

1 **Larger social networks may increase stigma against vocal illness:**
2 **An integrated empirical and computational study of deciphering help-seeking**
3 **behaviors and vocal stigma**

4
5 Aaron R. Glick, MSc^{1,9,10}, Colin Jones, MSc¹, Lisa Martignetti, MSc¹, Lisa Blanchette³, Theresa Tova³,
6 Allen Henderson, MM⁴, Marc D. Pell, PhD^{1,5}, Nicole Y. K. Li-Jessen, PhD^{1,5,6,7,8}

7
8 ¹ School of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, McGill
9 University, Quebec, Canada

10 ² School of Medicine, University of Montreal, Quebec, Canada

11 ³ The Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

12 ⁴ National Association of Teachers of Singing, Jacksonville, Florida, U.S.A.

13 ⁵ The Centre for Research on Brain, Language and Music, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

14 ⁶ Department of Biomedical Engineering, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

15 ⁷ Department of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

16 ⁸ Research Institute of McGill University Health Center, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

17 ⁹ Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

18 ¹⁰ Masonic Institute for the Developing Brain, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

19

20

21

22

23 *Correspondence to:* Nicole Li-Jessen; nicole.li@mcgill.ca; 2001 McGill College Ave, 8th Floor,
24 Montreal, Quebec, H3A 1G1, Canada

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background**

28 Individuals with a stigmatized medical condition are often reluctant to seek medical help. Among
29 professionals, singers and actors often experience stigma associated with voice disorders. Scientific
30 evidence for vocal stigma is, however, limited and primarily anecdotal. No quantitative research has
31 explored the impact that vocal stigma may have on help-seeking behavior in professional vocal
32 performers. This study deployed and integrated empirical and computational tools to (1) quantify the
33 experience of vocal stigma and help-seeking behaviors and (2) predict their modulations with peer
34 influences in social networks.

35 **Methods**

36 Experience of vocal stigma and information-motivation-behavioral (IMB) skills were prospectively
37 profiled using online surveys from a total of 403 Canadians (200 vocal performers and 203 controls). The
38 survey data were used to formulate an agent-based network model that numerically simulates the effect of
39 social interactions on vocal stigma and help-seeking behaviors. Each virtual agent updates their IMB
40 states via social interaction, which in turn changes their self- and social-stigma states. Profiles from vocal
41 performers and non-vocal performers were compared as a function of network size. Network analysis was
42 performed to evaluate the effect of social network structure on the flow of information and motivation
43 among virtual agents.

44 **Results**

45 Over 4000 simulation runs in each context, larger social networks are more likely to contribute to an
46 increase in vocal stigma. For small social networks, total stigma was reduced with higher total IMB but
47 much less so for large networks with around 400 agents. For the agent population of vocal performers
48 with high social-stigma and risk for voice disorder, their vocal stigma is resistant to large changes in IMB.
49 Agents with extreme IMB and stigma values are also likely to polarize their networks faster in larger
50 social groups.

51 **Conclusions**

52 We used empirical surveys to contextualize vocal stigma and IMB in real world populations and
53 developed a computational model to theorize and quantify the interaction among stigma, health-seeking
54 behavior and influence of social interactions. This work establishes an effective, predictable experimental
55 platform to provide scientific evidence in developing public policy or social interventions of reducing
56 health stigma in voice disorders and other medical conditions.

57 **Keywords**

58 agent-based models, health stigma, social computing, social networks, vocal health

59

60

61 **Background**

62 Occupational voice users contribute a significant labour force in Canada and elsewhere [1-5]. For
63 instance, more than 35,000 professional artists such as voice performers, radio hosts and singers are
64 employed in Canada as of 2016 [6]. Alarming, the estimated lifetime prevalence of voice problems is as
65 much as 80% for occupational voice users [7-9]. They also report devastating physical and emotional
66 difficulties as well as challenges in professional and career development [7, 8, 10, 11]. The direct health
67 care cost associated with voice problems is estimated as \$1.75 billion/year in Canada [12, 13]. Indirect
68 health care costs related to anxiety, loss of workdays and employment, and other negative quality-of-life
69 sequelae are incalculable [14-18]. Reduction in occupational vocal problems would improve patient well-
70 being and reduce the healthcare burden on society.

71 *Theoretical Framework of Health Stigma*

72 Stigma is considered a serious threat to population health inequalities as it disrupts resource availability,
73 social relationships and coping behaviors within society [19]. Individuals with a stigmatized medical
74 condition may become reluctant to seek medical help [20]. For example, a meta-analysis on mental health
75 stigma found a negative correlation between stigma and help-seeking [21]. Similarly, a meta-analysis of
76 stigma and health outcomes in HIV/AIDS found that those who experience symptoms of stigma were
77 21% less likely to access health and social services [22]. Individual studies also found associations
78 between stigma and avoidance or delaying of help-seeking in other health issues, including alcoholism
79 [23] and cancers [24]. Similarly, stigma against vocal illness, i.e., *vocal stigma*, is a known barrier to
80 vocal performers seeking help for work-related illness.

81 In 2019, Stangl et al. published a seminal paper “*The Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework*” in
82 BMC Medicine [25]. The paper proposed a hierarchy of social levels on which stigma operates, and a
83 series of processes leading from the creation of a stigma to its measurable outcomes. In brief, the
84 proposed framework consists of a multi-level social hierarchy, namely, individual, interpersonal,
85 organizational, community, and public policy. Within this hierarchy, the stigmatization process starts with

86 constituent factors that drive or facilitate health stigma. Then, individuals with a specific health condition
87 are “marked” or “labeled” with a stigma, followed by manifestations, i.e., attitudes, behaviors, and
88 experiences that arise from the stigma in those who are marked by the stigma and those around them.
89 Finally, the stigma manifestations affect a range of measurable outcomes on affected populations (e.g.,
90 access to healthcare) and the society (e.g., public policies against discrimination).

91 By adopting Stangl et al.’s framework to vocal stigma, vocal performers with vocal impairments can
92 entail catastrophic fears about losing the employment, social status, and creative fulfilment that their art
93 provides [26]. In other words, they fear the consequences of not being able to meet the vocal demands of
94 performance. This fear is a strong candidate for a driving factor in vocal stigma among vocal performers.
95 However, individuals face different vocal demands and consequences for being unable to perform. For
96 example, actors and singers face different vocal demands, and full-time performers face greater
97 consequences from voice disorders than those who have other sources of income. (**Figure 1**)





Figure 1. Proposed Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework for Vocal Stigma. Adapted from Stangl et al. (2019)

101 Predicting Help-Seeking Behavior

102 Predicting help-seeking and other behaviors that influence health is a major topic in the field of health
103 psychology [27]. One prominent psychological model for making these predictions is the Information
104 Motivation Behavioral Skills (IMB) model [28]. *Information* represents a person’s knowledge and beliefs
105 about the behavior, and about the issue that the behavior is intended to address. *Motivation* represents a
106 person’s attitudes toward the predicted behavior, and their perception of social norms around it, i.e., what
107 attitudes does the person believe other people hold? An example can be perceived costs and benefits of

108 the behavior. *Behavioral Skills* represents a person's ability to perform the behavior. This component can
109 include objective skills, psychological skills and more importantly self-efficacy, i.e., a person's intention
110 to seek help [29].

111 By applying this IMB model to vocal stigma, *information* includes a person's knowledge and beliefs
112 about voice disorders and related issues. *Motivation* includes a person's attitudes and perception of social
113 norms about seeking professional medical help for a voice disorder. Finally, *behavioral skills* represent
114 the intention to seek professional medical help if they acquire a voice disorder (**Figure 2**).



115
116 **Figure 2. Proposed Information Motivation Behavioral Skills Model of Predicting Help-Seeking**
117 **Behavior for Voice Disorders.** Adopted from Fisher et al. (2002).

118 Computer Simulation of Social Networks

119 In response to the well-recognized health challenges presented by stigma, various strategies have been
120 proposed to reduce the stigma around conditions such as HIV and mental illness. At the level of social-
121 stigma, one common approach is to provide information about a health condition to the general public,
122 emphasizing that affected individuals are not to blame for their condition. Other interventions include
123 promoting empathy and understanding toward affected individuals, for example via testimonials or social
124 contact between affected and unaffected individuals. For self-stigma, a provision of counselling or coping
125 strategies can also be implemented to affected individuals [30-32].

126 Of these, social contact has emerged as the most successful strategy for reducing stigma in adults [30, 33].

127 Computer simulation has emerged as a powerful, quantitative way to study social networks and their

128 effects on human behavior and public policy. In fact, social networks have been investigated as a
129 structural determinant of health on their role in the spread of social behaviors and attitudes affecting
130 health outcomes [34]. For instance, testable models have been developed to simulate the mechanisms of
131 misinformation, bias, and polarization in social networks [35, 36], characterize the effects of
132 misinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic [37], and help understand stigma and its impact on
133 obesity, depression, mental illness, heart disease, and HIV-prevention [38-41].

134 In particular, agent-based models (ABM) have become a pivotal simulation platform in social and
135 behavioral sciences in the fast-growing field of *social computing* [42-44]. ABM have been applied for
136 building and testing theories in stock markets [45-47], consumer behaviors [48-53], and psychological
137 cooperation [54-57]. For driver behaviors in particular [58-66], ABMs are used to simulate how the
138 behavior of a driver (*an individual agent*) will affect other drivers (*other agents*) and the evolving traffic
139 patterns (*emergent population behavior*). Rather than individual isolated decisions, social behaviors often
140 resulted from interactions among people with diverse backgrounds over time. Such characteristics match
141 very well with the framework of ABMs.

142 In essence, an ABM is built up by a collection of entities called *agents*, whose state and behavior are
143 governed by a set of computational *rules*. Agents “live” in the virtual *world*, which is discretized into
144 grids, or *patches*. Each *patch* is a certain situation or a physical environment that an agent lives in. In the
145 application of social behaviors, each agent can represent an individual person with distinctive features
146 with respect to demography, psychology and social history. Second, an individual agent makes its own
147 decision and adapts the behavior to the environment over time that effectively represents the dynamics of
148 social and physical influences on human behavior in the real world [43]. Lastly, ABM is technically
149 flexible for users to explore a wide parameter space and a long temporal scale, which otherwise would be
150 very costly or at times prohibitive with empirical experiments. For example, ABM can simulate human
151 interactions in social networks with the ability to control for network sizes, type and frequency of
152 interaction, and observe individual and group outcomes from weeks to years. Given that the process of

153 stigmatization is multiscale and time-evolving, ABM presents a new, exciting opportunity in the research
154 of health stigma.

155 Study Objectives

156 The objective of this study was to investigate the experience of vocal stigma using empirical survey
157 questionnaires and computer network models. The primary focus was to predict how peer interactions
158 could affect an individual's help-seeking behaviors and vocal stigma experience especially in vocal
159 performers. With a better understanding of vocal stigma, clinicians, social epidemiologists and public
160 health policy makers will be more informed of devising interventions aimed at reducing vocal stigma and
161 improving access to voice healthcare.

162 **2. Methods**

163 2.1. Empirical Study of Vocal Stigma Profiling

164 2.1.1. Survey Development and Deployment

165 The study protocol (A09-B73-20A) was approved by the Institutional Review Board at McGill
166 University, Canada. A 64-item questionnaire was constructed to survey individuals' demographics (6
167 items), occupation and training (3 items), vocal health history (14 items), IMB profile (30 items, 10 each
168 for information, motivation, and behavioral skills), experiences of vocal stigma (10 items, 5 each for
169 social-stigma and self-stigma) plus a single, open item for feedback. The questionnaire was developed in
170 consultation with an expert panel, including: (a) a speech-language pathologist with over 10 years of
171 experience working with clinical voice disorders; and (b) three professional vocal performers (one actor,
172 one singer, one actor/singer; each with over 20 years of experience) from the Alliance of Canadian
173 Cinema, Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA) or the National Association of Teachers of Singing
174 (NATS). Specific details of the survey construct and coding scheme are provided in *Supplementary*
175 *Information: Additional File 1*. The survey was deployed via *LimeSurvey*, Version 3 (LimeSurvey

176 GmbH, Hamburg, Germany), an open-source survey tool housed at McGill University. The survey took
177 participants around 10-15 minutes to complete all items.

178 2.1.2. Participant Recruitment and Compensation

179 A convenience sample of 200 professional vocal performers and 203 gender-matched controls were
180 recruited for this study. Professional vocal performers were recruited through membership offices of
181 ACTRA and NATS. For this study, professional vocal performers were defined as those receiving at least
182 part of their income via singing or acting performance. For the gender-matched control group, an online
183 recruiting platform Prolific (www.prolific.co) was used for recruiting non-vocal performers to the study.
184 Non-vocal performers were defined as receiving no income via singing or acting performance and having
185 no past or present employment in the arts sector listed in their participant profiles on Prolific.

186 Participants without a valid Canadian postal code were excluded from this study because an individual's
187 stigma experience and tendency to seek help are specific to their own countries' healthcare systems.
188 Participants were also excluded if they had a history of vocal pathology arising from cancer, stroke,
189 degenerative neurological conditions, or physical trauma to the throat, head and neck.

190 Interested individuals would first need to answer a set of screening questions to ensure their eligibility on
191 *LimeSurvey*. Eligible participants were directed to the consent form, in which the general purpose of the
192 study was described. Explicit reference to stigma was omitted to avoid response biases. A debrief with the
193 full purpose of the study was disclosed to participants at the end of the questionnaire, at which time they
194 could opt to withdraw their data from the study. In this study, no opt outs were requested at the end.

195 In terms of compensation, individuals in the vocal performer group, were given the choice to enter a raffle
196 for gift cards (each CAD \$50) by following an external link and providing their email address at the end
197 of the study. Participants in the control group were paid CAD \$5 via the Prolific platform.

198 2.1.3. Data Privacy

199 All data were collected anonymously and were stored on a secure server, hosted by McGill University.
200 Participant data did not contain any identifying information. The emails in the gift card raffle were not
201 linked to individual participant data. Participant identity was thus not traceable or identifiable. No
202 additional information was collected passively about participants' computers, e.g., IP address, cookies etc.

203 2.1.4. Preparatory Data Analysis

204 Given that the survey data is the data source for ABM development, we opted to summarize the statistics
205 of the empirical data here to avoid duplication and confusion from those of simulation experiments in
206 Section 3. In short, a total of 200 professional singers and actors and 203 controls participated in the
207 survey (both groups: ages 21-65; female 65%, male 32%, other 3%). Full details of the empirical data,
208 participant demographics and survey data statistics can be found in *Supplementary Information:*
209 *Additional File 2, Table 2.1-2.3* and *Additional File 3, Table 3.1-3.6* respectively.

210 With respect to vocal stigma experience, performers reported 14% more stigma than controls
211 ($t(401)=8.87$, $p=0.025$) overall. Among professionals, singers reported 15% more stigma than actors
212 ($t(198)=-1.67$, $p=0.025$). Irrespective of groups, stigma was negatively associated with (1) *age*
213 (Performers: $r=-0.27$, $p<0.001$; Controls: $r=-0.17$, $p=0.018$), (2) *recency of a voice disorder* (Performers:
214 $\rho=0.15$, $p=0.033$; Controls, $\rho=0.14$, $p=0.047$), and (3) *frequency of voice disorder* (Performers: $\rho=0.46$,
215 $p=0.005$; Controls: $\rho=0.26$, $p=0.031$).

216 To assess the association of stigma experience with IMB profiles, Pearson's product-moment correlations
217 showed that stigma correlated negatively with motivation (Performers: $r=-0.49$; Controls: $r=-0.59$,
218 $p<0.001$) and behavioral skills (Performers: $r=-0.28$; Controls: $r=-0.46$, $p<0.001$) in both participant
219 groups. Stigma was not significantly associated with information (Performers: $r=-0.09$, $p=0.205$;
220 Controls: $r=-0.09$, $p=0.200$), meaning there was not a definitive trend between stigma and an individual's
221 knowledge/beliefs regarding voice disorder or vocal health.


222 Broadly speaking, vocal stigma is found present among professional singers and actors in Canada. The
223 level of Motivation and Behavioral Skills of an individual were negatively associated with vocal stigma.
224 The negative association between age and experiences of stigma may indicate that early-career vocal
225 performers are more vulnerable to this stigma. The positive association between a history of vocal illness
226 and experience of vocal stigma may indicate that vocal stigma is not commonly recognized by individuals
227 without direct experience with a voice condition.

228 2.2. Computational Study of Simulating Social Interactions and Vocal Stigma

229 2.2.1. Vocal Stigma Agent-Based Models: Conceptual Framework

230 In this vocal stigma agent-based model (VS-ABM), each agent represents an avatar of a vocal performer
231 (VP) or a non-vocal performer (non-VP), who functions as a social actor and interacts with their peers to
232 share information and their motivations for help-seeking related to voice health. Depending on an agent's
233 geolocation, they have access to a small or a large peer network in the VS-ABM. When two agents
234 interact, they will exchange information and motivations related to vocal health.

235 An agent's vocal health (history and frequency of disordered voice), stigma experience (self- and social-
236 stigma) and IMB are connected via two feedback loops (social and personal), which in turn affects an
237 agent's tendency to seek help (**Figure 3**). The social loop simulates the interrelationship between social-
238 stigma and IMB. Also, an agent's motivation is linked to its own frequency of voice disorder. For
239 instance, if an individual has frequent relapses in voice disorders, they will likely have less motivation to
240 seek help from social partners and professionals. In contrast, the personal loop simulates the
241 interrelationship between self-stigma and IMB. Also, an agent's information related to vocal health is
242 contingent on its history of voice disorder. For instance, if an individual has prior experience with a voice
243 disorder, they will likely have more information about the nature of it and may have reduced their self-
244 stigma as a result.



245

246 **Figure 3. The Framework of Vocal Stigma Agent-Based Models (VS-ABM).** An agent’s vocal health,
247 vocal stigma, information, motivation, and behavioral skills (IMB) are presumably interrelated and
248 modulated via the social and personal feedback loops, which collectively affects an agent’s tendency to
249 seek help.

250 2.2.2 VS-ABM Design: World

251 The VS-ABM is developed with NetLogo version 6.3.0, a free and open-source, cross-platform, agent-
252 based modelling framework [67]. In our implementation, the VS-ABM world represents a small urban
253 community, which is divided into a total of 1089 patches (33 x 33), with a densely populated urban center
254 and a sparser rural perimeter. This geographical specification of the VS-ABM is based on the following
255 considerations. (**Table 1**)

256 First, the VS-ABM world size was set to approximate to the lower boundary of a sparse geographic
257 network. This is because simulated social network in all sizes need to fit within the ABM world without
258 being too densely populated. If the ABM world is too big, agents will be too far away from each other for
259 social interactions. Second, the VS-ABM world is set as box-bound. That is, agents on the left or the top
260 edges do not interact with the agent on the right or the bottom edges and vice versa. That way, agents in
261 the rural region at the outer border are constrained to have fewer possible connections compared to those
262 in the urban center of the simulation space. Note that about 5% of survey respondents were from rural
263 areas in Canada (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 2, Table 2.1*). To approximate this real-
264 world geographical distribution in the VS-ABM, we set the smallest network (50 agents) to have around
265 5% patches occupied by agents, whilst the same proportion of rural agents approaches 100% of occupied

266 patches for the largest social network (400 agents). This geographical specification allows the proportion
 267 of rural agents to remain 5% in both geographically sparse networks (with 50 agents) and socially sparse
 268 networks (with 400 agents).

269 2.2.2 VS-ABM Design: Individual Agent Attributes

270 Each agent has a set of attributes in terms of personal background (e.g., gender, age, education level,
 271 vocal training etc.) as well as experience related to voice health (e.g., information, motivation, behavior
 272 skills, self-stigma, social-stigma, history of voice disorder). (**Table 1**) All attributes are randomly
 273 assigned to each agent based on the normal distribution of the values from the demographic data in the
 274 empirical study. (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 2*)

275 **Table 1. Variables of World and Agents in the Vocal Stigma Agent-Based Model.**

ABM Variables	Real World Components	Estimated Range/Values
World Variables		
	Ratio of rural to non-rural agents	5%
	Rural area	55 patches
	Max number of links	min = 0, max = number of agents
	Number of interactions with the max number of links	Time when max number of links is established
Agent Variables		
	Gender	male, female
	Age	Mean = 43.68 (SD =12.56)
	Education level	High school diploma (9%), Apprenticeship/trade (5%), College/CEGEP (16.5%), Bachelors (46%), Graduate (23.5%) None (0%)
	Vocal training	None (4%), less than 1 year (11%), less than or equal to 3 years (21.5%), less than or equal to 5 years (13%), more than 5 years (50.5%)
	Proportion of income dependent on using their voice professionally	None or almost none (8%), less than half (24.5%), about half (17.5%), greater than half (18.5%), all (29%), not answered (2.5%)
	Information	0-20
	Motivation	0-20
	Behavior skills	0-20

Frequency of voice disorder	Never (51%), Every few years (33.5%), Yearly (9%), Quarterly (4.5%), Monthly (0.5%), All the Time (1.5%)
Previous history of voice disorder	Never (50%), currently have disorder (6%), within the past month (4.5%), within the past year (9.5%), more than a year ago (30%)

276

277 2.2.3 VS-ABM: Agent-Agent Social Interactions

278 Within the ABM world, agents are free to interact and exchange information with nearby peers. These
279 agents cannot move their location and are surrounded by neighbouring peers whom they are free to
280 interact with. Agents also randomly select their next agent for each interaction. The potential peers are
281 limited to a circular region around each agent with a radius of three patches. In other words, agents'
282 interaction space is 2.5% of the possible geographic space. We also assume that an agent with high initial
283 social-stigma may be reluctant to interact with their peers. As such, in the VS-ABM, if either agent has
284 high social-stigma (over 7.5), the chance of their peer interaction is set as 75%.

285 After each interaction, the IMB and vocal stigma of an agent will change incrementally. The exact
286 incrementation is formulated based on the linear regression analyses of help-seeking and stigma
287 relationship in the survey study (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 3, Table 5*). For example,
288 within the social loop, social-stigma is associated with information. After each peer interaction, an
289 agent's information will slightly change by a value that is randomly sampled from a normal distribution
290 centered around the mean, as obtained from the corresponding regression analysis (Information-Social-
291 Stigma: 0.066). The change in an agent's information can also cascade to changes in behavior skills and
292 motivation. The formulation is the same but with different center means derived from the corresponding
293 regression terms (Information-Behavioral Skills: 0.232; Motivation-Social-Stigma: 0.316). The
294 formulation of all agent-rules is detailed in *Supplementary Information: Additional File 4, Table 4.2*.
295 Below is pseudocode for the VS-ABM.

```
296 Procedure setup-and-run-simulation()  
297     Initialize global model parameters
```

```
298 Build simulation space
299 Initialize performers.
300 for each performer:
301     Set performer values, normally distributed
302     Set performer location
303 Call run()
```

```
305 Procedure performer-interacts-with-neighbor()
306 Randomly select 1 performer (current-performer)
307 If current-performer has any neighbors 3 patches away:
308     Randomly select 1 neighbor (current-peer) within radius 3 of current-performer
309     Create social link between current-performer and current-peer
310     If current-peer has  $\geq$  social-stigma than current-peer:
311         Adjust values based on SOCIAL LOOP:
312             ↓ social-stigma, ↑ information, ↑ motivation
313         Adjust values based on PERSONAL LOOP:
314             ↑ information, ↓ self-stigma, ↑ motivation
315     Else if current-peer < social-stigma than current-peer:
316         Adjust values based on SOCIAL LOOP:
317             ↑ social-stigma, ↓ information, ↓ motivation
318         Adjust values based on PERSONAL LOOP:
319             ↓ information, ↑ self-stigma, ↓ motivation
```

```
321 Procedure adjust-values(increase or decrease)
322     distribution = normal distribution with mean equal to slope of linear trend between components
323 in
324     balancing loop.
325     adjustment = random value sampled from distribution
326     If increase:
327         current-performer-value = current-performer-value + adjustment
328     Else if decrease:
329         current-performer-value = current-performer-value - adjustment
```

```
331 Procedure run()
332     number-interactions ← 0
333     While number-interactions < 500,000:
334         Call performer-interacts-with-neighbor()
335         Calculate global metrics and network measures
336         number-interactions ← number-interactions + 1
```

337 2.2.4 VS-ABM Simulation Experiments

338 This VS-ABM is designed to simulate social interaction and transfer of information/motivation among
339 peers as functions of network size and initial social-stigma. Simulation experiments were set up to answer
340 three research questions respectively (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 4, Table 4.1 for the*
341 *ABM world initialization and Table 4.3 for the initialization procedure of simulation experiments*).

342 *Research Question #1: Does vocal stigma decrease when there are larger social groups?*

343 To investigate the relation between network size and total stigma, we ran 500 simulations for each
344 network size with 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 300, 350 and 400 agents up to 500,000 social interactions. We
345 hypothesize that an agent's total stigma will reduce with increasing peer networks. With more peers
346 available to interact with, agents have a greater variety of peers to gain experiences and information from.
347 More peers, more information, and more interactions should make agents more likely to increase their
348 total IMB and lower their vocal stigma. Peers with extreme values for IMB and stigma may polarize their
349 limited network more severely than with a larger peer group.

350 *Research Question #2: Does vocal stigma decrease when peers are more willing to socially interact?*

351 To evaluate social willingness for agent-agent interactions, we ran additional 800 simulations initialized
352 for five agent populations with distinctive initial social-stigma profiles, since empirical data showed
353 differences between non-VP and VP groups (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 3, Table 3.1-*
354 *3.4*). Each group is assigned with an initial social-stigma value obtained from the empirical data
355 (*Supplementary Information: Additional File 3, Table 3.6*). For instance, the initial social-stigma value
356 for the "General Population" is 5.4, which is derived by averaging social-stigma scores from non-VPs and
357 VPs. While the VS-ABM does not explicitly model medical intervention, we assume that social
358 interventions based on peer interactions will act similarly on social-stigma. Related hypotheses are: (1)
359 social-stigma will decrease over time for agents who are more willing to interact; and (2) agents with high
360 social-stigma will be less likely to transfer information/motivation to peers. A total of 4000 simulations
361 were run for the following five agent populations.

362 (1) General Population of both non-VPs and VPs with average social-stigma and average risk and
363 incentive.

364 (2) non-VP group with low social-stigma with low risk of voice disorder and little incentive to seek
365 professional help.

366 (3) VP group with higher social-stigma with higher risk of voice disorder and more incentive to seek
367 professional help.

368 (4) VP group with a history of voice disorder having very high social-stigma elevated in part by no
369 intervention for the voice disorder.

370 (5) VP group with a history of voice disorder having high social-stigma that has been mitigated by
371 some social intervention.

372 *Research Question #3: How does social network structure impact IMB and stigma?*


373 A comprehensive network-based analysis was employed to evaluate the impact of social network
374 structure on the flow of information and motivation among agents for all 4000 simulations run. A
375 NetLogo network extension procedure (“nw”) was used to quantify two standard network measures,
376 namely, the degree of a node and local clustering coefficient [68]. The degree of the node (*count links*) is
377 used to measure the number of peers that an agent is connected to in the network. The local clustering
378 coefficient (*nw:clustering-coefficient*) is used to measure how densely connected an agent’s neighbors are
379 and how much they tend to group together in a network by averaging all individual nodes. While this
380 analysis could be performed on both the network size and social-stigma manipulations, we chose to focus
381 on network size for two reasons. First, social structure in these networks should be directly correlated to
382 the number agents in the simulation, since the simulation space does not change nor does the radius which
383 agents survey for neighbors. Second, in order to generalize across all simulations, we use an outcome
384 measure agnostic to initialized values of social-stigma, change in total stigma, which also allows us to
385 compare directly with change in IMB so they are on similar measurement scales. We thus test which
386 network structure, degree (number of peer connections) or clustering coefficient (peer connectedness), has
387 the largest impact on change over time.

388 **3. Results**

389 3.1 Overall Relation between Total Stigma and Social Network Size

390 Our original hypothesis for Research Question #1 was that vocal stigma would decrease with larger social
391 networks. Unexpectedly, this hypothesis was not supported by our ABM simulation results in looking at
392 changes in total stigma relative to the number of interactions with network sizes (50-400 agents) and
393 initial social-stigma profiles (low vs average vs high) for each VP, non-VP and general populations
394 **(Figure 4A)**.

395 First on the VP networks, agents in the two smallest network sizes (50 and 100) had their total stigma
396 stabilized as early as 25,000 social interactions. Their final total stigma values were also lower than initial
397 values, regardless of initial social-stigma. In contrast, when the networks became sizable (> 150 agents),
398 the trajectories of total stigma started to follow a log-normal distribution pattern. That is, agents' total
399 stigma quickly increased to a peak and then slowly leveled off but did not always return to initial values.
400 Interestingly, VP agents with high initial social-stigma took 25% fewer social interactions (50,000 to
401 100,000) to reach the peak of total stigma, compared to those with low initial social-stigma (the general
402 and non-VP groups). This initial observation suggests that total stigma likely worsens over time with
403 social interactions in larger network groups, particularly for individuals prone to higher social-stigma
404 such as VP at high risk for voice disorder and a tendency to not seek intervention.



405

406 **Figure 4. Total Stigma Experience as Functions of Network Size and Number of Interactions in**
 407 **Agents with Low, Average and High Initial Social-Stigma.** (A) Aggregated trends of mean total stigma
 408 scores. Each trend aggregated from 100 simulations initialized with social-stigma and network size. (B)
 409 Varying outcomes of mean total stigma score from individual simulations for VP agents with high risk of
 410 voice disorders, high initial social-stigma, and no intervention within the 400-agent network size. The
 411 aggregated trend, same as VP group in Fig 4A, for all 100 simulations is shown in bold. (C) A
 412 representative snapshot of simulated social networks with 400 VP agents near the maximal total stigma
 413 after 100,000 interactions in the 400-VP network. An agent's social-stigma is color-coded from low
 414 (Green) to high (Red).

415 To further examine this paradox, we proceeded to examine individual-specific variations in the evolution
 416 of total stigma in the largest network (400 agents) from the VP group with initial high stigma up to
 417 500,000 interactions (**Figure 4B**). Three distinct patterns emerged from this case simulation. (1) First, one
 418 set of simulations quickly leveled off towards a total stigma value lower than the initial value, which is
 419 denoted as the “*decreasing cohort*”. (2) Another set of simulations, which is denoted as the “*increasing*
 420 *cohort*”, increased rapidly towards a maximum between 50,000 and 200,000 interactions and then slowly
 421 leveled off to a total stigma value larger than the initial value. (3) Lastly, the “*chaotic cohort*” is a set of
 422 agent simulations that appeared to fluctuate randomly and did not appear to stabilize even after 500,000
 423 social interactions. An extended set of simulations were further run for the “*chaotic cohort*” and

424 confirmed that the total stigma value continued fluctuating randomly up to 10,000,000 interactions (data
425 not shown).

426 Except for the “*chaotic cohort*”, most agents’ total stigma appeared to approach maximum around
427 100,000 social interactions with large social networks. To understand one such maxima, we further
428 visualized an established social network from the “*increasing cohort*” in 400 VP agents after 100,000
429 social interactions (**Figure 4C**). Multiple clusters or social groups with similar social-stigma values were
430 formed within the global network, suggesting a homogenization with these highly interconnected social
431 groups. Also, these clusters were not isolated but rather fairly connected to neighboring groups. In other
432 words, peers were connecting with the whole set of the neighboring group, rather than simply
433 bottlenecking through a few nearby peers.

434 In particular, a few social groups appeared to have a heterogeneous mix of agents with initial low and
435 initial high social-stigma profiles (**Figure 4C: networks with mixed green and red color**), confirming
436 that agents could interact with opposite social-stigma values. Especially in this “*increasing cohort*”, the
437 emergence of mixed social groups in the global network coincides with the stabilization of total stigma
438 around the critical point of 100,000 social interactions. We speculated that, at the beginning of
439 interactions, agents would establish social groups with peers around them, becoming more like their
440 neighbors. Then, when social groups became homogenous, the total stigma would approach to its peak.
441 Eventually, when social groups with polarized views interacted, a mix of agents with low and high social-
442 stigma emerged and, paradoxically, stabilized the population’s social-stigma.


443 To answer Research Question #1, our simulation results indicated that, on average, vocal stigma increases
444 with larger social groups. However, there are non-trivial trends where total stigma diminishes as social
445 groups become less polarized. In addition, our results suggested that interactions between groups are not
446 bottlenecked with a small set of agents but distributed among the entire social group. The clusters can
447 exchange information/motivation with multiple members of neighboring groups, which may ultimately
448 result in less polarized neighboring groups.

449 3.2 Social Network Size in relation to Each IMB and Vocal Stigma Components

450 For Research Question #2, the original hypothesis was that social-stigma would decrease when agents
451 were more willing to socially interact, i.e., lower social-stigma and higher IMB. This hypothesis was
452 partially supported by our ABM simulation results in comparing the probability distributions of final IMB
453 and final total stigma scores between the smallest and largest social networks (50 vs 400 agents) (**Figure**
454 **5A-B**).

455 Following a total of 500,000 social interactions, a clear bimodal distribution of total IMB score was noted
456 in large but not in small networks across all three agent populations (**Figure 5A**). Of the total IMB score,
457 the first mode (local maximum) appeared around 60 and 75, whereas the second mode appeared around
458 110 in the probability density function. Each IMB element (information, motivation and behavioral skills)
459 also appeared to be highly coupled. That is, an agent population, regardless of its initial social-stigma, can
460 be sub-grouped into either with low IMB and high IMB. Such sub-group distinction is much more
461 pronounced in large social networks than small ones.

462 For the total stigma, a bimodal distribution also appeared in large but not small social networks across all
463 three agent populations (**Figure 5B**). Of the total stigma score, the first mode was centered around 10,
464 whereas the second mode was around 20 within the data. Each total stigma element (social- and self-
465 stigma) also displayed two distinctive peaks, but their distance was more separated in social-stigma score.
466 Additionally, comparing high-risk VP groups, those with social intervention had overall lower social-
467 stigma, whereas the maximal mode for the no intervention group showed higher social-stigma. Our results
468 indicated that social-stigma experience has more weight than self-stigma in the total stigma experience.



469

470 **Figure 5. Probability Distribution of Total IMB and Total Stigma Experience.** A total of 500,000
 471 social interactions were simulated for VP, Non-VP and general populations with low, average or high
 472 initial social-stigma. (A) Total IMB and its components (information, motivation, and behavioral skills) at
 473 50 and 400 network sizes (B) Total stigma and its components (self-stigma and social-stigma) at 50 and
 474 400 network sizes (C) Average change in total IMB (diamonds) and total stigma (circles) from their initial
 475 values. Each row of subplots represents a specific magnitude of change, i.e., from less than 1 SD (σ) to
 476 more than 2 SD increase (inc.) or decrease (dec.), in total IMB and total stigma. % = percentage of
 477 simulations with corresponding changes in total stigma across all network sizes. (D) Ratio of simulations
 478 with total stigma changes more than 1 SD (Panel C row 1 + 2) relative to those with little or no changes
 479 (Panel C row 3).

480

481 Further analysis was performed to evaluate the magnitude of changes in total IMB and total stigma by
 482 aggregating VP, non-VP, and general populations before and after the 500,000 interactions (**Figure 5C-**
 483 **D**). For total IMB, about 35% and 63% of agents showed increases or no changes of their scores in
 484 smaller networks (50 and 100 agents) at the end of simulations. With larger network sizes (>150 agents),
 485 about 36% of agents showed significant increases in their total IMB scores with more than two standard
 486 deviations (SD, σ), i.e., between 30 and 40 points increase from initial values. At the same time, about

487 39% and 21% of agents showed reduction in their IMB scores more than 1 and 2 SD respectively in these
488 larger networks (**Figure 5C**). For total stigma, all agents in smaller networks had negligible changes of
489 their scores, whilst 25% of them had total stigma increased by more than 6 points when they were in
490 larger networks. For those with high risk and high social-stigma, VP agents were 1.5 times more likely to
491 experience more total stigma if they had no intervention, compared to those with social intervention,
492 when they are in the largest social network (**Figure 5D**).

493 All in all, the aforesaid simulation results confirmed that higher total IMB was associated with lower total
494 stigma for small networks. Interestingly, IMB outcomes vary across network sizes. Despite minimal
495 change to total stigma, IMB tended to decrease more for larger social networks, while IMB for smaller
496 networks tended to increase. The bimodal distribution noted in large social networks (i.e., 400) may be
497 attributed to the increased likelihood that extreme values of social-stigma arise in the population. Also,
498 within a large social network, their social groups tend to be more polarized with group size as noted in
499 **Figure 4C**, leading to a wider separation between the two modes of the bimodal distributions.


500 To address Research Question #2, our results supported the hypothesis in cases of small networks, i.e.,
501 lower social-stigma leads to an overall decrease in total stigma. Larger networks are far more likely to
502 have significantly increased total stigma. For high-risk VPs, social interventions might help mitigate high
503 social-stigma and eventually a reduction in total stigma over time.

504 3.3 Network Structure in relation to Total IMB and Total Stigma

505 To understand the connections among agents in the social network, degree of node and clustering
506 coefficient were computed in relation to the changes in total IMB and total stigma when the social
507 network was established (i.e., after 100,000 social interactions) in all 4000 simulations.

508 First, the degree of node represents the number of social links that an agent has in a social network.
509 (**Figure 6A**) The average number of links ranged from 2.5 in the smallest social network (50 agents) to
510 13.5 in the largest social network (400 agents). This positive linear relationship is expected because each

511 agent has more peers to interact within their vicinity in larger social networks. For instance, the relative
512 patch coverage increases from 5% in the 50-agent network to nearly 36% in the 400-agent network.



513
514 **Figure 6. Network Structure Analysis of Network Size Effects on IMB and Vocal Stigma.**
515 (A) Distribution of average number of peer links (degree of nodes) by network size. (B) Distribution of
516 average local clustering coefficient by network size. (C) Total IMB values decrease as a function of
517 average number of peer links, which is highly correlated with network size. A clear bifurcation appears
518 around 4.5 peer links. (D) Total stigma values increase as a function of average number of peer links. No
519 bifurcation appears. However, distributions show a larger range of changing stigma values for more peer
520 links.

521
522 Second, the clustering coefficient represents how close-knit an agent's social group (i.e., cluster) is
523 interconnected in a social network. The clustering coefficient is measured on a scale of 0 to 1. A lower
524 cluster coefficient is when peers are only connected through the agent, whereas a higher cluster
525 coefficient is when agents' peers connected independently and create denser and tighter connections.
526 Interestingly, the average clustering coefficient for the network does not show a linear trend with network
527 size (**Figure 6B**). A wide spread of clustering coefficients was observed in small social networks whereas

528 the probability distribution approximated to a normal distribution towards a larger social network. The
529 cluster coefficient is also higher in larger networks (400 agents; mean (SD) = 0.61 (0.009)) than that of
530 smaller networks (50 agents; mean (SD) = 0.31 (0.086)). In small networks, agents were sparsely
531 randomized in the simulation space, which geographically favored agents being connected with their
532 neighboring peers only but not reaching out to other social groups that are further away.

533 Finally, we analyzed how the number of peer links (i.e., social partners) affects an agent's total IMB and
534 total stigma scores when the social network is stabilized, i.e., all links are maximally connected. For total
535 IMB, more peer links might relate to a gradual decrease in IMB. (**Figure 6C**) Upon the stabilization of
536 social networks, the IMB increases by 7.6 points in the smallest 50-agent network (1.5 social links);
537 whereas it decreases by 10.6 points in the largest 400-agent network (12.5 social links). For total stigma,
538 more peer links might contribute to a slight increase in total stigma (**Figure 6D**). Upon network
539 stabilization, the total stigma decreases by 1.2 points in the 50-agent network yet increases by 3.5 points
540 in the 400-agent network.

541 **4. Discussion**

542 By using a prospective survey and network simulations, we were able to: (1) characterize population
543 behavior related to vocal stigma in professional vocal performers; (2) identify which IMB and stigma
544 components contribute most to population outcomes; and (3) analyze network structure and social groups
545 to understand the impact of social interactions on population outcomes. Our VS-ABM allows each IMB
546 and stigma component to be examined independently while simultaneously modelling how each element
547 influences others. These components can vary for each individual and change as individuals interact with
548 peers with distinct IMB and health profiles.

549 4.1. Diverging population outcomes and heterogeneity within social groups

550 Three population behaviors, namely decreasing, increasing, and chaotic cohorts, were identified across all
551 network sizes. The “*decreasing cohort*” had characteristics that resembled the small network trends, such

552 that total stigma decreases and quickly stabilizes at a value less than the original population stigma. The
553 “*increasing cohort*” had characteristics that resembled the large network trends, where total stigma
554 increases to a maximum and then levels off towards a value larger than the initial stigma value. Such
555 stigma maxima are seen when the social network of the population is fully established, and social groups
556 are largely homogenous. When polarized homogenous groups start to interact and exert more influence on
557 each other, greater heterogeneity of the groups emerges at a population level. Lastly, the “*chaotic set*” is
558 referred to an oscillatory behavior when total stigma does not stabilize. Such complex patterns of vocal
559 stigma are not programmed (i.e., hard-coded) in VF-ABM but rather emerge *de novo* (i.e., emergency)
560 from dynamical systems. Our simulation outcomes may also be in line with a new notion of “stigma
561 mutation”. [69] For instance, stigma associated with COVID-19 has a social-historical context and
562 changes over time in response to the local and global environment. In our case, agents’ social-personal
563 backgrounds (e.g., occupation, medical history, initial social-stigma) modulate the evolution of their total
564 stigma in a network environment.

565 4.2 Social-stigma drives change in vocal stigma

566 We further investigated which specific IMB and stigma components drove changes in population
567 outcomes in relation to network size. Overall, information and behavioral skills tend to be coupled more
568 strongly with motivation being inversely related, i.e., higher information and behavioral skills relative to a
569 lower motivation. Social-stigma has more impact than self-stigma on total stigma. The variance of IMB
570 changes is considerably large across all network sizes, ranging from -6 to +5 SD changes on average. In
571 contrast, the variance of total stigma changes remains quite consistent – around 75%-85% of all
572 simulations show less than 1 SD change on average. Moreover, in larger network sizes, social interactions
573 led to three distinctive patterns of social-stigma, namely, (1) small decreases in low/ average risk groups,
574 (2) small increases in high-risk groups; or (3) large increases regardless of risk group. In particular, larger
575 networks with higher risk groups of voice disorders have considerably higher odds of increasing the total
576 stigma than those of lower risk groups. Among these higher risk individuals, those without medical

577 interventions have higher odds (4:4) to increase total stigma after social interaction than those who
578 received treatment (3:4). That is, for large networks (i.e., 400 agents), about 51% of VP with no
579 intervention are likely to increase their stigma after interacting with their peers; this likelihood drops to
580 41% if they receive intervention.

581 Another key observation is that IMB and stigma do not always have a directional relationship. For
582 instance, if we looked at simulated populations whose total stigma changed more than 1 SD with social
583 interactions, their IMB scores could increase by 20 points at most. For those with changes more than 2
584 SD in total stigma, IMB decreased significantly by 30 points – in this case, vocal stigma might get worse
585 despite informational and social intervention. Similar notions were also confirmed in reducing public
586 stigma of mental illness, in which stigma is difficult to eliminate especially if it is deep rooted in social
587 relationships [70].

588 4.3 Larger social groups may promote vocal stigma

589 Two standard network measures were analyzed to evaluate how connected VPs were (i.e., degree of node)
590 and how close their social groups were linked (i.e., clustering coefficient). As the network size increased,
591 a VP agent had more peers to interact and connect with in their vicinity. That is, for larger networks, peers
592 had consistently larger social groups. However, as we simulated hundreds of thousands of social
593 interactions, all agents were able to eventually interact and connect with all their potential peers and all
594 social groups were maximally interconnected or clustered. As social group networks stabilize and become
595 maximally connected, a gradual increase in total stigma and decrease in IMB was evident in larger but not
596 smaller social groups. These analytics also provided part of the evidence to answer Research Question #1,
597 i.e., larger networks stabilized towards more polarized social groups. This observation aligns with similar
598 social network findings of polarization of political groups and how negativity spreads through larger
599 social networks faster than positivity [71]-[72].

600 4.4. Limitations and Future Directions

601 This study investigates vocal stigma, for the very first time, in the context of social computing with
602 expected technical challenges. To start, our vocal-stigma specific questionnaire was deployed to
603 Canadians only for this initial round of analysis. Additional data from other countries can be collected to
604 evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of VS-ABM or if additional organization or institutional factors
605 (e.g., reimbursement system) will be needed to be included in future simulations. Second, our initial
606 model results suggest the presence of a “*chaotic set*” in the population behavior. A more rigorous analysis
607 of systems dynamics can be performed to evaluate when the system is in equilibrium or cycling in
608 parameter space, which is out of the scope of this paper. Third, causal models can be considered to further
609 examine the direction and causal relationships between components of IMB and stigma, since we
610 primarily focused on correlations between these measures. Lastly, for the network analysis, we took a
611 measured approach to establish a general trend for the population dynamics. However, more complex
612 network measures such as information transmission and node similarity can be employed to characterize
613 the details of stigma spread through the social network, instead of focusing on population averages in
614 IMB and stigma.

615 **Conclusions**

616 Stigma is a serious, intractable barrier that prevents vocal performers from seeking vocal healthcare. This
617 study integrated empirical survey and network simulation approaches to quantify the relationship of social
618 interaction and vocal stigma. VS-ABM computer models were built to numerically simulate peer
619 interactions and track person-level changes in the IMB framework. Our results highlight that an
620 individual’s social network plays an important role in the experience of vocal stigma. Especially for vocal
621 performers, social interventions, e.g., close peer support, may help reduce high vocal stigma over time.

622 **List of Abbreviations**

623 **ABM:** Agent-based model

624 **IMB:** Information-Motivation-Behavioral Skills Model

625 **LS/HS:** Low stigma and High stigma groups

626 **VP:** Vocal performer

627 **Declarations**

628 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

629 This study protocol (A09-B73-20A) was approved by the Institutional Review Board at McGill
630 University. All participants of this study gave their informed, written consent.

631 **Consent for publication**

632 Not applicable

633 **Availability of data and materials**

634 The computational code and the research data that support the findings of this study are available from the
635 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

636 **Competing interests**

637 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

638 **Funding**

639 This study was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (#430-
640 2020-00108), the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (388583), Digital Research Alliance of Canada
641 and Canada Research Chair research stipend (N.L.-J.). The presented content is solely the responsibility
642 of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the above funding agencies.

643 **Contributions**

644 **Aaron Glick:** Conceptualization (lead), Investigation (lead), Formal Analysis (equal), Writing – original
645 draft (lead). **Colin Jones:** Formal Analysis (equal), Data Curation (lead), Writing – original draft
646 (supporting). **Lisa Martignetti:** Investigation (supporting), Writing – review and editing (supporting).

647 **Lisa Blanchette:** Investigation (supporting), Writing – review and editing (supporting). **Theresa Tova:**
648 Investigation (supporting), Writing – review and editing (supporting). **Allen Henderson:** Investigation
649 (supporting), Writing – review and editing (supporting). **Marc Pell:** Supervision (supporting),
650 Conceptualization (supporting), Writing – review and editing (supporting). **Nicole Li-Jessen:** Supervision
651 (lead), Conceptualization (supporting), Funding Acquisition (lead), Resources (lead), Writing – review
652 and editing (lead).

653 **Acknowledgements**

654 The authors would like to thank for all individuals who participated in the survey study.

655 **References**

- 656 1. Titze, I.R., J. Lemke, and D. Montequin, *Populations in the U.S. workforce who rely on*
657 *voice as a primary tool of trade: a preliminary report*. *J Voice*, 1997. **11**(3): p. 254-9.
- 658 2. Verdolini, K. and L.O. Ramig, *Review: occupational risks for voice problems*. *Logoped*
659 *Phoniatr Vocol*, 2001. **26**(1): p. 37-46.
- 660 3. Vilkmán, E., *Voice problems at work: a challenge for occupational safety and health*
661 *arrangement*. *Folia phoniatria et logopaedica*, 1999. **52**(1-3): p. 120-125.
- 662 4. Jones, K., et al., *Prevalence and risk factors for voice problems among telemarketers*.
663 *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, 2002. **128**(5): p. 571-577.
- 664 5. Fellman, D. and S. Simberg, *Prevalence and Risk Factors for Voice Problems Among*
665 *Soccer Coaches*. *Journal of Voice*, 2017. **31**(1): p. 121. e9-121. e15.
- 666 6. Arts, C.C.f.t. *A Statistical Profile of Artists in Canada in 2016*. 2019 [cited 2020
667 2020/01/10]; Available from: [https://canadacouncil.ca/research/research-](https://canadacouncil.ca/research/research-library/2019/03/a-statistical-profile-of-artists-in-canada-in-2016)
668 [library/2019/03/a-statistical-profile-of-artists-in-canada-in-2016](https://canadacouncil.ca/research/research-library/2019/03/a-statistical-profile-of-artists-in-canada-in-2016).
- 669 7. Cutiva, L.C.C., I. Vogel, and A. Burdorf, *Voice disorders in teachers and their*
670 *associations with work-related factors: a systematic review*. *Journal of Communication*
671 *Disorders*, 2013. **46**(2): p. 143-155.
- 672 8. Martins, R.H.G., et al., *Voice disorders: etiology and diagnosis*. *Journal of Voice*, 2015.
- 673 9. Boltezar, L. and M. Sereg Bahar, *Voice Disorders in Occupations with Vocal Load in*
674 *Slovenia*. *Zdr Varst*, 2014. **53**(4): p. 304-10.
- 675 10. Cohen, S.M., et al., *Direct health care costs of laryngeal diseases and disorders*.
676 *Laryngoscope*, 2012. **122**(7): p. 1582-8.
- 677 11. Cohen, S.M., et al., *The impact of laryngeal disorders on work-related dysfunction*.
678 *Laryngoscope*, 2012. **122**(7): p. 1589-94.
- 679 12. Canada, H., *Canada Health Act Annual Report*. 2012-2013.
- 680 13. Canada, S.-L.A., *Insurance Programs*.
- 681 14. Roy, N., et al., *Voice disorders in teachers and the general population: effects on work*
682 *performance, attendance, and future career choices*. *Journal of Speech, Language, and*
683 *Hearing Research*, 2004. **47**: p. 542-551.

- 684 15. Thibeault, S., et al., *Occupational risk factors associated with voice disorders among*
685 *teachers*. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 2004. **14**(10): p. 786-792.
- 686 16. Dietrich, M., et al., *The frequency of perceived stress, anxiety, and depression in patients*
687 *with common pathologies affecting voice*. *Journal of Voice*, 2008. **22**(4): p. 472-488.
- 688 17. Smith, E., et al., *Effect of voice disorders on quality of life*. *Journal of Medical Speech-*
689 *Language Pathology*, 1996. **4**(4): p. 223-244.
- 690 18. Siupsinskiene, N., A. Razbadauskas, and L. Dubosas, *Psychological distress in patients*
691 *with benign voice disorders*. *Folia phoniatica et Logopaedica*, 2011. **63**(6): p. 281-288.
- 692 19. Hatzenbuehler, M.L., J.C. Phelan, and B.G. Link, *Stigma as a fundamental cause of*
693 *population health inequalities*. *American journal of public health*, 2013. **103**(5): p. 813-
694 821.
- 695 20. Scott, N., et al., *Stigma as a barrier to diagnosis of lung cancer: patient and general*
696 *practitioner perspectives*. *Primary health care research & development*, 2015. **16**(6): p.
697 618-622.
- 698 21. Clement, S., et al., *What is the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A*
699 *systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies*. *Psychological medicine*, 2015.
700 **45**(1): p. 11-27.
- 701 22. Rueda, S., et al., *Examining the associations between HIV-related stigma and health*
702 *outcomes in people living with HIV/AIDS: a series of meta-analyses*. *BMJ open*, 2016.
703 **6**(7): p. e011453.
- 704 23. Cellucci, T., J. Krogh, and P. Vik, *Help seeking for alcohol problems in a college*
705 *population*. *The Journal of general psychology*, 2006. **133**(4): p. 421-433.
- 706 24. Carter-Harris, L., et al. *Lung cancer stigma predicts timing of medical help-seeking*
707 *behavior*. in *Oncology nursing forum*. 2014. NIH Public Access.
- 708 25. Stangl, A.L., et al., *The Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework: a global,*
709 *crosscutting framework to inform research, intervention development, and policy on*
710 *health-related stigmas*. *BMC medicine*, 2019. **17**(1): p. 31.
- 711 26. Rosen, D.C., J.B. Sataloff, and R.T. Sataloff, *Psychology of voice disorders*. 2020: Plural
712 Publishing.
- 713 27. Norman, P. and P. Conner, *Predicting health behaviour: a social cognition approach*.
714 *Predicting health behaviour*, 2005. **1**(478): p. 17.8.
- 715 28. Fisher, W.A., J.D. Fisher, and J. Harman, *The information-motivation-behavioral skills*
716 *model: A general social psychological approach to understanding and promoting health*
717 *behavior*. *Social psychological foundations of health and illness*, 2003: p. 82-106.
- 718 29. DeBate, R.D., A. Gatto, and G. Rafal, *The effects of stigma on determinants of mental*
719 *health help-seeking behaviors among male college students: an application of the*
720 *information-motivation-behavioral skills model*. *American journal of men's health*, 2018.
721 **12**(5): p. 1286-1296.
- 722 30. Thornicroft, G., et al., *Evidence for effective interventions to reduce mental-health-*
723 *related stigma and discrimination*. *The Lancet*, 2016. **387**(10023): p. 1123-1132.
- 724 31. Morgan, A.J., et al., *Interventions to reduce stigma towards people with severe mental*
725 *illness: Systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Journal of psychiatric research*, 2018. **103**:
726 p. 120-133.
- 727 32. Brown, L., K. Macintyre, and L. Trujillo, *Interventions to reduce HIV/AIDS stigma: what*
728 *have we learned?* *AIDS education and prevention*, 2003. **15**(1): p. 49-69.
- 729 33. Adu, J., et al., *Social contact: Next steps in an effective strategy to mitigate the stigma of*
730 *mental illness*. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 2022. **43**(5): p. 485-488.

- 731 34. Zhang, J. and D. Centola, *Social Networks and Health: New Developments in Diffusion,*
732 *Online and Offline.* Annual Review of Sociology, 2019. **45**(1): p. 91-109.
- 733 35. Sikder, O., et al., *A minimalistic model of bias, polarization and misinformation in social*
734 *networks.* Sci Rep, 2020. **10**(1): p. 5493.
- 735 36. Tokita, C.K., A.M. Guess, and C.E. Tarnita, *Polarized information ecosystems can*
736 *reorganize social networks via information cascades.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2021.
737 **118**(50).
- 738 37. Gradoń, K.T., et al., *Countering misinformation: A multidisciplinary approach.* Big Data
739 & Society, 2021. **8**(1).
- 740 38. Mooney, S.J. and A.M. El-Sayed, *Stigma and the etiology of depression among the*
741 *obese: An agent-based exploration.* Soc Sci Med, 2016. **148**: p. 1-7.
- 742 39. Drapalski, A.L., et al., *A model of internalized stigma and its effects on people with*
743 *mental illness.* Psychiatr Serv, 2013. **64**(3): p. 264-9.
- 744 40. Garney, W.R., et al., *Evaluating community-driven cardiovascular health policy changes*
745 *in the United States using agent-based modeling.* J Public Health Policy, 2022. **43**(1): p.
746 40-53.
- 747 41. Marshall, B.D., et al., *A complex systems approach to evaluate HIV prevention in*
748 *metropolitan areas: preliminary implications for combination intervention strategies.*
749 PLoS One, 2012. **7**(9): p. e44833.
- 750 42. Giabbanelli, P.J., et al. *Ideal, best, and emerging practices in creating artificial societies.*
751 *in Proceedings of the Annual Simulation Symposium.* 2019. Society for Computer
752 Simulation International.
- 753 43. Smith, E.R. and F.R. Conrey, *Agent-based modeling: A new approach for theory building*
754 *in social psychology.* Personality and social psychology review, 2007. **11**(1): p. 87-104.
- 755 44. Elliott, E. and L.D. Kiel, *Agent-based modeling in the social and behavioral sciences.*
756 *Nonlinear Dynamics Psychol Life Sci,* 2004. **8**(8): p. 121-30.
- 757 45. Chen, S.-H. and C.-H. Yeh, *Evolving traders and the business school with genetic*
758 *programming: A new architecture of the agent-based artificial stock market.* Journal of
759 Economic Dynamics and Control, 2001. **25**(3-4): p. 363-393.
- 760 46. LeBaron, B., *Empirical regularities from interacting long-and short-memory investors in*
761 *an agent-based stock market.* Ieee transactions on evolutionary computation, 2001. **5**(5):
762 p. 442-455.
- 763 47. Llacay, B. and G. Pepper, *Using realistic trading strategies in an agent-based stock*
764 *market model.* Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory, 2018. **24**(3): p.
765 308-350.
- 766 48. Chen, D.-N., et al., *An agent-based model for consumer-to-business electronic*
767 *commerce.* Expert Systems with Applications, 2008. **34**(1): p. 469-481.
- 768 49. Garifullin, M., A. Borshchev, and T. Popkov. *Using AnyLogic and agent-based approach*
769 *to model consumer market.* in *Proceedings of the 6th EUROSIM Congress on Modelling*
770 *and Simulation.* 2007.
- 771 50. North, M.J., et al., *Multiscale agent-based consumer market modeling.* Complexity,
772 2010. **15**(5): p. 37-47.
- 773 51. Said, L.B., T. Bouron, and A. Drogoul. *Agent-based interaction analysis of consumer*
774 *behavior.* in *Proceedings of the first international joint conference on Autonomous agents*
775 *and multiagent systems: part 1.* 2002. ACM.

- 776 52. Schenk, T.A., G. Löffler, and J. Rauh, *Agent-based simulation of consumer behavior in*
777 *grocery shopping on a regional level*. Journal of Business research, 2007. **60**(8): p. 894-
778 903.
- 779 53. Zhang, T. and D. Zhang, *Agent-based simulation of consumer purchase decision-making*
780 *and the decoy effect*. Journal of business research, 2007. **60**(8): p. 912-922.
- 781 54. Gotts, N.M., J.G. Polhill, and A.N.R. Law, *Agent-based simulation in the study of social*
782 *dilemmas*. Artificial Intelligence Review, 2003. **19**(1): p. 3-92.
- 783 55. Elliott, E. and L.D. Kiel, *Exploring cooperation and competition using agent-based*
784 *modeling*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2002. **99**(suppl 3): p. 7193-
785 7194.
- 786 56. Ceschi, A., et al., *Cooperate or Defect? How an agent based model simulation on helping*
787 *behavior can be an educational tool*, in *Methodologies and Intelligent Systems for*
788 *Technology Enhanced Learning*. 2014, Springer. p. 189-196.
- 789 57. Marsella, S.C., D.V. Pynadath, and S.J. Read. *PsychSim: Agent-based modeling of social*
790 *interactions and influence*. in *Proceedings of the international conference on cognitive*
791 *modeling*. 2004.
- 792 58. Bernhardt, K., *Agent-based modeling in transportation*. Artificial Intelligence in
793 Transportation, 2007. **72**.
- 794 59. Dia, H., *An agent-based approach to modelling driver route choice behaviour under the*
795 *influence of real-time information*. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging
796 Technologies, 2002. **10**(5-6): p. 331-349.
- 797 60. Handford, D. and A. Rogers, *Modelling driver interdependent behaviour in agent-based*
798 *traffic simulations for disaster management*, in *Advances on Practical Applications of*
799 *Agents and Multiagent Systems*. 2011, Springer. p. 163-172.
- 800 61. Manley, E., et al., *A framework for simulating large-scale complex urban traffic*
801 *dynamics through hybrid agent-based modelling*. Computers, Environment and Urban
802 Systems, 2014. **44**: p. 27-36.
- 803 62. Mizuta, H. *Evaluation of metropolitan traffic flow with agent-based traffic simulator and*
804 *approximated vehicle behavior model near intersections*. in *Proceedings of the 2015*
805 *Winter Simulation Conference*. 2015. IEEE Press.
- 806 63. Paruchuri, P., A.R. Pullalarevu, and K. Karlapalem. *Multi agent simulation of*
807 *unorganized traffic*. in *Proceedings of the first international joint conference on*
808 *Autonomous agents and multiagent systems: part 1*. 2002. ACM.
- 809 64. Wahle, J., et al., *Anticipatory traffic forecast using multi-agent techniques*, in *Traffic and*
810 *Granular Flow '99*. 2000, Springer. p. 87-92.
- 811 65. Wahle, J. and M. Schreckenberg. *A multi-agent system for on-line simulations based on*
812 *real-world traffic data*. in *Proceedings of the 34th annual Hawaii international*
813 *conference on system sciences*. 2001. IEEE.
- 814 66. Zhang, L., et al., *Integrating an agent-based travel behavior model with large-scale*
815 *microscopic traffic simulation for corridor-level and subarea transportation operations*
816 *and planning applications*. Journal of Urban Planning and Development, 2012. **139**(2): p.
817 94-103.
- 818 67. Wilensky, U., *NetLogo*. 1999, Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based
819 Modeling: Northwestern University. Evanston, IL.
- 820 68. Stonedahl, F., *NetLogo Network Extension [Source code]*. 2011.
- 821 69. Farrimond, H., *Stigma Mutation: Tracking Lineage, Variation and Strength in Emerging*
822 *COVID-19 Stigma*. Sociol Res Online, 2021. **28**(1): p. 171-188.

- 823 70. Pescosolido, B.A., *The public stigma of mental illness: what do we think; what do we*
824 *know; what can we prove?* Journal of Health and Social behavior, 2013. **54**(1): p. 1-21.
- 825 71. Antypas, D., A. Preece, and J. Camacho-Collados, *Negativity spreads faster: A large-*
826 *scale multilingual twitter analysis on the role of sentiment in political communication.*
827 *Online Social Networks and Media*, 2023. **33**.
- 828 72. Felix, E. and F. Lynn, *Mental Health Stigma and Social Contact Revisited: The Role of*
829 *Network Closeness and Negativity.* Society and Mental Health, 2021. **12**(1): p. 49-63.
- 830 73. Bosnjak, M.G.M., *Effects of Questionnaire Length on Participation and Indicators of*
831 *Response Quality in a Web Survey.* Public Opinion Quarterly, 2009. **73**(2): p. 349-360.
- 832 74. Rosen, C.A., Lee, A. S., Osborne, J., Zullo, T., & Murry, T. , *Development and validation*
833 *of the VH110.* The Laryngoscope, 2004. **114**(9): p. 1549-1556.
- 834 75. Tsang, S., Royse, C. F., & Terkawi, A. S. , *Guidelines for developing, translating, and*
835 *validating a questionnaire in perioperative and pain medicine.* Saudi Journal of
836 *Anaesthesia*, 2017. **11**: p. S80.
- 837 76. Braun-Janzen, C., & Zeine, L. (2009), *Singers' interest and knowledge levels of vocal*
838 *function and dysfunction: Survey findings.* Journal of Voice, 2009. **23**(4): p. 470-483.
- 839 77. Jung, H., von Sternberg, K., & Davis, K. , *Expanding a measure of mental health*
840 *literacy: Development and validation of a multicomponent mental health literacy*
841 *measure.* Psychiatry Research, 2016. **273**: p. 278-286.
- 842 78. Colton, R.H., Casper, J. K., & Leonard, R. , *Understanding voice problems: A*
843 *physiological perspective for diagnosis and treatment.* 2011: Wolters Kluwer
844 *Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.*
- 845 79. Gilman, M., Merati, A. L., Klein, A. M., Hapner, E. R., & Johns, M. M. , *Performer's*
846 *attitudes toward seeking health care for voice issues: Understanding the barriers.* Journal
847 *of Voice*,, 2009. **23**(2): p. 225-228.
- 848 80. Christopher, M.S., *The ability of self-construals to predict psychological distress,*
849 *satisfaction with life, and help-seeking in ethnically diverse American college students*
850 *2004: University of South Dakota.*
- 851 81. Fischer, E.H., & Farina, A. , *Attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help: A*
852 *shortened form and considerations for research.* Journal of College Student
853 *Development*, 1995. **36**(4): p. 368-373.
- 854 82. Hammer, J.H., & Spiker, D. A. , *Dimensionality, reliability, and predictive evidence of*
855 *validity for three help-seeking intention instruments: ISCI, GHSQ, and MHSIS.* Journal of
856 *Counseling Psychology*, 2018. **65**(3): p. 394-401.
- 857 83. Vogel, D.L., Wade, N. G., & Haake, S. , *Measuring the self-stigma associated with*
858 *seeking psychological help.* Journal of Counseling Psychology, 2006. **53**(3): p. 325-337.
- 859 84. Rosen, D.C., Sataloff, J. B., & Sataloff, R. T. , *The psychology of voice disorders 2ed.*
860 *2021: Plural Publishing Inc.*
- 861 85. Clough, B.A., Hill, M., Delaney, M., & Casey, L. M. , *Development of a measure of*
862 *stigma towards occupational stress for mental health professionals.* Social Psychiatry
863 *and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 2020. **55**(7): p. 941-951.
- 864 86. Bradshaw, N., & Cooper, A. L. , *Medical privacy and the professional singer: Injury*
865 *stigma, disclosure, and professional ramifications on Broadway.* Journal of Singing,
866 *2018. 74*(5): p. 513-520.
- 867 87. Sataloff, R.T., Divi, V., Heman-Ackah, Y. D., & Hawkshaw, M. J. , *Medical history in*
868 *voice professionals.* Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America, 2007. **40**(5): p. 931-951.

869 88. Sloggy, J., Stemple, J., Rowles, G., & Andreatta, R. , *In support of the exceptional voice.*
870 Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, 2019. 4(6): p. 1306–1310.

871

872 **Supplementary Information**

873 **Additional File 1: Study Questionnaire**

874 The study questionnaire contained 64 items, grouped into 6 sections (sections A through F). Sections A, B,
875 and C respectively pertained to demographics (6 items), occupation and training (3 items), and vocal
876 health history (14 items). Section D measured predictors of help-seeking, and was divided into three
877 subsections: DI, DM, and DB, respectively measuring participants' levels of Information, Motivation, and
878 Behavioral Skills. Section E measured experiences of vocal stigma. Finally, section F consisted of a
879 single, open-ended item for feedback. Based on early piloting, we estimated the survey would take
880 participants around 10-15 minutes to complete, which is a good length of survey to ensure low dropout
881 rates[73]. The contents of each section are described below.

882 **Survey Sections A and B: Demographics and Occupation.** The questionnaire included a maximum of
883 six items for demographics (including one item that was only presented to some participants, based on
884 responses to previous items), and three items for occupational variables. Together, these nine items
885 evaluated possible drivers and facilitators of stigma as well factors which could otherwise influence
886 survey results (e.g., level of education).

887 **Survey Section C: Vocal Health History.** Vocal health variables were assessed by 14 items, including
888 the complete Voice Handicap Index-10 (VHI-10). The VHI-10 is a well-validated [74] clinical tool
889 commonly used to measure the impact that voice disorders have on quality of life. Two additional
890 questions: one in which participants were asked when they had most recently experienced a voice
891 disorder, and one which asked how frequently they experience voice disorders (with “never” being an
892 available response for both). For participants who indicated that they have or previously had a voice
893 disorder, two items ask whether they sought professional help, and if so, from which professionals.

894 **Survey Section D: IMB Scales for Predicting Help-Seeking.** All items in section D used a five-point,
895 Likert scale format from 0 to 4, in line with the VHI-10. The scales were labeled as 0 = strongly disagree,
896 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree except Information. In all three sections, a
897 participant's likelihood of seeking help was represented as the sum of their scores on all ten items in the
898 scale. This sum was a number between 0 and 40, where 40 represented the highest likelihood of seeking

899 help and 0 the lowest. To reduce the impact of response bias, some items were reverse-coded, but item
900 clarity was prioritized above creating a fully balanced scale [75].

901 *Section D-I: Information Scale.* Items in the Information scale were selected to assess participants'
902 knowledge and beliefs about the following five facets of voice and vocal health: (a) vocal health issues
903 (items DI-2 and 10), (b) vocal health resources (DI-4 and 5), (c) voice care (DI-1 and 3), (d) vocal
904 anatomy and physiology (DI-6 and 7), and (e) signs and symptoms of voice disorders (DI-8 and 9). Of
905 these, DI-3, 4, 5, and 10 were adapted from Braun-Janzen and Zeine [76], DI-2 was adapted from Jung et
906 al. [77], and the rest, DI-1, 6, 7, 8, and 9, were written for this study based on information in Colton et al.
907 [78]. Response categories for Information items were labeled to indicate perceived truthfulness of the
908 statements: 0 = definitely false, 1 = probably false, 2 = not sure, 3 = probably true, and 4 = definitely true.
909 There were four reverse-coded items in the Information section.

910 *Section D-M: Motivation Scale.* Items in the Motivation scale were selected to assess participants'
911 attitudes and normative beliefs toward help-seeking for voice disorders. Items DM-1, 2, 3, 4, and 9 were
912 either based on or taken directly from Gilman et al. [79]; item DM-10 was adapted from Christopher [80];
913 item DM-5 was adapted from Jung et al. [77]; and items DM-6, 7, and 8 were adapted from Fischer and
914 Farina [81]. There were five reverse-coded items in this section.

915 *Section D-B: Behavioral Skills Scale.* Items in the Behavioral Skills scale were selected to assess
916 participants' intentions to seek help. Items DB-1 and 2 were adapted from the Mental Help-Seeking
917 Intentions Scale, items DB-3 through 6 were adapted from the Intentions of Seeking Counselling
918 Inventory, and DB-7 through 10 were adapted from the General Help-Seeking Questionnaire, all
919 reviewed by Hammer and Spiker [82]. There was one reverse-coded Behavioral Skills item. This
920 imbalance in reverse-coded items rises from a lack of reversed items in the source materials.

921 **Survey Section E: Stigma Scale.** Section E used the same Likert format as section D-M and D-B. The
922 ten items making up the stigma scale were selected to assess participants' perceptions of both self-stigma
923 (items ES-1 through ES-5), and social-stigma (items EO-1 through EO-5). Items ES-1, 2, 3, and 5 were
924 adapted from Vogel et al. [83], while ES-4 was written for this study based on Rosen et al. [84]. Items
925 EO-1, 2, 3, and 5 were based on Clough et al. [85], and EO-4 was based on discussions of VPs' reputation
926 found in, among others, Bradshaw and Cooper [86], Sataloff et al. [87], and Sloggy et al. [88]. The
927 stigma scale included four reverse-coded items. As with each of the I, M, and B sections, the level of
928 stigma experienced by a participant was measured as the sum of the ten scores.

929 **Survey Section F: Open-Ended Feedback.** After answering all the other items, participants could share
930 perspectives on voice disorders and vocal stigma that they felt were not addressed by the rest of the
931 questionnaire.

932 *Special Notes: Below is a reproduction of the content in the final survey. Text in italics is for the reader's*
933 *information only and was not visible to participants. Questions marked with a * were reverse-coded.*

934 **WELCOME MESSAGE**

935 Vocal Illness Experiences

936 Welcome to this survey about people's experiences with vocal illnesses. We'll start with a few simple
937 questions to make sure you fit our study's criteria. After that, there will be a consent form, followed by a
938 survey.

939 You can save your progress and return at any time, but you can't go back to previous questions after you
940 have moved to the next page.

941 Click next to continue.

942 **PARTICIPANT SCREENING**

943 **X1 Do you have a Canadian Address?**

- 944 a. Yes
945 b. No

946 **X2 Are you between the ages of 20 and 65?**

- 947 a. Yes
948 b. No

949 **X3 Has your voice ever been affected by one of the following conditions:**

- 950 • **Cancer in the head/neck**
951 • **Stroke**
952 • **Parkinson's Disease, ALS, or other neurodegenerative conditions**
953 • **Physical trauma to the throat, neck, or head (e.g., caused by car accident)**
954 a. Yes
955 b. No

956 *Participants who answered X1, yes; X2, yes; X3, no were able to continue to the consent section.*
957 *Otherwise, they saw the following message:*

958 "Thank you for responding to our survey. Unfortunately, you don't quite fit for what we're trying to
959 study. Feel free to share our study if you know anyone who does, so they can enter the draw for a gift
960 card!"

961 **CONSENT SECTION**

962 *Consent split* **Are you a professional singer or actor (i.e., you make at least some income via**
963 **performance)?**

- 964 a. Yes
965 b. No

966 *Participants who answered "yes" became part of the performer group, while participants who answer*
967 *"no" became part of the control group. Their respective consent forms were presented here.*

968 *Participants in both groups who did consent to participate were able to proceed to the rest of the study.*

969 *A – Demographics*

970 *A-1* **What gender do you identify as?**

- 971 a. Male
- 972 b. Female
- 973 c. I prefer not to answer
- 974 d. Other: _____

975 *A-2* **Are you a member of a visible minority?**

- 976 a. No
- 977 b. Yes
- 978 c. I prefer not to answer

979 *A-3* **What is your age? (Years)**

980 _____

981 *A-4* **What are the first three characters of your Canadian post-code?**

982 _____

983 *A-5* **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

- 984 a. High school diploma
- 985 b. Apprenticeship or trades certificate/diploma
- 986 c. College or CEGEP degree/diploma, or university degree lower than bachelor's
- 987 d. Bachelor's degree
- 988 e. Graduate degree (master's or doctorate)
- 989 f. None of the above

990 *Participants who responded to A-5 with any answer other than (a) or (f) were shown item A-5.1:*

991 *A-5.1* **In which area(s) did you obtain a degree/diploma/certificate?**

992 Check all that apply

- 993 a. Performance (e.g., music, acting, dance...)
- 994 b. Healthcare
- 995 c. Biology or Physiology
- 996 d. Other

997 ***B - Occupation***

998 *B-1* **Which of these statements about your occupation best describe you?**

- 999 a. I am a professional actor (including theatre, film/TV, Voice Actor; not including musical theatre/opera).
- 1000 b. I am a professional singer (including concerts, recordings, staged productions; solo and ensemble).
- 1001 c. I am not a professional vocal performer.

1004 *B-2* **How much voice training have you received? (Training includes any lessons, classes, or coaching with a focus on learning voice skills for spoken or sung performance.)**

- 1005 a. None
- 1006 b. Less than 1 year
- 1007 c. 3 years or less
- 1008 d. 5 years or less
- 1009 e. More than 5 years

1011 *B-3* **Approximately how much of your income is made by working as a singer or actor in an average year (pre-pandemic)?**

- 1012 a. None or almost none
- 1013 b. Less than half
- 1014 c. About half
- 1015 d. More than half
- 1016

- 1017 e. All or almost all
1018 f. I prefer not to answer

1019 **C - Vocal Health**

1020 **Please read the following information about voice disorders before continuing.**

1021 **Voice disorders are a wide range of conditions that impact a person's voice in various ways,**
1022 **including the tone, pitch, loudness, and more. A voice disorder is not the same as a speech disorder**
1023 **(which impacts your ability to speak fluently and accurately, such as a stutter or a lisp).**

1024 **For this study, a voice disorder refers to any disturbance to how your voice normally functions or**
1025 **sounds, in a way that interferes with your daily conversation and/or your professional work as a**
1026 **performer.**

1027 **Exceptions: (the following would not be considered a voice disorder):**

- 1028 • **The problem resolves on its own within 1-2 days and does not come back regularly.**
1029 • **The problem is related to a brief illness such as a cold or flu, and voice symptoms**
1030 **resolve at a similar time to other symptoms.**

1031 **C-1 When was the last time you had a voice disorder?**

- 1032 a. I have never had a voice disorder
1033 b. I currently have a voice disorder
1034 c. Within the past month
1035 d. Within the past year
1036 e. More than a year ago

1037 *Participants who responded to C-1 with any answer other than (a) were shown item C-1.1:*

1038 **C-1.1 Did you approach a professional to help identify, overcome, or cope with this issue?** (In this
1039 question, a professional can include anyone whose job includes helping people with their voice or
1040 other health issues. Possible examples include: doctor, speech-language pathologist, voice
1041 teacher/coach, massage therapist, psychologist, acupuncturist, etc.)

- 1042 a. No
1043 b. Yes

1044 *Participants who responded to C-1.1 with (b), were shown item C-1.1.1:*

1045 **C-1.1.1 What type of professional did you seek help from? (You may list several)**

1046 _____
1047 _____
1048 _____
1049 _____
1050 _____
1051 _____

1052 **C-2 How often have you experienced a voice disorder?**

- 1053 a. Never
1054 b. Once every few years
1055 c. Once or twice every year
1056 d. Once or twice every three months

- 1057 e. Once or twice every month
 1058 f. Almost all the time

1059 **C-3 These are statements that many people have used to describe their voices and effects of their**
 1060 **voices on their lives. Choose the response that indicates how frequently you have the same**
 1061 **experience.**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: never	1: almost never	2: sometimes	3: almost always	4: always
C-3.1	My voice makes it difficult for people to hear me.					
C-3.2	People have difficulty understanding me in a noisy room.					
C-3.3	My voice difficulties restrict personal and social life.					
C-3.4	I feel left out of conversations because of my voice.					
C-3.5	My voice problems cause me to lose income.					
C-3.6	I feel as though I have to strain to produce voice.					
C-3.7	The clarity of my voice is unpredictable.					
C-3.8	My voice problem upsets me.					
C-3.9	My voice makes me feel handicapped.					
C-3.10	People ask, “what’s wrong with your voice?”					

1062 **D – Likelihood of Seeking Help**

1063 **DI: Information**

1064 **Please rate the following statements according to how confident you are that they are true:**

1065 **0 = definitely false; 1 = probably false; 2 = not sure; 3 = probably true; 4 = definitely true**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: Definitely False	1: Probably false	2: Not sure	3: Probably true	4: Definitely true
DI-1	Well-hydrated vocal folds are less likely to become injured with use.					
DI-2*	A performer with good technique does not develop voice problems.					
DI-3	Whispering can be harmful to the vocal mechanism.					
DI-4*	A family doctor is qualified to diagnose injuries on the vocal folds.					
DI-5*	A speech-language pathologist is qualified to prescribe medication (drugs) to an individual with voice disorders.					
DI-6	When you speak or sing on a higher pitch, your vocal folds become longer and thinner.					
DI-7	The vocal folds open and close during					

	speaking and singing.					
DI-8	Hoarseness is a common symptom of work-related voice disorders.					
DI-9	Muscle tension in the neck can be a symptom of a voice disorder.					
DI-10*	The treatment of choice for early-stage vocal nodules is complete vocal rest until symptoms subside.					

1066 **DM: Motivation**

1067 **Please rate the statements below on a scale of 0 – 4, where:**

1068 **0 = strongly disagree; 1 = disagree; 2 = neutral; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree**

Item	Item text	0: strongly disagree	1: disagree	2: neutral	3: agree	4: strongly agree
DM-1*	I do not see a specialist when I have voice problems because I am afraid of what may be found.					
DM-2*	I may not seek health care for my voice problem because I anticipate or experience difficulty with accessing public health services.					
DM-3*	I have anxiety/fear about going to a specialist for problems with my voice.					
DM-4	My voice is an important part of my profession.					
DM-5	Speech therapy is a helpful treatment for voice problems.					
DM-6	A person with a voice disorder is not likely to solve it alone.					
DM-7*	A person should work out their own problems; getting voice therapy would be a last resort.					
DM-8*	There is something admirable in the attitude of someone who is willing to cope with their voice difficulties without resorting to professional help.					
DM-9*	I may not seek health care for my voice problem because I anticipate or experience difficulty with affording private health services.					
DM-10	If I were experiencing a voice problem, my work colleagues would think I should seek professional vocal health services.					

1069 **DB: Behavioral Skills**

1070 **Please rate the statements below on a scale of 0 – 4, where:**

1071 **0 = strongly disagree; 1 = disagree; 2 = neutral; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: strongly disagree	1: disagree	2: neutral	3: agree	4: strongly agree
<i>DB-1</i>	If I had a vocal health concern, I would intend to seek help from a vocal health professional.					
<i>DB-2*</i>	If I was experiencing a voice disorder, I would try to solve it on my own rather than seeking help.					

1072 **The next 4 items fill in the blank of the following sentence:**

1073 **“If I was experiencing a voice disorder, I would be likely to seek help from _____.”**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: strongly disagree	1: disagree	2: neutral	3: agree	4: strongly agree
<i>DB-3</i>	...a family doctor/general physician.					
<i>DB-4</i>	...a laryngologist/ENT (Ear, Nose, and Throat doctor)					
<i>DB-5</i>	...a speech-language pathologist.					
<i>DB-6*</i>	...an alternative medicine practitioner (e.g., acupuncture, reiki, homeopathy)					

1074 **For the purposes of the rest of the questionnaire, the term “vocal health professional” will refer to**
 1075 **laryngologists/ENT (Ear, Nose, and Throat doctors), and speech-language pathologists.**

1076 **The next 4 items fill in the blank of the following sentence:**

1077 **“I would be likely to seek help from a vocal health professional if _____.”**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: strongly disagree	1: disagree	2: neutral	3: agree	4: strongly agree
<i>DB-7</i>	... my voice sounded hoarse or rough.					
<i>DB-8</i>	... my voice often felt tired after use.					
<i>DB-9</i>	... using my voice felt painful or uncomfortable.					
<i>DB-10</i>	... I had to cancel a performance/contract because of voice problems.					

1078 ***E – Experiences of Stigma***

1079 **Please rate the statements below on a scale of 0 – 4, where:**

1080 **0 = strongly disagree; 1 = disagree; 2 = neutral; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree**

1081 *Items numbered as EO pertain to social-stigma; items numbered as ES pertain to self-stigma*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Item text</i>	0: strongly disagree	1: disagree	2: neutral	3: agree	4: strongly agree
<i>EO-1*</i>	Where I work, a person experiencing a voice disorder would be given understanding and support.					
<i>EO-2*</i>	If I had a voice problem, my colleagues and employers would encourage me to see a vocal health professional.					
<i>ES-1</i>	I would feel inadequate if I went to a vocal health professional for help with my voice.					
<i>EO-3*</i>	I would feel comfortable telling my peers I was seeing a vocal health professional for a voice disorder.					
<i>ES-2</i>	I would feel worse about myself if I could not solve my voice problems on my own.					
<i>ES-3*</i>	My view of myself would not change just because I made the choice to see a vocal health professional about my voice.					
<i>ES-4</i>	If I had a voice problem, I would blame myself.					
<i>ES-5</i>	It would make me feel inferior to ask a vocal health professional for help.					
<i>EO-4</i>	My professional reputation would suffer if I went to a vocal health professional.					
<i>EO-5</i>	I worry what potential employers would think if they found out I had seen a vocal health professional for a voice disorder.					

1082 **Reminder: for this survey, “vocal health professional” refers to laryngologists/ENTs (Ear, Nose,**
 1083 **and Throat doctors), and speech-language pathologists.**

1084 ***F – Feedback***

1085 *F-1* If there is anything you would like to say about stigma and voice disorders that was not covered
1086 by this questionnaire, you can tell us here:

1087 **Additional File 2: Study participant demographics**

1088 **Supplementary Table 2.1. Participant Demographics.** Data are presented as response frequencies
 1089 except the age variable as group means.

Variable	Category	Vocal Performers		Controls		<i>p</i>
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Gender identity						.835 ^a
	Male	64	32	65	32	
	Female	130	65	132	65	
	Other	4	2	6	3	
	Prefer not to answer	2	1	0	0	
Visible minority status						.001 ^a
	Not a visible minority	156	78	135	66.5	
	Visible minority	37	18.5	68	33.5	
	Prefer not to answer	7	3.5	0	0	
Rural vs non-rural						.973 ^a
	Rural	10	5	10	4.9	
	Non-Rural	190	95	193	94.6	
Education level						.288 ^a
	High school diploma	18	9	26	12.8	
	Apprenticeship or trades certificate/diploma	10	5	4	2	
	College or CEGEP degree/diploma, or university degree lower than bachelor's	33	16.5	29	14.3	
	Bachelor's degree	92	46	102	50.2	
	Graduate degree (master's or doctorate)	47	23.5	41	20.2	
	None of the above	0	0	1	0.5	
Degree area						<.001 ^a
	Performance	124	62	2	1	
	Health sciences	10	5	37	18.2	
	Both performance and health sciences	6	3	0	0	
	Other area(s) only	42	21	137	67.5	
	N/A ^c	18	9	27	13.3	
Age						<.001 ^b
	Mean	Years		Years		
		43.68		33.76		
	<i>SD</i>	12.56		10.29		

1090 ^aResults of a chi-squared test of independence between participant groups.

1091 ^bResults of a Student's t-test between participant groups.

1092 ^cN/A= participants to whom this item was not presented because they reported their education level as
 1093 "high-school diploma" or "none of the above."

1094
1095
1096 **Supplementary Table 2.2. Occupation and Training.** Data are presented as response frequencies.

Variable	Category	Vocal Performers		Controls		<i>p</i>
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Performer type						N/A
	Actor	118	59	N/A		
	Singer	82	41	N/A		
Vocal training						<.001 ^a
	No training	8	4	154	75.9	
	<1 year training	22	11	37	18.2	
	≤3 years	43	21.5	3	1.5	
	≤ 5 years	26	13	5	2.5	
	>5 years	101	50.5	4	2	
Proportion of income from performance						N/A
	None or almost none	16	8	N/A		
	Less than half	49	24.5	N/A		
	About half	35	17.5	N/A		
	More than half	37	18.5	N/A		
	All or almost all	58	29	N/A		
	Prefer not to answer	5	2.5	N/A		

1097 ^aResults of a Mann-Whitney U-test between participant groups.

1098
1099 **Supplementary Table 2.3. Vocal Health Profiles.** Data are presented as response frequencies except
1100 VHI-10 score in group means.

Variable	Category	Vocal Performers		Controls		<i>p</i>
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Recency of a voice disorder						<.001 ^a
	Never had a voice disorder	100	50	186	91.6	
	Currently have a voice disorder	12	6	2	5.9	
	Within the past month	9	4.5	1	0.5	
	Within the past year	19	9.5	1	0.5	
	More than a year ago	60	30	13	6.4	
Frequency of experiencing voice disorders						<.001 ^a
	Never	102	51	188	92.6	
	Once every few years	67	33.5	12	5.9	
	Once or twice every year	18	9	1	0.5	
	Once or twice every three months	9	4.5	1	0.5	
	Once or twice every month	1	0.5	0	0	
	Almost all the time	3	1.5	1	0.5	

Sought professional help for previous voice disorder? <.001^b

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
N/A ^d	100	50	186	92.6
No	23	11.5	15	7.4
Yes	77	38.5	2	1

VHI-10 <.001^c

	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Score	7.01	7.03	3.74	4.65

1101 ^aResults of a Mann-Whitney U-test between participant groups.

1102 ^bResults of a chi-squared test of independence between participant groups.

1103 ^cResults of a Student's t-test calculated between participant groups.

1104 ^dN/A= participants to whom this question was not presented because they reported never to have had a voice disorder.

1105

1106 **Additional File 3: Questionnaire results for VP and control group**

1107 **Table 3.1. Means and standard deviations (SD) of stigma experience scores between vocal**
 1108 **performers and controls. * < 0.05**

Scores	Vocal Performers	Controls	t(401)	p
Total stigma (max: 40)	11.15 (6.68)	9.74 (5.84)	2.25	.025*
Self-stigma (max: 20)	5.20 (3.76)	4.88 (3.50)	0.88	.379
Social-stigma (max: 20)	5.95 (3.85)	4.86 (2.96)	3.18	.002*

1109
 1110 **Table 3.2. Means and standard deviations (SD) of IMB scores between vocal performers and**
 1111 **controls. * < 0.05**

Scores	Vocal Performers	Controls	t(401)	p
Information (max: 40)	26.88 (4.64)	23.48 (2.87)	8.87	<.001*
Motivation (max: 40)	30.60 (5.00)	28.01 (4.99)	5.19	<.001*
Behavioral skills (max: 40)	28.69 (4.79)	27.52 (4.96)	2.41	.017*

1112
 1113 **Table 3.3. Correlations for help-seeking and stigma relationship from the vocal performer group**

	Information	Motivation	Behavioral Skills	Total Stigma	Self-stigma	Social-stigma
Information	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Motivation	.247***	1.00	-	-	-	-
Behavioral skills	.225***	.534***	1.00	-	-	-
Total stigma	-.09	-.49***	-.28	1.00	-	-
Self-stigma	-.079	-.441***	-.231***	-	1.00	-
Social-stigma	-.079	-.410***	-.267***	-	.540***	1.00

1114 Significance levels reported as ** $p = .01$ *** $p < .001$

1115 **Table 3.4. Correlations for help-seeking and stigma relationship from the control group**

	Information	Motivation	Behavioral Skills	Total Stigma	Self-stigma	Social-stigma
Information	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Motivation	.191**	1.00	-	-	-	-
Behavioral skills	.050	.534***	1.00	-	-	-
Total stigma	-.09	-.59***	-.46***	1.00	-	-
Self-stigma	-.078	-.534***	-.391***	-	1.00	-
Social-stigma	-.086	-.542***	-.450***	-	.645***	1.00

1116 Significance levels reported as ** $p = .01$ *** $p < .001$

1117

1118

1119 **Table 3.5. Linear regression predictions for help-seeking and stigma relationship from the**
 1120 **performer group**

	Behavioral skills	Self-stigma	Social-stigma
Information	0.232	0.064 [6.911]	0.066 [7.720]
Motivation	0.511	0.267 [15.341]	0.316 [15.604]
Behavioral skills	-	0.181 [10.400]	0.215 [12.106]
Self-stigma	-	-	1.805 [5.532]

1121 Regression terms for $y = mx + b$ reported as $m[b]$ with x listed in rows and y listed in columns

1122 **Table 3.6. Means and standard deviations (SD) of IMB and Stigma values for demographic**
 1123 **subgroups related to history of voice disorder and tendency to seek professional help. Bolded**
 1124 **numbers are used to set up the five agent populations in the VS-ABM.**

		Information	Motivation	Behavioral Skills	Self-stigma	Social-stigma
1.	General population (403)	25.17 (4.20)	29.30 (5.15)	28.10 (4.90)	5.04 (3.63)	5.40 (3.47)
2.	All Controls (203)	23.48 (2.87)	28.01 (4.99)	27.52 (4.96)	4.88 (3.50)	4.86 (2.96)
2.a	Controls no history of voice disorder (186)	23.49 (2.90)	28.35 (4.92)	27.79 (4.75)	4.78 (3.54)	4.73 (2.99)
2.b	Controls with history of voice disorder (17)	23.29 (2.59)	24.29 (4.18)	24.59 (6.31)	5.94 (2.94)	6.23 (2.25)
2.b.i	Controls with history who did not seek help (15)	22.8 (2.31)	23.67 (3.89)	23.93 (6.44)	6.2 (3.05)	6.53 (2.20)
2.b.ii	Controls with history who sought help (2)	27.00 (1.41)	29.00 (4.24)	29.50 (0.71)	4.00 (0)	4.00 (1.41)
3.	All VPs (200)	26.88 (4.63)	30.60 (5.00)	28.69 (4.79)	5.2 (3.76)	5.95 (3.85)
3.a	VPs no history of voice disorder (100)	26.37 (3.95)	31.41 (4.41)	28.93 (4.41)	4.29 (3.41)	5.25 (3.29)
3.b	VPs with history of voice disorder (100)	27.39 (5.20)	29.78 (5.43)	28.45 (5.15)	6.11 (3.88)	6.64 (4.24)
3.b.i	VPs with history who did not seek help (23)	28.96 (4.41)	27.17 (5.17)	25.70 (4.88)	6.52 (4.13)	7.39 (4.35)
3.b.ii	VPs with history who sought help (77)	26.92 (5.35)	30.34 (5.41)	29.27 (4.97)	5.99 (3.82)	6.42 (4.21)

1125

1126

1127

1128 **Additional File 4: Agent-based model rule for Stigma and IMB model**

1129 **Supplementary Table 4.1. Initial Configuration of VS-ABM.**

ABM Variables	Real World Components	Initial Configuration
Agents	People who use their voice, and may have prior knowledge, history, and understanding of voice disorders and relevant treatment	[50, 75, 100, 125, 150, 200, 250, 300, 350, or 400] depending on the relevant simulation
Patches	Geographic location and proximity	1089 patches (grid of 33x33)
Time	Interaction with peer	500,000 interactions typically, 10,000,000 interactions for stability analyses

1130

1131 **Supplementary Table 4.2. Rules of VS-ABM**

Agent behavior	Rule	Value or threshold
1. Select neighbor to interact with	Randomly select a peer within proximity of the agent	3 patches in any direction (except on world edges)
	Create a link with selected peer	
	Calculate absolute value of difference between agent and peer's social-stigma (<code>difference_peer_socialStigma</code>)	<code>abs(social_stigma - peer_social_stigma)</code>
2. Compare agent and peer social-stigma. If social-stigma >= peer's social-stigma	Check if the agent's social-stigma is high.	<code>social_stigma > 7.5</code>
	If so, there's a 75% chance the agent will still interact. If no interaction occurs, link is still established, but no values change.	
2a. Social feedback loop	If they interact, agent's social-stigma decreases by a random value based on a normal distribution centered around the difference between agent and peer's social-stigma	<code>social_stigma - random-normal(difference_peer_socialStigma, 0.01 * difference_peer_socialStigma)</code>
	Information increases	<code>information + random-normal(0.066, 0.25*0.066)</code>
	Motivation increases	<code>motivation + random-normal(0.316, 0.25*0.316)</code>

2b. Personal feedback loop	If they interact, agent's information increases	information + random-normal(0.066, 0.25*0.066)
	Self-stigma decreases by a random value based on regression of self-stigma and information	self_stigma - random-normal(0.064, 0.01 * 0.064)
	Motivation increases	motivation + random-normal(0.316, 0.25*0.316)
3. Compare agent and peer social-stigma. If social-stigma < peer's social-stigma	Check if the peer's social-stigma is high.	peer_social_stigma > 7.5
	If so, there's a 75% chance the peer will still interact. If no interaction occurs, link is still established, but no values change.	
3a. Social feedback loop	If they interact, agent's social-stigma increases by a random value based on a normal distribution centered around the difference between agent and peer's social-stigma	social_stigma + random-normal(difference_peer_socialStigma, 0.01 * difference_peer_socialStigma)
	Information decreases	information - random-normal(0.066, 0.25*0.066)
	Motivation decreases	motivation - random-normal(0.316, 0.25*0.316)
3b. Personal feedback loop	If they interact, agent's information decreases	information - random-normal(0.066, 0.25*0.066)
	Self-stigma increases by a random value based on regression of self-stigma and information	self_stigma + random-normal(0.064, 0.01 * 0.064)
	Motivation decreases	motivation - random-normal(0.316, 0.25*0.316)

1132

1133 **Supplementary Table 4.3. Initial Values for Analysis Groups of VS-ABM Simulation Experiments**

Group	Real World Components	Mean	Standard Deviation
Constant Parameters (based on VP population)			
	Age	43.68	12.56
	Information	26.88	4.64

	Motivation	30.60	5.00
	Behavior Skills	28.69	4.79
	Self-Stigma	5.20	3.76
Variable Parameters (100 simulations run for each set of variable parameters 1 and 2)			
1a. Network size: 50	Number of agents	50	
1b. Network size: 100	Number of agents	100	
1c. Network size: 150	Number of agents	150	
1d. Network size: 200	Number of agents	200	
1e. Network size: 250	Number of agents	250	
1f. Network size: 300	Number of agents	300	
1g. Network size: 350	Number of agents	350	
1h. Network size: 350	Number of agents	400	
2a. non-VP Group	Social-Stigma	4.86	3.756
2b. General Population	Social-Stigma	5.46	3.756
2c. VP Group	Social-Stigma	5.95	3.756
2d. VP Group, high risk, with stigma mitigation	Social-Stigma	6.42	3.756
2e. VP Group, high risk, with no stigma mitigation	Social-Stigma	7.39	3.756

1134