Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Zlepšování percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce

Improving perceptual skills of second language learners

(bakalářská diplomová práce)

Autor: Albert Černý
Vedoucí práce: Václav Jonáš Podlipský, Ph.D.
Olomouc 2011

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl úplný seznam použité a citované literatury.

V Olomouci dne 19. května 2011 .....

I would like to thank Václav Jonáš Podlipský, Ph.D. for his incredible help and enthusiasm about my thesis.

I would also like to thank all of the 19 students from the Department of British and American Studies at the Palacký University in Olomouc who kindly took part in the experiment.

I would like to thank Jana Jiroutová, my fellow Translation and Interpreting student at Palacký University for her assistance with the rather time-consuming process of data analysis.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Theoretical Background

In this paper, I shall investigate improving perceptual skills of second language learners. The issue of second language (L2) acquisition is related to speech perception, to the concept of foreign accent and even more so to the concept of "perceptual foreign accent". From the viewpoint of a student of translation and interpreting from and into English, I find the topic of the present study important for these two reasons: First of all, speech perception plays a major role in interpreting. Being able to understand L2 speech is crucial for consecutive and especially for simultaneous interpreting, during which there is practically no time for analyzing the L2 input that the interpreter continually receives. Second, the present study involved subtitles translation (see end of section 2.1. and Appendices 2 and 3). In the literature review to follow, I rely heavily on these two sources: Sebastián-Gallés (2005; section 1.1 of the present paper) and Højen (2003; sections 1.1.1 -1.1.3. of the present paper). Most research papers referred to in these sections are references adopted from these two authors (they are listed separately in the reference list, section 5.2.).

What is actually meant by speech perception? Simply put, it is the process which enables a listener to extract meaningful words from an acoustic wave (Sebastián-Gallés, 2005: 547). The field of cross-language speech perception studies the perceptual consequences of what happens when the listener hears a foreign language, while the field of L2 speech perception explores perception of one's second language (Sebastián-Gallés, 2005: 547).

Before examining the abovementioned issues more closely, let me define a few basic terms which will be used throughout the present paper. L1 is the first language, the mother tongue or native language. L2 is the second language, target language or simply the language that a learner is acquiring. In learning and perceiving L2, both languages interfere. It can be helpful when L1 and L2 are similar in a particular respect – this is called "positive transfer". When the languages differ in a particular respect and the L1 grammar is applied to L2, it is called "L1 interference" or "negative transfer", which is harmful for L2 acquisition. As Trubetzkoy (1969) put it, "The sounds of the foreign language receive an incorrect phonological interpretation since they are strained through the 'phonological sieve' of one's own mother tongue." Therefore, the listener is provided with distorted phonetic data.

But what are the units of speech perception? This intriguing question was asked by Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 552) and she offered a number of possible answers. It is hardly the phoneme because, as she explains, a phoneme is realized differently depending on the

phonemes surrounding it. It seems more logical to speak of syllables as most languages would divide the same word in a fairly similar way. Yet, when Otake and colleagues (1993) asked Japanese and English speakers to count the syllables of an identical word, conflicting numbers were found. Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 553) wrote that Otake's study (1993) suggested that "languages can be sorted in terms of their rhythm and that this dimension has important consequences for the way languages are perceived."

As Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 554) argues, the rhythm of languages is very important, too. On the basis of many studies (e.g. Bahrick & Pickens, 1998), she claims that human newborns can tell the difference between e.g. Japanese and English but not between Dutch and English. The reason for this is that the latter two belong to the same group – Pike (1945) suggested that languages can be sorted into syllable-timed and stress-timed languages, which is the case of Dutch and English. Interestingly, these early abilities of distinguishing languages with a different rhythm pattern may have an impact on the way the L2 is acquired later in life (Sebastián-Gallés, 2005: 554).

Another ability that people have at an early age is being able to tell whether a sequence of sounds could be a word in their native language. This is called phonotactics and it also influences L2 perception to a great extent. Speaking of L1, let us say that a frequent consonant cluster at the beginning of a word is called "legal" (as is the case of /tr/ in English). On the other hand, "illegal" consonant clusters cannot be found in that position (like /tl/ in English). Many studies (e.g. Massaro & Cohen, 1983; Hallé et al., 1998) have found the tendency of L1 listeners to perceptually replace illegal consonant clusters by legal ones. By extending this tendency to L2 speech perception, the listeners fail to hear the correct words and what is more, they are often misunderstood when they repeat what they thought they heard.

Generally, the field of study of L2 perception has been mostly looked into on a rather detailed basis. As Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 546) puts it, "most studies have dealt with the perception of segments (vowels and consonants). (...) But there is much more to the field of speech perception that depends on the phonological properties of the native language (or first language, L1) than just the perception of phonetic segments." Indeed, a lot of research has been done for instance on the pronunciation and perception of /r/ and /l/ by Japanese learners of English (e.g. Hirata, 2007), on VOT values (e.g. Thornburgh & Ryalls, 1998) and on vowel duration and consonant voicing of English language learners from around the world (e.g.

Broersma, 2010). The present study would like to look at the issue from a broader perspective.

It should also be noted that a lot of research exploring the neural-sensory representations of speech has more recently been carried out. According to Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 549), the electrophysiological measuring of the Mismatch Negativity response (MMN), a specific neural response of the brain to stimulation, is a useful tool. Such a response occurs when a series of identical sounding stimuli is interrupted by a different one called "the deviant". She believes that MMN provides data on a rather abstract level of L2 processing.

Speaking more broadly, people involved in this field of study have been trying to find factors leading to improvement of L2 perception skills. L2 speech perception models like the Perceptual Assimilation Model (PAM) and the Speech Learning Model (SLM) have been developed. Since this paper focuses on improving L2 perception skills, in the subsequent sections, I will discuss some of the factors known to bring about such improvement. Højen (2003) reviewed research studies that tried to identify factors leading to improvement of L2 perception skills. They are the age of onset of learning (AOL), length of residence/experience (LOR), L1 use, and gender. In sections 1.1.1-1.1.4, I draw heavily on Hojen's (2003) paper.

1.1.1 Age of onset of learning

According to Højen (2003), the age of onset of learning (AOL) is the age of first exposure to L2 which is most often exchangeable with the age of arrival into the L2 speaking country. Also, the earlier one arrives, the better for acquiring the L2. Højen (2003) gives an overview of literature (e.g. Johnson & Newport, 1989; Lenneberg, 1967; Long, 1990; Scovel, 1969) that hypothesized that the brain loses its plasticity after puberty, although the existence of such a critical period has been put into question by many other studies. The so called AOL effect could be equally due to the fact that with increasing age the L1 phonetic system develops, its categories are sharpened and "become more likely to assimilate L2 speech sounds" (Flege et al, 1999).

The proponents of the critical period suggest that if AOL is low enough, L2 learners may acquire an L2 without a foreign accent. Although the main focus of the present paper is on speech *perception* rather than production, it may be that foreign accent is caused by foreign perception or a "perceptual foreign accent". As Højen (2003; 66) notes, "A number of

studies support the assumption of the Speech Learning Model that inaccurate L2 speech production is caused by inaccurate perception."

1.1.2 Length of residence

Another factor leading to improvement of L2 perception skills is length of residence (LOR) which is defined as the amount of time spent (and by extension then, the amount of L2 experience received) in an L2 speaking country. According to Højen (2003: 30), many studies have found the LOR effect and fewer have not. Even though he found no studies where there was no perceived (global) foreign accent in adult learners of English, some have shown that it is possible for late learners to produce speech that receives the ratings of native speakers (Bongaerts, 1999; Bongaerts et al., 1997). More interestingly, a study by Flege and colleagues (1996) showed that adults learned to perceive an L2 contrast which did not map onto their L1 phonetic system. Højen (2003) concludes that no matter how much time learners spend in the L2 speaking country, for the LOR effect to occur, it is crucial that they "receive a substantial amount of native-speaker input".

1.1.3 How L1 use relates to L2 speech perception models

As mentioned above, the first and the second language may interfere. Now, I would like to look at the degree to which using L1 affects L2 and vice versa. Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 547) mentions three types of perceptual problems L2 learners may encounter. First, they may ignore the contrasting information and regard two distinct L2 sounds as one which is referred to as "deafness". Second, they may perceptually create additional information not present in the actual L2 sound. This is for instance often the case of Spanish learners of English who tend to insert a vowel before words beginning with /s/ and a consonant (e.g. the word *string* becomes *estring*). Third, non-existent (or illegal) consonant clusters in the learners' native language may be transformed to fit their L1 phonetic inventory. Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 547) calls these phenomena "illusions".

The Speech Learning Model developed by Flege and described by Højen (2003) claims that the reason why L2 speech sounds are perceived inaccurately is the assimilation of the L2 sounds by the L1 phonetic categories of the learner. The model claims that L1 and L2 phonetic systems interact and that foreign accent is caused by inaccurate perception and representation of the L2 speech sounds. (For more details on SLM, see below in this section.) Similarly, the Perceptual Assimilation Model (PAM) (e.g. Best, 1995) claims that the L1

structure influences "the way non-native phonemic systems are perceived" (Sebastián-Gallés, 2005: 548).

The present study argues that watching a video in the L2 with subtitles in the L1 hinders L2 perception. This is consistent with both PAM and the SLM which claims that "L1 use has been shown to affect the degree of foreign accent and also affects the accuracy with which L2 speech sounds are perceived and produced" (Højen, 2003: 53).

In studies mentioned by Højen (2003), "high-use learners" use the L1 roughly 30% of the time or more. It was shown that foreign accent ratings of low-use learners who arrived early into the English-speaking country are the best, while ratings of high-use learners arriving late are the worst (Guion et al., 2000; Flege et al., 1997). As far as the effects of L1 use on L2 perception are concerned, the study of MacKay (2001) found that only high-use learners arriving late into the English-speaking country differed from the native-speakers (in the identification of English stops) while L2 perception abilities of both low- and high-use learners arriving at an early age were found to be as good as those of the native-speakers (MacKay, 2001).

The Speech Learning Model (SLM) takes AOL, L1 use and the differences between the two phonetic systems into account (Flege, 1995: 239). Unlike the Critical Period Hypothesis, the SLM postulates that "the mechanisms and processes, used in learning the L1 sound system remain intact after acquisition of the L1 and can be applied to the learning of the L2 sound system" (Højen, 2003: 50). Therefore, the processing of the L1 and L2 sounds happens in a "common phonological space" and learners must distinguish the contrasts between different L1 and L2 speech sounds themselves (see Højen, 2003: 50). The question remains, however, what is being perceived as a *different* speech sound from the ones already present in the L1 phonetic inventory.

As Højen (2003: 50) notes, the notion of "new sound" as the L2 speech sound which lacks a counterpart in the L1 was abandoned by Flege (1995) who suggested that dissimilarity to the closest L1 sound and AOL both play a part in establishing a new L2 category. For example, for a relatively dissimilar L2 sound, "learners might be able to form a new category even if their AOL is 20 years," (Højen, 2003: 50) and especially if their L1 use is low. Moreover, for an extremely dissimilar L2 sound, they should be able to create a new category no matter what the AOL is and no matter how high their L1 use is (see Højen, 2003: 50-52 for more details).

Visibly, the SLM works with age-related factors other than the maturation of the brain. On the contrary, the proponents of the Critical Period Hypothesis would agree that AOL

influences L2 performance only up to the age of 12 years – until puberty (Højen, 2003: 53). Contrastively, a study by Flege et al. (1999) found that AOL influences L2 performance even after the age of 12 (see Højen, 2003: 53), which was in tune with the SLM claiming that "there is no critical period for L2 speech learning. (Højen, 2003: 57)" To explain why the age of arrival so frequently influences L2 performance, the SLM provides two reasons. First, it is because the amount and quality of L2 input the adults receive differs from the one that children are provided with. Second, it is because the L1 phonetic system continues to develop throughout the life span and has increasingly tends to assimilate L2 sounds to L1 categories (Højen, 2003: 58).

1.1.4 Gender

Men and women differ in perceiving and producing speech sounds. Some studies on speech perception and production have found further evidence of the fact. Yet, it must be said that gender has been treated as a rather secondary variable compared to L1 use and AOL. As Højen (2003) writes, "Flege et al. (1995) reported that the effect of gender interacted with the AOL variable." When women arrive in the L2 speaking country at a young age, they tend to fare better in the perceived foreign accent ratings than men. This changes as soon as the age of arrival rises – higher AOL makes men receive better foreign accent ratings. Flege and colleagues (1995) speculated that it is because women who arrive late in the L2 speaking country often have to stay at home and take care of children while men go to work where they receive substantially more L2 input. All in all, a number of studies failed to find the gender effect on L2 performance (see Hojen, 2003: 49).

Højen (2003) noticed an interesting finding related to the fact that the way men and women produce speech sounds may differ anatomically: "Ryalls et al. (1997) found that women had longer VOTs in all English stop consonants than men did." This made Højen (2003) speculate that men could have an advantage of learning languages with shorter VOTs. I believe that Czech, with its shorter VOT norms, is a language it could be applied to as well. Therefore, theoretically, it should be easier for English-speaking men to learn Czech stops than for English-speaking women. From the perspective of L2 perception which the present paper focuses on, it would mean that understanding English female speech is harder for Czechs than understanding English male speech, because of a bigger VOT difference. The problem with this assumption is that if the trend is similar in all languages, listeners might already be accustomed to perceiving the other gender differently and compensate for it the

way they probably compensate for the higher formant frequencies of female speech (speaker normalization).

1.1.5 Speech Perception Training

Phoneticians have paid less attention to speech perception training than to speech perception learning (described above). Here, two questions arise: First, what is the point of speech perception training? Second, how can one define successful training method? According to Lively and Pisoni (1994), successful second- or foreign-language perception training results in developing new perceptual categories for nonnative phonemic contrasts. Yet, I would like to say that developing usable nonnative phonetic categories takes time. In the case of Logan et al.'s (1991) study, Japanese subjects needed 2500 trials before improvement in the /r-l/ identification could be seen.

It is not easy to determine which training methods are most effective. Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 560) compared two different ones. One includes a high variability both in speakers and stimuli (e.g. Logan, Lively & Pisoni, 1991), while the other works with unreal, good, synthetic stimuli which the participants are able to categorize correctly at first while later the difficulty is slowly increased (e.g. McCandliss et al., 2002). However different these two training methods may seem, Sebastián-Gallés (2005: 560) claims that the resulting performance levels have largely been very similar. On the contrary, a number of studies suggest that using synthetic stimuli for speech perception training is less effective (e.g. Logan et al., 1991). These studies investigate the ability of Japanese adults to learn the English /r/-/l/ contrast. I shall discuss some of them in more detail below.

Much research on L2 speech perception training has been focused on Japanese adults learning the English /r/-/l/ contrast. Most of all, it is because it is exceptionally hard. As Iverson and colleagues (2005: 3267) put it, "Best and Strange (1992) hypothesised that the English /r/-/l/ distinction is particularly hard for Japanese adults because they are both assimilated into a single Japanese /r/ category." When adults are learning a second language, they "must learn to attend selectively the acoustic dimensions that cue specific phonetic categories in the new language" (Logan et al., 1991: 882). Japanese adults are too sensitive to acoustic cues that are not helpful for English /r/-/l/ categorization (Iverson et al., 2005). In other words, they pay attention to the marginal signals. The role of selective attention in perceptual learning has been an issue present in all of the four studies I rely on here (Iverson et al., 2005; Lively & Pisoni, 1994; Lively et al., 1993; Logan et al., 1991).

Nosofsky (1986, 1987) claims that while listeners are acquiring a new category their perceptual space is "shrunk" or "stretched" by selective attention (Logan et al., 1991: 874). As was already mentioned above (see 1.1.3), learners may or may not establish a new phonetic category when they hear a new L2 sound. The stretching of the listener's perceptual space makes the L2 item less similar to the existing L1 category. The shrinking makes the new item fit better into the already existing L1 inventory. So, when a Czech listener is confronted with the English fricative present in /θ/ *thigh*, his perceptual space may shrink to fit the new sound into the existing /s/ category. Selective attention weights are thought to be modified during training (Lively and Pisoni, 1994: 2085) which may be the key feature of successful speech perception training method.

There are further factors which influence the effectiveness of speech perception training. High Variability Phonetic Training (Logan et al., 1991), as described by Iverson and colleagues (2005), works with natural speech stimuli by multiple talkers and phonemes in different phonetic contexts. The listeners identify the sounds they hear and are immediately given feedback. To illustrate the importance of high variability, Logan and colleagues (1991) write about a study by Strange and Dittmann (1984). In the study, improvement in discrimination of the synthetic stimuli was found during training, but was not found later on in the post-test where natural speech stimuli were used instead. Visibly, this training method failed to generalize to naturally produced, real words. What is it that makes natural speech more suitable for training than synthetic stimuli? Logan and colleagues (1991) argue that training with synthetic speech provides subjects with insufficient and misleading information about the cues for the new phonetic categories they are trying to acquire. This is probably the reason why Strange and Dittmann's (1984) participants failed to identify /r/ and /l/ in real speech after listening to synthetic stimuli during training. Listeners need to learn to cope with the variability that arises between and within speakers for the following reasons (Logan et al., 1991: 876): First, the sizes and shapes of the different speakers' vocal tracts vary. Second, their vocal chords function differently. Third, each speaker is influenced by dialect and finally, some may speak faster than others. With multiple talkers, listeners store talker specific information in their minds, which provides them with the variability needed for the nonnative contrasts to be acquired. Training with a single speaker offers no such benefits.

The present paper would like to investigate a more general and practical way of improving perceptual skills through training. The effects of watching subtitled foreign-

language video material shall be discussed. More precisely, listeners will be confronted with regionally-accented variant of English known as Cockney.

1.1.6 Pronunciation features of Cockney (Estuary English)

The regional accent concerned in the present experiment is Cockney or, in other words, Estuary English spoken in London. In this section, I would like to describe the key features of the accent. Here, I rely heavily on Accents of English 2: The British Isles (Wells, 1982). Cockney is spoken in East London and its speakers are famous for having developed an extensive rhyming slang. This, however, is of little importance to the present study. It is the phonological oddities of Cockney which I am concerned with. The aim of the present experiment is to show whether listeners can adapt to a previously unknown accent after receiving some accented L2 input (not whether they can remember a number of rhyming collocations and their meanings). Therefore, rhyming slang was not present in the training and testing material (see Methods). In his well-acclaimed book on accents of English in Britain, Wells (1982: 302) writes about the pronunciation of Cockney: "Its most striking phonetic characteristics are undoubtedly the noticeably shifted diphthongs and the extensive use of the glottal stop, as [ˈwʌɪʔɐ] *waiter*." Except from these two characteristics, I would like to mention /l/ vocalization and the so called "TH Fronting".

1.1.6.1 The Diphthong Shift

Perhaps the most prominent feature of Cockney is the diphthong shift. According to Wells (1982: 306), G. B. Shaw referred to the phenomenon in his play Pygmalion by representing the alphabet as "I, Ber-ee, Ser-ee, Der-ee, Er-ee..." For instance, the word *fleece* is pronounced as [fləis] instead. Next, the most Cockney-flavoured starting point of the diphthong in *goose* would be [ə] and the realization of the diphthong would be similar to that of RP /əu/. As Wells (1982) puts it, "Hence, Cockney *soup* may sound identical to RP *soap* when both are pronounced [səup] (Gimson 1980: §7.25)." The RP pronunciation of *face* is /eɪ/, while the first element of the vowel spoken in London is opener and more central written as /ʌɪ /. "Cockney /ʌɪ / overlaps with RP /aɪ/ so that Cockney *paint* may sound identical to RP *pint* (Wells, 1982: 307)." The starting point of the vowel in *price* is backer than in RP and in "dialectal" Cockney, it may even be rounded (Wells, 1982: 307). Next, the starting point of the vowel in *choice* is closer than in RP, therefore [oɪ] in Cockney. The broadest Cockney variant of *goat* is close to /au/, so the words *phone* and *home* are

pronounced as /fʌun/ and / hʌum/. Finally, a true Cockney speaker, like the ones in the exposure material, would use a monophthong in *mouth* and *about* pronouncing it as [mæ:f] and [ə'bæʔ]. Please refer to section 3.2 below for evidence of the diphthong shift reported in the answers submitted by the participants in the present study.

1.1.6.2 Glottaling of /t/ and /h/

Preglottaling and glottaling of /t/ in final position is very common in British English in general. So, when *pot* is pronounced as [pɒʔt] or even as [pɒʔ], it is not so surprising. More controversially, however, the speakers of Cockney tend to glottalize /t/ in the middle of words. As Wells (1982: 324) notes, "A bare [ʔ] as the realization of word-internal intervocalic /t/ is one of the most stereotyped characteristics of Cockney, as [bʌʔə]." Words pronounced this way are fairly hard to understand. Glottaling of other stops and fricatives inside of words such as /p, k/ or /f, v, θ, ð/ may also occur, although it not so common. More frequently, one may encounter glottaling of /h/ in the word-initial position in words like *Harry*, *harm* or *have* pronounced as [ʔæɹəi], [ʔɑ:m] and [ʔæv].

1.1.6.3 Other features of Cockney

As Wells puts it (1982: 313), /l/ is very susceptible to vocalization in syllable-final position resulting in a close back vocoid [o] or [u], hence the pronunciation of [fɪo̯] *fill*, [fɪo̯d] *field*, [fɔu̯] *fall* and ['pʰɪipo] *people*. Finally, pronunciation of /θ/ and /ð/ as /f/ and /v/ respectively is called TH Fronting (Wells, 1982: 328) and results in *thinking* pronounced as [fɪŋkɪn] and the word *other* pronounced as [ʌvə]. Both of these phenomena were very frequent in the exposure material. They are dealt with in more detail in section 3.2.

1.2 The Current Issue

As was mentioned above, improving speech perception is closely related to L1 use (Højen, 2003). The present study speaks to the many ways of training L2 speech perception by offering a more general, less academic, every-day method – watching foreign-language films with matching subtitles. I intend to find out whether the findings of a study by Mitterer and McQueen (2009). They argue that foreign subtitles help perceiving a foreign language as they indicate "which words (and hence sounds) are being spoken" (Mitterer and McQueen, 2009). However obvious this statement may seem, the authors claim that little research has been carried out in the area.

Previous research, as they say, mostly focused on plot memory, grammar and vocabulary learning. They have found only one study dealing with subtitles and phonological processing (Bird and Williams, 2002) which reported small benefits of using non-native subtitles. Mitterer and McQueen (2009) focus on lexically-guided perceptual learning in a foreign language. They explain that "listeners may be able to retune speech sound categories based on their knowledge about how foreign words ought to sound". They address the issue by providing speakers of L1 with regionally-accented L2 input.

Their experiment was carried out with Dutch participants fluent in English. The participants watched subtitled video material of a previously unknown, accented variant of English. By watching a 25-minute version of a film, they were exposed to strongly-accented Australian or Scottish English (see section 2.1. for more details). For each accent, there were four separate groups of participants – one with English subtitles, one with Dutch subtitles, one without any subtitles (No-subtitles group) and one group that took part in the test without watching the film (Control group). After watching the film, an audio post-test followed to asses how well the listeners adapted to the accent during exposure. In the post-test, the participants were presented with audio excerpts and they were asked to repeat back what they heard. Half of the material used in the post-test came from the exposure material ("old" phrases already heard in the film) while the other half consisted of completely "new" audio excerpts which the participants had not heard before.

As Mitterer and McQueen (2009, 5) explain, "First, we tested whether audiovisual exposure allows listeners to adapt to an unfamiliar foreign accent. Second, we asked whether subtitles can influence this process." The study showed that watching the video with English subtitles improved L2 perception skills of the English-subtitles group while watching the video with Dutch (native-language) subtitles hindered L2 perception skills of the Dutch-

subtitles group. The results of the "No-subtitles group" were better than the results of the Dutch-subtitles groups when the correct percentage of previously unheard ("new") items was compared. This suggested that watching the film with no subtitles makes it easier for the listeners to understand previously unheard ("new") items in the post-test than watching the film with subtitles in Dutch. This is why native-language subtitles were found to hinder L2 perception skills. On the whole, Mitterer and McQueen (2009) found that quick adaptation to accented foreign speech is achievable by using lexical knowledge in the form of subtitles to retune phonetic perception. The listeners in their experiment clearly benefited from the fact that they knew what words they were hearing. The aim of my study is to find out whether their findings could be replicated with Czech participants. I intend to investigate whether English subtitles also help Czech learners of English perceive regionally accented English better.

The second objective of my paper is to determine whether there is any improvement in English speech perception thanks to exposure (or L2 input received) during the test itself. In a paper by Broersma (2008), categorization of /v/ versus /f/ on the basis of the length of the preceding vowel was studied. In an earlier study (Broersma, 2005), she had found that Dutch listeners seemed to ignore vowel duration as a cue to word-final voicing. However, vowel duration was intentionally made uninformative and misleading in the stimuli that were used. Vowels were made short before voiced and not voiceless consonants and they were made long when followed by a voiceless or not voiced consonant. In a reanalysis of her old results, Broersma (2008) found that "Dutch listeners did use vowel duration initially, but quickly reduced its use, whereas the English listeners used it consistently throughout the experiment" (Broersma, 2008: 712). In other words, the Dutch participants relied to some extent on vowel duration in the first couple of trials, but as the experiment continued, their use of this as a voicing cue was reduced. "Thus, nonnative listeners adapted to the stimuli more flexibly than native listeners did" (Broersma, 2008: 712). Broersma's findings suggest that second-language listeners can *tune in* to the listening material to become more efficient in their perceptual judgments. While Broersma's test focused solely on the /v-f/ contrast, the present study will investigate whether more general adaptation to accented foreign speech is achievable in the course of the test. The present study will ask if the quick *tuning in* is still possible when the variability in the listening material is substantially greater.

Some studies mentioned by Højen (2003) claim that in the process of second language learning, L2 speech production may precede speech perception. It is a controversial statement

especially when the testing method in the study of Mitterer and McQueen (2009) is considered. The participants of their experiment were asked to listen to audio excerpts of regionally accented English and then repeat back orally what they heard. This was thought to provide data about the extent to which the participants understood the words being spoken. Yet, as Højen (2003) notes about a study by Bohn & Flege (1997), "experienced Germans' production, but not perception, of /ɛ/ and /æ/ was native-like." Therefore, production may precede perception. Here, the question arises whether some of the data Mitterer and McQueen (2009) obtained in their experiment might have been misguided by solely relying on answers orally produced by their participants. One may speculate whether their participants simply repeated what they heard not having to think about the actual words or the meaning of the utterance. It must be said that Mitterer and McQueen (2009) realized the potential problem. They write, "It was stressed that there was no need to imitate the accent of the speaker." The question remains to what extent this kind of instruction prevented their participants from imitating the speakers from the excerpts on the basis of sounds rather than words. The present study shall evade the problem altogether by requiring a written transcription from the participants.

2 METHODS

2.1 Training and testing material and procedure

The audio-visual exposure material used by Mitterer and McQueen (2009) was one episode of an Australian sitcom Kath and Kim (McKenna et al., 2002) and a shortened version the Scottish film Trainspotting (MacDonald and Boyle, 1996). The participants of the present experiment watched a shortened, 22-minute version of the film Lock, Stock and Two Smoking Barrels (Ritchie, 1998) set in East End London, the home of Cockney and the epicentre of Estuary English, so to speak. The screening of the shortened film was intended as speech perception training. The participants of this study were divided randomly into two groups with different subtitles. The first group (n = 10) watched the film with English subtitles while the second group (n = 9) watched it with subtitles in Czech. For the English-subtitles group, original hard-of-hearing subtitles provided on the DVD (Ritchie, 1998) were extended to represent all 1806 words spoken (for the transcript, see Appendix 2). Czech subtitles (see Appendix 3) were created by translating the extended English subtitles and provided with similar timing and identical display format. For the video material (the

shortened English-subtitles version of the film and the shortened Czech-subtitles version) and for the audio file used in the post-test, please refer to the CD attached to this study.

After watching the audio-visual training material, the participants took part in an audio-only post-test. They were presented with 50 audio excerpts played only once. The excerpts were introduced by spoken numbers from 1 to 50 and followed by 20 seconds of silence. Each excerpt had an average duration of 2.6 seconds and the duration of the entire test was 18 minutes 51 seconds. Half of the audio material used in the post-test was "old" (excerpts taken from the film that they had watched). In other words, there were 25 old excerpts that the participants were already familiar with. The remaining 25 excerpts were completely "new", albeit spoken by speakers heard in the audio-visual material. The "old" and "new" excerpts were arranged alternately, which the participants had not been informed about. For the transcript of the excerpts (considered as the correct answers in the post-test), see Appendix 4.

A three-page answer sheet containing a brief questionnaire and 50 numbered spaces for answers was used for the test. The questionnaire contained a set of simple questions. The participants were asked about their age, gender and whether they suffered from any kind of hearing impairment. They were further asked whether they had been to London (and how much time they had spent there), whether they had seen the film (and how many times they had seen it), whether they had attended any phonetic seminars and how familiar they were with the pronunciation of the Cockney dialect (on a scale from 0 to 4). They were also asked about the amount of time they had been learning English so far and about the time they had spent in an English-speaking country. The answers provided were entered into a spreadsheet and considered as variables (see section 3 Results). In the audio post-test, the participants were asked to write down what they heard as precisely as possible into the corresponding, numbered spaces provided. The training (screening of the shortened film) and the testing were carried out in an interpreting laboratory (built as part of the New Translation and Interpreting Modules for English Philology Studies [ISAPT] project) equipped with good quality PCs and circumaural headphones. The participants watched the film separately on separate PCs and were able to adjust the volume of their headphones comfortably. During the whole test, the experimenter monitored all participants. Nobody was seen to have been glancing at other participants' PC screens, which could result in watching some of the material with inappropriate subtitles. More importantly, the participants were informed before the experiment that the film and the subsequent audio post-test contain potentially offensive

language. One participant asked about the degree of violence portrayed in the black-comedy thriller. Nevertheless, nobody quit.

When I was translating the English subtitles into Czech, I encountered a number of translation issues. I will address two of them briefly in this section. The translation of English swear-words is often controversial. Especially when phrases as They're still fucking guns and they still fire fucking bullets are translated literally, that is when they are rendered word-word. Swear-words and their broader expressive collocations are language- and culture-specific, therefore literal translation could result in misunderstanding and confusion on the part of the target-text reader. The approach I used in translating vulgar parts of the English subtitles of the film was "dynamic equivalence" as described by Nida (1982). He writes that dynamic equivalence is "the quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the receptor language that the RESPONSE of the RECEPTOR is essentially like that of the original receptors" (Nida, 1982). I intended to translate in such a way that the target readers of the Czech subtitles would react similarly as the source-text readers reacted when being confronted with the original. So the above-mentioned phrase was rendered as Pořád to jsou zbraně a lítají z nich náboje, kurva which could be back-translated into English as They're still weapons and bullets fly out of them, fuck. Usually, English names and nicknames are even more culture-specific and often misleading. For instance as regards gender, the names Jordan, Taylor, Harper or Cameron, to list but a few, are not gender-specific. Gender was of little importance in the names of the actors of the film. However, I decided to keep their English names and nicknames (e.g. Soap or Bacon) in the Czech subtitles to prevent confusion.

2.2 Participants

Nineteen students from the Department of British and American Studies at the Palacký University in Olomouc participated in the test. There were 10 female and 9 male participants. All of them were native speakers of Czech with 11.5 years of English learning on average. In the questionnaire provided, none stated having a hearing impairment, 10 stated that they had been to London and 9 wrote they had not. Only 2 of the participants had seen the film before; three times and once respectively. Four people had attended phonetic seminars at the English Department before the testing. For the effect that these variables had on the post-test, please see Results. For the present experiment to be credible, it was essential to select participants who had minimal experience with spoken Cockney (or Estuary English). The participants were also asked about the time they had spent in London – none had spent there more than a week.

3 RESULTS

3.1 The audio post-test reviewed

The data were submitted to a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA). The dependent variable was the proportion of correctly repeated words, which I will call "Overall % Correct" for convenience. I scored how many content and function words were repeated correctly by assigning 5 points to each function word and 10 points to each content word; their sum represented 100%. The number of points each participant scored in each excerpt was then divided by the corresponding 100% figure and entered into a spreadsheet. Each listener's scores for all 50 excerpts were then averaged. In total, there were 950 excerpts to be analyzed (19 participants x 50 excerpts). Please refer to the CD attached to this study for two spreadsheets containing results of individual participants as well as overall results and corresponding graphs.

The between-subject independent variables were: English and Czech subtitles called "Subtitles" for convenience, "Gender" (male and female), "Been to London" (yes or no), "Phonet Sem" (yes or no), and "Years of learning" (self-reported years of learning English). With these four variables, a series of one-way ANOVAs was run. The two within-subject variables were: "Old vs. New % Correct" (comparing the percentage correct for the old and for the new excerpts) and improvement during the test "IMPR" (comparing the mean the percentage correct of the first 25 and the next 25 answers). It was tested whether there was a significant effect of "Old vs. New % Correct" factor and "IMPR" factor by a pair of repeated-measures ANOVAs.

The aim of my study was to see whether the findings of Mitterer and McQueen (2009) could be replicated with Czechs. The Dutch participants of their English-subtitles group clearly benefited from the fact that they knew what English words they were hearing. As was mentioned above (see section 1.2), I intended to ask whether English subtitles also help Czech learners of English perceive regionally accented English more easily. No significant main effect of "Subtitles" was found on "Overall % Correct": $F(1, 17)=.75449$, $p=.39716$. Yet, Mitterer and McQueen (2009) reported better results of the English-subtitles group compared to the Dutch-subtitles group with both "old" and "new" excerpts. To make the results of the current study directly comparable to the study of Mitterer and McQueen (2009), an additional pair of one-way ANOVAS was performed with "Subtitles" as the independent variable; one with "New % Correct" as the dependent variable and one with "Old % Correct" as the

dependent variable. No significant main effect of "Subtitles" on "New % Correct" was found: F(1, 17)=.88334, p=.36045. Likewise, no significant main effect of "Subtitles" on "Old % Correct" was found: F(1, 17)=.41678, p=.52712. In other words, participants in the English-subtitles group achieved significantly better score neither with "old" items nor with "new" items than participants in the Czech-subtitles group did. It is not surprising, then, that there was no significant interaction between the "Subtitles" condition and the "Old-New" within-subject factor. For the possible reasons why the present study failed to replicate the findings of Mitterer and McQueen (2009), please refer to Discussion.

The main effect of gender on "Overall % Correct" was close to being significant: F(1, 17)=4.3086, p=.05341. It suggests that males were slightly better at understanding regionally accented English the female participants. Men managed to transcribe 77.37% of the audio material correctly. The overall performance of women was worse: 67.76%. Yet, as the result was not significant, it cannot be said that gender played a substantial role. On the other hand, the fact that 10 participants visited the city of London made a clear difference, although they only spent 2.66 days in London on average (the time ranged from 0 to 1 week). A significant main effect of "Been to London" on "Overall % Correct" was found: F(1, 17)=6.99, p=.01703. Logically, it implies that participants who had been to London fared better in the test than those who had not been there. On average, they had 77.77% of the answers correct while those who had not been to London scored only 66.24% on average.

To find out whether participants who have been to London fared better in listening to the "new" excerpts, the interaction of the "Old-New" condition and "Been to London" was measured. The resulting effect of "Been to London" x "Old-New" approached the level of significance: F(1, 17)=3.4833, p=.07934. Surprisingly, having attended a phonetic seminar was not of much help in the present test. Even though the percentage of correct answers of those who attended a phonetic seminar was higher, the difference was not significant and no significant main effect of "Phonet Sem" on "Overall % Correct" was found: F(1, 17)=.74565, p=.39988. The overall results also indicate that identifying words in "old" excerpts proved significantly easier than when listening to previously unheard ("new") utterances: F(1, 20)=59.761, p=.00000.

Interestingly, there was no significant correlation between "Overall % Correct" and "Years of learning".

As stated above (see section 1.2), the second objective of my paper was to determine whether there was any improvement in English speech perception thanks to exposure (or L2 input received) during the test. Interestingly, the opposite tendency was found. The

performance during the initial part of the test was reported as clearly better than during its final part creating a difference between the mean score in the first 25 responses and the next 25 responses: F(1, 18)=52.699, p=.00000. On average, the participants scored 76.89% correct in the first 25 excerpts and no more than 67.73% in the next 25 excerpts of the test. In Discussion below, I will address these findings.

3.2 How Czech listeners perceived Cockney in the test

In section 1.1.6., basic features of Cockney pronunciation were described. They are the diphthong shift, glottaling of /t/ and /h/, /l/ vocalization and "TH Fronting". It was satisfying to find that the answers provided in the test demonstrated clearly how the actors' pronunciation differed from what the participants expected to hear. In excerpt 27 (see Appendix 4), the correct transcription was: *Keys. I want keys, now*. Nevertheless, one participant thought he heard the following sentence: *Case. I want case, now*. This is consistent with what the Cockney speaker said as his vowel in [ki:z] shifted to become [kəiz] instead. Similarly, in excerpt 44, the opening of the /əʊ/ diphthong in /fʌʊn/ *phone* was so wide, that 18 out of 19 participants rendered the sentence *I'm gonna phone him* as *I'm gonna find him*. This particularly bad performance of the vast majority of participants may have also been caused by the fact that the sentence had not been present in the video material – the excerpt was "new". Glottaling of /t/ did not cause such global problems, although a number of participants rendered *I might get laughed at* as *I might get laughter* (excerpt 28). This was, I believe, due to *at* /æt/ being pronounced as [æʔ] and due to its coalescence with the previous word. Glottaling of /t/ in word-internal position as in *Tom, the fatter you get, the sadder you get* caused some problems (excerpt 40). Many participants left a blank space in the place of *fatter* not being able to decipher the meaning of [ˈfæʔə].

Glottaling of /h/ made some participants transcribe *Just hide* as *Just died* (excerpt 15). I believe they did not transcribe it as *Just tied* because /t/ was unaspirated. One may speculate that maybe once these participants determined they heard a stop somewhere between /t/ and /d/ which was unaspirated, they automatically opted for /d/ ignoring the fact that it could a part the previous word. But the pronunciation [dʒəsˈta:id] could apply to *Just hide* as well as *Just died*, so the question arises whether transcriptions of this kind should be regarded as wrong (they were regarded this way in the present test). It is also interesting that in the case of *Just hide*, two features of Cockney pronunciation compete. If both glottaling of /t/ and

glottaling of /h/ were to be obeyed, the resulting pronunciation [dʒəsˈʔaːid] would be somewhat confusing. Yet, glottaling of /t/ does not occur. What makes the native-speaker in the film opt for /h/ glottaling instead? One may speculate that Czech listeners after some exposure to Cockney regard glottaling of /t/ as much more frequent that glottaling of /h/. Therefore, when they are confronted with the two phenomena competing, they choose to rely on the more frequent one. In excerpt 26, the phrase *This is a bit heavy* found both /t/ and /h/ glottaling applied resulting in [ˈðɪsɪzəˈbɪʔɛvɪi]. Only two participants rendered this part of the excerpt correctly.

Vocalization of /l/ was most transparent in the excerpt 31 where most participants left a blank space in the place of *pile* pronounced as [pʰɑɪo̯] in the phrase *That pile takes care of Harry*. Vocalization of /l/ did not cause significant problems in the transcription of other excerpts. Finally, fronting of /θ/ and /ð/ occurred in the testing material in phrases like *Where are the others?* [ʌvəz] or *And think* [fɪŋk] *about what we're gonna do*. It did not cause much difficulty to the Czech listeners as /f/ and /v/, unlike /θ/ and /ð/, are present in their native-language phonemic inventory.

4 DISCUSSION

In this paper, I investigated the topic of L2 speech perception improvement. I reviewed literature on L2 speech perception and L2 speech perception training. It was investigated whether the findings of the study by Mitterer and McQueen (2009) could be replicated with Czechs. As the title of their study suggests, they found that foreign subtitles help but native-language subtitles harm foreign speech perception. The first research question of the present study was whether L2 speech perception of Czech participants learning English also benefits from watching English-language video with English subtitles. Unlike the findings of Mitterer and McQueen (2009), the results of the present study failed to find that watching video material with Czech or English subtitles makes a significant difference in the subsequent audio test. Why is it so? I believe there are more possible explanations.

First, for the experiment to be credible, one may speculate about how naive the participants should be as to the purpose of the experiment. In the present experiment, they were thoroughly informed about its nature before the training part (screening of the film) began. When one is told to watch a film with subtitles without being informed about the following test, no unusual behaviour should occur. On the other hand, telling the participants

in advance that they will be tested with audio-only excerpts from the film may change their attitude. Especially the members of the L1-subtitles group may then try to ignore the native-language subtitles and focus on the actual English words being spoken. Anyway, in the case of Mitterer and McQueen (2009), the participants "were completely informed about the nature of the study," too. I believe future research could deal the issue of "unconscious testing".

More probably, the present study failed to replicate the findings of Mitterer and McQueen (2009) because of differing numbers of participants. Here arises the issue of a "characteristic sample". The data submitted by the 19 people taking part in the present experiment may be lacking in statistical value as the sample of respondents is not very large. This cannot be said about the experiment carried out by Mitterer and McQueen (2009) as 121 people took part in their test. At this point, it may be of help to compare the testing method of the present study with the method used by Mitterer and McQueen (2009). As was described in section 2.1., there were 50 audio excerpts played only once in the testing part of the current experiment. Mitterer and McQueen (2009) had 80 audio excerpts in their test (so the amount of data available was even larger). More importantly, however, each excerpt was played twice with a pause of 3.5 times of its duration. One may speculate about the possible results had the excerpts in the present experiment also been played twice. Virtually, playing the same excerpt twice should result in higher percentage of the correct answers. One may also speculate about whether the score would increase globally, or whether playing the excerpts twice would help only certain participants leaving the others further behind.

The second research question of the current study was whether there is any improvement in English accented speech perception abilities thanks to exposure (or L2 input received) during the test itself. In the case of Broersma's study (2008), improvement during the /f-v/ categorization test was found. The intention of the present study was to find out whether Broersma's findings are replicable with material of much greater variability. In other words, I investigated whether improvement of accented speech perception skills occurred after exposure to audio-visual material. From the results of the audio post-test, it cannot be excluded that *tuning in* does happen. However, it could not be evidenced in the form of an increase of correct responses throughout the test. As was stated in section 3.1, there was a significant decrease of about 9.16% in the performance of the participants. In the initial part of the test, where "Overall % Correct" of the first 25 excerpts was measured, the participants scored 76.89% on average. During the remaining part of the test where "Overall % Correct" of the next 25 excerpt was measured, they scored no more than 67.73%. What is the reason of

this finding? I believe that the decrease in speech perception skills found in the current study is due to listeners' fatigue. The test was a challenge and the total amount of time they had to concentrate for was close to 19 minutes. Another reason why the present study failed to replicate the findings of Broersma (2008) may be that the greater variability in the audio-material provided in the present test made the process of *tuning in* more difficult.

To sum up, I would like to analyze the results already mentioned in section 3.1. Because no significant main effect of "Subtitles" on "Overall % Correct" was found, the performance of the participants in the post-test was hardly influenced by the subtitles-group they were in. More surprisingly, being a man or a woman made for a difference in understanding regionally-accented English speech, which was close to significant; males fared slightly better than females. One might speculate that it was due to the fact that the average time male participants had spent in London was 3.56 days; while the average time female participants had spent there was 1.85 days. Indeed, having been to London was found as a significant advantage as those who had been to the city scored on average 77.77% compared to 66.24% of those who had not visited it. When the interaction of the "Old-New" condition and "Been to London" was measured, it was found that hearing a completely "new" excerpt in the test caused less difficulty to those who had been to London than those who had not. Finally, having attended a phonetic seminar at the Department of British and American Studies of the Palacký University in Olomouc was not found to be of much help in the present test. It must be said, however, that the average score of those 4 participants who have attended a phonetic seminar was 75.97% compared to 71.1% which is the average of those who had not attended it.

5 REFERENCES

5.1 References of papers used

Broersma, Mirjam. 2008. "Flexible cue use in nonnative phonetic categorization." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 124(2): 715-712.

Broersma, Mirjam. 2010. "Perception of final fricative voicing: Native and nonnative listeners' use of vowel duration." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 127(3): 1644-1636.

Hirata, Yukari, Elizabeth Whitehurst, Emily Cullings. 2007. "Training native English speakers to identify Japanese vowel length contrast with sentences at varied speaking rates." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 121(6): 3845-3837.

Højen, Anders D. 2003. Second language speech perception and production in adult learners before and after short-term immersion. Aarhus: University of Aarhus.

Iverson P., V. Hazan, and K. Barrister. 2005. "Phonetic training with acoustic cue manipulations: A comparison of methods for teaching English /r/-/l/ to Japanese adults." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 118(5): 3278-3267.

Lively, S. E., and D. B. Pisoni. 1994. "Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/. II. Long-term retention of new phonetic categories." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 96(4): 2087-2076.

Lively, S. E., J.S. Logan, and D. B. Pisoni. 1993. "Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/. II: The role of phonetic environment and talker variability in learning new perceptual categories." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 94(3): 1255-1242.

Logan, J.S., S.E. Lively, and D. B. Pisoni. 1991. "Training Japanese Listeners to Identify English /r/ and /l/: A first report." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* (89): 874-86.

Mitterer, Holger and James M. McQueen. 2009. "Foreign Subtitles Help but Native Language Subtitles Harm Foreign Speech Perception." *PLoS ONE* 4(11): e7785

Nida, E. 1982. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Ritchie, Guy. 1998. *Lock, Stock and Two Smoking Barrels* (DVD). UK: PolyGram Filmed Entertainment.

Sebastián-Gallés, Núria. 2005. *Cross-Language Speech Perception*. In The Handbook of Speech Perception, edited by David B. Pisoni and Robert E. Remez, 566-546. Oxford: Blackwell.

5.2 References adopted from other authors (printed here for the reader's convenience)

Bahrick, L. E., and J. N. Pickens. 1988. "Classification of bimodal English and Spanish language passages by infants." *Infant Behaviour and Development* (11): 277-96.

Best, C. T. 1995. *A direct realist view of cross-language speech perception*. In Speech Perception and Liguistic Experience, edited by W. Strange, 206-171. Baltimore, MD: York Press.

Bird S. A., J. N. Williams. 2002. "The effect of bimodal input on implicit and explicit memory: An investigation into the benefits of within-language subtitling." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 533–509.

Bongaerts, T. 1999. *Ultimate attainment in L2 production: The case of very advanced late L2 learners.* In Second language acquisition and the Critical Period Hypothesis, edited by D. Birdsong, 159-133. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bongaerts, T., C. Summeren, B. Planken, and E. Schils. 1997. "Age and ultimate attainment in the pronunciation of a foreign language." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 466-447.

Broersma, M. 2005. "Perception of familiar contrasts in unfamilir positions." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 117: 3891-3890.

Flege, J. E., G. H. Yeni-Komshian, and S. Liu. 1999. "Age constraints on second-language acquisition." *Journal of Memory and Language* 41(1): 104-78.

Flege, J. E., N. Takagi, and V. A. Mann. 1996. "Lexical familiarity and English-language experience affect Japanese adults' perception of /r/ and /l/." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 99(2): 1173-1161.

Guion, S. G., J. E. Flege, and J. D. Loftin. 2000. "The effect of L1 use on pronunciation of Quichua-Spanish bilinguals." *Journal of Phonetics* 28(1): 42-27.

Hallé, P. A., J. Seguí, U. Frauenfelder, and C. Meunier. 1998. "Processing of illegal consonant clusters: A case of perceptual assimilation?" *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 24: 608-592.

Johnson, L.S., and L. E. Newport. 1989. "Critical period effects in second language learning: the influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language." *Cognitive Psychology* 21(1): 99-60.

Lenneberg, E. 1967. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.

Long, M. H. 1990. "Maturational constraints on language development." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 285-251.

MacCay, I. R. A., J. E. Flege, T. Piske, C. Schirru. 2001. "Category restructuring during second-language speech acquisition." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 110(1): 528-516.

MacDonald, A., D. Boyle. 1996. *Trainspotting*. UK: Channel 4 films.

Massaro, D. W., and M. M. Cohen. 1983. "Phonological context in speech perception." *Perception & Psychophysics* 34: 338-48.

McCandliss, B.D., J.A. Fiez, A. Protopapas, M. Conway, and J. L. McClelland. 2002. "Success and failure in teaching the r-l contrast to Japanese adults: Predictions of a Hebbian model of plasticity and stabilization in spoken language perception." *Cognitive, Effective and Behavioural Neuroscience* (2): 108-89

McKenna, R., G. Riley, J. Turner, R. Kershaw, and T. Emery. 2002. *Kath & Kim*, Season 1. Australia: Riley Turner Productions.

Nosofsky, R. 1986. "Attention, similarity, and the identification-categorization relationship." *J. Exp. Psychol.*: General 115: 57-39.

Nosofsky, R. 1987. "Attention and learning processes in the identification and categorization of integral stimuli." *J. Exp. Psychol.*: Learn. Memory Cognit. 15: 708-700.

Otake, K., G. Hatano, A. Cutler, and J. Mehler. 1993. "Mora or syllable? Speech segmentation in Japanese." *Journal of Memory and Language* 32: 258-78.

Pike, K. L. 1945. *The Intonation of American English.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Scovel, T. 1969. "Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance." *Language Learning* 19: 253-245.

Strange, W., and S. Dittmann. 1984. "Effects of discrimination training on the perception of /r-l/ by Japanese adults learning English." *Percept. Psychophys.* 36: 145-131.

Thornburgh, D. F., and J. H. Ryalls. 1998. “Voice onset time in Spanish-English bilinguals: Early versus late learners of English.” *Journal of Communication Disorders* 31(3): 229-215.

Trubetzkoy, Nikolai Sergeyevič. 1969. *Principles of Phonology* translated by Christine Anne Marie Baltaxe. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

6 APPENDIX

6.1 Appendix 1: České shrnutí

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá zlepšováním percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce, což z hlediska studenta překladu a především tlumočení velice důležité téma. Hlavní inspirací je studie zabývající se vnímáním méně obvyklých variet angličtiny holandskými posluchači, kterou vypracovali Mitterer a McQueen v roce 2009. Výsledky jejich studie nasvědčují tomu, že sledování cizojazyčných filmů s titulky v daném jazyce vede ke zlepšení percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce. Tato bakalářská práce si především klade za cíl, zjistit, zdali je možné replikovat zmíněnou studii s českými respondenty. Dalším cílem této práce je zhodnotit, zdali v průběhu samotného testování došlo ke zlepšení vnímacích schopností respondentů, což nastalo ve studii Broersmové z roku 2008.

Na začátku práce je přehled literatury na téma percepce v cizím jazyce. Zabývám se zde hlavními faktory, které působí na percepční dovednosti v cizím jazyce. Jsou jimi: věk příjezdu do země mluvící daným jazykem (AOL), doba pobytu v dané zemi (LOR), míra užívání mateřského jazyka ve vztahu k modelům, které byly vypracovány na téma percepce v cizím jazyce a míra do jaké pohlaví ovlivňuje percepční dovednosti v cizím jazyce. V rozsáhlejší podobě se zde zabývám trénováním (či cvičením) percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce. Před úvodem do samotné studie, která je jádrem této bakalářské práce, uvádím základní rysy londýnského dialektu Cockney, což je varieta angličtiny užívaná v audiovizuálním a zvukovém materiálu této studie.

Následuje úvod do hlubší problematiky této studie, přesnější popis studie Mitterera a McQueena (2009), na které je tato práce založena, a odůvodnění některých rozdílných postupů zvolených v této studii. Další částí této bakalářské práce je popis metody měření percepčních dovedností respondentů a popis materiálu zvoleného pro test. Materiál se skládá z části audiovizuální a z části zvukové. Respondenti nejdříve sledují film a poté podstoupí test založený na transkripci zvukového záznamu. Film *Lock, Stock and Two Smoking Barrels* jsem zvolil kvůli zmiňované varietě angličtiny zvané Cockney. V této části práce popisuji přesný postup, kterým byl testovací materiál vytvořen. Zvukový test měřil percepční dovedností a především zlepšení percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce poté, co respondenti shlédli film. Zde uvádím přesná kritéria, která při měření hrála roli, a způsob, jakým bylo dosaženo výsledků. Dále je zde popsán charakter respondentů a kritéria, kterými se od sebe respondenti odlišovali.

Další obsáhlou část této práce tvoří pojednání o výsledcích zmíněného testu a detailní popis statistických operací, které byly s naměřenými hodnotami provedeny. Zde uvádím výčet všech proměnných a jednotlivé výsledky, které se k nim vztahují. Tato část práce také obsahuje pojednání o tom, jak se zákonitosti dané variety angličtiny projevily v odpovědích respondentů provedeného testu – je zde uvedeno několik fonetických transkripcí a chyby, jichž se respondenti kvůli nezvyklosti Cockney v odpovědích často dopouštěli.

Hlavní částí práce je diskuze, která hodnotí naměřené výsledky, uvádí je do praxe, zkoumá jejich význam i původ a především je srovnává s výsledky studie Mitterera a McQueena (2009). Výsledky této studie se v plné míře neshodují s výsledky výchozí holandské studie. V této části práce nabízím několik možných vysvětlení tohoto jevu. Zde zodpovídám otázku položenou v úvodu a popisuji, do jaké míry bylo možné studii Mitterera a McQueena

replikovat s českými respondenty. Současně odpovídám na otázku, zdali došlo ke zlepšení v průběhu samotného testu a zabývám tím, do jaké míry je možné replikovat zjištění Broersmové (2008) v širším měřítku, které tato studie nabízí. Závěr je shrnutím konkrétních výsledků naměřených během testu. Současně zde vysvětluji, proč některé výsledky nejsou relevantní a jaké mezi výsledky můžeme nalézt vztahy.

6.2 Appendix 2: English extended subtitles

Ed can hassle a few quid here and there, but his real talent lies in cards and gambling with cards. Bacon could see that his days of selling moody goods on street corners are numbered. It's time to move on and he knows it.

The skinny one is Tom and he's the entrepreneur of the bunch. He's got a couple of dirty little fingers in a couple of dirty little pies. Nick here, however, has made it his business to have all 20 fat little fingers and toes in every dirty bent and stolen pie in London. Between the two of them, there ain't much you can't get hold of.

Oi! Keep your fingers out of my soup!

Soap is called Soap because he likes to keep his hands clean of any unlawful behaviour. He's proud of his job and even more proud that it's legal. He represents the more sensible side of the four.

Are you sure you can afford 25?
It depends on how you look at it. I can afford it as long as I see it again if that's what you mean.
Got the rest from the fat man and Bacon?
Fat man, Bacon and myself. Looks like it's time to make that call to Harry.
Who's this fat man then, eh?
Do you want a sandwich Bacon?

It's not easy to take a seat at this card table. The amount of money involved has to be a 100 grand upwards and there's no shortage of punters. The man who decides whether you get to play or not is this man. Harry or as some including himself like to call him: Hatchet Harry.

You got it all?
100 grand.
Well, if you've got, you've got it. Now, if you don't mind.

Ed has been playing cards since he could lift them up. And he soon discovered that he had a big advantage. It's not that he's good with cards or even good at counting them. It's that he's good with reading people's reactions no matter how subtle. And everybody has reactions. Especially when it comes to money.

Invitations.
Invitations?
Yeah, invitations, you know, four little white pieces of paper with your names.
Well, we've got a hundred thousand bits of paper with the Queen's head on. Will that do?

Evening, Fraser. Don, Phil. It's a bit dramatic, innit? Is this supposed to be symbolic?

Apparently it's for security.
Yeah? I'd have brought me glove if I'd have know.
You must be Eddie, JD's son.
You must be Harry. Sorry, didn't know your father.
Never mind son, you just might meet him if you carry on like that.
Evening, Tanya. It's been a while.
Alright, Ed.

Got ya!
Twenty grand, open.
I fold.
Don't go and spend that all at once, boy.

Give me back my money! Fucking slags. Give me back my money. Give it back! Wankers! Wankers!

Fucking bastard. Oh my good god. We'll take you to the cleaners.

Twenty grand open.
Thirty thousand. Back to you already, Eddie.
Fifty grand.
Eighty grand.
One hundred grand.
Whoa, whoa, Fells, look I know...
I know you're not in which means no one cares what you know. Two hundred and fifty.
That's quite a raise.
That's one hundred and fifty on my one hundred.
Yeah and is there anything else you wanna say?
As you know this puts us in an awkward position. I don't have enough to continue.
We will have to see both of your cards if no one loans Eddie the money to continue. Either it's a loan or we see both of your cards.

I will.
You will what?
I will loan you the money.
No, I think I'd rather just turn them over.
I'm not interested in what you would rather. I wanna keep going. I'm also offering you the money. So we don't have to turn them over because you can borrow.
I need two hundred and fifty grand.
No, you need five hundred grand to see me.
That's if I wanna see you?
Well, you're gonna have a problem carrying on, ain't ya?
I'll see you.
OK. Before I loan you this, I expect if you lose, of course, my money back within a week. Crystal? That's Sunday, OK?
Is that it?
Now let's see his fucking cards.

Hello boy. Feeling a bit poorly? I know your friends are responsible for most of the cash. So I'm gonna give you one week to find it. Otherwise, I will take a finger of each of you and

your friends' hands for every day that passes without payment. And then when you've run out of digits your dad's bar and who knows what then. All right, my son?

This doesn't look good.
He then proceeded to explain the unfortunate position they were in. Harry would start sizing up all of their fingers in a week because he knew there was no way Ed could settle that debt on his own. Harry saw it as their money on the table so it was their debt off the table. Ed would hate to admit it, but he could've kissed the old bastard for that. If he said he wanted to settle the debt on his own, it would have been a lie.

I wish to Christ he would have let me settle the debt on my own.

I'm gonna kill him.
Stop fucking about, Tom. And think about what we're gonna do. Now, sit down.
What's all the fuss about Harry? Why don't we just boycott the payment?
Let me tell you about Hatchet Harry. Once there was this geezer called Smithy Robinson who worked for Harry. It was rumoured that he was on the take. Harry's invited Smithy round for an explanation. Smithy didn't do a very good job. Within a minute Harry's lost his rag, reached out for the nearest thing at hand which happened to be a 15-inch black rubber cock. He's then proceeded to batter poor Smithy to death with it. Now that was seen as a pleasant way to go. Hence, Hatchet Harry is a man you pay if you owe.

Where's Eddie?
Where do you think? The bottom of a bottle and has been for two days. It's hit him hard.
Yeah, it's hit us all hard.
Yeah but he's got to tell his dad he's about to lose his bar.

What's all the flapping about then?
You told the old man yet?
I'm hoping I won't need to.
I've got a plan. Now listen carefully.

Four young fellas got in deeper than they could handle. They owe me half a million pounds.
How much?
Half a million.

I'm game.
Me too.
Oh, God.
We hit them as soon as they come back. We'll be prepared waiting. And they're armed.
What was that? Armed? What do you mean armed? Armed with what?
Bad breath, colourful language, feather duster? What do you think they're gonna be armed with? Guns, you tit.
Guns? You never said anything about guns. A minute ago this was the safest job in the world. Now, it's turning into a bad day in Bosnia.

Soap, stop being such a mincer. I've thought about that and...
And what exactly?
And all we have to do is find out who's carrying them.
Well, they could all be carrying them for what we know.

Only one of them carries them going to the job. So I assume the same one will be carrying them when they come back from the job.
Oh, you assume do you? And what did I say about assumption being a brother of all fuck-ups?
It's the mother of all fuck-ups, stupid...
Well, brother, mother, any other sucker. It don't make any difference. They're still fucking guns and they still fire fucking bullets.
Soap if you have a better idea, how to get £500,000 in the next few days, let us know.

Where did you get these? A fucking museum?
Nick the Greek.
How much did you part with? 700 for the pair.
Drachmas, I hope.
I'd feel safer with a chicken drumstick. These are gonna do more harm than good.
Jesus, Tom. Do these work?
I don't know. They look nice, though, don't they? I rather like them.
Now, that's the top of the list of priorities, that is.

Ladies, back to more important issues if you don't mind. We have only got two real guns, apparently, that's what they are. So we find a good place to all hide next door. We wait till it sounds like the right time, then we jack-in-the-box, look nasty and stuff, cocoon them in gaffer tape, nick their van, swap the gear into the new van and bring it all back here. As long as we're all out of our hiding places quickly it's the last thing you're gonna expect. Oh, and if Tom or anyone else for that matter feels like giving them a bit of a kicking, I'm sure it won't do any harm.

Yeah, little bit of pain never hurt anybody if you know what I mean. Also, I think knives are a good idea. Big fuck-off shiny ones. Ones that look like they could skin a crocodile. Knives are good because they don't make any noise. And the less noise they make, the more likely we are to use them. Shit them right up. Makes it look like we're serious. Guns for show, knives for a pro.

Soap, is there something we should know about you?
I'm not sure what's more worrying, the job or your past.

Where the hell are we gonna hide?
Don't complicate things. Just hide.

We're on. Come on, they only weigh a pound or two.
Shut up and back up.
Spin 'round, big boy.
Fuck! Stay down, stay down!
Tie them up, tape them up. Hands and face.
On the floor!
Bend over the fucking desk.
Keys. I want keys, now.
I'll find you.
'Course you will, sweetheart.
I'll find you.
What do you think this is? Fucking hide and seek?

That one. Search that one.
Right, I'll see you in the van when you've finished with handsome here.

Jesus, that wasn't too bad, was it?
When the bottle in my arse has contracted, I'll let you know.
Bacon, see what we've got.
Let's have a butchers, eh?
We've hit the jackpot, lads.
We've got God knows how much of this stinking weed. A shitload of cash. And a traffic warden.
What?
Jesus, have we got a traffic warden?
I think he's still alive.
He's got claret coming out of him somewhere.
What did they want with a traffic warden?
I don't know. I don't think we need him. Knock him out and dump him at the lights.
Knock him out? What do you mean knock him out? Knock him out with what?
I don't know, use your imagination.
Don't touch him up. Knock him out.
I'll knock you out in a minute. Look, you wanna knock him out? You knock him out.
I fucking hate traffic wardens.

All right, that's it. We're done.
We're off.
Here, Ed. Are you sure it's a good idea to take all these bags to yours?
Well, it's the only place we can take it and it's the last place they're gonna look. Anyway, fuck it. The battle is over and the war is won.
Now Tom, can you take this to Nick the bubble and we get rid of it quick?

Not a bad day.
That pile takes care of Harry.
What's left over? Give me half a chance to count it.
What about this gear, then, eh?
Oh, what? You want a toke on that?
No, I don't think I want any of that horrible shit.
Can we lock up and get drunk now please?

Jesus!
I don't believe this. What the fuck has happened here?
Jesus.
The money. The gear.
This is fucked. No money. No weed. It's all been replaced by a pile of corpses.
All right. Don't panic. Let's think about this.
Fuck that, you can think about it. I'm panicking and I'm off.

Oh no. Not again.
That's it. I'm off.
Tom, that is our bag.
Ed. Hold on.
This is our bag.

That's it. We're off.
I'll see you in the car. I'm gonna take these guns.
Tom, don't fuck about.
I'll see you in the car. It'll only take a minute.
What is going on?
I don't know. But what I do know is there's no more Harry. Which means there's no more debt. And if there's no more debt, there's no more problem. And there's no more problem with the neighbours, because they're all dead. And I think, if I get this right, we haven't done anything wrong, we're in the clear.

You took your time. Where the hell have you been?
Sit down, I'll tell you.
So the traffic warden identified the neighbours' bodies, which sort of puts us in the clear. The only thing connecting us with the case is those shotguns.
And Tom took care of them.
You did take care of the shotguns, didn't you, Tom?
I wanted to talk to you about that.
Well, talk.
Well, actually, no...
I've got them sitting in the car.
I was gonna sell them back to Nick the Greek, but I'm having a bit of trouble getting hold of him.
You dippy bastard!
So the only thing connecting us with the case is in the back of your car which is parked outside!
They cost a 700 quid. I'm not gonna throw them away. They're hardly likely to trace them back to us, are they?
Do you really think it's worth taking the risk of 700 pounds?
Tom, you're a dick.
Now, you take those guns and you throw them of a bridge.
And throw yourself off while you're at it.
Now.
Look, all I'm...
Now, Tom.

Can I have beer please, Dad?
I'm busy, get it yourself.

6.3 Appendix 3: Czech subtitles

Ed si dokáže různě přivydělat, ale nejvíc od ruky mu jdou karty a hraní o peníze. Bacon si uvědomil, že dobám, kdy prodával kradené zboží na ulici, je konec. Je mu jasné, že je nejvyšší čas jít dál.

Ten hubeňour je Tom a má ze všech nejpodnikavější hlavu. Má prsty ve několika různých obchodech. Zato Nikos se vyznačuje tím, že po celém Londýně nenajdete jedinou levárnu, ve které by nebyl zapletený. Jestli tihle dva o něco nemají, nejspíš to ani nebude k sehnání.

Hej! Od polívky ruce pryč! Soap se tak jmenuje, protože si za žádnou cenu nechce ušpinit ruce nezákonným jednáním. Je hrdý na svoji práci a ještě víc hrdý na to, že je legální. Je z nich asi nejrozumnější.

Určitě si můžeš dovolit 25? Záleží na tom, jak se to vezme. Můžu si to dovolit, pokud ty prachy ještě někdy uvidím.
A máš zbytek od tlusťocha a Bacona? Mám svůj, tlusťochův i Baconův podíl. Je čas konečně zavolat Harrymu.
Kdo je u tebe tlusťoch, vole?
Dáš si sendvič, Bacone?

Zahrát si karty u tohohle stolu není jen tak. Ve hře musí být alespoň 100 tisíc liber a sázkařů je vždycky dost. Tohle je člověk, který rozhoduje o tom, kdo si může zahrát a kdo ne. Harry, nebo, jak mu někteří včetně jeho samotného říkají: Hatchet Harry.

Máš ty prachy?
Sto tisíc.
No, jestli je máš, tak to máš mít. A teď mě určitě omluvíš.

Ed hrával karty od chvíle, kdy je dokázal udržet. A brzy přišel na to, že má talent. Neumí s kartama nijak zvlášť zacházet ani je počítat. Ale umí číst reakce lidí, a to i ty nejnenápadnější. A každý nějak reaguje. Hlavně když jde o peníze.

Pozvánky.
Pozvánky?
Jo, pozvánky, takové ty papírky se čtyřma jménama.
Pokud vím, tak tady v tašce máme tisíc papírku s ksichtem královny. To by mohlo stačit, ne?

Zdravím, Frasere. Ahoj, Done. Phile. Nedramatizujete to trochu zbytečně? Bral jsem to spíš symbolicky.
Je to v zájmu bezpečnosti.
Přišel bych třeba v rukavičkách, kdybych to věděl.
Ty asi budeš Eddie, Jay-Deeho syn.
A ty budeš Harry. Jejda, tvýho tátu jsem nestih.
Tím se netrap, hochu. Nebuď drzý, nebo se k němu velmi rychle připojíš.
Zdravím, Tanyo. Dlouho jsme se neviděli.
Čau, Ede.

Mám tě!
Dávám dvacet tisíc.

Pokládám.
Jenom to všechno neutrať najednou!

Vraťte mi ty prachy! Zkurvení kokoti! Vraťte mi ty prachy! Chci je zpátky! Hajzlové! Hajzlové!

Šmejd jeden. Ježiši marja. Já si tě podám, kamaráde.

Dávám dvacet tisíc.
Třicet tisíc. Jsi na řadě, Eddie.
Padesát tisíc.
Osmdesát tisíc.
Sto tisíc.
Pánové, to chce klid, já vím, že sice...
Tebe se to netýká, takže na tom, co víš, nebo nevíš, nesejde.
Dvě stě padesát tisíc.
To je docela dost. To je sto padesát k mojí stovce.
Je to všechno, co mi k tomu řekneš?
Jak vidíš, jsme jaksi v prekérní situaci. Nemám dost na to, abych hrál dál.
Pokud Eddiemu nikdo nepůjčí peníze, obracíte karty oba. Buď mu někdo půjčí, nebo obracíte karty.

Tak jo.
Co tak jo?
Já ti ty peníze půjčím.
Já bych je rád obrátil.
Mě ale vůbec nezajímá, co bys rád. Chci hrát dál. Taky ti nabízím ty peníze. Takže nemusíme končit, protože si můžeš půjčit.
Potřebuju dvě stě padesát tisíc.
Ne, pokud chceš hrát dál se mnou, budeš potřebovat pět set.
Pokud chci hrát dál, jo?
To bude trochu problém, co?
Tak já hraju dál.

Dobře. Než ti ty peníze půjčím, říkám, že je chci zpátky za týden, teda pokud prohraješ. Jasné? To je v neděli, jasné?

To je všechno?
A teď ty jeho zkurvený karty.

Chlapečku, není ti do zpěvu? Vím, že v tom s tebou jedou kámoši. Takže vám dám týden na to, abyste ty prachy sehnali. Jinak každý další den po splatnosti všichni přijdete o prst. A až vám prstíky dojdou, přijde tvůj táta o bar a bůh ví, co potom. Rozumíme si?

To nevypadá moc dobře.
Ed jim hned nato vylíčil, v jak nepříjemné situaci všichni byli. Harry jim půjde všem po prstech, protože ví, že Ed sám by takový dluh nikdy nebyl schopný splatit. Podle Harryho to byly peníze všech, takže i dluh musí splatit společně. I když si to úplně nepřipouštěl, Ed děkoval bohu, že to Harry vnímal takhle. Kdyby jim teď řekl, že by to nejradši splatil sám, byla by to lež.

Kéž bych to mohl splatit sám.

Já ho zabiju!
Ty vole, uklidni se, Tome. A přemýšlej o tom, co budeme dělat. A teď si pěkně sedni.
Co nám může udělat nějaký Harry? Můžeme ten dluh prostě bojkotovat, ne?

Tak hele, ty asi nevíš, kdo je Hatchet Harry. Kdysi pro Harryho dělal chlap jménem Smithy Robinson. Říkalo se, že ho bere na hůl. A tak ho Harry požádal o vysvětlení. Smithy nebyl zrovna přesvědčivý. Minutu nato Harrymu došly nervy a popadl třiceti centimentrovej vibrátor, co měl zrovna po ruce. Tím pak umlátil chudáka Smithyho k smrti. A tohle prý patří k těm lepším koncům. Takže když dlužíš někomu jako Hatchet Harry, tak zaplatíš.

Kde je Eddie?
Kde asi? V prdeli. Je úplně na dně už dva dny. Zasáhlo ho to.
Jo, všechny nás to zasáhlo.
Ale on bude muset říct tátovi, že přijde o bar.

Co je? Už jsi to řekl tátovi?
Doufám, že ani nebudu muset. Mám totiž plán. Tak dobře poslouchejte.

Čtyři mladí kluci to trošku přehnali.
Dluží mi půl milionu liber.
Kolik? Půl milionu.

Já do toho jdu.
Já taky.
To snad není možný!
Zaútočíme hned, jak se vrátí. Budeme hezky vyčkávat. A mají zbraně.
Cože? Zbraně? To má být jako co? Jaký zbraně?
Zápach z úst, vulgární mluva a smetáky, vole. O jakých zbraních je asi řeč? Pistole, ty blbečku.
Pistole? O pistolích řeč nebyla.
Před chvílí to byla nejbezpečnější akce na světě. Teď je z toho válka v Bosně.
Nebuď tak měkkej, Soape. Já jsem to promyslel.
To by mě zajímalo jak.
Stačí zjistit, kdo z nich ty zbraně má.
No, mohl by je mít každý. O tom my víme velký kulový.
Když jdou na akci, bývá ozbrojenej jenom jeden. Takže myslím, že když se budou vracet, bude to zase on.
Jo ty myslíš?
Víš, co se říká, vole? Jeden myslel a posral se.
Jeden myslel a druhý se posral, vole.
To je jedno kdo, každopádně to bylo v prdeli. Vyjde to na stejno. Pořád to jsou zbraně a lítají z nich náboje, kurva.
Soape, pokud máš lepší nápad, jak za pár dnů sehnat 500 000 liber, sem s ním.

Kdes tyhle šunky sehnal? V zastavárně? Od Nikose.
Kolik si za ně dal? 700 za obě.
Doufám, že drachem.

Cítil bych se líp s rohlíkem v ruce. Tohle nám spíš zavaří, než pomůže.
Ty vole, Tome. Fungujou vůbec?
Já nevím. Vypadají dobře, ne? Mě se docela líbí.
Že na tom, jak vypadají, zrovna záleží!

Dámy, máme důležitější věci na práci, pokud dovolíte. Máme jenom dvě opravdový brokovnice, teda aspoň doufám. Takže se všichni schováme u nich vedle v bytě. Počkáme, až přijde ten správný čas a rozjedem to. Musíme vypadat drsně, oblepíme je páskou, vezmeme jim dodávku, přeložíme věci do naší dodávky a převezem to zpátky sem. Pokud vystartujeme dost rychle, tak je to ani náhodou nebudou čekat. Jo a pokud by měl Tom, nebo někdo další chuť jim dát trochu do dršky, určitě to ničemu neuškodí.

Jo, trocha bolesti nikoho nezabije, víš co. Co takhle nože? Pořádný stříbrný mačety, z toho se poserou. Nože, kterejma bys mohl vykuchat krokodýla. Nože jsou výhodný, protože nedělají kravál. A čím míň kraválu dělají, tím spíš je použijeme. Vykucháme je za živa. Bude to vypadat, jako že to myslíme vážně. Co pistole naznačí, završíme nůž.

Hele, nechceš nám o sobě něco říct?
Nevím, jestli mi víc nahání strach tohle, nebo tvoje minulost.

Kde se tady chceš tak asi schovat, vole?
Nekecej a prostě se schovej.

Jdeme na to.
Vždyť neváží ani kilo.
Držte huby a žádný kraviny!
Tady jsem, chlapečku.
Kurva! Lehnout jsem říkal!
Svázat a obmotat páskou! Ruce i xicht.
K zemi, hajzle!
Předkloň se, ty šmejde.
Klíče. Chci ty klíče hned teď
Já si vás najdu.
To víš, že jo, miláčku.
Já si vás najdu.
Hrajeme kurva na schovávanou, nebo co?
Tamten je bude mít. Prohledej ho.
Uvidíme se v dodávce, až tady s holkama skončíte.

Ty vole, to nebylo vůbec špatný.
Řeknu ti, až mi přestane cvakat u prdele.
Podívej se, jak jsme na tom, Bacone.
Rozbalíme si dárečky?
Tak tomu říkám Vánoce, vole.
Máme bůh ví kolik tohohle smradlavýho hulení. Hromadu prachů. A strážníka městský policie.
Co?
Ježiši kriste, máme policajta?
Myslím, že je na živu.
Někde mu teče červená.

Co měli proboha v úmyslu s policajtem?
Nemám ponětí. Ale nám je tady k hovnu! Zmlaťte ho a vyhodíme ho na semaforu.
Zmlátit? Jako jak zmlátit? Čím zmlátit?
Nevím, zapoj představivost, vole.
Neřekl jsem nakřápnout, ale zmlátit.
Já tě asi za chvíli zmlátím, ty vole. Chceš ho zmlátit? Tak si ho zmlať sám.
Ty vole, policajty fakt nenávidím.

A je to. Máme to.
Tak jedem.
Tady máš, Ede. Myslíš, že je dobrý nápad, brát to k tobě domů?
Jinou možnost stejně nemáme a je to poslední místo, které je napadne. To je jedno. Bitva skončila a válku jsme vyhráli my.
Tome, vem to prosím tě Nikosovi, ať se toho co nejdřív zbaví.

To byl den.
Tahle hromádka řeší Harryho.
Kolik zbývá? Kdybys mě aspoň nechal to dopočítat.
A co to hulení?
Co? Chceš práska?
Ne, díky, o tenhle sajrajt nemám opravdu zájem.
Můžem konečně zamnout a opít se?

Ježiši kriste!
Tomu se nechce věřit. Co se tu kurva dělo?
Ty vole.
Co ty prachy? A hulení.
Je to v prdeli. Jsou pryč. A hulení taky. Někdo nám to vyměnil za hromadu mrtvol.
Tak jo. Klid, buď v pohodě. Uvažuj, co to znamená.
Já seru na to, co to znamená. Nejsem v pohodě a mizím.

To snad není možný! Já už nechci.
To mi stačí. Mizím.
Tome, to je naše taška.
Počkej, Ede.
To je přece naše taška.
Tak jo. Padáme.
Běž klidně do auta. Já hned přijdu. Vezmu ještě tyhle brokovnice.
Ty vole, nedělej kraviny a pojď.
Běž klidně do auta. Já hned přijdu.
Co se děje?
Nemám ponětí. Ale jedno vím jistě – Harry už není. Což znamená, že náš dluh už není. A když není dluh, tak není žádný problém. A se sousedama taky není problém, protože jsou všichni mrtví. A pokud se nepletu, my jsme nic neudělali a jsme čistý, doufám.

Trvalo ti to věčnost. Kdes byl, ty vole?
Sedejte, hned vám to řeknu.
Ten policajt identifikoval těla našich sousedů, což nás tak nějak zachránilo. Poslední věc, co nás s tím vším spojuje, jsou ty brokovnice.
A těch se zbavil Tom, že jo?

Zbavil ses těch brokovnic, že jo?
O tom jsem s váma chtěl mluvit.
Tak teda mluv.
No vlastně jsem se jich nezbavil.
Mám je v autě.
Chtěl jsem je prodat zpátky Nikosovi, ale nějak se mi nedaří se s ním spojit.
Ty ses asi zbláznil!
Takže poslední věc, co nás s tím vším spojuje, leží na zadním sedadle tvýho auta na parkovišti?!
Stály mě 700 liber. Nezahodím je jen tak. Jaká je asi pravděpodobnost, že je vystopujou až k nám?
Ty si jako myslíš, že takovej risk stojí za 700 liber?
To ses posral.
Teď hned vezmeš ty brokovnice a hodíš je z mostu do řeky.
A můžeš tam mimochodem skočit taky.
Hned.
Ale já bych...
Hned.

Táto, dal bych si pivo.
Nemám čas, nalij si sám.

6.4 Appendix 4: Audio post-test transcription (50 excerpts)

1) Now if you don't mind. (old)
2) Look at that one there. (new)
3) That depends on how you look at it. (old)
4) You want one as well, darling? (new)
5) And think about what we're gonna do. Now, sit down. (old)
6) It's a deal, it's a steal. (new)
7) And they're armed. What was that? Armed? (old)
8) Well, this seems to be a waste of my time. (new)
9) What do you mean armed? (old)
10) Hold on, you want one as well?
11) How to get 500 000 pounds (old)
12) That's my 25 grand, it's all there. (new)
13) These are gonna do more harm than good. (old)
14) Very nice, Harry. (new)
15) Don't complicate things, just hide. (old)
16) What's it for? (new)
17) Where the hell are we gonna hide? (old)
18) So why the fuck are you counting it? (new)
19) Back to more important issues if you don't mind. (old)
20) You're not funny, Tom. You're fat. (new)
21) We wait 'till it sounds like the right time. (old)
22) Jesus, it's good in here, innit? (new)
23) If you know what I mean. (old)
24) And what the hell are you doing here? (new)
25) Knives are good because they don't make any noise. (old)
26) This is a bit heavy. This is London, not the Lebanon. (new)
27) Keys. I want keys, now. (old)

28)I might get laughed at (new)
29)I'll find you. (old)
30)I wanna look fucking mean. (new)
31)That pile takes care of Harry. (old)
32)And what are we supposed to do with these? (new)
33)What about this gear then, eh? (old)
34)Where the fuck are they going? (new)
35)No, I don't think I want any of that horrible shit. (old)
36)I'm losing patience, hurry up, girls! (new)
37)What the fuck has happened here? (old)
38)I heard about him. He's a fucking lunatic. (new)
39)You can think about it. (old)
40)Tom, the fatter you get, the sadder you get. (new)
41)Which means there's no more debt (old)
42)Will you two stop flirting for a minute? (new)
43)What is going on? (old)
44)I'm gonna phone him. (new)
45)And if there's no more debt, there's no more problem. (old)
46)I thought it might be a good idea to disguise ourselves a little. (new)
47)Now. (old)
48)Where are the others? (new)
49)Invitations. Invitations? (old)
50)It appears so. (new)

7 ANOTACE

Autor:	Černý Albert
Katedra:	Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky FF UPOL
Název česky:	Zlepšování percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce
Název anglicky:	Improving perceptual skills of second language learners
Vedoucí práce:	Václav Jonáš Podlipský, Ph.D.
Počet stran:	42
Počet znaků:	55723 + přílohy
Počet příloh:	4
Počet titulů použité literatury:	34
Klíčová slova v ČJ:	cizí jazyk, poslech, percepce, Cockney, SLA,
Klíčová slova v AJ:	foreign language, listening, perception, Cockney, SLA, Second language acquisition,

Anotace v ČJ: Hlavní inspirací této práce je studie zabývající se vnímáním méně obvyklých variet angličtiny holandskými posluchači. Výsledky zmíněné studie nasvědčují tomu, že sledování cizojazyčných filmů s titulky v daném jazyce vede ke zlepšení percepčních dovedností v cizím jazyce. Hlavním cílem této práce bylo zjistit, do jaké míry je možné replikovat výsledky zmíněné studie s českými respondenty. Práce provádí přehled literatury na téma percepce cizího jazyka a na téma zlepšování percepce cizího jazyka. Test ověří, zdali poslech titulkované řeči povede ke zlepšení vnímání neznámé variety angličtiny. Dalším cílem této práce je ověřit, zdali během samotného testu nastane u respondentů zlepšení percepčních schopností.

Anotace v AJ: This paper is mainly inspired by a study dealing with perception of accented English by Dutch listeners. The results of the study suggest that watching foreign-language films with matching subtitles improves second-language perception skills. The main aim of the present paper is to find out whether the findings of the study mentioned could be replicated with Czech subjects. The paper provides a review of literature on second-language speech perception and on speech-perception training. A test will show whether listening to subtitled speech improves the perception of previously unknown, accented variant of English. The additional objective of the present paper is to investigate whether there is any improvement in English accented speech perception abilities thanks to exposure during the test itself.