Lecturers' spoken discourse were dominantly disrupted through the segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material are more dominantly using the segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material and the periods of time when no phonation is being made during spoken discourse.

Table. 3 The Function of Speech Disruption Realization in Lecturers' Discourse Spoken

No	Function of Speech Disruption	Percentage (%)
1	periods of time when no phonation is being made during spoken discourse	27 %
2	The segment of repetition in part- word	5 %
3	The segment of repetition in whole- word	10%
4	The segment of repetition in multi- word	14%
5	The segment of repetition in Phrasal- word	4%
6	The segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material	33%
7	to integrate the conventional words or phrases that do not contribute information to an utterance	23 %
8	conventional but nonlexical one-syllable filler vocalizations	6.35 %
Total		100

The Segment of Lexical, Morphological, syntactic, semantic, and phonological material

Grammatically, the function of the word in the clause structure acts as a Noun. Meanwhile, in the incorrect clause, the function of the word before the disruption occurs acts as an adjective. Morphologically, the speaker immediately changes the word to be correct by the affixation process of adding -s to linguistics which changes the meaning of the word and its grammatical function as;

[1] *Incorrect: All the topics that we are discussing is a part of [linguistic] linguistics*

Correct: All the topics that we are discussing is a part of linguistics

In the Incorrect clause above, the use of "The segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material" indicates that clause [1] spoken by the lecturer experiences a disruption in a single lexical such as linguistic. More clearly, the speaker realizes that the function of the word spoken in the clause is incorrect so that there is a morphological revision of the lexical position targeted in the utterance of the clause. The lecturer's understanding of the correctness of words through morphology is also considered a factor that can cause speech disruption in conversational clauses in the learning process. Furthermore, the lecturer's understanding in the linguistics unit can trigger speech disruption during lectures such as in clauses [2] and [3] as;

[2] *Incorrect: They [connect] are relevant with sentences, clauses and etc.,*

Correct : They are relevant with sentences, clauses and etc.,

[3] *Incorrect: This [analyzes] analysis is focused on the descriptive qualitative.*

Correct: This analysis is focused on the descriptive qualitative

The clause [2], the lecturer's speech disruption was found through the integration of *lexical* usage that was not in accordance with the actual one so that the clause was considered lexically incorrect. In this clause, there was a revision of the word connect to be relevant which was considered the correct lexical to complete the clause to be correct. This revision was considered a pause for the speaker because speech disruption occurred when the word in the clause was realized by the speaker to be incorrect with the correct linguistic unit proficiency. In contrast to clause [3], the speaker continued the revision after the incorrect pronunciation based on *phonological function*. The speaker realized that the word should not be placed as a verb function but rather as a noun function to be analyzed. The understanding of lecturers who always follow the proficiency of linguistics sometimes experiences disturbances in speaking English for the sake of the correct clause heard by students.

Segment of Repetition as the Periods of time is being made during spoken discourse

Having examined the lecturers' spoken discourse, it was found that periods of pauses occurred in clauses uttered by the speaker. The periods of time found occurred within 25 seconds when the clause was delivered. The periods of time that occurred were realized in two types, namely silent pauses and filled pauses that caused speech disruption in the articulatory speech production process. The results of the analysis realized that the periods of time that occurred in clauses containing *em, ah..a* which were considered as filled pauses in clauses found in the middle of the clause. These pauses were categorized as articulatory sounds that did not have a grammatical function but were considered as meaning in filling the gaps in the actual word gaps in the clause. Furthermore, pauses also occurred when the speaker made a verb word at the beginning of the clause as a frame to conceptualize the verb of the second or subsequent clause. Consequently, pauses that occurred between the first and the next clause experienced silent pauses. Similarly, pauses can also occur when the verb at the beginning of the first clause is considered as a frame to conceptualize the information to be conveyed by the speaker such as clauses;

[4] *Incorrect: these material em...em can be classified into some parts...*

Correct: these material can be classified into some parts. (no pauses)

[5] *Incorrect: Ah..a. it analyzes_the discourse correctly*

Correct: it analyzes_the discourse correctly (no pauses)

In clause [5] above, it explains that the period of time occurs in the middle of the clause, namely *em...em*, after being preceded by a *noun*, namely *these material*. In this clause, filled pauses *em..em* are framed by the speaker to fill the sound gap during pauses in the clause and when conceptualizing the idea of information in front of it. Filled pauses in the clause also act as interval pauses in lexical formation according to the function and grammar in the clause. In contrast, clause [6] includes *ah..a..* as interval pauses at the beginning of the clause prior to the clearly of the forward information. Filled pauses at the beginning have a longer interval since the frame of the cognitive ideas are still being conceptualized rather than the filled pauses in the middle of the clause. Overall, the filled pauses in clauses in are designed as the negation of the central information toward which the clauses are designed. It is different with the following clauses which is designing the unifications of central information by applying silent pauses as;

[6] *Incorrect: I motivate students all as well as improving their listening ability*

Correct: I motivate students all as well as improving their listening ability (no pauses)

[7] *Incorrect: They distinguished the draft and the development*

Correct: They distinguished the draft and the development (no pauses)

In clause [6], silent pauses occur with a lower interval when placed in the middle of a clause without articulatory speech production. The pauses in the clause are related to *motivate*, which functions as a *verb* in English grammar. The word is framed as a central idea in the clause when it emphasizes the information conveyed in the next clause. However, in the clause, *silent pauses* experience a lower interval period compared to *filled pauses*. Similarly, in clause [7], silent pauses occur at the beginning of the clause or after the subject is placed, such as *they....distinguished*, which constructs the clause structure, namely the *verb* where after is preceded by the subject. The function of silent pauses in the clause is framed to ensure the selection of a more appropriate lexical unit in the completeness of the word that is preceded.

Segment of repetition in part-word, whole-word and multi-word

Speech disruption variations are also found in the lecturers' spoken discourse, involving speech disruption functioning as segment *repetition in part-word, whole-word, and multi-word*. As found in the clause, the segment is allocated as an affirmation of the word delivered is appropriate to complete the clause. Negation of words is categorized as an explanation in the framed information causing repetition in the speaker's speech in speech disruption. The pause period occurs in the clause spoken by the speaker. In the segment, repetition in part-word is

found as in clauses [8] and [9] experiencing speech disruption in monosyllables of the words *c...check* and *prac__practice* with the presence of syllable emphasis at the beginning of the word. This occurrence in these words is interpreted to convey a message of information regarding *listening* and *pronunciation* in the clause. The results of the analysis realize that repetition in part-word as in clauses [8] and [9] that occurs in the clause is categorized as articulatory sound emphasis phonologically which is considered as a deep meaning in the clause information that acts as a *verb*. Furthermore, differences in segment repetition are found in spoken discourse such as in clauses [10]. *Whole-word repetition* also occurs when the speaker makes the verb at the beginning of the clause as a frame to conceptualize the verb as an affirmation of the *noun* or information after being preceded by it, namely *verb + noun (opening the gates)* which is considered as a frame to conceptualize the information that will be conveyed by the speaker such as clauses;

[8] *Incorrect* : We *c...check* again the pronunciation as in the brackets. Ok?

Correct: We check again the pronunciation as in the brackets. Ok?

[9] *Incorrect*: Try to *prac__practice* the listening once more

Correct: Try to practice the listening once more

[10] *Incorrect*: She is opening opening the gates

Correct: She is opening the gates

Segment of Interjection as the integration of words or phrases in utterance information

The integration of word or phrases were equally found on the Lecturers' Discourse Spoken which is the framework on the the categorization of interjection as the speech disruption as the clause realization. Having analyzed the clauses as in [11], the word of *well* is emphasized to avoid silent pauses or filled pauses as in the clauses. Furthermore, the word *well*, is regarded as the negation toward the preceed information as;

[11] *Incorrect*: Well, we can see here some examples on the board

Correct: we can see here some examples on the board.

Gazing upon the clauses [11], the word *well* is vividly applied in discourse spoken as there are several meaning based on context in the class of information. In addition to the function of utterance information, word-process will conduct the quality of the information given.

Discussion

The details of the procedure involving the process-to-object category display various groups of words analyzed through lexical, morphological, syntactic, and phonological sorting through interval pauses. This *sorting* is very important in the arrangement of words in sentences implied, especially the lexical realization that functions in clauses that undergo revision when there is a change in word formation based on the speaker's cognition of linguistic units in English. In reconstruction through revision, speech disruption occurs which is considered to be a possible speaker's infuency in discourse classroom, but it is categorized as language proficiency according to the correct linguistic unit such as *linguistic* that function as adjectives are changed to *linguistics* that function as *noun*. Other reconstructions also seem to be found in spoken discourse lecturers, namely repetition of part-words, multi-words, and whole words that aim to minimize incorrect grammar and emphasize the main core in the information of the expression. For example, if a word *prac__practice* contains two syllables in pronunciation, then the speech disruption in *repetition of part-words* in the sentence can be compressed. Likewise, *whole-word and multi-word repetition* are framed by speakers as repetition processes aimed at maintaining the essence of the sentence.

Speech disruption is also found through *interjections*, which are also most common when lecturers deliver lecture material in class. This segment is considered a strategy for constructing sentences based on their social context and the genre of the lecture topic (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013). By adjusting the appropriate word and the function of linguistic units, it can create a vulnerability to speech disruption without reducing the grammatical quality and meaning of the English.

Similarly, (Guo LY, 2008; Costa et al., 2023; Kowal, O Connel & Sabin 1975) concern that students' speech disruption is predominantly based on the construction of language

competencies in their speech, beyond morphological, syntactical, and phonological processes. Speech disruption, under some assumptions, such as limitations in language production and neurolinguistic disruption, is not fully considered a characteristic of speech disruption. Furthermore, (Venkatanarayana et al., 2019) asserts that speech disruption occurs variably when first language proficiency is linked to second language production. In general, speech disruption occurs when a person's language proficiency varies in lexical and grammatical structure. In contrast, (Chen et al., 2022) asserts in their research that speech disruption is more concentrated in individuals with brain disruption or aphasia. Their research found that speech disruption, especially in children, requires improved motor control of speech.

The results of the analysis show that the realization of speech disruption in lecturers' spoken discourse indicates that the ability to understand comprehensive linguistic units tends to be affected. Competence in changing the processes of lexis, grammar, and phonology still tends to produce speech disruption in lecturers, especially in English teaching. This application is considered common for an academic in the production of English as a foreign language. Context is also considered to influence language production when realized interpersonally and ideationally. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Speakers realize that the delivery of English at the academic level, especially to students at the highest level of education, will be more careful in conveying the language. In addition, the use of meaning and grammatical function, speech disruption is more common when the application of mood in the language tends to vary in lecture topics.

CONCLUSIONS

Lecturers' Speech of discourse classroom evokes speech disruption in the English language learning process for each level. The repetition and revision are the main focus in speech disruption that is realized in lecturers' speech discourse. The segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material is the dominant occurrences in speech disruption by the lecturers' speech discourse classroom. This is implied to the influence of proficiency on linguistic units that correspond to language competence and a tendency to reveal the occurrence of speech disruption in spoken discourse problems. The data identified were projecting repetition, revisions, interjections, silent pauses and filled pauses. In addition to the types of speech disruption, there were either concluded that the realization of speech disruption occurs or the clause produced by the speaker refers to the functions as to integrate the interval of silence based on the time of silent pauses, the segment of repetition in part-word, the segment of repetition in whole-word, the segment of repetition in multi-word, the segment of repetition in phrasal-word, the segment of lexical morphological, syntactic, semantic, or phonological material. Other research trends in speech disruption are more often found and focused only on children or individuals with language motor disruption and do not focus on language competence. This study applies speech disruption to adults who have English as a foreign language competence and is designed only for an academic context. The spoken discourse studied will certainly influence the speech disruption variant. Level theory is designed and recommended as an integration in the exploration of speech disruption for different ages and academic levels. The novelty of this research is suggested as a concept for exploring speech disruption at different ages and academic levels with the aim at discovering potential speech disruption based on social and cultural contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is conveyed to Universitas HKBP Nommensen and FKIP UHN Medan for the financial support and motivation for the Internal research in 2025 which can be completed well. Furthermore, thanks are given to the support of colleagues from the English Language Education lecturers at HKBP Nommensen University Medan for their willingness to spend time in carrying out this research until the completion.

REFERENCES

- Addlesee, A., & Damonte, M. (n.d.). *Understanding Disrupted Sentences Using Underspecified Abstract Meaning Representation*. 1–5.
- Alghaberi, J. A. (2019). Methods for Teaching Speaking Skill At Tamar Schools and Their Impacts on Learners' Oral Competency. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 7(2), 39. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v7i2.1732>
- Alotumi, M. (2021). EFL college junior and senior students' self-regulated motivation for improving English speaking: A survey study. *Heliyon*, 7(4), e06664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06664>
- Arslan, B., & Göksun, T. (2022). Aging , Gesture Production , and Disfluency in Speech : A Comparison of Younger and Older Adults. 46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13098>
- Baumgarten, N. (2016). L2 English Academic Speaking Development: Insights from a Multilingual University Context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.039>
- Chen, W., Weijer, J. Van De, Qian, Q., & Zhu, S. (2022). Tone and vowel disruptions in Mandarin aphasia and apraxia of speech. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 00(00), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2022.2081611>
- Cloudia Ho, Y. Y. (2020). Communicative language teaching and English as a foreign language undergraduates' communicative competence in Tourism English. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 27(1), 100271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2020.100271>
- Costa, J. B., Ritto, A. P., & Sassi, F. C. (2023). *Analysis of cumulative risk predictors for persistent stuttering: family perception and amount of speech disruptions*. 1782(6). <https://doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20232022206en>
- Discourse In The Elt Discourse In The Elt*. (n.d.).
- Disfluencies in spontaneous speech in easy and adverse communicative situations : The effect of age*. (2019). DiSS.
- Disfluencies, S., & Young, I. N. A. (2024). *Speech disfluencies in autistic young adults and controls*.
- Duffley, P. (2020). Clause Structure, Complements, and Adjuncts. *The Oxford Handbook of English Grammar*, February, 358–374. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198755104.013.9>
- Engelhardt, P. E., & Markostamou, I. (2025). Disfluency across the lifespan : an individual differences investigation. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 32(1), 93–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2024.2354958>
- Halliday, M. A. ., & Matthiessen, M. I. . (2014). *Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar 4th Edition*.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2013). Halliday's introduction to functional grammar: Fourth edition. In *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar: Fourth Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269>
- Hoa, P. Van, & Vui, N. Van. (2015). *Applying grammatical metaphor to academic writing*. 1(12), 105–108.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Hu, Z. (2023). *Halliday Model of Grammatical Metaphor* (Z. Hu (Ed.); pp. 161–175). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-3852-0_16
- Kormos, J., Suzuki, S., & Eguchi, M. (2022). The role of input modality and vocabulary knowledge in alignment in reading-to-speaking tasks. *System*, 108(April 2021), 102854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102854>
- Kumar, T. (2021). The impact of written visual materials in the development of speaking skills in English language among secondary level students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 1086–1095. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.76>
- Lee, Y. J., & Liang, J.-C. (2012). Using Video Technology to Diagnose EFL Students' Cognitive Learning Difficulties in Public Speaking. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 64, 671–

An Analysis of Lecturers' Speech Disruption on the Teaching and Learning Process

680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.079>

- Lie, A., Tamah, S. M., Gozali, I., Triwidayati, K. R., Utami, T. S. D., & Jemadi, F. (2020). Secondary School Language Teachers' Online Learning Engagement During the Covid-19 Pandemic in Indonesia. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 19, 803–832. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4626>
- Mahmud, Y. S. (2019). the Representation of Local Culture in Indonesian Efl Textbooks: Rationales and Implications. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 61. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v5i2.1727>
- Meier, A., Grinde, S., Johansson, S., Karlsson, J., Nordgren, G., Olsson, R., Rocksten, F., Sandsten, M., & Ingrid, S. (2025). *Stuttering: the nature of the speech disruptions – a multimodal study of articulation and phonation*. September. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2025.1623308>
- No, A. (2012). *Cognition and Neurosciences Disruption of writing processes by the semanticity of background speech*. 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00936.x>
- Nouri, J. (2019). Students Multimodal Literacy and Design of Learning During Self-Studies in Higher Education. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 24(4), 683–698. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-018-9360-5>
- Oberfeld, D., Staab, K., Kattner, F., & Ellermeier, W. (2024). *Is Recognition of Speech in Noise Related to Memory Disruption Caused by Irrelevant Sound?* <https://doi.org/10.1177/23312165241262517>
- Rastri, A., Rezeki, Y. S., Salam, U., Riyanti, D., & Surmiyati, S. (2023). An Analysis of Students' Problems in Writing a Research Proposal. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 5(1), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v5i1.3479>
- Ruiz-Madrid, N., & Valeiras-Jurado, J. (2020). Developing multimodal communicative competence in emerging academic and professional genres. *International Journal of English Studies*, 20(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.401481>
- Sassi, F. C., & Costa, J. B. (2018). *Frequency of speech disruptions in Parkinson ' s Disease and developmental stuttering : A comparison among speech tasks*. 1–12.
- Sidabutar, U. (2021). *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Students ' Perception toward English Speaking Motivatio n during Online Learning System through Multimodal Approach*. 3(6), 4014–4024.
- Sidabutar, U., & Tampubolon, S. (2024). *Students ' Performance in Cultural Text Writing Based on Situational Context and Cohesive Devices : A case study of Discourse Analysis*. 10(1), 1091–1100.
- Suhirman, L., & Rahayu, B. (2021). Empowering EFL Teachers for Scientific Writing in PPG Workshop: Writing Classroom Action Research Proposal. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 6(2), 473. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i2.414>
- Taverniers, M. (2008). Interpersonal grammatical metaphor as double scoping and double grounding. *Word*, 59(1–2), 83–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2008.11432582>
- Venkatarayana, B., Mahesh, M., Siddaraju, K., & Prathibha, A. (2019). *Language Familiarity Hypothesis and Delayed Auditory Feedback : A Study on Speech Disruptions in Typical Kannada (L1) -English (L2) Bilinguals*. 0917(1), 154–171.
- Watkins, K. E., Chesters, J., & Mo, R. (2018). *Transcranial direct current stimulation over left inferior frontal cortex improves speech fluency in adults who stutter*. 1161–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy011>
- Wu, L., & Halim, H. B. A. (2024). Task complexity and foreign language writing emotions as predictors of EFL writing performance. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(March). <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1323843>