

1

2

3 Observer-rated outcomes of Communication-Centered Treatment (CCT) for adults who stutter:

4

A preliminary study

5

6

7

8 Courtney T. Byrd^{1¶}, Geoffrey A. Coalson^{1¶*}, Danielle Werle^{1¶}

9

10 ¹Arthur M. Blank Center for Stuttering Education and Research, The University of Texas at

11 Austin, Austin, Texas, United States of America

12

13 *Corresponding author

14 E-mail: geoffrey.coalson@austin.utexas.edu

15

16

17 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

18

19 **Abstract**

20 Previous studies have reported that adults who stutter demonstrate significant gains in
21 communication competence, per self-ratings and clinician-ratings, upon completion of a
22 communication-centered treatment, or CCT. The purpose of the present study was to determine
23 whether gains in communication competence would also be reported by untrained observers.
24 Eighty-one untrained observers completed an online survey that required each to view one of two
25 videos depicting an adult who stutters during a mock interview recorded prior to CCT or after
26 CCT. Participants were then asked to rate the communication competence of the interviewee on
27 a 100-point visual analog scale and provide additional demographic information.
28 Communication competence of the adult who stutters was rated significantly higher in their
29 post-treatment video. Two observer-based factors were significantly associated with ratings of
30 communication competence: years of education and years the respondent had known an adult
31 who stutters. Upon controlling for these demographic factors, significantly higher ratings of
32 communication competence for the post-treatment video were maintained. Although
33 preliminary, findings suggest gains in communication competence demonstrated in previous
34 studies through clinician and client observations are not limited to the sterile clinical
35 environment, and further emphasizes the ecological validity of CCT. [*ClinicalTrials.gov*
36 NCT05908123; <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT05908123>]

37

38 Introduction

39 Public perception that adults who stutter are poor communicators is pervasive. Decades
40 of research illustrate the widespread belief that effective communication – a skill that is
41 considered essential for academic success (e.g., [1]), workplace advancement (e.g., [2-5]), and
42 interpersonal relationships (see [6-7]) – cannot be adequately attained in the presence of stuttered
43 speech. Based on this assumption, treatment options for adults who stutter have historically
44 focused, in part or whole, on learning to speak fluently, and concealing moments of overtly
45 stuttered speech (see systematic review by Brignell et al. [8]). The assumption that
46 communication skills cannot be gained or improved without suppressing stuttered speech has
47 gone unchallenged within clinical trials for decades. Only recently have clinical researchers
48 demonstrated that targeting fluency during treatment is not necessary to improve the
49 communication competency of persons who stutter.

50 Byrd and colleagues [9-11], for example, explored the impact of participation in a
51 *communication-centered treatment (CCT)* designed to improve communication skills with no
52 attempt to change speech fluency. Participants were rated to be significantly stronger
53 communicators post-treatment by clinicians who were unfamiliar with the participants and
54 blinded to pre-/post-treatment status of video samples [9-10]. Participants themselves also
55 reported significantly stronger communication competencies after treatment across a variety of
56 speaking contexts (dyad, small group, large group, public presentation) and listeners (strangers,
57 acquaintances, friends; Coalson et al. [11]). Critically, neither self- nor clinician ratings of
58 communication competency were predicted by pre-treatment stuttering frequency.

59 Taken together, these clinical data provide preliminary but compelling evidence that
60 fluency and communication are not inextricably linked, at least from the perspective of speakers

61 who stutter and their clinicians. Although promising, both the participants and the clinicians in
62 the prior studies had shared knowledge of the nature of stuttering, the focus of CCT, and the
63 desired clinical outcomes; thus, there was a relatively stable internal criteria for subjective
64 evaluation, that one could argue may diverge from the appraisal of unfamiliar, untrained
65 laypersons. Potential bias also may result from the sampling context. Clinicians who
66 participated in the previous studies were blind to the pre- versus post-treatment status of videos,
67 and videos were randomized, but they were evaluating a large number of consecutive videos
68 depicting participants who stutter – a scenario rarely encountered in everyday life which may
69 have also potentially compromised their ratings.

70 Therefore, to extend previous findings to a more ecologically valid context, the present
71 study examined whether post-treatment gains in communication competency observed by
72 clinicians in previous studies to reflect behavioral changes that are also identifiable to untrained,
73 naïve observers. To do so, we recruited a large cohort of untrained observers to rate the
74 communication competency of an unfamiliar adult who stutters based on a video sample
75 recorded either before treatment had begun (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli) or after treatment had
76 been completed (Post-treatment Video Stimuli). To explore implicit factors known or suspected
77 to influence social evaluation, and evaluation of people who stutter (e.g., [12-13]) in particular,
78 we also considered to what extent demographic and observer-related factors may account for
79 perceived communication competency ratings for each video sample.

80 **Communication-Centered Treatment (CCT) for stuttering**

81 The majority of treatment approaches for adults who stutter primarily or exclusively
82 targeted fluency-centered speech techniques intended to either eliminate or minimize moments

83 of stuttered speech (i.e., fluency shaping [14-15]; stuttering modification [16]). Yet, from the few
84 randomized control trials (RCTs) that exist for adults who stutter, it is evident that fluency-
85 centered treatment (a) has minimal impact on the psychological consequences of stuttering [17-
86 18]), (b) is prone to high rates of relapse (71% [19]), and (c) may compromise the speaker's
87 innate ability to communicate (e.g., unnatural, effortful, and/or incongruent with their identity
88 [20]). Additionally, listeners often rate speech techniques often employed during treatment to
89 achieve fluency as equally or less desirable than stuttered speech [21-23].

90 Furthermore, several recent studies indicate that stuttering severity does not predict
91 communication attitudes in person who stutter regardless of age (e.g., children [24]; adults: [25]).
92 These data challenge the assumption that fluency must be targeted to facilitate positive
93 perspectives of self and/or communication in persons who stutter. In fact, Byrd and colleagues
94 [9-11, 26-27] provide evidence that significant positive changes in communication attitudes, and
95 communication competence, can be reliably attained through participation in a treatment that
96 focuses on improving overall communication and *explicitly* excludes clinical goals that attempt
97 to hide, eliminate, or modify stuttered speech in children and adults following CCT.

98 **Preliminary findings with children who stutter**

99 Byrd et al. [26, n = 23, ages 7- to 14-years old] examined changes in cognitive and
100 affective wellbeing before and after treatment reported by 23 children and adolescents who
101 stutter and their parents. Specifically, adolescents who stutter reported greater quality of life (as
102 measured by the Overall Assessment of Speaker's Experience with Stuttering [28]) following
103 treatment, and parents reported significant improvement in their child's ability to establish peer
104 relationships (as measured by the PROMIS-Pediatric Short Form Peer Relationships Scale [29]).

105 A follow-up study by Byrd et al. [27] replicated these findings in an additional 23 child and
106 adolescent participants (ages 7- to 14-years old). That is, participants and their parents reported
107 significant post-treatment gains in quality of life and peer relationships. Combined, these
108 findings indicate that treatment that excludes any attempt to modify speech fluency of children
109 who stutter, and instead targets communication skills, results in significant gains that meet or
110 exceed those previously reported for fluency-focused or stuttering modification treatment
111 approaches.

112 Byrd et al. [9] extended analyses of their communication centered, whole person
113 approach, by examining communication competencies in 37 children and adolescents who stutter
114 (ages 4- to 17-years old) pre- versus post-treatment. An unfamiliar clinician rated pre- and post-
115 treatment presentations (3 to 4 minutes in length), recorded in front of a large group of peers,
116 based on nine difference communication skills: (1) language use, (2) language organization, (3)
117 speech rate, (4) intonation, (5) volume, (6) gestures, (7) body position, (8) eye contact, and (9)
118 facial affect (for detailed description, see Byrd et al. [9-10]). Findings provided preliminary
119 evidence that, in addition to replicating the positive post-treatment changes in cognitive and
120 affective aspects of stuttering reported in prior studies (Byrd et al. [26-27]), clinicians rated
121 communication competency of children and adolescents who stutter during presentations as
122 significantly stronger in samples recorded after treatment. Of particular relevance to the present
123 study, these changes in communication competence following CCT were not significantly
124 predicted by pre-treatment stuttering frequency.

125 **Preliminary findings with adults who stutter**

126 Positive post-treatment gains in communication competence after treatment reported for
127 children who stutter have been replicated in adults who stutter who have participated in CCT.
128 Coalson et al. [11] examined self-reported clinical outcomes from 33 adults who stutter after an
129 11-week communication-centered treatment (for greater detail see Byrd et al. [10]) program
130 similar to the one-week treatment program for children described in Byrd et al. [9, 26-27]).
131 During the first and last week of treatment, participants completed the Self-Perceived
132 Communication Competence [30] - a brief scale designed to self-assess communication skills in
133 four specific communicative contexts (dyad, small group, large meeting, presentation) with three
134 interlocutors (stranger, friend, acquaintance). Significant gains in self-rated communication
135 competence were reported post-treatment across all 12 speaking scenarios and, similar to the
136 children and adolescents who stutter in Byrd et al. [9], post-treatment gains were not predicted
137 by stuttering frequency.

138 Improvement in communication competence is not limited to the perspective of the
139 speaker who stutters. Byrd et al. [10] examined post-treatment communication competencies in
140 11 adults who stutter who participating in communication-centered treatment. Each participant
141 completed a mock interview with an unfamiliar interviewer during the first week (pre-treatment
142 sample) and final week (post-treatment sample). Randomized video samples of these interviews
143 were rated offline by an unfamiliar speech-language pathologist blind to pre-/post-treatment
144 status of each video. As observed for children and adolescents who have participated in CCT,
145 adults who stutter demonstrated observable post-treatment improvements in eight of the nine
146 targeted communication competencies (i.e., language use, language organization, speech rate,
147 intonation, volume, gestures, body position, eye contact, and facial affect), and, again, these
148 improvements were not predicted by pre-treatment stuttering frequency. Taken together with

149 Coalson et al. [11], these preliminary data suggest that expert clinicians, as well as the adults
150 who stutter themselves, observe positive changes in communication competencies when
151 completing CCT, irrespective of pre- and/or post-treatment stuttering severity.

152 **Untrained observers**

153 Although the client- and clinician-based outcome measures used in Byrd et al. [9-11] are
154 commonplace within clinical trials of adult stuttering treatment (e.g., [17, 31-34]; however, see
155 [35-38] for third-party ratings of naturalness), it could be argued that the changes reported were
156 evaluated from two parties – the client and the clinician – whose shared perspectives invite a
157 potential for rater bias because of their personal history and knowledge of stuttering and/or
158 stuttering treatment. A logical means to address potential rater biases due to familiarity with the
159 condition, and/or its treatment, is to examine clinical outcomes from the perspective of raters
160 who have neither – the naïve observer.

161 To date, no clinical trials known to the present authors have investigated post-treatment
162 *communication competence* for adults who stutter from the perspective of the naïve observer.
163 Unlike clinicians or participants, untrained observers provide a valuable means to assess the
164 ecological validity of any communicative outcome measure, by virtue of their inherently variable
165 standards of communication competence. Novice laypersons rely upon a range of intrinsic and
166 extrinsic cues to evaluate the quality of a speaker's communication competence that are likely
167 dissimilar from speakers and well-trained clinicians. By assessing the perspective of a large
168 group of untrained observers, we can capture the variance of such internal criteria while also
169 measuring the ecological impact of CCT outcomes. Thus, our primary research question is to
170 assess to what extent the gains in communicative competence observed by clinicians in previous

171 studies are also evident to general public. That is, we will analyze whether treatment outcomes
172 observed by the trained clinician withstand the inherent variability of observer judgement.

173 **Observer-based variables**

174 Naïve observers within the general public hold a well-documented negative bias towards
175 persons who stutter (e.g., [39-42]). A number of demographic factors have been found to
176 influence an observer's evaluation of any speaker (e.g., age, gender, education, occupation,
177 familiarity with language/multilingualism), including those who stutter (see [13, 43-44]). Such
178 demographic factors as well as additional observer-based factors have a potential or documented
179 influence on naïve observers' attitudes towards adults who stutter (e.g., familiarity with person
180 who stutters [45-46]; personal history with a communication disorder [47-48]; visible and/or
181 nonvisible disability [49]).

182 Additionally, factors known to mitigate an observer's overall evaluation of an adult who
183 stutters as a *person* may override any attempt to measure a targeted trait, such as communication
184 abilities, of specific communicative traits, resulting overly positive evaluations (see Werle &
185 Byrd [50] for positive feedback bias by professors when evaluating presentations students who
186 stutter) or overly negative evaluations (see Byrd et al. [12], for gender bias towards adults who
187 disclosure stuttering). Given the central nature of communication abilities to how a person who
188 stutters is perceived to the general public, it is worthwhile to examine whether ratings of
189 communication competence – the focus of the present study – are attributable to public biases.
190 Said another way, it is possible that observer ratings of the communication competence of a
191 particular adult who stutters may be driven entirely by their overall perception of all people who
192 stutter irrespective of their communicative skills. Thus, a second critical question to consider is

193 to what extent observer-based factors mediate the opinions of the general public when rating
194 communication abilities in adults who stutter to discern the unique influence of communication
195 competence from generalized biases – positive or negative – towards adults who stutter.

196 **Rationale for the present study**

197 The purpose of the present study was to examine how naïve observers rate the
198 communication skills of an adult who stutters who completed an approach to treatment that
199 focuses on communication effectiveness and makes no attempt to modify fluency or reduce
200 stuttered speech. A secondary aim of this study was to assess whether observer-based factors of
201 untrained observers influence perceived communication competence.

202 **RQ1:** Does communication effectiveness training yield positive gains in naïve observers’
203 evaluation of the communication skills of an adult who stutters?

204 **RQ2:** Do observer-based variables predict evaluation of the communication skills of an adult
205 who stutters?

206 **Methods**

207 The following study was approved by the authors’ university institutional review board (IRB:
208 2015-05-0044) and is part of an ongoing series of registered clinical trials (clinicaltrials.gov,
209 NCT 05908123 [51]) designed to examine clinical outcomes of the Blank Center CARE
210 Model™. Consent was obtained by all survey respondents prior to viewing communication
211 competence stimuli. Communication competency stimuli was comprised of two separate videos:
212 one depicting a speaker before he had completed CCT (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli) and one
213 depicting the same speaker after he had received CCT (Post-treatment Video Stimuli).

214 **Communication-Centered Treatment (CCT)**

215 A detailed description of the treatment program is provided in Byrd et al. [10]. The over-
216 arching goal is to ensure individuals who stutter communicate effectively, advocate for
217 themselves in a manner that maintains agency, and ensure their quality of life does not depend on
218 producing, or attempting to control, stuttered speech. In brief, adult participants complete 11
219 weeks of treatment comprised of two 60-minute sessions per week (one group session, one
220 individual session), totaling 22 sessions which include training in Communication, Advocacy,
221 Resilience, and Education (the Blank Center CARE Model™). With respect to Communication,
222 participants receive explicit instruction on how to appropriately incorporate nine core
223 communication skills that do not rely on fluency speech production (i.e., language use, language
224 function, speech rate, intonation, volume, gestures, body position, eye contact, facial affect).
225 Training provided during the individual sessions provide a natural foundation for the weekly
226 group sessions, wherein participants apply these skills in a variety of functional yet challenging
227 speaking scenarios, including mock job interviews, small group mingling, impromptu
228 icebreakers, one-on-one interactions with unfamiliar persons, and multiple presentations varied
229 both in purpose (e.g., informative, persuasive, inspirational) and audience composition (e.g.,
230 small and large groups, familiar and unfamiliar listeners).

231 **Communication competency stimuli**

232 Two video samples were selected from the 22 unscripted, impromptu mock interviews
233 generated before and after treatment examined by Byrd et al. [10] – one recorded pre-treatment
234 and its post-treatment counterpart. Each of the two video stimuli depicted a one-one-one, in-
235 person mock interview between (a) an adult who stutters, who served as the interviewee, and (b)

236 an unfamiliar clinical staff member of the Blank Center, who served as the interviewer. The
237 same adult who stutters served as interviewee in both Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Video
238 Stimuli. Interviewers differed between video stimuli to limit potential habituation to speaker.
239 Each interviewer was unfamiliar with the participant who served as the interviewee, and both
240 were provided identical, commonplace interview questions as prompts (e.g., “What do you
241 consider your strengths and weaknesses?”; “Describe a prior work-related issue and how you
242 addressed it.”).

243 Selection criteria included (a) significant intra-speaker gains in communication
244 competence as rated by the speech-language pathologist evaluator, and (b) relatively comparable
245 stuttering frequency and severity. Although selecting a pre- and post-video sample of the same
246 participant with identical stuttering frequency and severity was not possible, as unscripted
247 interactions naturally vary in length, stuttering frequency, and stuttering severity, the video
248 samples selected for the present study were matched as closely as possible. As detailed in Table
249 1, stuttering severity equivalents for both the Pre- and Post-treatment Video Stimuli were rated
250 as *moderate* per the Stuttering Severity Index – 4th Edition (SSI-4 [52]) Stuttering frequency and
251 severity ratings for each video were completed by an unfamiliar speech-language pathologist
252 trained in disfluency count scoring but unfamiliar with the participant and the timepoint (Pre-
253 treatment, Post-treatment) of each video. To further examine perceptual differences between
254 video samples, a validation survey (administered as part of a separate project, Byrd et al. [53])
255 asked a separate cohort of naïve observers not included in this study to rate stuttering severity
256 using a 100-point visual analog scale (0 = no stuttering, 100 = extremely severe stuttering) after
257 rating one of the two video samples. Naïve observers rated stuttering severity to be statistically

258 comparable ($p = .95$) between Pre- and Post-treatment Video Stimuli, with nearly identical mean
 259 severity ratings ($M = 64.71$ and 64.95 , respectively; see Table 1).

260 **Table 1. Characteristics of Pre-Treatment and Post-Treatment Video Stimuli**

	Pre-treatment Video Stimuli	Post-treatment Video Stimuli
%SS ^a	10.60%	8.24%
Total syllables	594	1258
Total words	453	959
SSI-4 ^b	Moderate	Moderate
Frequency	7	6
Duration	10	10
Physical Concomitants	10	9
Total	27	25
Observer-Rated Severity (100-point VAS)		
<i>M</i> (SE)	64.71 (2.54)	64.95 (2.41)
<i>N</i>	63	57
Length of Video	5 min, 30 sec	6 min, 25 sec

261 ^aPercent of stuttered speech, disfluency types based on Yairi and Ambrose [54]

262 ^bStuttering Severity Instrument-4th Edition [52]

263 The participant who served as the interviewee in the selected Pre- and Post-treatment
 264 videos was an adult Hispanic male who stutters. The participant spoke English and described
 265 himself as monolingual. No additional communication, developmental, psychological,

266 neurological, and/or physical issues were reported by the participant or identified by the clinician
267 during initial evaluation.

268 **Survey administration and respondent description**

269 The two selected video samples were embedded in a Qualtrics-based survey distributed to
270 adult, untrained observers via MTurk platform who were compensated for their participation,
271 with the survey prompting one of the two videos in succession of access of the survey to ensure
272 random observation of the Pre- and the Post-treatment sample. Each survey began with an
273 informed consent landing page, followed by the instructions: “You are about to watch a video of
274 an interview. Immediately following the video, you will be asked questions about the
275 interviewee. The interview will be approximately 5 to 7 minutes in length. You will only be
276 able to move forward in the survey after you have watched the video in its entirety.” Participants
277 then watched either the video of the participant before training (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli), or
278 the participant after training (Post-treatment Video Stimuli), with the “advance” button disabled
279 for both the survey portal and the embedded video. Following the video, respondents were
280 provided the following instructions accompanied by a 0-100 visual analog rating scale: “Using
281 the scale below, please rate the interviewee’s communication skills. 0 = Communication skills
282 not at all effective, 50 = Communication skills somewhat effective, 100 = Communication skills
283 extremely effective.” Participants were then asked to describe what factors led to their rating in
284 a free response text box. Following their rating and written feedback, respondents were asked to
285 provide demographic information (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, occupation,
286 primary language). Participants were also asked to report their personal relationship with
287 stuttering, persons who stutter, or other communication disorders (“Are you a person who
288 stutters? Do you personally know a person who stutters? If so, please describe your relationship

289 and how long you have known this person. Have you had previous speech, language, and/or
290 hearing evaluation or therapy?") as well as any visible or nonvisible diagnoses unrelated to
291 communication difficulties (i.e., physical condition, psychological condition, neurological
292 condition, emotional condition, vision/hearing loss, reading disorder, other/describe, none).
293 Each survey included three attention check questions and four comprehension check questions to
294 assess quality of individual responses. Survey data was collected in July 2021, and all
295 respondents who completed the survey following the Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Video
296 Stimuli in full were paid per MTurk standards of distribution.

297 The survey was initiated by 128 respondents (67 Pre-treatment Video Stimuli, 61 Post-
298 treatment Video Stimuli). Of these 128 respondents, 36 (28%, 19 Pre-treatment Video Stimuli,
299 17 Post-treatment Video Stimuli) did not pass at least one of the seven attention/comprehension
300 check questions during the course of the survey and were excluded from final analysis. Of the
301 remaining 92, four were excluded because they self-identified as a person who stutters (2 Pre-
302 treatment Video Stimuli, 2 Post-treatment Video Stimuli). Seven additional respondents were
303 excluded (3 Pre-treatment Video Stimuli, 4 Post-treatment Video Stimuli) due to free-response
304 items that suggested unclear understanding of the task (e.g., "*She [the interviewer] can ask some*
305 *more questions.*"), questionable attention to the study (e.g., "*Everything is perfect.*"), or
306 potentially auto-generated responses (e.g., unusual format of free-responses repeated across
307 items or participants). The final corpus included 81 respondents (43 Pre-treatment Video Stimuli,
308 38 Post-treatment Video Stimuli). See Table 2 for detailed description of respondents.

309 **Table 2. Demographic characteristics of naïve observer groups**

Video Stimuli Groups

	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	<i>N</i>	<i>t, X²</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>N</i>	43	38	81		
Age	43.4 (16.4)	41.8 (16.5)	42.4 (16.5)	.39	.35
Race				1.75	.19
Native American or					
Alaskan Native	0	0	0		
Asian	8	5	13		
Black or African					
American	6	3	9		
Native Hawaiian or					
Pacific Islander	0	0	0		
White	27	29	56		
Other Identification	2	1	3		
Ethnicity				.74	.39
Not Hispanic or Latino	38	31	69		
Hispanic or Latino	5	7	12		
Self-Identified Gender				2.9	.09
Male	19	24	43		
Female	24	14	38		
Other Identification	0	0	0		
Years of Education	16.4 (2.7)	16.5 (3.0)	16.5 (2.8)	-.13	.45
Primary Language				.07	.80
Bengali	0	1	1		

English	36	31	67		
Filipino	1	0	1		
French	0	1	1		
Hindi	0	1	1		
Marathi	1	0	1		
Portuguese	2	1	3		
Saurashtra	1	0	1		
Swedish	0	1	1		
Tamil	2	1	3		
Turkish	0	1	1		
Knows adult who stutters	25	19	44	.54	.46
Years known	12.6 (17.0)	9.7 (14.2)	11.2 (15.8)	.83	.21
Nonvisible or mixed disability	8	8	16	.08	.78

Note. Means and standard deviations (in parenthesis) reported for age, years of education, and years known.

310 **Analyses**

311 **RQ1:** An independent *t*-test was conducted to compare naïve observers' evaluation of
 312 communication competency depicted in one of two stimuli - a video depicting an adult who
 313 stutters who received communication effectiveness training (Post-treatment Video Stimuli) or a
 314 video depicting an adult who stutters who has not received communication effectiveness training
 315 (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli). Video type (Post-treatment Video Stimuli, Pre-treatment Video
 316 Stimuli) served as the independent variable, and ratings from the 100-point visual analog scale
 317 (VAS) of communication skills served as the dependent variable (0 = low competence, 100 =

318 high competence). Effect sizes were obtained using Cohen's d [55]. Because of the preliminary
319 nature of the data and modest sample size, findings were verified by non-parametric analysis
320 (Mann-Whitney U , $\alpha = .05$).

321 **RQ2:** A linear regression was conducted to assess the influence of viewing
322 communication competency stimuli (Post-treatment Video Stimuli, Pre-treatment Video Stimuli)
323 and nine observer-related variables (age, race, ethnicity, gender, years of education, non-English
324 primary language, knowing an adult who stutters, number of years respondent has known adult
325 who stutters, nonvisible diagnosis; see Table 2) upon ratings of the communication skills of an
326 adult who stutters. Categorical variables with responses that were either not reported (i.e., non-
327 binary self-identified gender) or reported infrequently (i.e., non-English primary language with
328 fewer than 4 respondents) were transformed to create a single binary variable (i.e., male/female;
329 English/non-English primary language). To maintain relatively even distribution amongst
330 categories during analysis, race was collapsed into a single binary variable (i.e., White, people of
331 color) due to relatively infrequent self-identification as Black/African American ($n = 9$; Pre-
332 treatment Video Stimuli = 6, Post-treatment Video Stimuli = 3) or racial identification that was
333 not included in existing categories ($n = 3$, Pre-treatment Video Stimuli = 2, Post-treatment Video
334 Stimuli = 1).

335 To determine which of the nine observer-related factors held meaningful predictive value
336 of observer ratings, and therefore qualify for entry into the linear regression, we applied a
337 version of Hosmer et al.'s [56] step-by-step method for *purposeful selection of covariates*
338 modified for OLS linear regression. First, nine univariate analyses were conducted for each
339 variable (chi-square tests for categorical variables, independent t-tests for continuous variables).
340 Only variables with p -values greater than 0.25 were excluded. Second, a model with non-

341 excluded variables was fitted, then each predictor re-assessed and deleted if significance
342 exceeded $p > .05$. Third, the reduced model was compared to the original model using F values
343 to ensure improved fit and to verify that change in beta coefficients between models did not
344 exceed 20% (i.e., deleting-refitting-verifying cycle). Fourth, any variables that were excluded
345 during the initial step were re-entered into the model, one at a time, but retained only if p -values
346 were less than .05. Fifth, any interaction terms of interest between the remaining variables were
347 entered into the model. Interaction terms were assessed using the deleting-refitting-verifying
348 cycle used for main effects and retained only if statistically significant at $p < .05$ and if model
349 fitness improved. Any main effects and interaction terms remaining after these steps were
350 completed comprised the final model (see Table 3). Because of the preliminary nature of the data
351 and modest sample size, bootstrap analysis was conducted to confirm initial findings (95%
352 confidence intervals; 5000 samples).

353

354

355

Table 3. Summary of regression analyses of stimuli (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli, Post-treatment Video Stimuli) and observer-based factors predicting communication skills of an adult who stutters, as rated by naïve observers

	Variable	<i>B</i>	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Model 1	Intercept	-5.25	-11.34, .78		-1.68	.089	6.03	1, 79	.071
	Pre-/Post-treatment Video Stimuli	11.24	2.38, 20.11	.27	2.46	.013			
Model 2	Intercept	-5.68	-11.25, -.11		-1.95	.046	7.30	3, 77	.221
	Pre-/Post-treatment Video Stimuli	12.12	3.97, 20.26	.29	2.84	.004			
	Years of education	-2.47	-3.92, -1.03	-.33	-3.28	<.001			
	Years AWS known	.23	-.03, .49	.17	1.67	.087			
Bootstrapped	Intercept		-11.59, .07			.063			
	Pre-/Post-treatment Video Stimuli		3.88, 20.72			.007			
	Years of education		-3.99, -.85			.003			
	Years AWS known		.01, .46			.049			

Note. CI = confidence interval for unstandardized beta coefficients; AWS = adult who stutters

354 **Results**

355 **RQ1:** An independent *t*-test was conducted to assess how naïve observers rate
356 communication skills of an adult who stutters. As depicted in Fig 1, findings reveal significantly
357 stronger perceived communication skills when viewing the video of a speaker post-CCT (Post-
358 treatment Video Stimuli; $M = 70.3$, $SD = 21.1$) than when viewing a video of a speaker pre-CCT
359 (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli; $M = 59.0$, $SD = 20.1$), $t(79) = 2.46$, $p = .016$, $d = .55$ [medium
360 effect size]. Findings were confirmed via nonparametric analysis, $U(43,38) = 532.50$, $z = 2.70$,
361 $p = .007$.

362 **RQ2:** A linear regression was conducted to determine the contribution of observer-
363 related factors (i.e., age, race, ethnicity, gender, years of education, non-English primary
364 language, knowing an adult who stutters, number of years respondent has known adult who
365 stutters, nonvisible diagnosis) upon ratings of the communication skills of an adult who stutters.
366 As expected, the video stimuli depicting a speaker post-treatment was a significant predictor of
367 higher observer ratings when entered as the lone predictor variable ($\beta = .67$, $p = .013$), explaining
368 7.1% of the variance ($R^2 = .071$; $F(1, 79) = 6.03$, $p = .016$; see Model 1 in Table 2). Upon
369 completing Hosmer et al.'s (2013) purposeful selection of covariates, only two factors were
370 identified as potential predictive covariates: (1) years of education, which significantly predicted
371 observer ratings ($\beta = -.33$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 12.2% of the variance ($R^2 = .122$), and (2)
372 years the respondent has known an adult who stutters, which approached significance ($\beta = .17$, p
373 $= .087$), and accounted for 2.8% of the variance ($R^2 = .028$). After accounting for the
374 contribution of these two observer-based factors, video stimuli of a post-treatment speaker
375 remained a significant, positive predictor of improved observer ratings ($\beta = .29$, $p = .004$) with

376 the final model accounting for 22.1% of the variance ($R^2 = .221$; $F(3, 77) = 7.30$, $p < .001$; see
377 Model 2 in Table 3).

378 To verify these outcomes, a bootstrapping analysis was conducted to determine 95%
379 confidence interval (CI) for unstandardized beta coefficients of each factor based on 5000
380 samples. Bootstrap analysis confirmed a significant, positive coefficient for video stimuli
381 depicting a post-treatment speaker ($p = .007$, [CI: 3.88, 20.72]) while controlling for potential
382 influence of both observer-related factors (years of education: $p = .003$, [CI: -3.99, -.85]; years
383 respondents have known an adult who stutters: $p = .049$ [CI: .01, .46]).

384 Discussion

385 The primary purpose of this study was to examine whether naïve observers rated an adult
386 who stutters as a stronger communicator after completing a specialized 11-week treatment
387 program (CCT) designed to enhance communication skills rather than stuttering frequency or
388 severity. A secondary purpose was to examine to what extent observer-related factors mediated
389 these ratings. A large sample of naïve observers were recruited to view, and then rate, one of
390 two videos of an adult who stutters who had completed the treatment program (Post-treatment
391 Video Stimuli) or who had yet to complete the treatment program (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli).
392 Findings indicate that naïve observers rated the speaker in the Post-treatment Video Stimuli to be
393 a stronger communicator than the same speaker in the Pre-treatment Video Stimuli video. Two
394 observer-rated factors were identified as significantly associated with communication
395 competency ratings: (1) years of rater education and (2) years the rater had personally known an
396 adult who stutters. Accounting for these factors, naïve observers nevertheless rated the video of
397 the adult who stutters recorded after training as a significantly stronger communicator.

398 **RQ1: Communication competence gains from the perspective of**
399 **naïve observers**

400 Naïve observers rated the communication competence of an adult who stutters
401 demonstrates during a mock interview recorded after CCT (Post-treatment Video Stimuli) as
402 significantly higher than the video of the same adult, in the same mock interview setting,
403 recorded prior to CCT (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli). These findings are consistent with the
404 significant pre-/post-treatment gains in communication competence reported for adults who
405 stutter as rated by speech-language pathologists [10] and client's self-reported dyadic
406 interactions ([11]; dyadic interactions: $p < .0001$). Findings also corroborate significant gains in
407 communication competence observed by speech-language pathologists for young children and
408 adolescents after a one-week treatment program based on the same clinical principles [9].
409 Consistency across ratings of communication competence from three difference perspectives –
410 client, clinician, and naïve observer – provide confidence that changes in previous studies were
411 not attributable to rater bias (i.e., client or clinician) and perhaps reflect a meaningful change in
412 communication abilities also observable by untrained laypersons.

413 Unlike previous studies by Byrd and colleagues [9-10], wherein a single clinician rated
414 pre-/post-treatment video samples from multiple adults who stutter (i.e., many-to-one), the
415 structure of observation in this study was reversed. In those previous studies, our analyses
416 captured the variance of treatment outcomes across multiple participants, with rater variance held
417 constant by use of a single clinician rater. In the present study, multiple observers rated
418 communication competence of a single adult who stutters (i.e., one-to-many) based on viewing
419 one of two videos. By assigning one video to one respondent per survey, we were able to

420 minimize respondent burden of watching multiple videos and potential order effects. Moreover,
421 this statistical design allowed us to capture the variance of responses amongst the general public
422 in response to changes in communication competence previously observed by clinicians. These
423 data provide preliminary proof that gains observed in the clinic may also generalize to the
424 perceptions of unfamiliar observers beyond the clinic – an issue of critical concern for any
425 clinical trial and many participants in treatment. That being said, it is possible that the
426 consistency between within-clinic and beyond-clinic evaluation of communication competence
427 observed in this study may vary between individual participants. A natural next step is to assess
428 the variance of treatment outcomes across participants by a single naïve observer, similar to one-
429 to-many rating design in Byrd et al. [9-10], practical issues notwithstanding (e.g., order effects,
430 participant/respondent burden). For now, findings from the present study provide meaningful
431 external validity for the positive outcomes a novel treatment approach, and suggest that gains in
432 communication competence, when observed in the clinic by a single clinician, will likely be
433 observed by the general public.

434 As noted, stuttering frequency and severity in the Pre-Treatment and Post-treatment
435 Video Stimuli were comparable (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli: SSI-4: 31 moderate [score 27];
436 Post-treatment Video Stimuli: SSI-4: moderate [score 25]), lending support to the notion that
437 ratings of communication competence were not driven by changes on overt or observable
438 stuttering behaviors. One may suggest that, similar to the rationale of the present study for
439 communication competence, ratings of stuttering severity provided by expert clinicians may not
440 reflect judgments of severity by the naïve listeners in the general public, and potentially
441 influenced the observed-based ratings of communication competence more than expected.
442 Comparable observer-based ratings of stuttering severity for Pre-Treatment and Post-treatment

443 Videos reported in Table 1 ($p = .95$) suggest this was not the case. It is also possible that
444 observer judgment of stuttering severity was less distracting because it was accompanied by
445 higher (or lower) communication abilities. For example, Werle et al. [57] found that naïve
446 observers who view a presenter who producing 15% SLDs but demonstrates high
447 communication competence rate the stuttering as less distracting than the same presenter
448 produced 15% SLDs but demonstrated low communication competence.

449 Further assessment of qualitative feedback from respondents in the present study support
450 the findings of Werle et al. [57] and indicate that fluency was less of a concern in the presence of
451 stronger communication competence in the Post-treatment Video Stimuli. When comparing the
452 most neutral observers (i.e., 50% who provided the neither the most or least favorable ratings in
453 each group; 25th to 75th percentile), respondents who watched the Post-treatment Video Stimuli
454 noted that they certainly heard the interviewee stuttering, but also commented that its importance
455 was offset by communication skills (e.g., *“The interviewee was very articulate and concise in his
456 language and tone of voice. He used his hands when speaking, which made him appear more
457 animated and that was easier to follow.”* *“Even though the interviewee had a stuttering issue, he
458 was able to explain himself well. He gave good examples when asked for them by the
459 interviewer.”*; *“I believe that [he] communicated well. ... He looked the interviewer directly in
460 the eyes, smiled, and nodded.”*). Accordingly, respondents who viewed the Pre-treatment Video
461 Stimuli (25th to 75th percentile) often focused either on stuttering alone (e.g., *“He was not bold
462 and confident about the way he deliver[s] things. He is a stammer[er]”*; *“The interviewee has a
463 speech impediment and it is difficult for him to communicate verbally.”*) or stuttering in addition
464 to poor nonverbal communication skills (e.g., *“He seems to stay within his capabilities of
465 communication, but his stutter is distracting. He answers questions directly, but he doesn't use*

466 *much eye contact.*”; “*He had a stutter and his body language looked tense but he gave great*
467 *answers.*”) In sum, although similarly moderate stuttering was present in both videos and
468 perceived by both respondent cohorts, qualitative data from the present study indicate that,
469 consistent with Werle et al. [57], heightened communication skills of the speaker who received
470 training helped to minimize the relevance of stuttering severity during observers judgment.

471 **RQ2: Observer-based factors associated with ratings of** 472 **communication competence**

473 Two demographic factors – years of education and years the respondent had known an
474 adult who stutters - were identified as significant predictors of observer-rated communication
475 competence. Specifically, observers rated communication competence to be stronger as the
476 number of years the respondent had personally known an adult who stutters increased, but
477 weaker as the amount of education the respondent had completed increased. Although observer-
478 rated evaluations of communication competence remained significant upon controlling for these
479 factors during analyses, the potential implications of these two factors warrant discussion. In
480 terms of the number of years respondents have known a person who stutters, previous research
481 has indicated that people who have developed first-hand relationships with any stigmatized
482 groups are likely to report improved overall judgments of persons within that group (e.g., [58-
483 59]), including persons who stutter (e.g., [60-61]; cf. [46, 62]). It is noteworthy that simply
484 knowing/not knowing a person who stutters was insufficient to impact ratings, suggesting that
485 the quantity and perhaps quality of time spent with an individual who stutters is necessary to
486 significantly change how one views the communication abilities of a person who stutters. Future
487 studies examining observer evaluations of participants who stutter should continue to include this

488 as a measured factor, based on its long-standing influence on the general public views
489 individuals who stutter.

490 Across videos, there was a significant negative relationship between years of education
491 and communication ratings, wherein participants with higher levels of education often provided
492 lower ratings of the speaker's communication abilities, regardless of the video presented. To be
493 clear, the mean number of years of education for each respondent group was equivalent (Pre-
494 treatment Video Stimuli; $M = 16.4$ years of education; Post-treatment Video Stimuli, $M = 16.5$
495 years of education, $p = .45$). Research investigating responses to historically stigmatized groups
496 has documented several patterns of responses held by evaluators. The pattern of response in the
497 present study is consistent with the status characteristic model (e.g., [63]). Within this model,
498 evaluators hold lower expectations of a particular group, and group members must perform
499 exceptionally compared to in-group peers to achieve equivalent ratings. This pattern of response
500 is in contrast to the positive feedback bias found in the shifting standards model in which lower
501 expectations of the stigmatized group result in unduly earned higher ratings [64]. Relevant to the
502 present study, researchers have found that when evaluators are judging individuals for maximum
503 competency or skills, they align more with the status characteristic model [65]. In other words,
504 when tasked with examining for top performance, evaluators rate members of stigmatized groups
505 more critically and assign lower ratings. One interpretation of the present results is related to the
506 video context and protocol directions. Job interviews are arguably high-stakes experiences in
507 which candidates are evaluated critically. It is possible that, when tasked with evaluating
508 communication skills within this high-stakes context, individuals with more years of education
509 were evaluating more sensitively and/or with higher expectations than individuals with fewer

510 years of education. This could possibly be anchored in their own personal experiences as either
511 an interviewee or interviewer.

512 Results are contrary to recent works by Werle and Byrd [50, 66], however, who detailed a
513 potential positive response bias when raters with higher years of education (i.e., college
514 professors) evaluate students who stutter. It is possible that positive response bias becomes less
515 evident for respondents who experience fewer years of academic evaluation based on
516 communication abilities, or perhaps a unique pattern observed for professors and teachers whose
517 job duties require ongoing evaluation of adult students. It is also possible that dyadic speaking
518 context lowered the likelihood of positive feedback bias found for professors, who were perhaps
519 more likely to overcorrect their personal biases observed for Werle and Byrd [50, 66] when
520 presented with a speaker in a context for which they regularly provide evaluation (e.g.,
521 presentations). In that respect, positive response bias for the mock interviews included in the
522 present study may be more apparent for respondents with a history of employment or training in
523 human resources. Combined, although these two factors held significantly influence on ratings
524 of communication competence, the significance of video status (Pre-treatment versus Post-
525 treatment) beyond the influence of these factors, as well as the large number of demographic
526 information included in the analyses, provides greater confidence that CCT training may be
527 effective irrespective of unique demographic factor.

528 **Limitations and future studies**

529 Although these combined factors accounted for an estimated 22.1% of the variance in the
530 sample population of untrained observers – a non-trivial amount of inter-subject variability when
531 evaluating communication competence of an adult who stutters - we acknowledge that a number

532 of additional factors, known and unknown, beyond the focus of CCT also influence observer
533 judgments. For example, visual nonverbal information (e.g., attire, physical appearance,
534 environments) have a documented effect on evaluator judgments (e.g., [67]). To this point, it
535 should be noted that the same adult was depicted in both video samples in the present study and,
536 by coincidence, the participant happened to be wearing a necktie on during the first interview
537 (Pre-treatment Video Stimuli). Although this may be considered more professional attire, this
538 video was also rated less favorably, suggesting that attire was less critical than overall
539 communication skills. Another unfortunate potential speaker-based factor that may influence
540 ratings, but unrelated to CCT, was degree of accent and language proficiency. To be clear, the
541 interviewee in this study was monolingual with no observable accent, nor did respondents note
542 the speaker's accent or English proficiency during subjective feedback. During pilot studies,
543 however, naïve observers rated a multilingual adult who stutters with strong English proficiency
544 but a heavier accent less favorably during a similar interview sample. These same respondents
545 often provided specific negative feedback focusing on the speaker's accent and/or level of
546 English proficiency. Future studies of this nature should provide a clear definition of as well as
547 linguistic versus speech fluency from the outset, similar to the instructions provided to
548 respondents in Werle and Byrd [50, 66] fluency versus communication skills.

549 From a methodological standpoint, video samples that naturally vary in length and content
550 also introduce potential confounds. For example, in the present study, the Post-treatment Video
551 was longer and contained more total words than the Pre-treatment Video Sample, introducing the
552 possibility that respondents became fatigued or impatient when viewing and prior to VAS rating.
553 Again, the Post-treatment Video Sample received a significantly stronger mean rating than the
554 Pre-treatment Video Sample, which tempers this concern. It is also possible that, although both

555 mock interviews were unprompted events, and interviewers were unknown to the participants,
556 the participant benefitted from the previous mock interview experience and felt at greater ease in
557 the identical space provided for both interviews. Additional review of communication skills in a
558 different space, or perhaps investigation of content overlap between interviews, would address
559 this point. Yet another consideration is that dyadic interviews lend themselves to a specific, one-
560 on-one style of interaction that favors certain adults who stutter more than others, and post-CCT
561 gains may not necessarily generalize to other contexts such as presentations (however, see
562 Coalson et al. [11] for post-CCT gains across all speaking contexts as rated by adult clients who
563 stutter). It is important to note this is one entry in a series of clinical trials focused on the
564 outcomes of CCT from a variety of perspectives (e.g., self, clinician, observer). A larger cohort
565 of respondents is always necessary to corroborate preliminary results, and examination of
566 clinical outcomes will continue across multiple contexts, from multiple perspectives, and with
567 multiple measures, in future studies.

568 **Conclusion**

569 This study examined the clinical outcomes of CCT – a specialized treatment for adults
570 who stutter that focuses on communication rather than fluency – from the perspective of naïve
571 observers. Results found that naïve observers rated a participant depicted in a video sample
572 recorded after treatment as a significantly stronger communicator than a video of the same
573 participant recorded prior to treatment. Findings provide corroborating evidence that clinical
574 gains in communication competence rated by clinicians, and self-rated by participants, in
575 previous studies was also observed for unfamiliar, untrained observers.

576 **Acknowledgements**

577 This project was supported by the foundational grant support funded to the Arthur M.
578 Blank Center for Stuttering Education and Research and endowed support provided through the
579 Michael and Tami Lang Stuttering Institute, the Dr. Jennifer and Emanuel Bodner
580 Developmental Stuttering Laboratory, and the Dealey Family Foundation Stuttering Clinic
581 awarded to the second author. The authors would like to thank Michael Mahometa for his
582 assistance with statistical analysis and all survey participants.

583 **References**

- 584 1. Morreale SP, Osborn MM, Pearson JC. Why communication is important: A rationale for
585 the centrality of the study of communication. *J Assoc for Commun Adm.* 2000;29(1):1.
- 586 2. AC Nielsen Research Services. Research on employer satisfaction with graduate skills.
587 Interim Report Canberra, Australia. 1998
- 588 3. Mikkelson AC, York JA, Arritola J. Communication competence, leadership behaviors, and
589 employee outcomes in supervisor-employee relationships. *Bus Prof Commun Q.* 2015
590 Sep;78(3):336-54.
- 591 4. Payne HJ. Reconceptualizing social skills in organizations: Exploring the relationship
592 between communication competence, job performance, and supervisory roles. *J Leadersh
593 Organ Stud.* 2005 Jan;11(2):63-77.
- 594 5. Scudder JN, Guinan PJ. Communication competencies as discriminators of superiors' ratings
595 of employee performance. *J of Bus Commun (1973).* 1989 Jun;26(3):217-29.
- 596 6. Beebe SA, Beebe SJ, Redmond M, Geerinck T, Salem-Wiseman L. Interpersonal
597 communication: Relating to others. 6th Can. Ed. Toronto: Pearson Canada; c2015.
- 598 7. Spitzberg BH, Cupach WR. Interpersonal skills. In: Knapp ML & Daly JA, editors. *The
599 Sage handbook of interpersonal communication.* 4th ed. Los Angeles (CA); SAGE; 2011.
600 p. 481-524.

- 601 8. Brignell A, Krahe M, Downes M, Kefalianos E, Reilly S, Morgan AT. A systematic review
602 of interventions for adults who stutter. *J Fluency Disord.* 2020 Jun;64:105766. doi:
603 10.1016/j.jfludis.2020.105766. Epub 2020 Apr 30. PMID: 32438123.
- 604 9. Byrd CT, Winters KL, Young M, Werle D, Croft RL, Hampton E, Coalson G, White A,
605 Gkalitsiou Z. The Communication benefits of participation in Camp Dream. *Speak. Live.:*
606 *An extension and replication. Semin Speech Lang.* 2021 Mar;42(2):117-135. doi: 10.1055/s-
607 0041-1723843. Epub 2021 Mar 16. PMID: 33725730.
- 608 10. Byrd CT, Coalson GA, Young MM. Targeting communication effectiveness in adults who
609 stutter: A preliminary study. *Top Lang Disord.* 2022 Jan 1;42(1):76-93.
- 610 11. Coalson, GA, Byrd, CT, Werle D. Self-reported communication competence by adults who
611 stutter following communication competence treatment (CCT). Poster session presented at:
612 National Black Association for Speech, Language, and Hearing Conference 2023. Apr 20-
613 22. Washington, DC.
- 614 12. Byrd CT, McGill M, Gkalitsiou Z, Cappellini C. The effects of self-disclosure on male and
615 female perceptions of individuals who stutter. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol.* 2017 Feb
616 1;26(1):69-80. doi: 10.1044/2016_AJSLP-15-0164. PMID: 28056467.
- 617 13. Louis KO. Epidemiology of public attitudes toward stuttering. In *Stuttering meets*
618 *stereotype, stigma, and discrimination: An overview of attitude research 2015* (pp. 7-42).
619 West Virginia University Press Morgantown, WV.
- 620 14. O'Brian S, Carey B, Onslow M, Packman A, Cream A. *The Camperdown program for*
621 *stuttering: treatment manual.* Sydney: Australian Stuttering Research Center. 2010 Jan.
- 622 15. Kroll R. The Fluency Plus Program: an integration of fluency shaping and cognitive
623 restructuring procedures for adolescents and adults who stutter. In: Guitar B & McCauley R,
624 editors. *Treatment of stuttering: Established and emerging interventions.* Philadelphia(PA):
625 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2010. p. 277-311.
- 626 16. Van Riper C. *The treatment of stuttering.* Englewood Cliffs(NJ): Prentice Hall; 1973.
- 627 17. Menzies RG, O'Brian S, Onslow M, Packman A, St Clare T, Block S. An experimental
628 clinical trial of a cognitive-behavior therapy package for chronic stuttering. *J Speech Lang*
629 *Hear Res.* 2008 Dec;51(6):1451-64. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0070). Epub 2008 Jul
630 29. PMID: 18664696.

- 631 18. Menzies R, O'Brian S, Packman A, Jones M, Helgadóttir FD, Onslow M. Supplementing
632 stuttering treatment with online cognitive behavior therapy: An experimental trial. *J*
633 *Commun Disord.* 2019 Jul-Aug;80:81-91. doi: 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2019.04.003. Epub 2019
634 May 2. PMID: 31100535.
- 635 19. Craig AR, Hancock K. Self-reported factors related to relapse following treatment for
636 stuttering. *Aust J Hum Commun Disord.* 1995 Jun 1;23(1):48-60.
- 637 20. Cream A, Onslow M, Packman A, Llewellyn G. Protection from harm: the experience of
638 adults after therapy with prolonged-speech. *Int J Lang Commun Disord.* 2003 Jan
639 1;38(4):379-95.
- 640 21. De Nardo T, Tetnowski JA, Coalson GA. Listener perceptions of stuttering and stuttering
641 modification techniques. *J Fluency Disord.* 2023 Mar;75:105960. doi:
642 10.1016/j.jfludis.2023.105960. Epub 2023 Jan 27. PMID: 36736074.
- 643 22. Manning WH, Burlison AE, Thaxton D. Listener response to stuttering modification
644 techniques. *J Fluency Disord.* 1999 Dec 1;24(4):267-80.
- 645 23. Von Tiling J. Listener perceptions of stuttering, prolonged speech, and verbal avoidance
646 behaviors. *J Commun Disord.* 2011 Mar-Apr;44(2):161-72. doi:
647 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.09.002. Epub 2010 Sep 16. PMID: 20947094.
- 648 24. Winters KL, Byrd CT. Predictors of communication attitude in preschool-age children who
649 stutter. *J Commun Disord.* 2021 May-Jun;91:106100. doi: 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2021.106100.
650 Epub 2021 Apr 14. PMID: 33862497.
- 651 25. Werle D, Winters KL, Byrd CT. Preliminary study of self-perceived communication
652 competence amongst adults who do and do not stutter. *J Fluency Disord.* 2021
653 Dec;70:105848. doi: 10.1016/j.jfludis.2021.105848. Epub 2021 Apr 8. PMID: 33895686.
- 654 26. Byrd C, Chmela K, Coleman C, Weidner M, Kelly E, Reichhardt R, Irani F. An introduction
655 to camps for children who stutter: What they are and how they can help. *Perspect ASHA*
656 *Spec Interest Groups.* 2016 Mar 31;1(4):55-69.
- 657 27. Byrd CT, Gkalitsiou Z, Werle D, Coalson GA. Exploring the effectiveness of an intensive
658 treatment program for school-age children who stutter Camp Dream. *Speak. Live.: A*
659 *follow-up study. Semin Speech Lang.* 2018 Nov;39(5):458-468. doi: 10.1055/s-0038-
660 1670669. Epub 2018 Sep 19. PMID: 30231266.


- 661 28. Yaruss JS, Quesal RW. Overall assessment of the speaker's experience with stuttering.
662 Stuttering Therapy Resources, Inc; 2016
- 663 29. Dewalt DA, Thissen D, Stucky BD, Langer MM, Morgan Dewitt E, Irwin DE, Lai JS,
664 Yeatts KB, Gross HE, Taylor O, Varni JW. PROMIS Pediatric Peer Relationships Scale:
665 Development of a peer relationships item bank as part of social health measurement. *Health*
666 *Psychol.* 2013 Oct;32(10):1093-103. doi: 10.1037/a0032670. Epub 2013 Jun 17. PMID:
667 23772887; PMCID: PMC3865609.
- 668 30. Richmond VP, McCroskey JC. *Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and*
669 *effectiveness.* Pearson; 1997.
- 670 31. Cream A, O'Brian S, Jones M, Block S, Harrison E, Lincoln M, Hewat S, Packman A,
671 Menzies R, Onslow M. Randomized controlled trial of video self-modeling following
672 speech restructuring treatment for stuttering. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* 2010 Aug;53(4):887-
673 97. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2009/09-0080). Epub 2009 Dec 22. PMID: 20029053.
- 674 32. Erickson S, Block S, Menzies R, O'Brian S, Packman A, Onslow M. Standalone Internet
675 speech restructuring treatment for adults who stutter: A phase I study. *Int J Speech Lang*
676 *Pathol.* 2016 Aug;18(4):329-40. doi: 10.3109/17549507.2015.1101156. Epub 2015 Nov 7.
677 PMID: 27063674.
- 678 33. Erickson S, Block S, Menzies R, Onslow M, O'brian S, Packman A. Standalone Internet
679 speech restructuring treatment for adults who stutter: A pilot study. *J Clin Pract Speech*
680 *Lang Pathol.* 2012;14(3):118-23.
- 681 34. Menzies RG, Packman A, Onslow M, O'Brian S, Jones M, Helgadóttir FD. In-Clinic and
682 Standalone Internet Cognitive Behavior Therapy Treatment for Social Anxiety in Stuttering:
683 A Randomized Trial of iGlebe. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* 2019 Jun 19;62(6):1614-1624. doi:
684 10.1044/2019_JSLHR-S-18-0340. Epub 2019 May 20. PMID: 31112442.
- 685 35. Carey B, O'Brian S, Onslow M, Block S, Jones M, Packman A. Randomized controlled non-
686 inferiority trial of a telehealth treatment for chronic stuttering: The Camperdown Program.
687 *Int J Lang Commun Disord.* 2010 Jan-Feb;45(1):108-20. doi: 10.3109/13682820902763944.
688 PMID: 19424889.
- 689 36. Carey B, O'Brian S, Onslow M, Packman A, Menzies R. Webcam delivery of the
690 Camperdown Program for adolescents who stutter: A phase I trial. *Lang Speech Hear Serv*

- 691 Sch. 2012 Jul;43(3):370-80. doi: 10.1044/0161-1461(2011/11-0010). Epub 2012 Jan 9.
692 PMID: 22232423.
- 693 37. Carey B, O'Brian S, Lowe R, Onslow M. Webcam delivery of the Camperdown Program for
694 adolescents who stutter: a phase II trial. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch*. 2014 Oct;45(4):314-
695 24. doi: 10.1044/2014_LSHSS-13-0067. PMID: 25091362.
- 696 38. O'Brian S, Onslow M, Cream A, Packman A. The Camperdown Program: outcomes of a
697 new prolonged-speech treatment model. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2003 Aug;46(4):933-46.
698 doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2003/073). PMID: 12959471.
- 699 39. Guntupalli VK, Kalinowski J, Nanjundeswaran C, Saltuklaroglu T, Everhart DE.
700 Psychophysiological responses of adults who do not stutter while listening to stuttering. *Int J*
701 *Psychophysiol*. 2006 Oct;62(1):1-8. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2005.11.001. Epub 2006 Jan 18.
702 PMID: 16414137.
- 703 40. Hurst MI, Cooper EB. Employer attitudes toward stuttering. *J Fluency Disord*. 1983 Mar
704 1;8(1):1-2.
- 705 41. Ruscello DM, Lass NJ, Schmitt JF, Pannbacker MD. Special educators' perceptions of
706 stutterers. *J Fluency Disord*. 1994 Jun 1;19(2):125-32.
- 707 42. Van Borsel J, Brepoels M, De Coene J. Stuttering, attractiveness and romantic relationships:
708 the perception of adolescents and young adults. *J Fluency Disord*. 2011 Mar;36(1):41-50.
709 doi: 10.1016/j.jfludis.2011.01.002. Epub 2011 Jan 20. PMID: 21439422.
- 710 43. Chu SY, Unicomb R, Lee J, Cho KS, St Louis KO, Harrison E, McConnell G. Public
711 attitudes toward stuttering in Malaysia. *J Fluency Disord*. 2022 Dec;74:105942. doi:
712 10.1016/j.jfludis.2022.105942. Epub 2022 Nov 7. PMID: 36395547.
- 713 44. Lefort MKR, Erickson S, Block S, Carey B, St Louis KO. Australian attitudes towards
714 stuttering: A cross-sectional study. *J Fluency Disord*. 2021 Sep;69:105865. doi:
715 10.1016/j.jfludis.2021.105865. Epub 2021 Jul 22. PMID: 34380103.
- 716 45. Klassen TR. Perceptions of people who stutter: Re-assessing the negative stereotype.
717 *Percept Mot Skills*. 2001 Apr;92(2):551-9. doi: 10.2466/pms.2001.92.2.551. PMID:
718 11361320.
- 719 46. White PA, Collins SR. Stereotype formation by inference: a possible explanation for the
720 "stutterer" stereotype. *J Speech Hear Res*. 1984 Dec;27(4):567-70. doi:
721 10.1044/jshr.2704.567. PMID: 6521464.

- 722 47. Lass NJ, Ruscello DM, Pannbacker M, Schmitt JF, Middleton GF, Schweppenheiser K. The
723 perceptions of stutterers by people who stutter. *Folia Phoniatr Logop*. 1995;47(5):247-51.
724 doi: 10.1159/000266358. PMID: 8563776.
- 725 48. Zhang J, Kalinowski J, Saltuklaroglu T, Hudock D. Stuttered and fluent speakers' heart rate
726 and skin conductance in response to fluent and stuttered speech. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*.
727 2010 Nov-Dec;45(6):670-80. doi: 10.3109/13682820903391385. PMID: 20017588.
- 728 49. Zernitsky-Shurka E. Ingroup and outgroup evaluation by disabled individuals. *J Soc*
729 *Psychol*. 1988 Aug;128(4):465-72. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1988.9713766. PMID: 2972885.
- 730 50. Werle D, Byrd CT. Professors' perceptions and evaluations of students who do and do not
731 stutter following oral presentations. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch*. 2022 Jan 5;53(1):133-149.
732 doi: 10.1044/2021_LSHSS-21-00069. Epub 2021 Dec 3. PMID: 34861764.
- 733 51. Byrd, C. T. The Blank Center CARE Model™: A non-ableist approach to treatment.
734 ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT05908123. Updated June 18, 2023.
735 <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05908123>
- 736 52. Riley G. Stuttering severity instrument for children and adults. Pro-Ed; 1994.
- 737 53. Byrd CT, Werle D, Coalson GA. Observer-rated outcomes of Communication-Centered
738 Treatment (CCT) for adults who stutter. Poster session presented at: Georgia Speech-
739 Language-Hearing Association. 2023 Feb 24-25. Savannah, GA.
- 740 54. Yairi E, Ambrose NG. Early childhood stuttering for clinicians by clinicians: Pro-Ed; 2005.
- 741 55. Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Academic press; 2013 Sep 3.
- 742 56. Hosmer Jr DW, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX. Applied logistic regression. John Wiley &
743 Sons; 2013 Apr 1.
- 744 57. Werle D, Byrd CT, Coalson GA. Impact of self-disclosure and communication competence
745 on perceived listener distraction. *J Commun Disord*. 2023 Apr 25;103:106333. doi:
746 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2023.106333. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37130470.
- 747 58. Allport GW. The nature of prejudice. Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley; 1958.
- 748 59. Pettigrew TF, Tropp LR. A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *J Pers Soc*
749 *Psychol*. 2006 May;90(5):751-83. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751. PMID: 16737372.
- 750 60. Hughes CD, Gabel RM, Palasik ST. Examining the Relationship Between Perceptions of a
751 Known Person Who Stutters and Attitudes Toward Stuttering. *Can J Speech Lang Pathol*
752 *Audio*. 2017 Jul 1;41(3).

- 753 61. Hughes S, Gabel R, Irani F, Schlagheck A. University students' perceptions of the life
754 effects of stuttering. *J Commun Disord.* 2010 Jan-Feb;43(1):45-60. doi:
755 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2009.09.002. Epub 2009 Sep 23. PMID: 19836026.
- 756 62. Doody I, Kalinowski J, Armson J, Stuart A. Stereotypes of stutterers and nonstutterers in
757 three rural communities in Newfoundland. *J Fluency Disord.* 1993 Dec 1;18(4):36.
- 758 63. Foschi M. Gender and double standards for competence. *Gender, interaction, and inequality.*
759 1992:181-207.
- 760 64. Biernat M, Manis M, Nelson TE. Stereotypes and standards of judgment. *J Pers Soc*
761 *Psychol.* 1991 Apr;60(4):485.
- 762 65. Biernat M, Kobrynowicz D. Gender- and race-based standards of competence: lower
763 minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *J Pers Soc Psychol.*
764 1997 Mar;72(3):544-57. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.72.3.544. PMID: 9120783.
- 765 66. Werle D, Byrd CT. College professors' perceptions of students who stutter and the impact on
766 comfort approaching professors. *J Fluency Disord.* 2021 Mar;67:105826. doi:
767 10.1016/j.jfludis.2020.105826. Epub 2020 Dec 25. PMID: 33360979.
- 768 67. Burgoon JK, Manusov V, Guerrero LK. *Nonverbal communication.* New York: Routledge;
769 2016 Jan 8.
- 770

771 **Fig 1.** Communication competence of an adult who stutters, as rated by untrained observers
772 before CCT (Pre-Treatment) and after CCT (Post-Treatment)



773

774