The Thesis Committee for Genessee Rebecca Klemm
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-DISCLOSING STUTTERING: THE IMPACT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SCHOOL-AGE LISTERNERS WHO STUTTER

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Courtney T Byrd

Elizabeth Hampton

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-DISCLOSING STUTTERING: THE IMPACT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SCHOOL-AGE LISTENERS WHO STUTTER

by

Genessee Rebecca Klemm, BSHDFS

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2014

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the individuals who stutter that I was lucky enough to cross paths with at the University of Texas Speech and Hearing Center. Keep saying what you need to say no matter what.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank a number of individuals who made this research project possible including Mark Rogers, Megann McGill and the undergraduate researcher assistants who helped bring this project to life. I would also like to thank Olivia Reed who was my partner and friend throughout this process. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Courtney Byrd who inspired and guided this project. Her passion and dedication to research in this field and to her students is inspiring. I am a better clinician and person for having met her. In addition, this project would not have been possible without the help of Elizabeth Hampton, and the participants and their families who gave their valuable time to this initiative.

Thank you to my family Nandy, Larry, Holly, Lisa, Mike and Elsie for bringing so much joy to my life and for reminding me to enjoy the adventure!

Abstract

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-DISCLOSING STUTTERING: THE IMPACT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SCHOOL-AGE LISTENERS WHO STUTTER

Genessee Rebecca Klemm, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Courtney Byrd

Abstract: Previous research has indicated that the use of self-disclosure statements may be beneficial in improving listener's perceptions of a speaker who stutters. While some research to this point is available concerning the perceptions of adults, this theory has not been studied in school-age populations. In addition, information about the perceptions of listeners who are also stutterers is unexplored. This study seeks to address these voids in the literature and also to explore the impact of gender bias in the context of self-disclosure. This study seeks to bolster the evidence-based practice for the technique of self-disclosure and to better understand the perceptions of school-age listeners. Such information could improve treatment delivery and outcomes as part of a comprehensive intervention program for individuals who stutter. Research objectives were explored by exposing participants to two of four possible videos of a speaker who stutters (a male who self-discloses, male who does not self-disclose, female who self-discloses, and a female who does not self-disclosure). Directly after viewing the videos the participant

completed a survey probing for perceptions of the speaker, information about their experience with and knowledge of stuttering, and allowing for additional comments to be reported. Results indicated a preference for the speaker who self-disclosed. However, some differences were noted between then listener groups (stutterers versus. non-stutterers). The participants who stuttered tended to be less impacted by the presence or absence of a self-disclosure; they more often reported perceiving "no difference" between the speakers across a variety of traits in comparison to the participants who do not stutter. These results indicate that individuals who stutter and individuals who do not stutter may perceive the use of self-disclose differently. Results, in regards to gender bias, were inconclusive. In summary, results from the current study add to the body of research supporting the use of self-disclosure statements and suggest that individuals who stutter may perceive their use differently than individuals who do not stutter.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

The act of self-disclosing one's status as a person who stutters has been proposed as a way to limit the negative impact stuttering may have on a listener's perception of the speaker. A limited number of studies have investigated the effect of self-disclosure on listener perceptions. However, to date, to the present author's knowledge, there are no data regarding the impact of self-disclosure when the person who is self-disclosing and the listener are both school-age. In addition, no evidence-based information is available specific to how listener perceptions might vary when the listener is also a person who stutters. The present study seeks to address three goals (1) to determine if the act of self-disclosing improves the school-age listener's perceptions of a peer who stutters (2) to determine if perceptions of self-disclosure are different for the listener who stutters as opposed to the listener who does not (3) to determine if listener perception is subject to gender bias. The resulting data will further our understanding of the potential benefit(s) and subsequent recommendations for using self-disclosure statements in treating school-age children who stutter.

The fluency of an individual's speech distinctly compromises the listener's impressions of the speaker (Franck, Jackson, Pimentel & Greenwood, 2002). People who stutter are consistently rated more negatively with respect to their personality and intelligence, among other attributes. These negative misperceptions have been explored in both child and adult listeners.

Negative bias toward people who stutter has been documented in adults from many spheres including teachers (Yeakle & Cooper, 1986), special educators (Ruscello, Lass, Schmitt, & Pannbacker, 1994), college professors (Daniels, Panico & Sudholt, 2011), and parents (Crowe & Cooper, 1977). Perhaps even more surprising is that this

negative bias was found to appear among speech-language pathologists as well (Lass, Ruscello, Pannbacker, Schmitt & Everly-Myers, 1989). Lass et al. (1989) found that when speech-language pathologists were asked to list as many adjectives as they could think of to describe four hypothetical stutterers, 69.9% adjectives listed were negative, 24.2% were positive, and 5.9% were neutral. This finding is particularly disconcerting as speech-language pathologists should be the most educated about stuttering.

There are also data regarding the school-age child's perception of a person who stutters. Franck, Jackson, Pimentel and Greenwood (2002) conducted a study examining 75 fourth and fifth grade school-age child listener perceptions of an adult male reading a passage while stuttering versus the same adult male reading the same passage without stuttering. The authors sought to determine if these differences in perception were specific to intelligence-related traits and/or personality-related traits. Participants viewed the videos in the classroom setting and then filled out a survey including bi-polar adjective pair scales. This investigation revealed that school-age children's perceptions of the speaker when he stuttered was more negative than when they were rating him when he did not stutter. No significant difference was detected between personality-related and intelligence-related characteristics; both were rated negatively to a comparable degree. Results suggest that school-age children also have negative biases towards the speaker who stutters. However, this study is limited in its application to peer-to-peer interactions as the speaker was not a peer but an adult male. Information about how school-age children perceive a peer who stutters would be useful in developing treatments that address the unique challenges a school-age child faces in social relationships.

Although studies examining the school-age child's perception of stuttering are not available, studies examining the school-age child's perceptions of non-typical speech other than stuttering are available. Research to date suggests that children generally

perceive non-typical speech more negatively than typical speech. These negative reactions to communication disorders have been documented to appear as early as kindergarten (e.g., Blood & Hyman, 1997). However, younger subjects tend to have less negative perceptions than older children. This suggests that sensitivity to and negative perceptions about different ways of speaking develops early and intensifies over time.

Researchers who have investigated listener's perceptions of a speaker who stutters have predominantly utilized questionnaires to probe for information. However, there is at least one study wherein the investigators moved beyond this paper-based assessment. Guntupalli and colleagues examined the physiological responses of fluent listeners while listening to a speaker who stutters (Guntupalli et al., 2006). In this study the heart rate and skin conductance were measured while listening to stuttered speech. The authors reported that listeners had a physiological and emotional response to stuttering as evidenced by increased skin conductance and lower mean heart rate. Participants also completed a survey about their perceptions of the speaker. They reported feeling more "nervous", "uncomfortable", "tensed" and "unhappy" while listening to the stuttered speech. This suggests that listeners have a physiological and cognitive response to stuttered speech. Self-disclosing has been proposed as a way to reduce the anxieties of the listener by providing information about why the disfluencies are occurring and permitting stuttering to be a topic of conversation. Self-disclosing may also convey general speaker confidence and provide the listener with some guidance about how to respond, among other benefits.

The presence of negative bias towards speakers who stutter is evident. However, the basis of these negative perceptions is unclear. Various authors have suggested that stereotypes proliferated in the media is a possible source of bias (Cappellini, 2012). Others have suggested that negative reactions stem from a listener's discomfort about

how to react to stuttering and uncertainty about the person who stutters in general (White & Collins, 1984; Woods & Williams, 1976). Peer perceptions are of particular interest as increased understanding of these perceptions may provide insight to the source of some of the social consequences school-age children who stutter experience.

Research has indicated that children who stutter are at increased risk for negative social experiences such as bullying and being teased. Langevin, Bortnick, Hammer, and Weibe (1998) reported that 57% of children who stutter reported being teased/bullied about their stuttering, and that 81% reported that they were upset about being teased or bullied. In addition, in a survey of adults who stutter, 83% of the respondents reported being bullied in school (Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999). Bullying is known to have psychological costs that may contribute to the child who stutters employing avoidance strategies, developing poor self-esteem, and experiencing minimal to no progress in therapy (Blood & Blood, 2004; Healey, Scott Trautman, & Susca, 2004). Furthermore, Hugh-Jones and Smith (1999) reported that as many as 75% of adults who stutter believed that bullying negatively impacted their academic work. A greater understanding of peer perceptions may aid in reducing bullying behaviors and the psychological consequences that accompany it. Examining the perceptions of peers who do and do not stutter as they observe a peer self-disclose would provide such insight.

ABOUT SELF-DISCLOSURE

In the literature, the terms "self-disclosure" (Healey, Gabel, Daniels & Kawai, 2007) and "acknowledgement" (Collins & Blood, 1990) have been used to describe the act of disclosing or acknowledging stuttering in one's own speech. Self-disclosure has been suggested as a way to overcome the desire to hide stuttering. This strategy has been

recommended for individuals who stutter as a means of reducing anxiety, promoting self-acceptance, and regaining a sense of control over communicative interactions (Bloodstein, 1995; Collins & Blood, 1990; Sheehan, 1975; Van Riper, 1982). This strategy is often implemented through a hierarchical strategy where the speaker uses a self-disclosure statement first in situations that feel safe, such as with a close friend, and then works toward using self-disclosure in a more challenging situation.

The technique of self-disclosure is actively applied in therapy at the recommendation of experts in the field, but the benefits of using self-disclosure statements are largely limited to clinical anecdotal reports. Only a small number of studies have been completed examining the impact of using self-disclosure statements. For example, Collins and Blood (1990) had 84 nonstuttering female undergraduate college students view two of four tapes of a white male being interviewed. The four possible viewing conditions were of a mild stutterer who did and did not self-disclosed, as well as a severe stutterer who did and did not self-disclose. In the self-disclosure condition, the speaker indicated that he had stuttered his whole life, was in speech therapy with the goal of improving his fluency, and was open to people discussing his stuttering as he knew it made some people uncomfortable. In the condition where a self-disclosure statement was not present, the speaker spoke about his progress in school but did not mention anything about stuttering. The listeners were asked to rate the speakers in terms of intelligence, personality, and appearance and they were informed that they would needed to choose one of the two speakers to work with the coming week. The speaker who self-disclosed was rated higher in all measures. In addition, severe stuttering without the use of self-disclosure was rated more negatively than mild stuttering. These results indicate that the use of self-disclosure statements may improve perceptions of speakers who stutter, especially if their stuttering is severe in nature.

Healey, Gabel, Daniels, and Kawai (2007) conducted a follow up study examining the use of self-disclosure more closely. In this study, 90 listeners viewed one of three videos of a male speaker with severe stuttering while he was giving a monologue. In the tapes, the speaker either self-disclosed at the beginning of the monologue, self-disclosed at the end of the monologue, or did not self-disclose at all. The viewers rated the speaker on a set of six Likert scale statements and three open-ended questions. Results indicated that the speaker who self-disclosed at the beginning of the monologue was perceived more positively than the speaker who self-disclosed at the end of the monologue. This information is helpful in that it provides specific information about the importance of the delivery of the self-disclosure statement. The present study employed the use of a self-disclosure statement at the beginning of the monologue in response to this finding.

More recently, Lee and Manning (2010) contributed to present understanding of self-disclosure in their study that explored listener's responses to stuttering, self-disclosure, and stuttering modification. Participants viewed two videos: one where a person who stuttered self-disclosed and one where the speaker did not self-disclose. Again the findings indicated that the speaker who self-disclosed was rated as more favorable than the speaker who did not.

Taken together, these studies provide a preliminary investigation of the impact of using self-disclosure statements. However, a significant void in the literature still exists. Little is known about the potential benefit of self-disclosure statements for school-age children. Research about the perceptions of other communication disorders has suggested that listener perceptions change with age. Therefore, it is possible that the perceptions of children may differ from those of adults (Blood & Hyman, 1997). In addition, no research is available about how a listener who stutters perceives a speaker who stutters

when they self-disclose. Research in this area could provide valuable insight regarding the way in which self-disclosure should be discussed and approached in therapy. Improving our understanding of the client's perspective may help clinicians increase client buy-in and success with this therapy tool. Last but not least, the presence of gender bias in this area of research has not been studied. Negative perceptions and stereotypes have been documented in both male and female individuals who stutter (Lass et al., 1992; Ruscello et al. 1994). However, studies investigating the use of self-disclosure have only investigated the perceptions of male speakers.

Purpose

There are three primary goals of the present investigation. The first goal is to determine if the act of self-disclosing improves the school-age listener's perceptions of a peer who stutters. Second, this study seeks to determine if perceptions of self-disclosure are different for the listener who stutters as opposed to the listener who does not. The third goal is to determine if listener perception is subject to gender bias. A group of listeners who stutter will be presented with two of four possible video conditions (male who self-discloses, male who does not self-disclose, female who self-discloses, female who does not self-disclose) and asked to complete a survey probing for their perceptions of the speaker and their knowledge of stuttering, among other information. The listener who stutter's perceptions will be compared to a group of age-matched typically fluent peers. It is hypothesized that both listener groups will have more positive perceptions of the child who self-discloses. In regards to gender bias, it is hypothesized that gender bias will only be present when the speaker does not self-disclose. This research project was conducted with the goal of generating additional evidence-based support for the use of self-disclosure as a clinical tool.

Method

STUDY DESIGN

The design of this study is a systematic replication of a master's thesis study completed by Colleen Cappellini (2012) under the supervision of Courtney T. Byrd, PhD CCC-SLP at the University of Texas at Austin. Colleen Cappellini conducted a study investigating the impact of self-disclosure on listener's perceptions of adults who stutter. Dr. Courtney Byrd is also the supervisor of this study and a partner study currently being completed by Olivia Reed. In replicating the Cappellini's 2012 study, necessary methodological changes were made in order to explore the perceptions of school-age children who do and do not stutter.

In specific, for the present study, two participant groups, children who stutter (CWS) and children who do not stutter (CWNS), viewed two of four possible video recordings (1. male who self-discloses, 2. male who does not self-disclose, 3. female who self-discloses, and 4. female who does not self-disclose). After viewing the video recordings the participant was asked to complete a survey questionnaire probing their perceptions of the speaker and also their prior experience with stuttering.

STIMULI

Speakers: Two speakers were filmed in creating the stimulus material: one school-aged male and one school-aged female. The female was a 9 years, 7 month old who began stuttering at age of 3. She had received speech therapy at The University of Texas at Austin Speech and Hearing Center (UTSHC) from the age of 4 years to 7 years. From age 7 years until the time of filming she received services elsewhere. The male speaker was a 7 years, 5 months old who began stuttering at the age of 3. He had been enrolled in speech therapy at the UTSHC for one and a half months prior to the filming.

In addition, he had received previous therapy elsewhere when he was in pre-kindergarten. Both the male and female speakers were native English speakers and did not exhibit a regional accent. Neither the male nor female speaker demonstrated deviant articulation, nasality, voice quality, resonance, speech rate, or speech loudness.

Recording Equipment: The videos were recorded by a staff member of the Moody College of Communication at the University of Texas at Austin. This staff member has a B.A. in Communication from Stephen F. Austin State University and has been producing video for the Moody College of Communication for 13 years. The videos were recorded with a Panasonic AG-HMC150, along with a Sennheiser EW 100 G3 wireless microphone system. The videos were edited using Final Cut Pro 7.0 on an Apple Mac Pro then exported as QuickTime movie files using the H.264 video codec. The videos were uploaded to a private Dropbox.com folder to share the files easily among the research team and to allow flexibility relative to the viewing location.

Setting: Both speakers were filmed individually while seated at a table in the same room. The room had white walls and no windows. The speakers were filmed so that they were visible from the chest up, with the table out of site. The speakers faced the camera directly to create the impression that the speaker was communicating directly to the listener. In the background, a white wall was visible, as was a small portion of a one way mirror window. Although a small portion of the window was visible, the viewer was unable to see anything on the other side of the window. This setting was chosen to encourage uninterrupted focus on the speaker.

Filming: Both speakers were filmed on the same day in the same location. The speakers read through the passage several times before filming. Each speaker was recorded several times and the recording that most closely matched the script was chosen for use.

Passage reading: The speakers were filmed while reading a modified version of the Rainbow Passage. The script included an introduction of the speaker and the reading material (e.g. "Hello my name is Sarah and I am going to read a passage about rainbows"), a self-disclosure statement ("I sometimes stutter, so you might hear me repeat words or sounds, but if you have any questions or want me to say anything again, just let me know"), and a portion of the Rainbow Passage. This self-disclosure statement was carefully worded to ensure that it did not sound like an apology.

Also included in the script were specifically planned voluntary stutters. Voluntary stuttering, as opposed to relying on natural moments of stuttering, was used to control for differences in stuttering frequency and disfluency type. This was implemented based on findings from previous studies that indicate that degree of stuttering severity can influence the listener's perceptions of the speaker (Panico, Healey, Brouwer & Susca, 2004). Scripting the disfluencies reduced the difference in type and frequency of stutters presented by the two speakers. The scripted disfluencies were highlighted so that they were easy to identify when reading. The passage was 166 words in length without the self-disclosure statement and 195 words when the self-disclosure statement was included. The speakers were asked to include 9 inaudible sound prolongations, 18 audible sound prolongations, 13 single syllable repetitions yielding 40 total stuttering-like disfluencies (24.1% of the passage without the self-disclosure statement and 20.5% of the passage with the self-disclosure statement). Despite efforts to limit variation in stuttering presentation, the speakers produced some authentic stutters, which created slight variation between the two speakers' recordings. The videos also differed slightly from each other in reading fluency (e.g. pausing and re-reading words) and slight mispronunciation of words (e.g. "prism" was pronounced "primes"). Given the fact that

they were authentic stutterers, some variability between the reading passages was inevitable but nonetheless was controlled for to a maximum degree (See Table 1).

Table 1 – Percentage of Stutters in Stimulus Passage

	Male	Female
Single-sound repetitions (SSR)	8.4%	8.4%
Whole word repetitions (WWR)	0.6%	0.6%
Audible sound prolongations (ASP)	10.8%	13.9%
Inaudible sound prolongations/blocks (ISP)	4.8%	4.2%

As previously discussed, four tapes were created: male child without self-disclosure statement, male child with self-disclosure statement, female child without self-disclosure statement, female child with self-disclosure statement. In the original recordings, the self-disclosure statement was included. Splicing out the self-disclosure statement using a straight cut editing technique, created the videos that excluded the self-disclosure statement. This process ensured that both recordings were identical with the exception of the presence or absence of the self-disclosure statement.

SURVEY

The survey was comprised of two parts. The first part included 10 questions where the participant was asked to compare their impressions of the speakers in the two videos. The participant was asked to select in which tape (tape 1, tape 2 or no difference) the speaker demonstrated a certain characteristic more. For example, “In which tape do

you think the speaker appeared more intelligent?" and "In which tape did you feel less distracted while trying to listen to the reading?" Part two of the survey was comprised of a series of open-ended questions assessing the participant's experiences with individuals who stutter, their knowledge of stuttering, their perceptions of the speakers and the speakers' communication, and their knowledge about self-disclosure. They were also provided a space to add any additional comments.

Pre-survey Screener: Before participating in the research task, all participants were administered a screener to assess their knowledge of vocabulary concepts used in the survey (e.g., words such as confident, distracted, friendly). The pre-survey screener provided a target word and then offered three definitions of the word. A graduate student from the Communications Sciences and Disorders program at The University of Texas at Austin created the pre-screener survey. Participants had the option of being read the survey aloud or completing the screener independently. Participants had two opportunities to answer the pre-screener survey with 100% accuracy. All participants were able to obtain a score of 100% when given two attempts. Participants were offered a 15-20 minute break after completing the pre-survey screener and before beginning the research task. This break time was implemented to avoid priming the listener to think of these vocabulary words reviewed in the pre-survey screener while completing the research task.

PARTICIPANTS

The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board provided approval for the completion of this study. In addition, informed consent was granted by the guardian of the child and assent was granted by the participating child.

Participants were recruited from the UTSHC and from the general population in Austin, Texas. All participants were between the ages of 6;0 and 13;11. There were two participant groups (1) school age children who stutter and (2) an age-/gender-matched group of school age children with no history of stuttering. The age-/gender-matched peer group was randomly selected from a pool of subjects participating in a similar child self-disclosure research project (Olivia Reed, 2014) and was within 6 months of age of the participants who stutter. All participants who stuttered had been diagnosed at the UTSHC and had received speech therapy services during the preceding 2 years. All participants were native English speakers with no reported history of speech/language impairments, learning disabilities, or developmental disabilities.

RESEARCH TRAINING PROTOCOL

A team of master's degree students and undergraduate research assistants carried out the research task. All researchers were students in The University of Texas at Austin's Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders and were approved by the International Review Board for participation. As previously noted, the research procedure was adapted from a thesis project completed by Colleen Cappellini. The two master's level graduate students leading this project modified Cappellini's method to meet the needs/purpose of this project.

Undergraduate research assistants completed a 2-hour training program where they were provided with general information about stuttering and self-disclosure, and were given in-depth instruction regarding the procedures specific to this research task. Accuracy of administration was confirmed by directly supervising a portion of the undergraduate research assistant's during task administration. In addition, each test

administration session was audio recorded and reviewed by a researcher to confirm that information was properly reported. Weekly meetings were also held for the entire research team to ensure consistency in administration.

PROCEDURE

The research task was carried out in a variety of locations such as the UTSHC, the participant's homes and in local bookstores. Location selection was determined by participant's guardian's preference. The locations used were comparable in that all settings were quiet with minimal distractions. Each participant completed the required tasks under the supervision of one to two researchers. Upon arrival, the participant's guardian was asked to read and sign a consent form and the participant was provided with an assent form to sign. The assent was written in child-friendly language and the participant was invited to ask any questions. The participant was informed that they would be viewing two recordings of people talking and then would be asked to answer questions about the recordings.

Prior to watching the video recordings, the participant completed the pre-survey screener and then provided with a 15-20 minute break. Directly after the break, the participant randomly viewed two of the four possible video options (male self-disclosure, male no self-disclosure, female self-disclosure, and female no self-disclosure). Video order was selected by systematic randomization, which involved creating a list comprehensive list of all possible video pairings. Participants were assigned to view a video pairing based on the date of their testing.

Video recordings were viewed from a laptop placed near the participant. The participant was instructed on how to adjust the volume of the laptop so that they could

adjust the volume to their desired level. While the videos were being viewed, the researcher remained in the room but was careful not to distract the participant.

After watching the videos, the listener was presented with the survey. The participant was given the option of reading and completing the survey aloud with the help of the researcher or reading and completing the survey independently. This option was provided to account for differing reading levels across the age-span of the participant pool. If the researcher did present the survey aloud, she aimed to present the questions in the most neutral tone possible.

After the survey was completed, the participant was provided with a debriefing form that was written in child-friendly language. The participant's guardian was given a debriefing form that included more complete, detailed information about the project. The researcher also discussed the purpose of the study with the participant and their guardian and answered any questions that they had at that time.

STORING DATA

Hard copies of surveys, consent forms, were stored in a locked filing cabinet located in a locked room in the UTSHC. Data were also stored electronically on a password protected Dropbox.com folder. Only IRB authorized individuals had access to these files.

Results

To review, this thesis provides preliminary data for an ongoing larger scale study that will allow for a better understanding of whether or not self-disclosure impacts listener perception and whether or not the impact is specific to status as a person who stutters and/or gender. Participants were asked a series of questions to determine whether or not self-disclosure made an impact on the person's perception of the speaker. Three question types were presented: forced-choice questions, open ended questions probing for knowledge of and experiences with stuttering, and open ended questions probing for perceptions of the speaker and for the speaker's communication. For the present study two of four possible video conditions were administered to four child dyads.

Each dyad will be discussed descriptively with respect to the responses to the questions. In addition to comparing these responses, we also analyzed the participant post-survey report of experience and/or prior knowledge of stuttering with regard to whether or not these past experiences influenced any notable response differences. Responses are presented first with regard to where the two talker groups were the same followed by where they differed.

SELF-DISCLOSURE ONLY CONDITION

Two sets of dyads viewed a video order that differed only in the presence of a self-disclosure statement (male with self-disclosure statement, male without self-disclosure statement). One dyad consisted of 6-year-old males, and the other consisted of 7-year-old females.

Males

In terms of whether or not the speaker was perceived differently specific to self-disclosure, both male participants indicated that in the tape with no self-disclosure the speaker appeared more insecure. They also agreed that there was no difference between the two tapes for: more intelligent, more confident, more distracted, more shy, more unintelligent, and less distracted. However, they differed in their selection with regard to the following questions: more friendly, more outgoing, and unfriendly. The participant who stutterers indicated that that there was "no difference" between the speakers in measures of friendliness but indicated that the speaker who self-disclosed was more outgoing. The participant who does not stutter preferred the speaker who did not self-disclose in measures of friendliness and indicated that speaker who did not self-disclose was "more outgoing".

Overall, both the male participant who stutters and the male participant who does not stutter favored the speaker who self-disclosed. When asked 10 questions, the male participant who stutters favored the speaker who self-disclosed in 2/10 opportunities, and perceived "no difference between the speakers" in 8/10 opportunities. Similarly, when asked the same 10 questions the male participant who does not stutter preferred the speaker who self-disclosed in 3/10 opportunities, the speaker who did not self-disclose in 1/10 opportunities and perceived no difference between the speakers in 6/10 opportunities.

This dyad varied in their self-report of past experience with stuttering and also knowledge of people who stutter. The male participant who stutters reported that in addition to stuttering himself, he also had a sibling who stutters and that he had both formal and informal experiences with stuttering. The male participant who does not

stutter reported never having met someone who stutters and having received no education about stuttering.

In response to the open ended questions, the male participant who does not stutter described the speaker who self-disclosed as "friendly" and "intelligent" but made no comment about the speaker who did not self-disclosure. The male participant who stutters made a limited number of comments about the speaker but stated that he thought both were "nice".

When asked for comments on the speaker's communication the male participant who stutters indicated that the speaker "stuttered a lot" for both videos but that in the video with self-disclosure "sometimes he didn't stutter and sometimes he did". By comparison, the male participant who does not stutter reported that both speakers were "good". He added that in the first video the speaker's "stuttering was not too bad". Neither participant added additional comments when asked.

Females

Within the female participant dyad both participants reported "no difference" in regards to whether the speaker appeared: friendlier, more confident, more unfriendly, and more insecure. The dyad differed in their perception of the speaker in measures of: more outgoing, more intelligent, more distracting, more shy, more unintelligent, and less distracted. The female participant who did not stutter indicated that the speaker who self-disclosed was more outgoing, more unintelligent, and less distracting. She rated the speaker who did not self-disclose as more intelligent, more distracting, and more shy. Thus, the female participant who did not stutter favored the speaker who self-disclosed in 3/10 opportunities, favored the speaker who did not self-disclose in 3/10 opportunities and perceived "no difference" between the speakers in 4/10 opportunities. In contrast, the

female participant who stutters indicated that there was “no difference” between the two speakers in any of the measures (indicated 10/10 for “no difference”).

The female dyad had different experiences with and knowledge of stuttering. The female participant who does not stutter reported she had never met someone who stutters or had any formal education about stuttering. However, she reported having some informal experiences with stuttering (reading a book). The female participant who stutters had met other individuals who stutter and had formal and informal experiences learning about stuttering. In addition, she reported using self-disclosure statements “sometimes”.

In response to the open ended questions, the female participant who stutters noted that the speaker stuttered and commented that in both videos he “did a good job” and was a “friendly person”. The female participant who does not stutter reported the speaker who self-disclosed “sort of went like r-r-r-r-rainbow” and that the speaker who did not self-disclose “stopped when he was talking”.

GENDER ONLY CONDITION:

In the gender only condition, participants first viewed the male self-disclosure video followed by the female self-disclosure video. The participants consisted of two 13-year-old male subjects. As with all of the dyads, one of the subjects was a person who stutters and the other was a person who does not stutter.

In terms of whether or not the speaker was perceived differently specific to gender, the two male participants selected the tape where the speaker was male, Tape 1, for the following variables: more outgoing and less distracted. They chose the tape where the female was the speaker, Tape 2, for the following items: more distracting, more shy, and more insecure. They agreed there was no difference between the male and female

speaker with respect to the rating of “more unintelligent.” They differed in their selection with regard to the following variables: more friendly, more intelligent, more confident, and more unfriendly. The participant who did not stutter indicated that there was “no difference” between the speakers in measures of friendliness and intelligence. He indicated that the female speaker was “more outgoing”. The participant who did stutter provided mixed responses. He indicated that the female speaker was “more friendly” but when asked who was “more unfriendly” he also selected the female. These are conflicting responses. Similarly, the speaker who stuttered indicated that the male speaker was “more intelligent” but then later indicated that there was “no difference” between the speakers in regards to who was “more unintelligent”. The cause of inconsistency in responses is unknown. ” The participant who stutters indicated that the male speaker was “more outgoing”.

Overall, the participant who stuttered rated the male speaker higher than the female speaker. Specifically, he favored the male speaker in 8/10 opportunities, the female in 1/10 opportunities, and perceived “no difference between the speakers” in 1/10 opportunities. The participant who does not stutter preferred the male speaker but not as strongly. When asked ten questions, he favored the male speaker in 5/10 opportunities, the female 1/10 opportunity, and perceived “no difference between the speakers” in 4/10 opportunities.

In addition to forced-response questions discussed above, both subjects were asked a series of open-ended questions. The first set of questions addressed the participant’s knowledge of and familiarity with stuttering. Both participants indicated that they had met someone who stutters but did not personally know a stutterer. When asked about experiences learning about stuttering, the person who was not a person who stutters reported that he had seen a movie where the character was a person who stutters. He

indicated that although he had not been taught formally about stuttering, he knew about stuttering in general. The participant who was a person who stutters indicated that he had received formal training about stuttering during speech therapy but had not had any informal learning experiences with stuttering, such as watching a movie featuring a character that stutters.

The second set of questions were open-ended questions probing perceptions of the speaker, the speaker's communication and any additional comments. The non-stuttering participant commented that he "felt the speaker was very confident" and that the female speaker was "shy and kept to herself". The stuttering participant indicated that the male speaker "felt friendlier" and "outgoing" whereas he viewed the female speaker to be "not as outgoing" and "less comfortable".

In regards to the speaker's communication the participant who did not stutter commented that he "felt that the speaker repeated the beginning of words often" and in regards to the female speaker that "It seemed that the speaker paused before she started more of the words in the passage". These comments were judged to be neutral comments about the speaker's communication rather than negative perceptions of the speaker themselves. When asked about the speaker's communication, the participant who stutters indicated that he understood the male speaker but "didn't really understand" the female speaker. He also commented that the female speaker "felt uncomfortable and was constantly moving around during the story".

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND GENDER CONDITION

In the self-disclosure and gender video-viewing dyad, participants first viewed the male self-disclosure video followed by the female video with the self-disclosure

statement. The participants consisted of two 6-year-old male subjects. As with all of the dyads, one of the subjects was a person who stutters and the other was a person who does not stutter.

This dyad is unique in that both gender and presence of a self-disclosure statement may have influenced the listener's perceptions. The two participants selected the tape where the speaker was female and there was no self-disclosure statement for measures of "less distracting". They agreed there was "no difference" between the two speakers in regards to if the speaker was: friendly, intelligent, more distracting, more unfriendly, and more unintelligent. The participants differed in their selection with regard to the following questions: more outgoing, more confident, more shy, and more insecure. The participant who stuttered reported perceiving "no difference" between the speakers in any of these measures. However, the participant who did not stutter selected the male who self-disclosed for "more shy," and "more insecure" and selected the female who did not self-disclose for "more outgoing" and "more confident."

Overall, the male participant who stutters rated the female who did not self-disclose slightly higher than the male who did self-disclose. Specific to the 10 questions, he favored the male speaker in 0/10 opportunities, the female in 1/10 opportunities and perceived "no difference between the speakers" in 9/10 opportunities. The male participant who does not stutter preferred the female speaker who did not self-disclose to the male who self-disclosed more strongly than his age-matched peer. With respect to the 10 questions, he favored the male speaker in 0/10 opportunities, the female 5/10 opportunities, and perceived "no difference between the speakers" in 5/10 opportunities.

As with the other dyads, this pair had different experiences with and knowledge of stuttering. The male participant who stutters reported knowing a person who stutters "very well" and that he had informal and formal learning experiences about stuttering. He

also indicated that he uses self-disclosure statements. The male participant who does not stutter indicated that he had never met someone who stutters and had no formal or informal learning experiences about stuttering.

Both participants made comments in response to the open ended questions regarding the speaker and the speaker's communication. The male participant who does not stutter made significantly more comments than the male participant who does not stutter. When asked about the speaker, the male participant who stutters stated that both the male who self-disclosed and the female who did not self-disclose were "shy" and that they "didn't do good eye contact." He noted that the male did "more eye contact than the girl." In regards to the speaker's communication the male participant who stutters commented that the male "talked better than the girl because he had a louder voice" and that the girl "whispered."

The male participant who does not stutter made fewer comments about the speaker and the speaker's communication. He commented that both speakers seemed "nice." He also made positive comments about the speaker's communication noting the male who self-disclosed "was good at saying his words" and the female who did not self-disclose "talked nice."

Discussion

To review, the purpose of the present study was threefold. First, explore the impact of self-disclosure on school-age listener's perceptions of a peer who stutters. Second, to investigate the impact of listener group (if the listener is also a person who stutters) on perceptions. Thirdly, this initiative seeks to determine if gender bias is present in listener's perceptions of a peer who stutters. The information gathered in this study has provided insight into the three areas targeted. First, an analysis of each dyad's responses will be provided. Next, this information will be applied to the research questions previously discussed.

SELF-DISCLOSURE ONLY CONDITION

Recall two dyads viewed the condition exploring the impact of self-disclosure only. One male dyad, aged 6 years old, and one female dyad, aged 7 years old, viewed the video of the male speaker who did self-disclosed followed by the video of the male who did not self-disclose.

Males

The male participants slightly preferred the speaker who self-disclosed to the speaker who did not. Both participants rated the speaker who did not self-disclose negatively with respect to measures of outgoingness, unfriendliness, and insecurity and made positive comments about the speaker who self-disclosed, describing him as "friendly," "nice" and "intelligent." Additionally, neither participant negatively rated the participant who self-disclosed. However, in many measures the participants reported perceiving no difference between the two participants. The participant who stutters

reported perceiving no difference between the two speakers in 8/10 opportunities. The participant who did not stutter reported perceiving no difference between the speakers in 6/10 opportunities. Recall that for this particular condition, the same speaker was viewed in both videos. With that in mind, it is not surprising that the participants reported "no difference" between the two speakers, as the videos were in fact identical with the exception of the absence or presence of the self-disclosure statement.

On the other hand, given that the exact same person was viewed across both videos, any differences perceived may be more exclusively attributed to the presence and/or absence of a self-disclosure statement. To that end, when the ratings differed across viewings, those differences may provide insight into the potential impact of self-disclosure on listener perception. Specifically, results suggest that self-disclosing leads the listener to perceive the speaker more positively with respect to being friendly, nice and intelligent.

Another interesting and additional potential benefit to self-disclosure is the participant rating of a difference in the amount of stuttering between the two speakers. Although the male participant who stutter mentioned that both speakers "stuttered a lot" he went on to say that the speaker who self-disclosed sometimes stuttered and sometimes did not. This implies that he perceived less stuttering from the speaker who self-disclosed than the speaker who did not. The participant who does not stutter indicated that both speakers were "good" but that for the speaker who self-disclosed his "stuttering was not too bad." This also suggests that the participant perceived the severity of stuttering to be less for the speaker who self-disclosed. Thus, the use of self-disclosure may reduce listener focus on the behavior of stuttering and allow for more focus on the content of the speaker's message.

In summary, the male dyad both preferred the speaker who self-disclosed but only slightly. However, any difference perceived between the two videos should be considered significant since both videos were derived from a single recording and by design are identical with the exceptions of the presence or absence of the self-disclosure statement.

Females

In contrast to the male dyad, in the female dyad the participant who stutters and the participant who does not stutter reported different perceptions of the speaker. The participant who stutters reported perceiving no difference between the two speakers in any measure. However, she did make positive comments about the speaker who stutter's personality indicating a slight preference for the speaker who self-disclosed. By comparison, the participant who did not stutter rated the speaker who self-disclosed higher in personality related traits ("more outgoing") and lower in traits regarding intelligence. She rated the speaker who did not self-disclose higher in regards to intelligence and lower in reference to personality related traits ("more shy"). Thus, these findings suggest that the use of self-disclosure may have a differential impact on females who do versus those who do not stutter. Females who do not stutter may be more likely to view the person who stutters who self-discloses more favorably specific to intelligence. However, the use of self-disclosure may also compromise perceptions of the speaker's personality.

Neither female within this dyad provided many comments about the speaker or the speaker's communication. The limited number of comments reported in this dyad may have been related to the young age of the participants. However, slightly more commenting was found in response to the video that included a self-disclosure statement.

This may have occurred as a response to the presence of the self-disclosure statement. Then again, it is also possible that this occurred as a result of video order due to the fact that the self-disclosure video condition was viewed first. Commenting may have been more prevalent for the first video because of participation fatigue or loss of attention near the completion of the survey task.

GENDER ONLY CONDITION

To review, in this dyad the participants first viewed the video of the male speaker who self-disclosed followed by the female speaker who self-disclosed. This condition was designed to assess the impact of gender when a male and female speaker who stuttered used a self-disclosure statement. The participants in this dyad were 13-year-old males.

In this condition the two participants rated the male speaker higher than the female speaker. Both participants agreed that the male speaker was more outgoing and that they felt less distracted while listening to the male speaker than the female speaker. Both participants described the female speaker negatively in rating of personality, describing her as more shy and more insecure. They also found her to be more distracting. The participants did not rate the speakers differently in terms of intelligence.

The comments section reflected the same bias. The male speaker was described as "very confident" and "friendlier" while the female speaker was perceived to be "shy and kept to herself". She was also described as "less comfortable". The comments provided by the participants were relatively neutral about the speaker's communication but more negative about the speaker themselves. This suggests that the participants may have failed to parse apart features of the speaker's communication from the personality or

overall nature of the speaker. This information is pertinent in that it can provide insight to the thought process of the school-aged peer listener. Clinicians should stress to their clients who stutter that choosing not to self-disclose may allow the listener to make assumptions about them that apply to their whole personality as opposed to their speech alone.

In considering these results it is important to note that the male participants preferred the male speaker. The participants may have rated the speakers higher for a variety of reasons such as reliability, comfort, and more experience with people of their same gender. However, it is difficult to determine whether these ratings were because the listeners were the same gender of the speaker they preferred, or if males would also be rated higher than females by female listeners. Future research is warranted to investigate how females rate speakers of their same gender prior to drawing conclusions about gender bias in regards to stuttering and self-disclosure.

These results suggest that gender bias did exist in this dyad, as the male speaker was significantly preferred to the female speaker. However, this finding was only evident for measures of personality but not for measures of intelligence. In addition, the participants did not assign characteristics to the speaker's communication but rather to the speaker themselves.

A few differences were noted between the perception of the participant who stuttered and the participant who did not stutter. Both participants preferred the male speaker; however, the participant who stuttered preferred the male speaker more strongly. This may have occurred based on distractibility of the listener. Perhaps because the listeners who stutters is more accustom to hearing stuttered speech he was less distracted by the stuttering and was better able to focus on other traits the speaker presented with.

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND GENDER CONDITION

One dyad viewed the video presentation condition designed to assess the impact of self-disclosure and gender on the listener's perceptions. This dyad, made up of two six-year old males, first viewed the video of the male speaker who self-disclosed and then the video of the female speaker who did not self-disclose.

When all measures were considered no clear preference was found for the participant who stutters. In the forced-choice questions he reported "no difference" between the two speakers in 9/10 measures and preferred the female in 1/10 measures. However, in the open-ended questions his comments indicated a preference for the male speaker by saying, "He made more eye contact than the girl" and "I thought he talked better than the girl." Because this condition was probing for both conditions it is unclear whether this preference is attributable to gender bias or self-disclosure presence.

The participant who does not stutter exhibited a preference for the female who did not self-disclose in the forced-choice questions and also commented that "she talked nice" in the comments section. It is notable that the two participants differed in their perceptions of the speakers and that the speaker who stutters perceived less of a difference between the two speakers.

IMPACT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE

It was hypothesized that the act of self-disclosing would positively impact the listener's perceptions of the speaker in regards to intelligence and personality. The impact of self-disclosing was explored in three dyads. Of these six participants, three participants favored the individual who self-disclosed, one participant favored the speaker who did not self-disclose and two participants reported neutral or mixed preference. The

participant who had mixed preferences rated the individual who self-disclosed higher in personality related traits and lower in intelligence related traits.

While these results are varied, the majority of participants favored the speaker who self-disclosed as opposed to any other response category. Thus, self-disclosing does appear to positively impact the listener's perception of the speaker who stutters. These results are consistent with pervious research that was conducted regarding adults' perceptions of stutterers who self-disclose (Collins & Blood, 1990; Healey, Gabel, Daniels, & Kawai, 2007; Lee & Manning, 2010).

IMPACT OF LISTENER GROUP (STUTTERER VS. NON-STUTTERER)

A variety of perceptual differences were found between the listener groups. For example, degree of preference (e.g. strong, moderate, mild) was observed to be different in some dyads. However, the most salient finding in this area was the difference observed in perceptions of participants who stutter in comparison to the participants who did not stutter.

One of the themes discovered was that the participants who stutter more often reported perceiving "no difference" between the two speakers in a variety of measures. This suggests that individuals who stutter are less impacted by the use of self-disclosure statements and therefore may not perceive the value in using them. Conversely, these findings suggest that viewing the speaker differently is a perspective that is unique to the person who does not stutter as they lack familiarity with stuttering. Thus, the present results could demonstrate to the client who stutters that the use of self-disclosure is uniquely critical when speaking to persons who do not stutter. While further investigation of this finding is warranted, this finding may help deliver effective therapy interventions

by confirming the idea that using a self-disclosure statement can impact listener's perceptions even if the stutterer does not perceive the impact. This information could potentially improve client's confidence in pursuing this technique.

Impact of Gender Bias

Two dyads viewed a video order that probed for perceptions of gender. Of these four participants, two favored the male speaker. Both of these participants viewed the video of the male who self-disclosed followed by the female who self-disclosed. Also, both of these participants were male. The other two participants who viewed a video condition targeting gender perceptions were male and viewed a video of the male who self-disclosed followed by the female who did not self-disclose. The participant who stuttered had no clear preference, but the participant who did not stutter preferred the female speaker who did not self-disclose slightly. Due to variety of responses, no clear pattern is discernable. At this point, it is unclear if gender bias is impacted by the use of self-disclosure. Future investigation in this area is needed before any conclusion can be made.

Clinical Implications

While continuing research is needed, these preliminary results suggest that the use of self-disclosure does impact school-age listeners' perceptions of the speaker. This information lends further support to the use of self-disclosure as a technique for school-age children who stutter. In addition, this study concluded that listeners who stutter may not perceive a speaker differently if they self-disclose. This is significant in that it may impact the client who stutters confidence in the effectiveness and desire to use self-

disclosure. Clinicians should explain to these clients that listener mis-perceptions may be unique to listeners who do not stutter which should in turn provide additional support for the critical need to self-disclose when speaking with their typically fluent peers. This information may provide insight and embolden the client and clinician to consider using self-disclosure as a technique in their comprehensive speech therapy program.

LIMITATIONS

Several facets of the present study limit the conclusions that can be drawn from the provided results. The most salient limitation was the small participant group. In order to bolster the accuracy of the claims a larger participant group size would need to be studied to determine if similar patterns arise. Another limitation of this study is that there were only two female participants. Although stuttering presents in males more often than females, a closer gender balance would be ideal. In the survey, information about the listener's experiences with stuttering was gathered. However, this information was not considered. Listener experience may have been an important variable and should be examined to determine the impact of experience on listener's perceptions.

The passage readings were designed to be neutral but may have been so neutral that they detracted from the participant paying careful attention to differences between the speeches. In addition, the passage readings could potentially be shortened to ensure more focused attention with the school-aged listener. Poor attention to the details of the passages may have influenced listener perceptions.

Conclusion

Results from the present suggest that listeners were positively impacted by the use of a self-disclosure statement. Listeners who heard a self-disclosure statement were more likely to rate the speaker higher and to make more positive comments about the speaker than when the self-disclosure statement was not presented. In addition, this study confirmed that there are differences in perceptions when the listener is also a person who stutters. Listeners who stutter appear to be less likely to be impacted by the presence of a self-disclosure statement or to perceive a difference between the two speakers. This study did not find conclusive evidence of how the use of self-disclosure was impacted by gender bias. Overall, these results encourage the use of self-disclosure in school-age populations.

Appendices

Appendix A. Script read by speakers in video recordings.

Hi, my nnnname is ____, and I'm going to recite a passage about r-r-r-r-rainbows. (I sometimes stutter, so you might hear me repeat words or sounds, but if you have any questions or want me to say anything again, just let me know)

Wwwwhen the sunlight sssstrikes raindrops in the air, (block)they act like a p-p-p-p-prism and form a rrrrrainbow. Thhhhhe rainbow is a (block)division of w-w-w-w-white light into m-m-m-many beautiful colors. Thhhese take the shhhhape of a long round (block)arch with its path high above and its t-t-t-two ends apparently beyond the h(block)orizon. Thhhhere is, according to lllllllegend, a boiling pot of gold at w-w-w-wone end. P(block)-people look, but no w-w-w-one ever finds it. Wh-wh-wh-wh-when a man looks for sssssomething beyond his reach, his fffffriends say he is looking for (block)a pot of gold at the end of the r-r-r-rainbow.

Thhhhroughout centuries men have e(block)xplained the rainbow in vvvvarious ways. Sssssome have accepted it as a m-m-m-miracle without physical (block)explanation. T-t-t-to the Hebrews it was a token that there wwwwould be no more y-y-y-universal floods. Thhhhe Greeks used to (block)imagine that it was a ssssign from the gods to foretell wwwwar or heavy r-r-r-rain.

Number of words (not including disclosure/including disclosure): 166/195

Number of ISPs: 9/166 (5.4%); 9/195 (4.6%)

Number of ASPs: 18/166 (10.8%); 18/195 (9.2%)

Number of SSR's: 13/166 (7.8%); 13/195 (6.6%)

Total STG's/total words: 40/166 (24.1%); 40/195 (20.5%)

Appendix B. Pre-survey Screener

Pre-‐-Survey Screener Code: _____

Choose the best definition for each word.

1. Friendly
    A. Liking to talk and interested in others; social
    B. Welcoming and pleasant toward others; kind and helpful
    C. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
2. Outgoing
    A. Welcoming and pleasant toward others; kind and helpful
    B. Liking to talk and interested in others; social
    C. Having your attention drawn to something else; having a loss of focus
3. Intelligent
    A. Having or showing a mind free from doubt; comfortable with yourself; certain; sure
    B. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
    C. Able to learn, think, and understand quickly and easily; smart; bright
4. Confident
    A. Having or showing a mind free from doubt; comfortable with yourself; certain; sure
    B. Able to learn, think, and understand quickly and easily; smart; bright
    C. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
5. Distracted
    A. Liking to talk and interested in others; social
    B. Having your attention drawn to something else; having a loss of focus
    C. Welcoming and pleasant toward others; kind and helpful
6. Unfriendly
    A. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
    B. Welcoming and pleasant toward others; kind and helpful
    C. Not friendly or kind; hostile
7. Shy
    A. Liking to talk and interested in others; social
    B. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
    C. Having or showing doubt; not having self-‐confidence; not being comfortable with yourself
8. Unintelligent
    A. Having or showing a mind free from doubt; comfortable with yourself; certain; sure
    B. Able to learn, think, and understand quickly and easily; smart; bright
    C. Not able to learn, think, and understand quickly and easily; not smart

9. Insecure
    A. Having or showing doubt; not having self-‑confidence; not being comfortable with yourself
    B. Not comfortable with other people; easily frightened; timid
    C. Having or showing a mind free from doubt; comfortable with yourself; certain; sure

Definitions adapted from:

http://www.bigiqkids.com/spellingwords/onlinedictionary_p/perception.shtml

Appendix C. Survey

Survey
Code: _____
Age: _____
Gender: _____

Directions:

Please complete Part I before turning the page to Part II.

Please turn to the next page to begin Part I.

Part I
For each of the following questions please circle the choice (*Tape 1, Tape 2*, or *No difference*) you feel is the best answer.

Tape 1 refers to the first video clip you viewed.
Tape 2 refers to the second video clip you viewed.

In which tape do you think the speaker appears friendlier?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more outgoing?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more intelligent?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more confident?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape did you feel more distracted while trying to listen to the reading?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more unfriendly?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more shy?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more unintelligent?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape do you think the speaker appears more insecure?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

In which tape did you feel less distracted while trying to listen to the reading?
Tape 1 Tape 2 No difference

Thank you for completing Part I.

Please turn to the next page to begin Part II.

Part II

For each of the following questions, please provide a written answer to the best of your ability.

1. Have you ever met someone who stutters?

2. Have you ever personally known someone who stutters (other than yourself)?

3. If you answered **yes** to question 12, how long have you known this person (years)?

4. If you answered **yes** to question 12, how well do you know this person?

Not well at all 1----2----3----4----5----6----7 *Very well*

5. Have you ever stuttered?

6. If you answered **yes** to question 15, do you still stutter?

7. If you answered **yes** to question 15, how long have you stuttered?

8. If you answered **yes** to question 15, do you ever self-disclose about your stuttering? (Example of self-disclosure: *Just so you know I sometimes stutter, so you might hear me repeat some words or sounds*).

9. Have you ever been taught specifically about stuttering (for example: in school or at speech therapy)? Please describe.

10. Have you ever had any informal experiences with stuttering (e.g. reading a book about stuttering; watching a movie about stuttering, such as *The King's Speech*)? Please describe.

11. Please provide 1-3 comments about your perceptions of **the speaker** in each tape in the boxes provided:

Tape 1	Tape 2

12. Please provide 1-3 comments about your perceptions of **the speaker's communication** in each tape in the boxes provided:

Tape 1	Tape 2

13. If you have any additional comments, please feel free to write them in the space below (you may continue on to the back of this page if you need more space).

Thank you so much for your participation in this study!

References

Bloodstein, O. (1995) A handbook on stuttering, fifth edition. London: Chapman & Hall.

Blood, G. W., & Blood, I. M. (2004). Bullying in adolescents who stutter: Communicative competence and self-esteem. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders*, 31, 69–79.

Blood, G. W., & Hyman, M. (1977). Children's perceptions of nasal resonance. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 42, 446–448.

Cappellini, Colleen, "The Effects of Self-Disclosure on Listener Perceptions of Male and Female Individuals Who Stutter" (Master's Thesis, University of Texas, 2012)

Collins, C., & Blood, G.W. (1990). Acknowledgment and severity of stuttering as factors influencing nonstutterers' perceptions of stutterers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 55,* 75-81.

Crowe, T. A., & Cooper, E. B. (1977). Parental attitudes and knowledge of stuttering. *Journal of Communications Disorders*, 10, 343–357.

Daniels, D. E., Panico, J., & Sudholt, J. (2011). Perceptions of university instructors toward students who stutter: A quantitative and qualitative approach. *Journal Of Communication Disorders*, 44(6), 631-639.

Franck, A., Jackson, R., Pimentel, J., & Greenwood, G. (2003). School-age-children's perceptions of a person who stutters. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 28*: 1-15

Guntupalli, V. K., Kalinowski, J., Nanjundeswaran, C., Saltuklaroglu, T., & Everhart, D. E. (2006). Psychophysiological responses of adults who do not stutter while listening to stuttering. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 62, 1–8.

Healey, E., Gabel, R., Daniels, D., & Kawai, N. (2007). The effects of self-disclosure and non self-disclosure of stuttering on listeners' perceptions of a person who stutters. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 32: 51-69

Healey, E. C., Scott Trautman, L., & Susca, M. (2004). Clinical applications of a multidimensional approach for the assessment and treatment of stuttering. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders*, 31, 40–48.

Hugh-Jones, S., & Smith, P. K. (1999). Self-reports of short-and long-term effects of bullying on children who stammer. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 141–158.

Lass, N.J., Ruscello, D.M., Pannbacker, M., Schmitt, J.F., & Everly-Myers, D.S. (1989). Speech-language pathologists' perceptions of child and adult female and male stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 14, 127-134.

Lass, N.J., Ruscello, D.M., Schmitt, J.F., Pannbacker, M., Orlando, M.B., Dean, K.A., Ruziska, J.C., & Bradshaw, K.H. (1992). Teachers' perceptions of stutterers. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 23, 78-81.

Langevin, M., Bortnick, K., Hammer, T., & Wiebe, E. (1998). Teasing/bullying experienced by children who stutter: Toward development of a questionnaire. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders*, 25, 12–24.

Lee, K. & Manning, W. (2010). Listener responses according to stuttering self-acknowledgment and modification. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 35: 110-122.

Panico, J., Healey, E. C., Brouwer, K., & Susca, M. (2005). Listeners perceptions of stuttering across two presentations modes: A quantitative and qualitative approach. *Journal of Fluency Disorders,* 10, 65-85.

Ruscello, D.M., Lass, N.J, Schmitt, J.F, & Pannbacker, M.D. (1994). Special educators' perceptions of stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 7, 469-478.

Sheehan, J.B. (1975). Conflict theory and avoidance-reduction therapy. In J. Eisenson (Ed.) Stuttering: A second symposium (pp. 97-98). New York: Harper and Row.

Van Riper, C. (1982). *The nature of stuttering*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Woods, C.L., & Williams, D.E. (1976). Traits attributed to stuttering and normally fluent males. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 19, 267-278.

White, P., & Collins, S. (1984). Stereotype formation by inference: a possible explanation for the "stutterer" stereotype. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 27, 567-570.

Yeakle, M. K. & Cooper, E. B. (1986). Teacher perceptions of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 11, 345–359.

Vita

Genessee Rebecca Klemm was born in Chicago, Illinois to Holly and Larry Klemm. She attended the University of Texas at Austin and obtained a Bachelors of Science in Human Development and Family Sciences in 2009. She returned to the University of Texas in 2012 to pursue a Masters of Arts in Speech Language Pathology.

Email address: Genessee.Klemm@gmail.com

This thesis was typed by the author.