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**ABSTRACT**

This study is aimed to find out the errors of speech production in Dory’s utterances of *Finding Dory* movie. The theory used to find out the errors of Dory’s speech production was Levelt’s model of speech production (1999): conceptualisation, formulation, articulation, and self-monitoring. Words in the form of dialogues (Dory’s utterances when her short-term memory loss appeared only) were the data in this study. The research design of this study was qualitative.

The results showed the errors of speech production in Dory’s utterances were identified into five types such as words substitution, contradictory utterance, similar words rhyming, incomplete utterances, and hesitation utterance. The most affected stage by Dory’s short-term memory loss was conceptualisation. It was because during the times when short-term memory loss appeared, Dory realised that her disorder infiltrating the stage that made her to be unsatisfied and as the result, she retracted and performed her utterances from the beginning many times. Therefore, this study concluded the errors that Dory produced in her speech production were all caused by the interference of short-term memory loss.
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*ABSTRAK*

*Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu kesalahan-kesalahan yang terdapat pada produksi ujaran dalam ujaran-ujaran karakter Dory difilm Finding Dory. Teori yang digunakan untuk mengetahui kesalahan-kesalahan tersebut yaitu model produksi ujaran milik Levelt (1999) yang terdiri dari: konseptualisasi, formulasi, artikulasi, dan monitoring-mandiri. Kata-kata berupa dialog-dialog (yang hanya berisi ujaran-ujaran yang Dory ujarkan selama gangguan kehilangan memori jangka pendeknya muncul) merupakan data dari penelitian ini. Bentuk penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kualitatif.*

*Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kesalahan-kesalahan produksi ujaran dalam ujaran-ujaran karakter Dory diidentifikasi kedalam lima tipe yaitu substitusi kata-kata, ujaran yang bertentangan, kata-kata yang memiliki rima sama, ujaran-ujaran tidak lengkap, dan ujaran yang ragu-ragu. Tahapan produksi ujaran yang paling dipengaruhi oleh gangguan kehilangan memori jangka pendek pada ujaran-ujaran Dory yaitu tahapan konseptualisasi. Hal ini dikarenakan selama gangguan kehilangan memori jangka pendek muncul, Dory menyadari gangguan tersebut telah menganggu tahapan konseptualisasi miliknya sehingga hal ini membuatnya tidak puas terhadap hasil ujaran yang diproses di konseptualisasi. Sebagai akibatnya, Dory menarik kembali semua ujarannya dari awal dan mengatakan ulang ujaran-ujaran yang sudah ia perbaiki tersebut. Maka dari itu, penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa kesalahan-kesalahan yang Dory buat dalam produksi ujarannya disebabkan oleh gangguan dari kehilangan memori jangka pendek yang dideritanya.*

***Kata Kunci:*** *eror, psikolinguistik, produksi ujaran, model Levelt, konseptualisasi, formulasi, artikulasi, monitoring-mandiri*

**A. INTRODUCTION**

The speech production is somewhat allowing us to see one’s process of producing speech from the very first step such as conceptualising that will be uttered by a person to the last step of using it (the speeches) as the tool in doing interaction. This process of speech production obviously relates with the state of mind of the speaker him/herself which in other words, can be used to find out what may differ with each individual’s speech production. This is the matter - even if all people in this world have their own kind of languages as their tool to interact with other people (whether it is from the same language or not), each individual will inevitably produce his/her own language that marks it as different with other individual who speaks the same language. This makes the researcher wants to discuss a study concerning on speech production by a certain character.

This study is concerned in finding out the errors in Dory’s speech production. The researcher analyses the way Dory produced her utterances through Levelt’s model of speech production (1999) that covers four stages: conceptualisation, formulation, articulation, and self-monitoring. Yet, it is needed to be underlined that this study is only focused on Dory’s utterances when her short-term memory loss was acting up. Therefore, this study is entitled *The Errors of* *Speech Production in Dory’s Utterances of Finding Dory Movie.*

**B. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

**1. DEFINITION OF SHORT-TERM MEMORY LOSS**

Short-term memory loss is a condition when an individual lost everyday information that he/she has just learned (Irish Cancer Society 2010: 1). This is a normal condition of our everyday life, but when an individual tends to forget something more frequently and consistently, it may affect a lot of aspects in his/her life and this is a cause of concern. Repetition of same questions or phrases in one conversation, being confused and hardly keeping track of what just happened are some examples of short-term memory loss symptoms (Irish Cancer Society 2010: 1).

**2. LEVELT’S MODEL OF SPEECH PRODUCTION**

One of the concerns in psycholinguistics is about how an individual produces language. According to Scovel (1998: 6) “the production of language demands the synthetic talents of an imaginary mental chef, who selects the appropriate ingredients, weighs them carefully, and then stirs them together into a creative new dish.” Scovel (1998: 27) uses one of the most influential psycholinguistics models for speech production developed by Levelt with the stages are: conceptualisation, formulation, articulation, and self-monitoring.

**a. Conceptualisation**

This stage is very important in speech production because this is the stage where idea comes from. The process of turning what has been visually perceived into word or lemma following its proper name (Levelt, Roelofs, & Meyer 1999: 4). Since conceptualisation is the process going on someone’s mind, then it appears difficult to know what happens on someone’s mind. There are two sort of indicators to help knowing or understanding the stage of conceptualisation: model of addressee and discourse or situation model (Roelofs & Ferreira: 2). Model of addressee is meant to conceptualise words or lemmas based on the objects that have been visually presented. Meanwhile, discourse or situation model will conceptualise words or lemmas based on the situation where the visually presented objects are involved.

**b. Formulation**

Formulation is the next stage in speech production after people conceptualise their thoughts or feelings. Each word that flows easily from their mouth when people speak is the result of conceptualisation and formulation of speech. Although their speech may seem to be effortlessly come from their mouth, the speech fluency is the source to help people in understanding the speech process in the formulation stage. Levet et al. explain formulation stage focuses on forming the proper sentences through grammatical encoding after understanding what kind of message a speaker wishes to say (1999: 4). In this stage, an indicator to formulate the speaker’s message is through grammatical encoding (Roelofs & Ferreira: 3).

The way to find out whether one’s grammatical encoding contains any error or not, one can look at the slips of the tongue. Slips of the tongue helps people by showing detailed understanding of how speech is formulated (Scovel 1998: 31). This speech error occurs every day and it is normal. Slips of the tongue allow people to understand what a speaker wants to say and the errors allow them to seize the linguistic mechanism in one production briefly (Scovel 1998: 32). People tend to correct themselves before someone else does when they realise of making some errors in their speech.

**c. Articulation**

The third stage of speech production is articulation. Firstly, people conceptualise their thoughts and formulate it as their message that they intend to say and then they continue to articulate it as their speech. According to Levelt et al., articulation stage is about producing sounds to differentiate each word or lemma that a speaker intends to say (1999: 5). This stage involves the articulatory system of the body such as mouth, lungs, larynx or the ‘voice box’, and lips that work together with the phonetics plan at the same time (Scovel 1998: 44).

According to Scovel (1998: 41) this stage of speech production is like processing words from computer program to printer. However, if the printer is not working properly, some of the words might not be ‘articulated’ correctly. When the conceptualisation and formulation in the brain work properly then the articulation will articulate utterances properly as well. If there is error in the articulation, then it indicates that something goes off whether in the conceptualisation or the formulation stages.

**d. Self-Monitoring**

Contrary to conceptualisation and formulation, self-monitoring shows more proof of what is happening when people produce speech (Scovel 1998: 46). This stage aims to find out whether the articulated message contains any error, dysfluency, or other problem (Levelt et al. 1999: 6). There are two indicators to identify the way self-monitoring works by looking at the overt speech and/or articulation onset (Roelofs & Ferreira: 4).

According to Scovel (1998: 47), when people are not satisfied with their speech because they choose the wrong beginning in their conceptualisation stage, they tend to retract and perform the speech from the start. However, when people are satisfied with the conceptualisation, but they slip up in their formulation and articulation stages, they are more likely to correct a few syllables or words in the speech where it begins to slip up as seen in the example above.

**3. PREVIOUS STUDIES**

The first previous study was entitled *Language Disorder of Main Character in the Movie “My Name is Khan”* by Suherman, 2015. This study concerned on finding out the types of language disorder suffered by main character in *My Name is Khan* movie, Khan. Suherman used Carroll’s (1985) theory on language disorder in analysing the data on his study which were the utterances of Khan character. The form of Suherman study was a qualitative research with descriptive as its method in analysing the data. The result showed that Khan character of *My Name is Khan* movie suffered from two kinds of language disorder, expressive and receptive.

The second previous study was entitled *The Effects of Marine Conservation in Finding Dory Movie* by Dea Handini, 2017. The aim of Handini’s study was to reveal the positive and negative effects of Marine Life Institute as the conservation place towards the sea lives as portrayed in *Finding Dory* movie. Handini used ecocriticism approach as the theory in completing the aim of her study. As the results showed that the positive effects of Marine Life Institute towards the sea lives as portrayed in *Finding Dory* movie were to save Dory character from waste pollution in the sea and to treat the sick sea animals. However, the negative effects of the Marine Life Institute in *Finding Dory* movie seemed to be greater than the positive effects: domesticated the sea animals, set the sea animals in an appropriate aquarium, changed the natural ability of sea animals, and used the sea animals as economical comodity.

**C. RESEARCH METHOD**

Qualitative research is well known for its methods of using words and pictures as its data rather than number regarding that they (words and pictures) are more informative (Patton & Cochran 2002: 2). It is because words and pictures deliver more than certain value (for instance about the percentage) on certain phenomenon in society that they explain the cause-effect detailed. This study used qualitative research as its design regarding on its focus and data of the study. The instrument used in this study was the researcher himself. Words in the form of narrations and dialogues (utterances produced by Dory character only when her short-term memory loss acting up again) were used as the data needed in this study due to the form of this study as a qualitative research in which analysing words. The data needed (words in the form of narrations and dialogues) were taken from *Finding Dory* (2016) movie and its movie script by Andrew Stanton and Victoria Strouse. There were two steps done in collecting the data needed in this study. The researcher watched *Finding Dory* movie and took notes of which utterances (narrations and dialogues) of Dory character that she produced when her short-term memort loss was acting up.

The analysis started by displaying the data that had been uttered by Dory. This was included as the articulation stage which meant that the analysis of data started from the articulation stage. The next step was the self-monitoring stage. The researcher identified the speech errors of Dory’s utterances by finding out which part of the utterances that Dory was self-monitoring with or if in certain cases, Dory might not perform the self-monitoring, then the researcher looked for the speech errors. After finding out the speech errors that Dory had produced, then the researcher continued to analyse Dory’s formulation and conceptualisation stages. This process aimed to find out which stage that had been interfered by short-term memory loss that caused errors or other problems in Dory’s utterances. This led to the cause of whether, in formulation stage, where the speech errors that Dory produced were only the trivial ones or in conceptualisation stage where the speech errors were the biggest ones.

**D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**1. THE ERRORS OF SPEECH PRODUCTION IN DORY’S UTTERANCES**

This study concerned to find out the errors of Dory’s speech production that happened during the time when her short-term memory loss was acting up. Her short-term memory loss somehow interfered her interaction and conversation with other characters which causing some errors in her speech production.

1. **The Error in form of Word Substitution**

Dory suddenly remembered about her parents and decided to find them. She was so excited that she could remember her family again and asked Marlin and Nemo to come with her finding them. However, Marlin tried to stop her and refused to help due to his unpleasant memory of losing Nemo.

Data 1 min. 13:59

Marlin : Dory. No. No! This is crazy. Where exactly are you trying to go?

Dory : *To the... To the... gym of the... Baltic.*

Nemo : The jewel of Morro Bay, California.

Dory : *Yes!*

The focus of Dory’s conversation above was about the (suspected) place where Dory’s parents lived at the moment. The three characters who were involved in data 1 conversation: Dory, Marlin, and Nemo were talking about one particular place where Dory’s parents were at which was called ‘The Jewel of Morro Bay’. Yet, due to the fact that in this stage, Dory’s short-term memory loss occured, it got her to produce errors. Dory could not conceptualise the idea of her utterance based on what was going on with the conversation. She knew the focus, but could not remember its name (what was it called) and as the result, Dory conceptualised the closest name on her brain that she thought would be the name of the place.

Dory then continued to the next stage as formulation where she formulated the message into proper speech. The formulation stage indicated in data 1 above was when Dory replied the question of Marlin asking her destination of looking her parents. Dory replied that she was going to look for her parents in the gym of Baltic (even though it was supposed to be in ‘The Jewel of Morro Bay’). After finding out the speech error that Dory had made from her utterance above, this showed the stage that prompted Dory to produce speech error was conceptualisation. It was because her speech error was not the minor ones. Dory mentioned hesitantly a complete unlikely place from ‘The Jewel of Morro Bay, California’ to a place called ‘Gym of the Baltic’.

The type of error that Dory made in data 1 above was identified as word substitution. The error was identified in her words of ‘To the... To the... gym of the... Baltic.’ Dory should have said ‘The jewel of Morro Bay instead of the gym of the Baltic’ as the right name of her parents’ whereabout. This fact signified that Dory had just substituted the right name into the ones that she remembered. The error of word substitution occured because short-term memory loss struck Dory’s mind at the moment she conceptualised her speech.

**b. The Error in form of Contradictory Utterance**

Dory were caught by some people and brought from the ocean to the quarantine in The Jewel of Morro Bay, California. Dory then met Hank, an octopus who tried to escape from being released to the ocean by persuading Dory to give him her tag.

Data 3 min. 24:05

Dory : *What were we talking about?*

Hank : Um. You were about to give me your tag.Dory : *Well, I kind of like my tag. Why-Why do you want it?*

Hank : SO I CAN GO TO...! So that I can go to Cleveland.

Dory : *Cleveland. I hear good things about Cleveland. Why do you want to go there?*

Hank : Because if I stay here I’m going to get released back into the ocean. And I have extremely unpleasant memories of that place! I just want to live in a glass box alone. That’s all I want. GIVE ME YOUR TAG!

Dory : *Hey, man. Don’t touch my tag.*

Hank : Look. I don’t work here. It’s not like I have a map of this place.

Dory : *Huh! A map. Good idea. You take me to the map. I figure out where my parents are. Oh boy.*

Hank : Alright. If I get you to your family will you give me...

Dory : *I don’t have much. Um. I... How about if I give you this tag.*

Hank : Great idea.

The focus of Dory and Hank’s conversation above was about the tag on Dory’s fin (she wanted to give the tag to Hank). Yet, once again, her short-term memory loss attacked her on this stage, which caused Dory for not being able to remember the focus of her utterance. On the other hand, Dory’s formulation stage worked fine. She was able to formulate the message she wanted to deliver even after producing errors in the conceptualisation before. Right after when she asked Hank the focus of their conversation, Dory was able to formulate her speech in order to keep in track in the conversation.

After finding out the speech error that Dory had made from her utterance above, this led to the stage that caused Dory to produce speech errors. The stage was conceptualisation. In the beginning, Dory mentioned that she liked her tag and in the next seconds she mentioned ‘Um. I... How about if I give you my tag’ which was a contradictory utterance from what she said before. If the speech error in her utterance above occured in the formulation stage, then the error would only be in the form of slip of the tounge as misspoken and not mentioning a complete contradictory utterance from what she had stated before.

The type of error that Dory made in data 3 was identified as a contradictory utterance that Dory made. In the beginning of her conversation with Hank, she claimed that she liked her tag and thus refused to give it to Hank. Yet, when the conversation was about to end, Dory produced a contradictory utterance saying that she would like to give her tag to Hank. This contradictory utterance of Dory was identified as an error form since this was produced as the result of short-term memory loss’ interference. Dory could not remember about what she had uttered previously which made her to produce the contradictory utterance along with her changing mind (from refusing to give to willingly giving).

**c. The Error in form of Similar Word Rhyming**

Dory’s encounter with Destiny led her to another clue of her family’s whereabout; Open Ocean exhibit. She had to go from Destiny’s aquarium to the Open Ocean exhibit by swimming through the pipes.

Data 5 min. 34:50

Dory : *Always another way. There’s...There! Guys, follow me. I know how we can get**to**locomotion.*

Destiny : Open ocean.

Bailey : Open ocean.

Dory : *Exactly.*

In conceptualisation, the focus of data 5 conversation above was about a place called ‘Open Ocean’ as the place that Dory had to go to in getting closer to her parents’ whereabout. Consequently, the conceptualisation stage in this conversation that Dory had to conceptualise was a place called ‘Open Ocean’. Yet, in this stage, the idea that stayed on Dory’s mind was ‘locomotion’ not the ‘Open Ocean’. On the other hand, the formulation stage that experienced the speech error this time. Dory’s short-term memory loss struck her in this stage which causing her to perform the slip of the tounge. Dory accidentally formulated the message that she was supposed to utter ‘Open Ocean’ into ‘locomotion’.

The reason why Dory’s speech error above was identified as the error from formulation stage because she was satisfied with her conceptualisation. Dory was really sure with what she was about to say, therefore she did not retract her speech and perform it from the beginning. She only mentioned a wrong name of her parents’ whereabout from ‘Open Ocean’ to a place called ‘locomotion’ which rhymed to each other. Both ‘Open Ocean’ and ‘locomotion’ had four syllables.

The type of error that Dory made in data 5 was identified as similar word rhyming. Dory chose to mention the word that had similar rhyme sounding to the word that she could not remember due to her short-term memory loss. Dory was supposed to mention ‘Open Ocean’ instead of ‘locomotion’. Yet, during formulating the words of ‘Open Ocean’ in formulating stage, her short-term memory interfered and caused her to produce the error. Dory mentioned ‘locomotion’ as her final utterance.

**d. The Error in form of Incomplete Utterance**

As Dory arrived in the quarantine of Open Ocean, Hank helped her to get into the blue tang aquarium, but she could not find her parents and the other blue tang fish told her that her parents were gone.

Data 7 min. 1:04:40

Dory : *Mommy? Daddy? Help. No. No. No. Help. Help. Help me. Help. Help me. Please. Somebody help me! Hey, can... help me? Can you help me? I’ve lost them!*

Female Fish : Oh. Lost who?

Dory : *I-I-I-I...*

Female Fish : Ah, sorry, honey. I can’t help you if you don’t remember.

In conceptualisation stage, Dory was not able to conceptualise the focus of her conversation with the Female Fish. She was supposed to be able to form a complete and clear utterance as her response of the Female Fish’s question. The concept of data 7 conversation was Dory who just lost Nemo and Marlin when fell down to the aquarium. This implied that Dory should have been able to answer the Female Fish’s question that she lost her friends, Nemo and Marlin. In formulation stage, Dory was only able to formulate stuttering word as the result of her failed conceptualisation. She formulated any message that her conceptualisation was able to which came out as the incomplete utterance.

The stage that prompted Dory to produce speech errors which was conceptualisation. The reason of Dory’s speech error above was identified as the error from conceptualisation stage because her error was not the minor ones. Dory stuttered and could not even finish her utterance. Assuming that the error of her utterance above was indicated to occur in the formulation stage, subsequently the error would only be in the form of slip of the tongue. Dory might find an adequate utterance to tell the Female Fish about who she had lost. The type of error that Dory produced in data 7 above was an incomplete utterance. Due to her unstable state of mind (she was panicking at the moment) and added by her short-term memory loss that interfered right at the moment, Dory could not finish her utterance. She was only capable of producing stuttering words.

**e. The Error in form of Hesitation Utterance**

Dory finally reunited with her parents. She saw Hank and tried to convince her to come with her to the ocean.

Data 9 min. 1:17:34

Hank : What is it with you and ruining my plans? Listen to me, I have one goal in life. One! And it is to...

Dory : *No, you listen to me. What is so great about plans? I never had a plan. Did I plan to lose my parents? No. Did I plan to find Marlin? No. Did you and I plan to meet? Wait. Did we?*

Hank : Are you almost done?

Dory : *Well, I don’t think we did.*

In conceptualisation stage, Dory was able to utter the focus of her conversation with Hank. The focus was Dory wanted Hank to listen to her explaining why Hank should live in the ocean rather than being cooped up in a glass box for the rest of his life. Dory was able to conceptualise her speech without being interfered with her short-term memory loss (this was shown in the articulation stage that Dory produced no pause, stuttering, or even retracted her speech).

In formulation stage, Dory’s short-term memory loss struck which causing her to question her own utterance in the last italicised words of data 9 above. Dory was not sure with her own statement that she and Hank probably never planned to meet on such occasion. The moment Dory was doubting her statement was the time when her short-term memory loss struck. This resulted to her formulating the speech of ‘Wait. Did we?’ with questionable tone. Therefore, it could be stated that Dory was not successfully formulating her speech since there was a spark of doubt existed.

The error that Dory produced in her utterance above occured in the formulation stage. Dory did not attempt to retract her speech and perform it from the beginning. She just retracted her speech in the last words, ‘Wait. Did We?’ where her short-term memory loss began to occur. The type of error occured in data 9 was identified as hesitation utterance. Dory’s last words of ‘Wait. Did We?’ signified the error caused by her short-term memory loss. Dory was uncertain about her previous utterance because she could not remember well whether the previous utterance was right or wrong. Thus, she produced another utterance out of her uncertainty which then turned out as her error.

**2. DISCUSSION**

Comparing this study with Suherman’s study entitled *Language Disorder of Main Character in the Movie “My Name is Khan”* (2015) had shown similarity and differences. The similarity between Suherman’s study with the current study was on the fact that both studies concerned on psycholinguistics issue particularly on the utterances produced by characters who suffered from certain disorder. Suherman focused on analysing the types of language disorder produced by Khan character who suffered from autism. Meanwhile, the current study focused its analysis on the errors of speech production of a character who suffered from short-term memory loss named Dory in *Finding Dory* movie.

The differences between Suherman’s study and this study were the focus of the study, theory used, and research design. First, Suherman chose *My Name is Khan* (2015) movie as his focus to find out the types of language disorder posed by Khan character, while the current study chose *Finding Dory* (2016) movie as the focus of study to find out the errors of speech production in Dory’s utterances. Second, Suherman’s study used Carroll’s (1985) language disorder theory in his study, while the current study used Levelt’s model of speech production (1999) theory and two additional explanation by Scovel (1998) and Carroll (1999) on the speech production theory. Moreover, Suherman’s study was a qualitative research with descriptive approach as its method in analysing the data of his study while the current study was a qualitative research with conversation analysis as its method in analysing the data of the study.

For the second previous study, there were also similarity and differences appeared between this study and Handini’s *The Effects of Marine Conservation in Finding Dory Movie* by Dea Handini, (2017). Handini’s study concerned on explaining the positive and negative impacts of Marine Life Institute to the sea animals as shown in *Finding Dory* movie. The result of Handini’s study claimed the negative effects of the Marine Life Institute in *Finding Dory* movie seemed to be greater than the positive effects: domesticated the sea animals, set the sea animals in an appropriate aquarium, changed the natural ability of sea animals, and used the sea animals as economical comodity.

Between the results of Handini’s study with the current study showed similarity and differences. The similarity appeared on the use of *Finding Dory* movie as the object of the study. Meanwhile, the differences were: (1) the objectives of Handini’s study were the positive and negative effects of Marine Life Institute as the sea animals conservation place in *Finding Dory* movie, while the current study’s objective was to find out the errors of the speech production Dory’s utterances of *Finding Dory* movie who suffered from short-term memory loss and (2) even though both Suherman’s study and the current study used *Finding Dory* movie as the object of the study, yet the scope of current study set on the psycholinguistic field, while Handini’s study set her scope on the literature field.

The current study focused to find out the errors of speech production in Dory’s utterances of *Finding Dory* movie who suffered from short-term memory loss by using Levelt’s model of speech production (1999). The speech errors caused by short-term memory loss occured in Dory’s utterances were only found in two stages of speech production: conceptualisation and formulation stages. The errors found in conceptualisation stage of Dory’s utterances were identified as word substitution, contradictory utterance, similar words rhyming, and incomplete utterance. In this stage, the most common error that Dory produced were word substitution and incomplete utterance. Meanwhile, the errors found in formulation stage of Dory’s utterances were identified as similar words rhyming, incomplete utterances, and hesitation utterance. The most common error to occur in formulation stage was incomplete utterances.

**E. CONCLUSIONS**

There were two stages of speech production affected by her short-term memory loss in which resulting Dory to produce errors in her utterances. The two stages were conceptualisation and formulation. There were five errors of speech production found in Dory’s utterances such as word substitution, contradictory utterance, similar words rhyming, incomplete utterance, and hesitation utterance. The most affected stage by Dory’s short-term memory loss was conceptualisation. This happened due to the fact that Dory was not satisfied with the utterances (after being infiltrated by short-term memory loss) that she uttered in which causing her to retract and perform the utterances from the beginning. In addition, the form of speech errors that Dory produced often times were repetition and pauses (indicating hesitation).
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