

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

1

1

2

3

4 **Social Validation of Post-Treatment Outcomes of Adults Who Stutter Who Participated in**
5 **the Blank Center CARE™ Model Treatment: Replication and Extension**

6

7

Geoffrey A. Coalson¹, Courtney T. Byrd¹

8

¹The University of Texas at Austin

9

10

Author Note

11

Geoffrey Coalson



<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1179-2499>

12

Courtney T. Byrd



<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5773-0771>

13

14

15 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Geoffrey A. Coalson, Department
16 of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, CMB 3.102,
17 Austin, TX 78712, USA. Phone: 512-232-2999 Email: geoffrey.coalson@austin.utexas.edu.

18

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

2

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Abstract

Purpose: Social validation of treatment outcomes provides external validity of treatment from the perspective of untrained observers. To date, clinical efficacy studies of the Blank Center CARE Model indicate post-treatment gains in communication competence from the perspective of the participants and clinicians. An initial social validation study corroborated positive self- and clinician-rated treatment ratings with ratings from the general public for a single participant. The present study was designed to replicate and extend these findings by assessing clinical outcomes from the perspective of untrained observers across multiple participants and contexts.

Method: Ten adults who stutter provided communication samples one week before and after completing the Blank Center CARE Model treatment. A total of 1,110 untrained observers were recruited. Each untrained observer rated only one participant at one timepoint (pre-treatment or post-treatment) in one context (dyad or presentation), and each participant was asked to provide only one rating (communication competence or stuttering severity).

Results: A significant interaction indicated that post-treatment gains were observed for communication competence, but not stuttering severity, for both contexts.

Conclusions: Present findings provide further social validation of the Blank Center CARE Model of treatment. Untrained observers confirmed that participation in this strengths-based approach significantly enhances communication competence. Notably, these changes were observed regardless of pre- to post-treatment stuttering severity, lending additional support to the premise that communication and fluency are independent constructs.

Keywords: stuttering, adults, treatment, social validation, non-ableist

44 **Social Validation of Post-Treatment Outcomes of Adults Who Stutter Who Participated in**
45 **the Blank Center CARE Model Treatment: Replication and Extension**

46 A core component of the Blank Center CARE™ Model for stuttering (Communication,
47 Advocacy, Resiliency, Education, hereinafter the CARE Model) is improving the
48 communication competence of individuals who stutter while excluding any clinical goals
49 designed to change stuttering frequency or severity. Training in communication competence for
50 individuals who stutter, as conceived within the CARE Model, includes explicit training in core
51 communication skills and, importantly, considers communication to be effective only when
52 participants stutter openly. Positive post-treatment gains in communication competence for
53 adults who stutter have been reported from the perspective of clinicians (Byrd et al., 2022) and
54 the participants themselves (Coalson et al., 2024). Social validation studies provide external
55 confirmation of treatment outcomes observed by individuals in the general public with no vested
56 interest or knowledge of the expected treatment outcomes (Kazdin, 1999; Schloss et al., 1987).
57 A recent social validation study by Byrd et al. (2024a) asked untrained observers to rate the
58 communication competence of an adult who stutters based on one video sample recorded either
59 pre-treatment or post-treatment. The preliminary findings found that significant clinician-rated
60 and self-rated gains in communication competence reported in previous studies (Byrd et al.,
61 2022; Coalson et al., 2024) were also observed from the perspective of the general public.

62 As noted in Byrd et al. (2024a), significant post-treatment gains were limited to a single
63 participant in a single speaking context (i.e., dyadic mock interviews). Further, although
64 stuttering severity ratings of the selected pre- and post-treatment videos were carefully controlled
65 and comparable, comparison of untrained observers' ratings of communication competence
66 versus ratings of stuttering severity were not included during analysis. The purpose of this study,

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

4

67 therefore, was to replicate and extend findings in Byrd et al. (2024a) by (a) increasing the
68 number of participants ($N = 10$, as opposed to $N = 1$) and raters ($N = 1,110$, as opposed to $N =$
69 81), (b) including ratings of communication competence and stuttering severity (as opposed to
70 communication competence alone), and (c) rating video samples from two different speaking
71 contexts - dyad and presentation (as opposed to dyad alone).

72 **Stuttering treatment for adults**

73 Clinical studies examining outcomes for adults who stutter have traditionally focused on
74 fluency-focused treatments (see systematic reviews by Baxter et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2016).
75 Across these studies, post-treatment gains in fluency have been observed, but tempered by
76 individual variability, relapse, and participant dissatisfaction (e.g., Arya & Geetha, 2013; Craig
77 & Hancock, 1995; Cream et al., 2003; Irani et al., 2012; National Stuttering Association, 2009;
78 Stewart & Richardson, 2004; Yaruss et al., 2002). Additional research has not found that
79 treatments that target fluency yield improved communication competence (speaker-perspective:
80 Constantino et al., 2020; Corcocan & Stewart, 1995; Cream et al., 2003; Stewart & Richardson,
81 2004; listener-perspective: De Nardo et al., 2023; Manning et al., 1999; Von Tiling, 2011) or
82 self-reported quality of life (e.g., Boyle, 2015; Byrd, 2021). Notably, the present authors have
83 reported (e.g., Byrd et al., 2021; Byrd et al., 2022; Coalson et al., 2024; Byrd et al., 2024b) –
84 based on the perspective of people who stutter, clinicians and untrained observers – that changes
85 in fluency are not required for significant changes in the communication effectiveness and/or
86 quality of life of children and adults who stutter. These preliminary findings provide support for
87 the CARE Model of treatment, an alternative approach to stuttering treatment that is consistent
88 with the recent focus on mitigating ableism (i.e., fixing or curing a disabling condition) in
89 national health care policies held by the National Institutes of Health National Advisory Board

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

5

90 on Medical Rehabilitation Research (NIH-NABMRR, 2022) and the NIH Advisory Committee
91 Subgroup on Individuals with Disabilities (NIH, 2022), as well as the revised policies of the
92 American Psychological Association that move away from ableist practices during clinical
93 design and practice (APA, 2022).

94 Specifically, the CARE Model (Byrd, 2023b; Byrd et al., 2024c) provides a manualized,
95 strengths-based approach to stuttering treatment that targets communication competence,
96 advocacy, resiliency, and education – and that does not aim to fix or cure stuttering through the
97 targeting of goals designed to directly or indirectly increase fluency and/or modify stuttered
98 speech (for summary of CARE Model treatment, see Appendix A). Clinical studies (children:
99 Byrd et al., 2021, Byrd et al., 2024b; adults: Byrd et al., 2022, Coalson et al., 2024) indicate
100 significant post-treatment improvements in communication competence that are independent
101 from stuttering severity.

102 **Clinician ratings**

103 For example, Byrd et al. (2021) examined 37 children who stutter before and after
104 participation in CARE Model treatment. A certified and licensed speech-language pathologist
105 (SLP) who was not trained in this approach and was not knowledgeable of the targets or intended
106 outcomes, rated nine specific communication competences (i.e., language use, language
107 organization, speech rate, intonation, volume, gestures, body position, eye contact, and facial
108 affect) during impromptu presentations provided pre- and post-treatment. In addition to
109 replicating the cognitive and affective gains in previous studies completed with children who
110 stutter (Byrd et al., 2016a, 2016b, 2018), significant post-treatment gains were observed for eight
111 of these nine competencies. The gains in communication competence observed by clinicians
112 were replicated in a larger cohort (Byrd et al., 2024b; $N = 61$), with significant gains observed for

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

6

113 seven of these nine communication competencies. Importantly, post-treatment gains were not
114 significantly associated with pre-treatment stuttering frequency (Byrd et al., 2021; Byrd et al.
115 2024b). Similar to findings with children, Byrd et al. (2022; $N = 11$) found that an unfamiliar
116 clinician rated adults who stutter significantly higher in eight of the nine communication
117 competences following CARE Model treatment, and these changes were observed by the
118 clinician independent of stuttering severity, suggesting that pre-treatment stuttering severity does
119 not predict post-treatment communication competence. Taken together, these findings suggest
120 that CARE Model treatment is effective in increasing perceived communication competence
121 irrespective of stuttering severity, as rated by clinicians who are not trained in expected
122 outcomes of this approach.

123 **Self ratings**

124 Clinician-rated gains in communication competence following CARE Model treatment
125 have also been reported from the perspective of the participant. For example, Byrd et al. (2022;
126 $N = 9$) examined self-rated communication competence of adults who stutter following CARE
127 Model treatment using the Self-Perceived Communication Competence scale (SPCC; McCrosky
128 & McCroskey, 1988), which measures participants' self-rated communication abilities across
129 seven different speaking scenarios (e.g., dyad, small group, large presentation). Post-treatment
130 SPCC scores improved but did not reach significance ($p = .31$) in this small sample. A larger
131 follow-up study by Coalson et al. (2024; $N = 33$), however, found significant post-treatment
132 gains in communication competence, as measured by the SPCC. As was the case with the
133 clinician ratings, these gains were not accompanied by significant changes in stuttering severity
134 post-treatment.

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

7

135 Collectively, both clinician- and self-rating of communication competence following
136 CARE Model of treatment indicate improvements in communication competence are not
137 dependent on changes in stuttering behaviors. Although these self- and clinician-rated outcomes
138 are critical to our understanding of the clinical efficacy of this treatment program, ratings of
139 unfamiliar observers, or rather the general public, are needed to provide corroborating evidence
140 that the reported gains are not limited to the perspective of those involved in the treatment.

141 **Unfamiliar observer ratings**

142 Social validation studies provide a third-party evaluation of treatment measures from the
143 perspective of unfamiliar individuals who are not invested nor aware of the intended clinical
144 outcomes (Kazdin, 1977; Finn & Sladeczek, 2001). For example, Schloss et al. (1987a)
145 conducted a study to assess whether assertiveness training provided to three adults who stutter
146 resulted in changes that were observable not only to the clinicians, but to a small cohort of
147 untrained observers ($N = 10$ graduate students). Each student randomly viewed only one pre- or
148 post-treatment video sample of an adult who stutters and rated their overall assertiveness during
149 a mock interview. Because findings indicated an increase in assertiveness in videos recorded
150 after treatment, relative to pre-treatment videos, the researchers extended findings observed
151 within the clinic to the general public. A second social validation study conducted by Schloss et
152 al. (1987b) replicated these findings, again instructing untrained observers ($N = 11$) to rate video
153 samples of three adults who stutter pre- and post-treatment in a dyadic interview. Notably, post-
154 treatment gains in assertiveness ratings were not consistently associated with stuttering severity
155 across these studies.

156 Werle and Byrd (2022a, 2022b) conducted a experimental study wherein untrained
157 observers, in this case university professors ($N = 158, 238$), rated the communication competence

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

8

158 of an adult actor simulating stuttering and also demonstrating high or low communication
159 competence behaviors (e.g., facial affect, vocal variety, gestures, body positioning). Each
160 untrained observer rated only one video, and each rated the presenter using a standardized rubric
161 of ‘delivery’ (i.e., communication behaviors including vocal variety, eye contact, engagement,
162 gestures). Although stuttering was present and controlled across videos (i.e., 15% frequency,
163 identical type and secondary behaviors), professors rated the presenter with high communication
164 competence significantly higher than low communication competence. Although the presenter
165 was an actor simulating stuttering, rather than an individual who stutters who had undergone
166 treatment, findings provide some external validation of the importance of communication
167 competence to untrained observers relative the stuttering frequency or severity.

168 Byrd et al. (2024a) conducted a social validation study to assess whether untrained
169 observers corroborated the clinician-rated and self-rated gains in communication competence of
170 an actual adult who stutters following CARE Model treatment. In this study, 81 untrained
171 observers viewed one video - either a pre-treatment or post-treatment video of an adult who
172 stutters during a one-on-one mock interview. After viewing a video, untrained observers were
173 asked to rate the communication competence of the interviewee. Findings indicated that
174 untrained observers rated the adult who stutters as a significantly stronger communicator in post-
175 treatment videos. Notably, stuttering of the participant in video stimuli were rated by clinicians
176 as similar in terms of frequency (pre-treatment – 7%, post-treatment – 6%, as rated by Yairi and
177 Ambrose [2005] guidelines) and severity (pre-treatment – Moderate [score = 27], post-treatment
178 [score = 25], as rated by the Stuttering Severity Instrument-Fourth Edition, Riley [2009]).
179 Stuttering severity was also rated as similar by a separate group of untrained observers using a
180 100-point visual analog scale ($N = 120$, pre-treatment: $M = 64.71$; post-treatment: $M = 64.95$; $p =$

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

9

181 .95). Although post-treatment differences in stuttering were nominal from the perspective of
182 clinicians and untrained observers, a supplemental replication analyses was nevertheless
183 completed within the same study (Appendix S3, $N = 96$ untrained observers) based on pre- and
184 post-treatment videos from a second adult who stutters with an inverse stuttering profile – that is,
185 increased stuttering post-treatment - as rated by clinicians (pre-treatment stuttering frequency
186 and severity: 5%, Mild [Total SSI-4 score = 10]; post-treatment frequency and severity: 9%,
187 Mild [Total SSI-4 score = 14]) and untrained observers ($N = 85$; pre-treatment: 27.19; post-
188 treatment: 29.07, $p = .65$). Similar to the primary analyses, untrained observers rated
189 communication competence in the post-treatment video sample to be significantly stronger than
190 the pre-treatment video sample. Further, post-treatment gains in communication competence in
191 the primary and supplementary analysis remained significant when observer-based factors (e.g.,
192 demographics, familiarity with a person who stutters) were statistically controlled.

193 **Purpose of the present study**

194 The design of Byrd et al. (2024a), wherein many untrained observers viewed and rated
195 video samples from a single adult who stutters pre- and post-treatment, allowed researchers to
196 capture the variance of responses amongst the general public. This provided social validation of
197 one of the primary clinical outcomes of the CARE Model – increased communication
198 competence with no attempts to modify stuttered speech - for one participant. Byrd et al.
199 (2024a) noted that the gains reported from the perspective of untrained observers viewing only
200 one participant may or may not be observed when evaluating a group of participants before and
201 after treatment. Finally, Byrd et al. (2024a) also noted that by restricting the context of the video
202 sample to dyadic interaction (i.e., mock interview format), the communication gains could not be
203 generalized to additional challenging speaking contexts for adults who stutter. Replication of

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

10

204 these findings for one participant in a larger cohort of adults who stutter would provide evidence
205 that treatment effects, as rated by the untrained observer, generalize across a variety of
206 participants. In addition, although stuttering severity was held constant in pre- and post-
207 treatment video samples in Byrd et al. (2024a), and both supplemental replication data (in Byrd
208 et al., 2024a, Appendix S3) and qualitative data (in Byrd et al., 2024a, Appendix S2) supported
209 the notion that communication competence and stuttering severity were described as separate
210 constructs by untrained observers, one might argue that ratings of communication competence,
211 nevertheless, will reflect ratings of stuttering severity in a larger cohort. The purpose of the
212 present study was to directly address these three factors by replicating and extending the design
213 of Byrd et al. (2024a).

214 First, to capture the variance of treatment effects across participants, untrained observers in
215 the present study rated a larger number of adults who stutter before and after treatment
216 (*Timepoint*). If the perception of communication competence by untrained observers from a
217 larger cohort of clients replicates post-treatment gains observed for one client in Byrd et al.
218 (2024a), the findings will provide broader social validation of the intended treatment effects
219 across multiple participants. Second, to examine whether ratings of communication competence
220 and stuttering severity of a larger participant cohort were perceived as separate constructs by the
221 general public, the video samples were rated for stuttering severity as well as communication
222 competence (*Condition*). If untrained observers provide dissimilar ratings for stuttering and
223 communication across multiple participants, such findings would suggest that stuttering and
224 communication are considered distinct constructs by the general public. Third, to capture the
225 variance of treatment effects across contexts, untrained observers viewed pre- and post-treatment
226 videos of each participant in two different speaking situations: dyadic interaction and oral

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

11

227 presentations (*Context*). If untrained observers report that changes in post-treatment
228 communication competence extend across contexts, such outcomes will indicate the treatment
229 effects of the CARE Model can be generalized beyond a single interaction style.

230 In sum, the present study will serve as a large-scale social validation study of the CARE
231 Model treatment program described in Byrd et al. (2024a), wherein changes in communication
232 competence are targeted in the absence of fluency goals, but rather goals designed to guide adults
233 to communicate effectively while stuttering openly. Specifically, we are examining the
234 following research question: Does communication competence and stuttering severity differ pre-
235 versus post-treatment from the perspective of untrained observers?

236

237 **Method**

238 The following study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of
239 Texas at Austin (IRB: 2015-05-0044; see also Byrd, 2023a). All participants depicted in the
240 video stimuli provided written consent prior to enrollment in treatment. None of the participants
241 had previously received CARE Model treatment. Table 1 provides demographic and treatment
242 history details for each participant.

243 **Table 1**

244 *Demographics of Participants*

245 *[Table 1 removed per MedRxiv guidelines. Contact the corresponding author for information related*
246 *to participant demographics]*

247 Forty video samples (10 participants x 2 contexts x 2 timepoints) were embedded in a
248 Qualtrics-based survey and distributed to untrained observers via the Prolific[®] online data

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

12

249 collection platform. Untrained observers were recruited from over 83,000 adults in the United
250 States, United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada. All participants were paid for their participation
251 in accordance with standards of distribution for Prolific[®] (\$1.80 per participant, *Mdn* = 9 min per
252 survey; calculated on \$12/hour base rate). Participants who elected to participate in the study
253 were first presented with an informed consent cover letter that described the purpose of the
254 study, compensation procedures, the right to discontinue participation, and IRB approval
255 information. Consent to participate was acknowledged by clicking the advance button.

256 Each participant was randomly assigned to one of 40 videos (10 participants x 2 timepoints
257 x 2 context). Participants were excluded from participation if they had completed a survey
258 associated with the other 39 video samples. Each survey including a dyadic interaction began
259 with the following instructions: *You are about to watch a video of an interview. Immediately*
260 *following the video, you will be asked questions about the interviewee. The interview will be*
261 *approximately 5 to 7 minutes in length. You will only be able to move forward in the survey after*
262 *you have watched the video in its entirety.* Each survey including an oral presentation began
263 with the following instructions: *You are about to watch a video of a presentation. Immediately*
264 *following the video, you will be asked questions about the presenter. The presenter was*
265 *instructed to give an impromptu Zoom-based presentation to a small audience on one of five*
266 *topics (i.e., new inventions, best advice, best purchase, favorite month, favorite historical figure).*
267 *The presenter was given 1 minute to prepare. The interview will be approximately 2 to 3 minutes*
268 *in length. You will only be able to move forward in the survey after you have watched the video*
269 *in its entirety.* Following the video, respondents were provided only one of the two following
270 instructions accompanied by a 0-100 visual analog rating scale (VAS): (1) *Using the scale*
271 *below, please rate the communication competence of the person. 0 = Communication skills not*

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

13

272 *at all effective, 100 = Communication skills extremely effective.*(2) *Using the scale below,*
273 *please rate the stuttering severity of the person. 0 = no stuttering, 100 = extremely severe*
274 *stuttering.*

275 As in Byrd et al. (2024a), participants were then asked to provide demographic information
276 (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, occupation, primary language). Participants also
277 provided information about their personal relationship with stuttering, persons who stutter, or
278 other communication disorders (*Do you personally know a person who stutters? If so, please*
279 *describe your relationship and how long you have known this person. Have you had previous*
280 *speech, language, and/or hearing evaluation or therapy?*) as well as any visible or nonvisible
281 diagnoses unrelated to communication difficulties. Appendix B provides a detailed demographic
282 summary of untrained observers.

283 Consistent with Prolific[®] policy, and to improve response fidelity (Peer et al., 2021), each
284 survey included two comprehension checks and two attention checks (Oppenheimer et al.,
285 2009). Multiple-choice comprehension check screening items were included to ensure that
286 participants understand critical elements of the survey (e.g., understanding of compensation
287 terms, understanding of instructions). Multiple-choice attention check items included
288 instructional manipulation checks (e.g., *When asked to select your favorite color, select green.*
289 *This is an attention check. What is your favorite color?*) and nonsensical questions (e.g., *Rate*
290 *your agreement with the following statement. I swim across the Atlantic Ocean to get to work*
291 *everyday*). Participants must respond to both comprehension check and attention check questions
292 correctly to proceed. The survey was initiated by 1,141 respondents. Of these 1,141 respondents,
293 31 (2.72%) did not pass the attention or comprehension check questions during the survey and

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

14

294 were excluded from final analysis. The final corpus included 1,110 untrained observers as
295 respondents (see Appendix B for demographic summary of untrained observers).

296 **Procedures**

297 Three primary variables were examined in the present study: Timepoint, Context, and
298 Condition. *Timepoint* was defined as whether the video sample was recorded: (1) pre-treatment
299 (i.e., one week prior to the first treatment session) or (2) post-treatment (i.e., one week following
300 the final treatment session). *Context* was defined as the sampling context of the video: (1) a
301 dyadic interaction (i.e., virtual mock interview with an unfamiliar interviewer), or (2) an oral
302 presentation (i.e., virtual impromptu oral presentation on one of five topics to two additional
303 audience members). *Condition* was defined as which perceptual rating the untrained observers
304 were asked to provide: (1) a rating of communication competence, or (2) a rating of stuttering
305 severity. After viewing one video, each participant was asked to rate either (a) communication
306 competence, or (b) stuttering severity, using a 100-point VAS described above. Similar to Byrd
307 et al. (2024a), each untrained observer viewed and rated only one video, thereby eliminating
308 order effects, and were blinded to the time point of the video they observed. Table 2 provides a
309 summary of the number of participants who rated each video stimuli used in the present study.

310

311 **Table 2**

312 *Number of Non-Overlapping Untrained Observers Serving as Raters for Each Video Sample (Condition x*
313 *Timepoint x Context) Across Participants*

Communication Competence		Stuttering Severity	
Pre-Treatment	Post-Treatment	Pre-Treatment	Post-Treatment

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

P	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres	<i>N</i>
1	17	12	12	12	15	12	12	14	106
2	16	12	15	15	13	15	13	13	112
3	15	15	13	13	15	13	11	13	108
4	10	13	16	15	14	14	13	15	110
5	13	12	14	12	13	13	15	14	106
6	14	16	14	15	12	16	15	14	116
7	14	16	15	16	12	11	15	14	113
8	15	16	12	14	14	12	14	15	112
9	15	16	13	14	15	14	15	15	117
10	12	16	15	14	12	13	14	14	110
<i>N</i>	141	144	139	140	135	133	137	141	1,110

314 *Note.* P = Participant; Pres = presentation.

315 **Analysis**

316 A three-factor ANOVA was conducted to compare untrained observers' ratings, with
317 Timepoint (Pre-Treatment, Post-Treatment), Condition (Communication Competence, Stuttering
318 Severity) and Context (Dyad, Presentation), as the three independent categorical factors and
319 rating on the 100-point VAS as the continuous dependent variable. The three-way ANOVA was
320 two-tailed ($\alpha = .05$) and Bonferroni-adjusted p-values were applied during planned comparisons.
321 Effect sizes were calculated and interpreted using η^2 (Cohen, 1988).

322 To account for the potential influence of listener-based variables, similar to Byrd et al.
323 (2024a), nine additional observer-based factors were included as covariates: (1) age, (2) race
324 identification, (3) ethnicity identification, (4) gender identification, (5) years of education, (6)

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

16

325 primary spoken language, (7) knowing a person who stutters, (8) number of years the observer
326 has known a person who stutters, and (9) visible and/or mixed disability. Race and gender
327 categories had an insufficient number of respondents for valid statistical analysis across groups.
328 Rather than exclude demographic categories with a limited number of respondents, and similar to
329 Byrd et al. (2024a), groups were either combined or redistributed. Race categories with ≤ 10
330 (Native American or Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Race Not
331 Described) were re-grouped into a single category. Survey respondents who identified as non-
332 binary were randomly assigned and evenly redistributed to male or female.

Results

334 A significant main effect was detected for Timepoint $F(1,1109) = 5.04, p = .025, \eta^2 =$
335 $.005$ [small effect size], Condition $F(1,1109) = 92.66, p < .001, \eta^2 = .078$ [large effect size],
336 and Context $F(1,1109) = 5.08, p = .024, \eta^2 = .004$ [small effect size]. No significant two-way
337 interaction was detected for Timepoint x Context $F(1,1109) = 2.78, p = .097$ nor Condition x
338 Context $F(1,1109) = .09, p = .765$. A significant two-way interaction was detected between
339 Timepoint and Condition $F(1, 1109) = 7.19, p = .007, \eta^2 = .007$ [medium effect size]. As
340 depicted in Figure 1, significant pre- to post-treatment gains were observed for communication
341 competence ($p < .001$; dyad: $p = .004$; presentation: $p = .035$) but not stuttering severity ($p =$
342 $.757$; dyad: $p = .298$; presentation: $p = .137$). Findings also indicated that, irrespective of
343 context, significant differences were observed between ratings of communication competence
344 and stuttering severity at pre-treatment ($p < .001$; dyad: $p < .001$; presentation: $p < .001$) and
345 post-treatment ($p < .001$; dyad: $p < .001$; presentation: $p < .001$), suggesting that untrained
346 observers perceived these to be distinct variables. No significant three-way interaction was
347 detected $F(1, 1108) = .71, p = .401$.

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

17

348 Of the nine observer-based factors included as covariates, three were identified as
349 significant: age $F(1, 1109) = 6.30, p = .012, \eta^2 = .006$ [medium effect size]; ethnicity $F(1,$
350 $1109) = 13.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .012$ [large effect size]; personally knowing an adult who stutters
351 $F(1, 1109) = 5.68, p = .017, \eta^2 = .005$ [small effect size].

352

353

Discussion

354 The purpose of this social validation study was to assess whether gains observed following
355 CARE Model treatment by clinicians and participants were also observed by untrained
356 observers. This study replicates and extends a previous social validation study (Byrd et al.,
357 2024a) in terms of number of participants ($N = 10$, as opposed to $N = 1$), raters ($N = 1,110$, as
358 opposed to $N = 81$), context (dyadic exchanges and oral presentations, as opposed to dyad alone),
359 and perceptual ratings provided by untrained observers (communication competence and
360 stuttering severity, as opposed to communication competence alone). Findings indicate
361 significant gains in communication competence pre- to post-treatment across contexts with no
362 significant changes in stuttering severity.

Communication Competence

364 Untrained observers rated the communication competence of adults who stutter as
365 significantly higher for videos recorded after CARE Model treatment compared to videos
366 recorded before treatment. These findings replicate ratings from untrained observers in Byrd et
367 al. (2024a, $N = 81$ raters, $N = 1$ adult who stutters) on a larger scale ($N = 1,110$ raters, $N = 10$
368 adults who stutter). Significant gains post-treatment also corroborated post-treatment gains in
369 previous studies observed by participants (Coalson et al., 2024, $N = 33$) and clinicians (Byrd et
370 al., 2022, $N = 11$). Together, outcomes suggest that the communication competence of adults

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

18

371 who stutter following CARE Model treatment are perceived as significantly improved from
372 multiple perspectives.

373 As noted, social validation can provide evidence that self-perceived or clinician-perceived
374 gains following treatment are not based on potentially biased perspectives. It is important to note
375 that although the general public in the present study provide corroborating evidence of post-
376 treatment gains in communication competence, the perspective of the general public should
377 never take priority over participant self-perception during clinical intervention. That is, these
378 data should be considered supporting evidence for the treatment, but not used as a criterion for
379 clinical success. Failure to make this distinction risks a scenario wherein the general public, or
380 perhaps clinicians, promote treatment outcomes they consider to be successful even when the
381 participant does not (e.g., Constantino et al., 2017; Cream et al., 2003; Stewart & Corcoran,
382 1995).

383 **Stuttering Severity**

384 The present study also asked untrained observers to rate videos based on stuttering
385 severity. As noted, no significant changes in untrained observers' ratings of stuttering severity.
386 This finding replicates Byrd et al. (2024a) who reported significant changes in communication
387 competence of videos that did not statistically differ in stuttering severity, as rated untrained
388 observer (primary analysis, $N = 81$ raters, $p = .95$; supplemental replication analysis, $N = 96$
389 raters; $p = .65$). Findings also replicate data from observers in Werle and Byrd (2022a, 2022b)
390 and self-ratings in Coalson et al. (2024), in that gains in communication competence for adults
391 who stutter can be observed with no changes in stuttering severity.

392 Unlike the present study, videos in Byrd et al. (2024a) were selected specifically to control
393 for pre- and post-treatment variance in stuttering severity when assessing untrained observers'

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

19

394 ratings of communication competence. In the present study, pre- and post-treatment stuttering
395 severity were allowed to freely vary across participants. Inclusion of these ratings during
396 analyses provided the opportunity to contrast observer ratings of stuttering severity with
397 communication competence. At both timepoints and irrespective of context, untrained observers
398 provided significantly different ratings for communication competence and stuttering severity,
399 suggesting that these were considered to be independent constructs. Together, findings provide
400 large-scale social validation for a core clinical goal of the CARE Model - improved
401 communication competence without changes in stuttering severity.

402 **Speaking Context**

403 An extension of Byrd et al. (2024a) was the assessment of speakers in two different
404 speaking contexts - dyadic interaction (i.e., mock interview) and oral presentation (i.e.,
405 impromptu presentation to a small group). Untrained observers rated participants similarly - that
406 is, significant gains in communication competence with no significant changes in stuttering
407 severity - in both contexts. Findings from dyadic interactions replicate findings based on mock
408 interviews in Byrd et al. (2024a), and extend these gains to a second, dissimilar speaking context
409 (i.e., oral presentation). Findings suggest that changes in communication are not restricted to the
410 communication demands of one-on-one dyadic interactions and can be generalized across
411 contexts.

412 Findings inform clinical outcomes reported by adults who stutter, as measured by the
413 SPCC, in Coalson et al. (2024). As noted, the SPCC provides an index of self-perceived
414 communication competence across a variety of speaking contexts (i.e., public presentation, large
415 meeting, group interaction, dyadic interaction) and audience types (i.e, stranger, acquaintance,
416 friend). Although a priori power analysis in Coalson et al. (2024) restricted pre- to post-

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

20

417 treatment comparison to the Total SPCC score (i.e., averaged across seven context-dependent
418 subscales), descriptive data indicated post-treatment gains communication competence for
419 speaking contexts similar to those rated by untrained observers in the present study. Specifically,
420 a greater percentage of adults rated themselves as having “high” communication competence (>
421 87 Total SPCC Score) during dyadic interactions (pre-treatment: 21%, post-treatment: 36%) and
422 presentations (pre-treatment: 30%, post-treatment: 48%) and with strangers (pre-treatment: 24%;
423 post-treatment: 61%). Significant post-treatment gains found in the present study from the
424 perspective of untrained observers, along with the descriptive gains from the perspective of the
425 participant in Coalson et al. (2024), suggest that treatment effects generalize across contexts.

426 **Observer-Based Factors**

427 Three observer-based factors were found to influence perceptual ratings: age, ethnicity, and
428 whether the untrained observer personally knows a person who stutters. In general, younger
429 participants and participants who self-identified as non-Hispanic or Latino provided higher
430 ratings of communication competence than older and/or Hispanic or Latino observers. These
431 ratings, however, were not specific to either time point or either speaking context. Comparison
432 across studies provide some insight into the relative consistency of the factors when evaluating
433 individuals who stutter. For example, the two demographic factors - age and ethnicity - were not
434 identified as influential factors on ratings of communication competence in Byrd et al. (2024a)
435 during primary analysis, or supplemental replication analysis. Previous research has identified
436 age as a significant factor in the evaluation of negative beliefs or attitudes towards stuttering
437 (e.g., Arnold et al., 2016; Valente et al., 2017). Recent studies have also explored the beliefs of
438 Hispanic/Latino communities towards stuttering (e.g., Dean & Medina, 2021; Medina et al.,
439 2024). A recent study by Young and Byrd (2024), however, found that age and ethnicity did not

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

21

440 significantly influence employers' beliefs about individuals who stutter or their perception of the
441 communication competence after watching video samples of a job candidate who stutters. The
442 exact reasons for these changes are speculative at this point, and the purpose of including these
443 factors as covariates was to control for observer-based factors of significance, should they be
444 observed. It should be noted that findings across studies may be inconsistent due to the overall
445 lack of cultural diversity in stuttering research. Nevertheless, as the range of potentially
446 influential demographic factors continues to grow, researchers should continue to collect detailed
447 demographic data in studies of clinical outcomes. Importantly, although a variety of
448 demographic variables may influence ratings in studies of treatment efficacy from the
449 perspective of the general public, the positive gains of treatment remained in the present study
450 significant after controlling for these factors.

451 Familiarity with an adult who stutters, however, has been a reliably influential factor when
452 examining perceptual ratings of individuals who stutter, as seen in this study and previous
453 studies (e.g., Arnold et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2017; Young & Byrd, 2024)
454 and Byrd et al. (2024a; primary analysis, supplemental replication study). Across studies,
455 untrained observers who are personally familiar with an adult who stutters rate more favorably
456 than observers who reported they did not know a person who stutters. This finding is consistent
457 with the well-documented contact theory wherein individuals with first-hand knowledge of a
458 person from a specific identity or culture view these individuals more favorably (e.g., Allport,
459 1958; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Findings suggest that rater familiarity should continue to be
460 assessed, and controlled, when examining perceptions of the general public towards people who
461 stutter.

462 **Limitations and Future Studies**

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

23

486 scale study serve as social validation of a non-ableist approach designed to improve
487 communication while explicitly excluding fluency goals and, instead, emphasizing stuttering
488 openly as a fundamental step in effective communication.

489 **Acknowledgements**

490 This project was supported by the foundational grant support funded to the Arthur M.
491 Blank Center for Stuttering Education and Research and endowed support provided through the
492 Michael and Tami Lang Stuttering Institute, the Dr. Jennifer and Emanuel Bodner
493 Developmental Stuttering Laboratory, and the Dealey Family Foundation Stuttering Clinic
494 awarded to the second author. The authors thank Michael Mahometa for his assistance with
495 statistical analyses. We would also like to thank the adult participants who stutter, as well as their
496 families, who continue to participate in our ongoing clinical research.

497

498

499

500

501 **References**

- 502 American Psychological Association, APA Task Force on Guidelines for Assessment and
503 Intervention with Persons with Disabilities. (2022). *Guidelines for Assessment and*
504 *Intervention with Persons with Disabilities*. [https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-](https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-assessment-intervention-disabilities.pdf)
505 [assessment-intervention-disabilities.pdf](https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-assessment-intervention-disabilities.pdf)
- 506 Arnold, H. S., Li, J., & Goltl, K. (2015). Beliefs of teachers versus non-teachers about people
507 who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 43, 28-39.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2014.12.001>
- 509 Arya, P., & Geetha, Y. V. (2013). Factors related to recovery and relapse in persons with
510 stuttering following treatment: A preliminary study. *Disability, CBR and Inclusive*
511 *Development*, 24, 82-98. <https://doi.org/10.5463/dcid.v24i1.189>
- 512 Baxter, S., Johnson, M., Blank, L., Cantrell, A., Brumfitt, S., Enderby, P., & Goyder, E. (2016).
513 Non-pharmacological treatments for stuttering in children and adults: a systematic review
514 and evaluation of clinical effectiveness, and exploration of barriers to successful outcomes.
515 *Health Technology Assessment*, 20(2), 1–vi. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta20020>
- 516 Boyle, M. P. (2015). Identifying correlates of self-stigma in adults who stutter: further
517 establishing the construct validity of the Self-Stigma of Stuttering Scale (4S). *Journal of*
518 *Fluency Disorders*, 43, 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2014.12.002>
- 519 Byrd, C. T. (2023a). *The Blank Center CARE™ Model: A non-ableist approach to treatment*.
520 ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT05908123.
521 <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05908123>

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

25

- 522 Byrd, C. T. (2023b). *The Blank Center CARE™ Model: Application for School-Age Children*
523 *Who Stutter*. [Manual]. Arthur M. Blank Center for Stuttering Education and Research.
524 <https://blankcenterforstuttering.org/>
- 525 Byrd, C. T. (2021, July). *How to navigate fluency conformity and reduce stuttering stigma*
526 [Keynote presentation]. National Stuttering Association Convention, Austin, TX.
527 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=azDrm_NloyE
- 528 Byrd, C. T., Chmela, K., Coleman, C., Kelly, E., Reichhardt, R., & Irani, F. (2016a). An
529 introduction to camps for children who stutter: What they are and how they help.
530 *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, 1*, 55-69.
531 <https://doi.org/10.1044/persp1.SIG4.55>
- 532 Byrd, C. T., Coalson, G. A., & Conture, E. G. (2024c). *CARE Model of treatment for*
533 *stuttering: theory, assumptions, and preliminary findings*. Under review.
- 534 Byrd, C. T., Coalson, G. A., & Werle, D. (2024a). Observer-rated outcomes of communication-
535 centered treatment for adults who stutter: A social validation study. *PLOS ONE, 19*(5),
536 e0303024. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0303024>
- 537 Byrd, C. T., Coalson, G. A., Werle, D., Croft, R., Winters, K. L., & Young, M. M. (2024b).
538 Camp Dream. Speak. Live: A virtual adaptation. *MedRxiv*.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.22.24311294>
- 540 Byrd, C. T., Coalson, G. A., & Young, M. M. (2022). Targeting communication effectiveness in
541 adults who stutter: A preliminary study. *Topics in Language Disorders, 42*(1), 76-93.
542 <https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0000000000000270>

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

26

- 543 Byrd, C. T., Hampton, E., McGill, M. & Gkalitsiou, Z. (2016b). Participation in Camp Dream.
544 Speak. Live.: Affective and cognitive outcomes for children who stutter. *Journal of*
545 *Speech Pathology and Therapy*, 1(3), 1000116. [https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-](https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-5005.1000116)
546 [5005.1000116](https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-5005.1000116)
- 547 Byrd, C. T., Gkalitsiou, Z., Werle, D., & Coalson, G. A. (2018). Exploring the effectiveness of
548 an intensive treatment program for school-age children who stutter Camp Dream. Speak.
549 Live.: A follow-up study. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 39(5), 458–468.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1670669>
- 551 Byrd, C. T., Werle, D., & St. Louis, K. O. (2020). Speech-language pathologists' comfort level
552 with use of the term “stuttering” during evaluations. *American Journal of Speech-*
553 *Language Pathology*, 29(2), 841-850. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJSLP-19-00081
- 554 Byrd, C. T., Winters, K. L., Young, M., Werle, D., Croft, R. L., Hampton, E., Coalson, G.,
555 White, A., & Gkalitsiou, Z. (2021). The communication benefits of participation in Camp
556 Dream. Speak. Live.: An extension and replication. *Seminars in Speech and Language*,
557 42(2), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1723843>
- 558 Coalson, G. A., Byrd, C. T., Werle, D., Croft, R., & Mahometa, M. (2024). Self-perceived
559 communication competence of adults who stutter following communication-centered
560 treatment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 33(4), 1965–1985.
561 https://doi.org/10.1044/2024_AJSLP-23-00234
- 562 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

27

- 563 Constantino, C. D., Eichorn, N., Buder, E. H., Beck, J. G., & Manning, W. H. (2020). The
564 speaker's experience of stuttering: Measuring spontaneity. *Journal of Speech, Language,*
565 *and Hearing Disorders, 63*, 983-1001 https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-19-00068
- 566 Constantino, C. D., Manning, W. H., & Manning, S. N. (2017). Rethinking covert stuttering.
567 *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 53*, 26-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2017.06.001>
- 568 Corcocan, J. A. & Stewart, M. (1995). Stories of stuttering: A qualitative analysis of interview
569 narratives. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 23*, 247-264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-730X(98)00020-5)
570 [730X\(98\)00020-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-730X(98)00020-5)
- 571 Craig, A.R., & Hancock, K. (1995). Self-reported factors related to relapse following treatment
572 for stuttering. *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders, 23*, 48-60.
573 <https://doi.org/10.3109/asl2.1995.23.issue-1.04>
- 574 Cream, A., Onslow, M., Packman, A., & Llewellyn, G. (2003). Protection from harm: the
575 experience of adults after therapy with prolonged-speech. *International Journal of*
576 *Language and Communication Disorders, 38*(4), 379–395.
577 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13682820310001598166>
- 578 De Nardo, T., Tetnowski, J. A., & Coalson, G. A. (2023). Listener perceptions of stuttering and
579 stuttering modification techniques. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 75*, 105960.
580 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2023.105960>
- 581 Dean, L., & Medina, A. M. (2021). Stigma and the Hispanic stuttering experience: A qualitative
582 study. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 89*, 106056.
583 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2020.106056>

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

28

584 Finn, C. A., & Sladeczek, I. E. (2001). Assessing the social validity of behavioral interventions:
585 A review of treatment acceptability measures. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *16*(2), 176.

586 <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.16.2.176.18703>

587 Irani, F., Gabel, R., Daniels, D., & Hughes, S. (2012). The long term effectiveness of intensive
588 stuttering therapy: a mixed methods study. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *37*(3), 164–178.

589 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2012.04.002>

590 Johnson, M., Baxter, S., Blank, L., Cantrell, A., Brumfitt, S., Enderby, P., & Goyder, E. (2016).

591 The state of the art in non-pharmacological interventions for developmental stuttering. Part
592 2: qualitative evidence synthesis of views and experiences. *International Journal of*

593 *Language and Communication Disorders*, *51*(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460->

594 [6984.12182](https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12182)

595 Kazdin, A. E. (1977). Assessing the clinical or applied importance of behavior change through
596 social validation. *Behavior Modification*, *1*(4): 427-452.

597 <https://doi.org/10.1177/014544557714001>

598 Manning, W. H., Burlison, A. E., & Thaxton, D. (1999). Listener response to stuttering
599 modification techniques. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *24*, 267-280.

600 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-730X\(99\)00022-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-730X(99)00022-4)

601 McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring
602 communication competence. *Communication Research Report*, *5*(2), 108–113.

603 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824098809359810>

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

29

- 604 Medina, A. M., Mead, J. S., & Moore, S. (2024). Perceptions of and beliefs about stuttering in
605 the Hispanic/Latino community. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *111*, 106456.
606 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2018.1481145>
- 607 National Institutes of Health, NIH Advisory Committee to the Director Working Group on
608 Diversity. (2022). *Subgroup on Individuals with Disabilities Report*. Retrieved from
609 <https://acd.od.nih.gov/working-groups/disabilitiessubgroup.html>
- 610 National Stuttering Association. (2009). *The experience of people who stutter: A survey by the*
611 *National Stuttering Association. Executive summary*. Retrieved from
612 <http://www.westutter.org/assets/NSAsurveyMay09.pdf>
- 613 Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks:
614 Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social*
615 *Psychology*, *45*(4), 867-872. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.009>
- 616 Peer, E., Rothschild, D., Gordon, A., Evernden, Z., & Damer, E. (2021). Data quality of
617 platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, *54*,
618 1643-1662. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3>
- 619 Riley, G. D. (2009). *Stuttering severity instrument-Fourth edition (SSI-4)*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- 620 Schloss, P. J., Espin, C. A., Smith, M. A., & Suffolk, D. R. (1987a). Developing assertiveness
621 during employment interviews with young adults who stutter. *Journal of Speech and*
622 *Hearing Disorders*, *52*(1), 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshd.5201.30>

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

30

- 623 Schloss, P. J., Freeman, C. A., Smith, M. A., & Espin, C. A. (1987b). Influence of assertiveness
624 training on the stuttering rates exhibited by three young adults. *Journal of Fluency*
625 *Disorders, 12*(5), 333-353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0094-730X\(87\)90031-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0094-730X(87)90031-3)
- 626 Stewart, T. & Richardson, G. (2004). A qualitative study of the therapeutic effect from a user's
627 perspective. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 29*, 95-108.
628 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2003.11.001>
- 629 Valente, A. R. S., Louis, K. O. S., Leahy, M., Hall, A., & Jesus, L. M. (2017). A country-wide
630 probability sample of public attitudes toward stuttering in Portugal. *Journal of Fluency*
631 *Disorders, 52*, 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2017.03.001>
- 632 Von Tiling, J. (2011). Listener perceptions of stuttering, prolonged speech, and verbal
633 avoidance behaviors. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 44*(2), 161–172.
634 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.09.002>
- 635 Werle, D. & Byrd, C. T. (2022a). Professors' perceptions and evaluations of students who do
636 and do not stutter following oral presentations. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services*
637 *in Schools, 53*, 133-149. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_LSHSS-21-00069
- 638 Werle, D., & Byrd, C. T. (2022b). The impact of self-disclosure and strategies for
639 communication competence on professors' perceptions and evaluations of students who do
640 and do not stutter. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 65*(9), 3405-3419.
641 https://doi.org/10.1044/2022_JSLHR-22-00118
- 642 Yairi, E. & Ambrose, N (2005). *Early childhood stuttering: For clinicians by clinicians.*
643 Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.


SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

644 Yaruss, J. S., Quesal, R. W., Reeves, L., Molt, L. F., Kluetz, B., Caruso, A. J., McClure, J. A.,
645 & Lewis, F. (2002). Speech treatment and support group experiences of people who
646 participate in the National Stuttering Association. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 27(2),
647 115-33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0094-730x\(02\)00114-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0094-730x(02)00114-6)

648 Young, M. M. & Byrd, C. T. (2024). *Stuttering in the workplace: Employers' attitudes,*
649 *employability ratings, and hiring decisions.* Under review.

650 **Figure 1**

651 *Ratings of Communication Competence and Stuttering Severity for Adults Who Stutter at Before*
652 *and After Treatment (Pre-Tx, Post-Tx) Across Speaking Contexts (Dyad, Presentation)*



653

654

655

656

657 **Appendix A**

658 *Description of Treatment*

659 Communication competence training serves as one of the four distinct components of the
660 Blank Center CARE™ Model (Communication, Advocacy, Resilience, and Education). A brief
661 summary of the 11-week (i.e., 22-session) manualized treatment protocol is provided below.
662 Treatment consists of two 60-minute sessions per week consisting of one group session as well
663 as one individual session. Training provided during the individual sessions provide an
664 opportunity to review what will be covered, prepare for the activities, and debrief for the weekly
665 group sessions, wherein participants work towards strengthening their communication skills
666 across distinct speaking scenarios, including mock job interviews, small group interactions,
667 impromptu icebreakers, one-on-one interactions with unfamiliar persons, and multiple
668 presentations varied both in purpose (e.g., informative, persuasive, inspirational) and audience
669 composition (e.g., small and large groups, familiar and unfamiliar listeners).

- 670 ● **Week 1** (Sessions 1 and 2): Participants are introduced to the competencies that comprise
671 effective communication (i.e., language use, language organization, speech rate, intonation,
672 volume, gestures, body position, eye contact, facial affect). Participants receive focused
673 training in effective **body positioning and gestures**. Participants complete self-ratings of
674 these communication competencies following an impromptu small group presentation.
- 675 ● **Week 2** (Sessions 3 and 4): Participants identify and describe core components of
676 communication competence and receive focused training in effective use of **facial affect**,
677 while simultaneously continuing to strengthen competencies addressed in the prior sessions.
678 Participants complete self-ratings of communication competencies following a small group
679 informative speech presentation to unfamiliar persons.

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

33

- 680 ● **Week 3** (Sessions 5 and 6): Participants identify and describe core components of
681 communication competence and receive focused training in **turn-taking and listener**
682 **awareness**, while simultaneously continuing to strengthen competencies addressed in prior
683 sessions. Participants complete self-ratings of their communication competencies following
684 impromptu dyadic exchanges as well as impromptu small group presentations to unfamiliar
685 persons.
- 686 ● **Week 4** (Sessions 7 and 8): Participants identify and describe core components of
687 communication competence and receive focused training in effective **vocal variety (i.e.,**
688 **volume, rate, intonation)**, while simultaneously continuing to strengthen competencies
689 addressed in prior sessions. Participants complete self-ratings of communication
690 competencies following impromptu dyadic exchanges, as well as impromptu small group
691 presentations to unfamiliar persons.
- 692 ● **Week 5** (Sessions 9 and 10): Participants identify and describe core components of
693 communication competence and receive focused training in effective **language use and**
694 **organization**, while simultaneously continuing to strengthen competencies addressed in
695 prior sessions. Participants complete self-ratings of communication competencies after
696 completing 10+ dyadic interactions with unfamiliar persons.
- 697 ● **Week 6** (Sessions 11 and 12): Participants identify and describe core components of
698 communication competence and receive additional focused training in **stuttering openly-**
699 **that is, making no attempts to avoid stuttering, increase fluency, and/or modify moments of**
700 **stuttering**. Participants complete self-ratings of communication competencies following an
701 open mic presentation in a public forum.

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

34

- 702 • **Week 7** (Sessions 13 and 14): Participants **review and practice all core components of**
703 **communication competence simultaneously.** Participants complete self-ratings of
704 communication competencies following a persuasive speech given to a small group and a
705 large group of unfamiliar persons.
- 706 • **Week 8** (Sessions 15 and 16): Participants **review and practice all core components of**
707 **communication competence.** Participants complete self-ratings of communication
708 competencies after serving as an interviewee in a series of panel interviews, with potential
709 employers across diverse professions.
- 710 • **Week 9** (Sessions 17 and 18): Participants **review and practice all core components of**
711 **communication competence.** Participants complete self-ratings of communication
712 competencies following impromptu dyadic exchanges as well as impromptu presentation to
713 a small group of unfamiliar persons.
- 714 • **Week 10** (Sessions 19 and 20): Participants **review and practice all core components of**
715 **communication competence.** Participants complete self-ratings of communication
716 competencies following impromptu dyadic exchanges as well as impromptu presentation to
717 a small group of unfamiliar persons.
- 718 • **Week 11** (Sessions 21 and 22): Participants **review and practice all core components of**
719 **communication competence.** Participants complete a self-rating of communication
720 competencies after providing a presentation to an audience of >200 people.
721
722

Appendix B*Description of Non-overlapping, Untrained Observers Who Rated Each Video Sample (Condition x Timepoint x Context)*

	Communication Competence				Stuttering Severity			
	Pre-Tx		Post-Tx		Pre-Tx		Post-Tx	
	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres	Dyad	Pres
<i>N</i>	141	144	139	140	135	133	137	141
Age	38.5	38.8	39.6	38.6	39.2	39.0	38.6	39.4
	(13.2)	(13.0)	(13.0)	(13.8)	(13.5)	(13.1)	(13.1)	(13.4)
Race								
Native American or Alaskan Native	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	1
Asian	22	25	11	19	10	17	17	13
Black or African American	9	7	10	9	7	9	8	9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
White	106	106	111	107	108	103	99	107

SOCIAL VALIDATION OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES

					36			
Race Not Described	2	6	4	5	10	4	12	10
Ethnicity								
Not Hispanic or Latino	107	112	105	107	101	101	111	114
Hispanic or Latino	34	32	34	33	34	32	26	27
Self-Identified Gender								
Male	64	50	42	54	62	52	58	54
Female	75	91	96	83	73	81	77	86
Other Identification	2	3	1	3	0	0	2	1
Years of Education								
	16.9	16.8	16.5	16.7	16.0	16.4	16.5	16.3
	(3.8)	(3.0)	(3.6)	(3.2)	(3.0)	(3.0)	(3.0)	(3.2)
Non-English Primary Language								
	14	17	16	12	9	13	15	12
Knows adult who stutters								
	32	40	45	36	43	42	54	50
Years known								
	3.0	3.9	5.1	3.8	4.7	4.9	5.6	4.5
	(8.1)	(9.3)	(10.9)	(7.6)	(10.0)	(10.3)	(10.0)	(9.3)
Invisible or mixed disability								
	27	29	40	31	37	25	29	34

Note. Means and standard deviations (in parenthesis) reported for age, years of education, and years known. Pres = presentation, Tx = treatment.