Research Article

Effects of Altered Auditory and Oro-sensory Feedback on Speech Naturalness in Persons With and Without Stuttering

Geetha, Y. V.[a], Sangeetha, M.[b], Sundararaju, H.[c], Sahana, V.[d], Akshatha,V.[a], and Liji Antony[e]

JAIISH(2017)
Vol 36, pp. 12-19

Affiliations

[a]Department of Speech-Language Pathology, AIISH, Mysore
[b]Department of Clinical Services, AIISH, Mysore
[c]Department of Otorhinolaryngology, AIISH, Mysore
[d]Department of Speech-Language Sciences, AIISH, Mysore
[e]Lourdes Hospital, Cochin

Corresponding Author

Dr. Geetha Y. V., Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
Department of Speech-Language Pathology, AIISH, Mysore - 570006
Email: geethayelimeli@gmail.com

Key Words

Naturalness
Altered auditory feedback
Oro-sensory feedback

Abstract

Stuttering is one of the disorders of speech fluency influenced by many factors affecting the naturalness of speech. One of the major goals in stuttering management is providing natural sounding speech irrespective of the technique(s) adopted. The naturalness is measured with respect to various fluency parameters such as rate, continuity, effort, stress, intonation and rhythm, articulation and breathing pattern. There are many fluency inducing conditions of which altered auditory feedback (AAF) strategies are widely used with various wearable devices, especially in adults with stuttering who will not benefit much with the traditional approaches. The present study aimed to examine the speech naturalness induced by 3 AAF conditions [delayed auditory feedback (DAF), frequency altered feedback (FAF) and masking auditory feedback (MAF)] and altered oro-sensory feedback in adult persons with and without stuttering (PWS and PWNS). The fluent speech samples from 25 PWS and 25 PWNS in the age range of 18 to 25 years under different AAF and altered oro-sensory feedback conditions were given to experienced speech-language pathologists (SLPs) for judging speech naturalness compared to baseline without altered feedback condition. The analyses of results revealed that speech naturalness ratings were significantly poorer in PWS compared to PWNS in all the conditions. The results are discussed with regard to the nature of variability and the influence of various feedback conditions on speech naturalness.

Background

Stuttering is one such puzzling disorder of speech fluency, which is evading the researchers in terms of understanding its nature, cause and management issues. It is also a complex disorder wherein the symptoms possibly be manifested by a failure to convert linguistic intent into fluent output (Smith, Sadagopan, Walsh & Weber-Fox, 2010).

Current treatment programs for stuttering employ prolongation, feedback modification, rhythm, or rate control to help PWS reduce or eliminate the core stuttering behaviors.

Altered Auditory Feedback (AAF) is a well-known phenomenon. Several investigations in stuttering intervention have substantiated that delayed auditory feedback (DAF) at short delays and frequency-altered feedback (FAF) bring about immediate reduction in stuttering frequency (Hargrave, Kalinowski, Stuart, Armson & Jones, 1994; MacLeod, Kalinowski, Stuart & Armson, 1995; Kalinowski, Stuart, Sark & Armson, 1996; Stuart, Kalinowski, Armson, Stenstrom & Jones, 1996; Stuart, Kalinowski & Rastatter, 1997; Armson & Stuart, 1998). DAF is a condition where speakers hear their own speech with a short time delay. These delays are usually less than a quarter of a second (50-250 ms) shift in the time domain (Kalinowski et al 1996; Van Borsel, Reunes, & Van den Bergh, 2003). DAF was initially viewed as a tool for assisting the induction of the prolonged speech pattern. DAF is the only such stimulus that comprises marked disfluency-inducing effects in fluent speakers (Fukawa, Yoshioka, Ozawa, & Yoshida, 1988; Stuart, Kalinowski, Rastatter, & Lynch, 2002). Stuart et al. (2002) also reported that the speech disruptions during DAF largely attribute to the temporal alterations in the auditory feedback signal which impact the speech motor control system differently in PWS and PWNS. This highlights the strong association of auditory processing in fluent speech production both in people who stutter and in fluent controls (Fukawa et al 1988; Sutton, Roehrig, & Kramer, 1963). Fukawa et al (1988) also observed that PWS were more likely to be affected by DAF than PWNS, and normal males were more vulnerable to the effect than females.

FAF is a form of AAF where the frequency range of the speech is shifted up or down that leads to changes in pitch and hence shifts the entire speech spectrum. It is the shift in the frequency of a speaker's fed back voice up or down the scale (usually between one-fourth to one octave upper or lower) and the speaker hears his own voice at a higher or lower pitch depending on whether the shift in octave is above or below one's voice. FAF was first studied by Howell, El-Yaniv, and Powell, (1987), who concluded that FAF was much more effective than DAF. Natke, Grosser and Kalveram (2001) compared 10 PWS and 10 PWNS in spontaneous speech task under FAF with +1/2 and -1/2 octave shift and observed that in PWS downward shift of frequency led to significant fluency enhancement. Though fluency was enhanced by 21% in the upward shift condition, the level of significance could not be reached. However, there was no reduction in the rate of speech under FAF. Armson and Stuart (1998) who found increased fluency in reading compared to monologue task.

The Masked Auditory Feedback (MAF) to reduce stuttering is also quite popular. Significant decline in disfluencies has been observed with masked auditory feedback [MAF]. Frequency of stuttering events was reported to have decreased consistently in PWS across speaking tasks, on wearing a portable voice-activated masking device called the Edinburgh Masker (Block, Ingham & Bench, 1996). Keyhoe (1998) argued that successful carryover of fluency can be achieved with the combination of fluency enhancing techniques with the use of masker.

Kinesthetic sensation is another important feedback known to be integrally involved in attaining the movement goals. Oral sensory and perceptual integrity are important feedback components needed for the regulation and refinement of the patterns of oral manipulation. In the oral cavity there is an intimate interaction of sensory and motor functions for speech production. Disturbances in oral sensory perception have been found to be associated with disturbances in speech fluency in normal individuals and PWS. Research has shown significant contribution of oro-sensory information during both planning and execution of speech movements (Gracco, 1991; Gracco & Abbs, 1989). The oral sensory deprivation by anesthetization of the oral structures or temporary oral anesthesia (TOA) may act as a fluency facilitator in PWS. Uthappa, Shailat and Geetha (2010) reported a significantly reduced frequency of disfluencies in PWS under TOA, in comparison with the normal condition.

These therapeutic procedures using altered feedback conditions, although fluency enhancing, appear to be detrimental to speech naturalness. Limited literature has been reported on the nature of the speech quality that emerges from stuttering intervention using these procedures. But the few studies offer evidence that these therapeutic procedures result in speech that is different perceptually from the speech of normal speakers (Ingham & Packman, 1978; Runyan & Adams, 1978, 1979). These techniques are criticized on the basis that they might produce stutter-free speech, but post therapy speech is characterized as slow, monotonous, lacking in expression or unnatural and could be discriminated from the speech of PWNS (Onslow & Ingham, 1987).

Speech naturalness is a term which refers to "speech output that sounds normal or natural to the listener" (Parrish, 1951). It is a vital quality for a good speaker. Sanders, Gramlich and Levine (1981) defined speech naturalness as "the speech produced by speakers using the normal and customary speech patterns accepted by the community". Speech naturalness has a great significance to the success of treatment in fluency disorders. According to Curlee, (1993), measurement of speech naturalness is "basic" and "obligatory" in the assessment procedure of stuttering. The ultimate success of any stuttering intervention program is dependent on successful therapy outcomes, one of which is speech naturalness. Establishment of a natural sounding speech along with a reduction in core stuttering behaviors should be the treatment target in stuttering intervention (Franken, Boves, Peters & Webster, 1992; Kalinowski, Noble, Armson & Stuart, 1994; Onslow, Costa, Andrews, Harrison & Packman, 1996).

Martin, Haroldson and Triden (1984) were the first to systematically investigate naturalness of speech in PWS. A nine-point rating scale (one designated as highly natural and nine highly unnatural) was used to check the naturalness of speech samples from PWS and normal speakers under non-altered feedback (NAF) and less than 250 ms of DAF as rated by naive listeners. The speech of PWS was notably rated as more unnatural than that of normal speakers regardless of speaking under NAF or DAF. The naturalness ratings of the speech samples from PWS under NAF did not differ significantly compared to DAF in spite of the finding that the samples under DAF had no instances of stuttering. Numerous investigations have demonstrated that DAF as well as MAF decreases the rate of speech (Wingate, 1976; Perkins, 1979; Costello-Ingham, 1993), bring about an increase of fundamental frequency (Soderberg, 1959; Lechner, 1970) and vocal intensity (Howell, 1990), in addition to vowel elongation (Howell, Wingfield & Johnson, 1988; Howell, 2004), thus making the speech sound unnatural.

Several researchers have reported that listeners consider the post-therapy speech of PWS as sounding unnatural relative to the speech of typical in-

dividuals. Ingham, Gow and Costello, (1985) investigated the speech naturalness in spontaneous speaking samples of normal fluent speakers and PWS who had completed prolonged speech treatment program which were rated by thirty listeners. The speech of PWS after the completion of prolonged speech treatment program was judged to be more unnatural as compared to the fluent speakers. Franken, Boves, Peters, and Webster (1992) compared pre-therapy, post-therapy, and 6-month follow-up speech samples of PWS with samples from typical speakers and reported that the speech samples of PWS at pre-therapy, post therapy and six months follow up were judged to be different from the samples from PWNS. Their results revealed that the perceptual quality of post-therapy speech of PWS was not improved compared to their pre-therapy speech. Kalinowski, Noble, Armson and Stuart (1994) investigated speech naturalness of 10 PWS (5 - mild stuttering and 5 - severe stuttering) before and after the completion of Precision Fluency Shaping Program (PFSP). Even though post-therapy speech samples were almost free of disfluencies, raters perceived them as significantly less natural.

There is scientific literature ascertaining the establishment of a stutter-free natural sounding speech in PWS as a consequence of stuttering intervention programs. Onslow, Costa, Andrews, Harrison and Packman (1996) evaluated speech naturalness of PWS who underwent prolonged speech treatment, on various occasions up to 12 months post-therapy. Speech naturalness scores during post therapy were comparable to the scores of normal speakers. Post-treatment normal or near normal speech rates were associated with lower, more natural scores. Ingham, Kilgo, Ingham, Moglia, Belknap and Sanchez (2001) reported that PWS showed improved naturalness after the stuttering treatment program that trained PWS to reduce the frequency of short phonation interval during a conversational speech sample across speaking tasks and conditions known as Modifying Phonation Intervals (MPI). This treatment successfully established and maintained stutter-free natural-sounding speech.

Conversely, several researches have also shown that AAF need not necessarily result in abnormally slow or unnatural sounding speech (Stuart, Kalinowski, Rastatter, Saltuklaroglu & Dayalu, 2004; Armson & Kiefte, 2008). Stuart et al. (2004) found that the speech of PWS was judged to be more natural while they were wearing a Speech Easy device which delivered both DAF and FAF, compared to without the device. Stuart and Kallinowski (2004) investigated the effect of PFSP therapy and AAF on the perception of speech naturalness of PWS. The results revealed that the speech of PWS under AAF was judged to be significantly more natural than speech under MAF and speech produced during FAF condition was rated as more natural sounding than that produced under DAF. PWS having a mild degree of disfluencies were judged to have more natural sounding speech than those with severe degree under AAF. These findings support the argument that AAF benefits PWS through a reduction of stuttering with a gain in perceived speech naturalness. Similar results were reported by Stuart, Kalinowski, Saltuklaroglun and Guntupalli (2006) in a study examining the effect of AAF using in-the-ear device on the speech of PWS. Naive listeners rated the naturalness of reading and monologue speech samples of PWS, obtained with and without the device, at initial fitting, after 4 months and at 12 months follow-up. Feedback delivered encompassed both DAF and FAF. Speech samples produced with the device for both reading and monologue were rated to be significantly more natural compared to those without the device. Speech naturalness ratings were significantly better for the samples at 12 months follow-up than at the initial and 4-month period. The study results by Borsel and Eeckhout (2008) revealed that the speech samples from typically fluent speakers sounded more natural as compared to the speech samples from PWS speaking under DAF.

Determining naturalness has significant implication in a clinical context that makes use of unusual speech patterns such as prolonged or rhythmic speech, particularly for measuring and transforming speech quality during stuttering intervention. From a clinical perspective, it is imperative to understand as to what degree changes under AAF or other fluency enhancing techniques influence speech naturalness. It is a finding filled with possibilities for stuttering treatment research. Naturalness scores could be used not only to evaluate speech quality but also to modify speech quality. Speech naturalness scores might be used as functional contingencies to modify the post-therapy speech quality in PWS.

Despite the fact that the speech naturalness of treated PWS is a frequently voiced concern in the stuttering therapy literature, there are only very few studies that have investigated the impact of fluency enhancing techniques on speech naturalness. Divergent findings reported by these studies question the effectiveness of stuttering treatment techniques in establishing a natural sounding stutter-free speech. There are many individuals with stuttering who are unable to maintain fluency under prolongation or other evidence based procedures. For them often the wearable devices with DAF, FAF, and MAF in isolation or combination are recommended. There are limited studies comparing the naturalness of speech under different types of AAF, at different settings or under oral sensory feedback conditions. There are no studies which

have investigated the effect of AAF and TOA on the speech naturalness in PWS compared to PWNS. It is well known fact that PWNS are highly disfluent under DAF and other AAF conditions while PWS fare better. It would be interesting to see what naturalness parameters are affected under different condition in both groups. Such study would provide better insight into the theoretical and clinical aspects of AAF therapies. Hence, the present study was undertaken as a part of a larger project with an aim to investigate the effect of AAF and altered oro-sensory feedback (TOA) on speech naturalness in PWS compared to PWNS. The specific objectives were to investigate the effect of various conditions on speech naturalness in PWS compared to PWNS under;(i) DAF across different delay times (150, 200 & 250 ms), (ii) FAF across different FAF settings (+1 & -1 octave), (iii) MAF, (iv) temporary oral anaesthetization (TOA), and (v) v. across AAF and TOA conditions

Materials and Methods

Participants

The study included two groups of adult male participants within the age range of 18-30 years. The first group comprised of 25 PWS, 16 diagnosed as having moderate stuttering and 9 diagnosed with severe stuttering. The second group consisted of 25 age and gender matched fluent speakers (PWNS).

The participants in the clinical group were diagnosed by qualified speech language pathologists (SLPs) based on Stuttering Severity Instrument III (Riley, 1994). All the participants were informally screened to rule out any associated hearing, psychological or neurological problems. They were required to have a minimum educational qualification of tenth standard pass and native speakers of Kannada.

Materials

The materials used for the study comprised of; (i) DAF/FAF Assistant software version 1.1 for the presentation of Delayed Auditory Feedback (DAF) and Frequency Altered Feedback (FAF) at different settings, (ii) Computerized Speech Lab (module) software with Auditory Feedback Tools option to provide Masking Auditory Feedback (MAF), (iii) Xylocaine spray containing lidocaine topical aerosol 10% for providing temporary oral anesthesia (TOA) for altering the oral sensory feedback, (iv) Multidimensional Speech Naturalness scale (Kanchan & Savithri, 1997) for rating the naturalness of the speech sample, and (v) Sony HD Video recording equipment to video record speech samples, (vi) Different reading passages for different conditions, (vii) SPSS software for data entry and analysis, (viii) A checklist developed to collect demographic and other relevant information, and (ix) Stuttering Severity Instrument (SSI III; Riley, 1994).

Procedure

The participants were explained about the procedure of the study and an informed consent was obtained from all the participants before the commencement of the study. General demographic data was obtained from all the participants. In addition, stuttering onset related information was collected from PWS and stuttering severity instrument was administered.

The participants were seated in an acoustically treated room and speech samples were obtained from each participant. Baseline for monologue speech was recorded initially which was followed by various altered feedback conditions that were counterbalanced across the participants. For the masking auditory feedback condition, 70 dB SPL white noise was delivered using auditory feedback tools option in Computerized Speech Lab (CSL-4500). The effect of DAF was investigated with the delays of 150, 200 and 250 milliseconds, and FAF was used in two frequency shifts of +1 and -1 units in octaves. DAF/FAF Assistant (windows version 1.1 from Artefactsoft) software was used to deliver DAF and FAF. Further, oral anesthetization was used to eliminate oral sensory feedback which was administered by the otolaryngologist with Xylocaine spray containing lidocaine topical aerosol 10% anesthesia. The participants were asked to narrate stories or events to obtain the spontaneous speech sample across eight different conditions. The speech samples under normal and different feedback conditions were video recorded using Sony HD Handycam recorder.

The video-recorded speech samples were edited to obtain a one minute fluent speech samples for each of the eight conditions (baseline and altered feedback) from all the participants (50*8=400 samples). This was randomized and given to three post-graduate SLPs, who were native speakers of Kannada. The SLPs were kept blind to the objectives of the study. They were instructed to judge all the samples for naturalness using Multidimensional Speech Naturalness Scale (Kanchan & Savithri, 1997). This scale is based on 7 different fluency parameters (rate, continuity, effort, stress, intonation and rhythm, articulation and breathing pattern) to be rated on a two-point rating scale as natural and unnatural.

The ratings obtained were tabulated and statistically analyzed using SPSS software (version 21). The ratings of 7 fluency parameters were combined to obtain a total score. This total score was used as a measure of naturalness. Differences in speech naturalness parameters between PWNS and PWS



Figure 1: Mean naturalness scores under baseline, AAF and TOA conditions in PWS and PWNS for spontaneous speech task. Note. DAF1-150 ms; DAF2-200 ms; DAF3-250 ms; FAF1-+1 octave; FAF2- -1 octave; MAF- 70 dB white noise

across different AAF conditions for the total scores were analyzed using Mann-Whitney test. Friedman's test was used to check the significance across groups and Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to find significant difference in speech naturalness between specific groups. Inter and intra judge reliability was obtained for 10% of the sample after a gap of one week.

Results and Discussion

The total scores obtained for each participant on all the parameters based on the average ratings by the 3 judges were compiled for comparison across groups and conditions. The speech naturalness of PWS and PWNS across baseline and different feedback conditions is depicted in Figure 1. It can be noted that speech of PWNS was highly natural compared to that of PWS irrespective of feedback condition, in spite of variations in their fluency and rate of speech. The overall ratings ranged from 7.29 to 7.71 for PWNS whereas it was from 1.97 to 2.48 in PWS. The differences were highly significant at 0.01 level for all the conditions. The results are in consonance with that of Borsel and Eeckhout (2008), which revealed that the speech samples from typically fluent speakers were considered as more natural sounding as compared to the speech samples from PWS speaking under DAF.

Table 1 shows the average ratings of naturalness by the 3 judges for baseline and different AAF and TOA conditions between PWNS and PWS groups along with 'p' values.

The results of Mann Whitney test revealed a significant difference between PWS and PWNS at 0.01 level. The different feedback conditions within PWS and PWNS were compared. The results of Friedman test indicated a significant difference across different feedback conditions in PWNS [$\chi^2(7) = 24.98$, $p \leq 0.05$], while there was no significant difference in speech naturalness across different feedback conditions in PWS [$\chi^2(7) = 7.39$, $p \leq 0.05$]. Further, Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to find significant difference between specific conditions in PWNS, and the results (table 2) indicated a significant difference between baseline and FAF2, and between baseline and TOA condition. However, there was no significant difference observed between baseline and three DAF conditions, MAF and FAF1 conditions. Findings imply that reduction in frequency and oral sensory feedback had a significant effect in PWNS group.

Table 1: Mean speech naturalness rating across baseline and different feedback conditions

Conditions	PWNS	PWS	p
Baseline	7.71	2.37	0.01**
DAF1	7.59	2.12	0.01**
DAF2	7.62	2.02	0.01**
DAF3	7.47	2.23	0.01**
FAF1	7.53	1.97	0.01**
FAF2	7.29	2.76	0.01**
MAF	7.53	2.48	0.01**
TOA	7.43	2.32	0.01**

Note. DAF1-150 ms; DAF2-200 ms; DAF3-250 ms; FAF1-+1 octave; FAF2- -1 octave; MAF-70 dB white noise

The results of this study were in agreement with Martin, Haroldson and Triden (1984). The speech of PWS was rated as significantly more unnatural than that of normal speakers, regardless of speaking under NAF or DAF. There was no significant difference between the naturalness ratings of the speech samples from PWS under NAF compared to DAF in spite of the finding that the samples under DAF had no instances of stuttering. The findings imply that the naturalness may not only be

induced by changing the feedback condition, but also by several other factors. However, the findings of this study was not in agreement with findings of few other studies (Stuart et al., 2004; Armson & Kiefte, 2008) which stated that AAF does not necessarily result in abnormally slow or unnatural sounding speech.

From this study it can be noted that PWNS exhibited highly natural sounding speech under all the eight conditions which is surprising since AAF conditions are known to change various fluency measures in normal individuals. PWS had poor naturalness ranging between 2 to 3 on an eight point scale under all AAF and TOA conditions. The results indicate that PWS may have difficulty with fluency parameters such as rate, effort, stress, intonation, rhythm and breathing patterns even in their fluent utterances. This is in support with the study by Borsel and Eeckhout (2008), who reported that the speech samples from typically fluent speakers were considered as more natural sounding as compared to the speech samples from PWS speaking under DAF. However, among PWS, FAF2 and MAF conditions were slightly better in terms of speech naturalness than other conditions though not significant. This is in partial agreement with Stuart and Kallinowski (2004) who noted that speech produced during FAF condition was rated as more natural sounding than that produced under DAF. However, they observed that the speech of PWS under AAF was judged to be significantly more natural than speech under MAF.

Table 2: Results of Wilcoxon signed rank test for speech naturalness across feedback conditions in PWNS

Across conditions	|z|	p
MAF vs. Baseline	1.08	0.28
DAF1 vs. Baseline	0.00	1.00
DAF2 vs. Baseline	0.10	0.93
DAF3 vs. Baseline	1.30	0.19
FAF1 vs. Baseline	1.90	0.06
FAF2 vs. Baseline	2.61	0.01**
TOA vs. Baseline	2.61	0.02*
DAF1 vs. DAF2	0.51	0.61
DAF1 vs. DAF3	1.07	0.29
DAF 2 vs. DAF3	1.50	0.14
FAF1 vs. FAF2	1.84	0.07

Note. DAF1-150 ms; DAF2-200 ms; DAF3-250 ms; FAF1-+1 octave; FAF2- -1 octave; MAF- 70 dB white noise

Inter-judge and intra judge reliability for speech naturalness across different feedback conditions

The inter judge reliability was determined by comparing the speech naturalness ratings of three SLPs for different fluency parameters (rate, continuity, effort, stress, intonation and rhythm, articulation and breathing pattern) along with overall naturalness (totaling to eight) for 10% of the samples. The inter judge reliability using Cronbach's alpha test ranged from 0.5 to 0.9 for PWS and 0.5 to 0.8 for PWNS which indicated fair inter judge reliability. 10% of the samples were re-rated by all the three judges for checking intra-rater reliability. Intra-rater reliability ranged from 0.6 to 0.8 for PWS and 0.7 to 0.9 for PWNS, indicating fair intra rater reliability.

Conclusions

The present study showed that PWS exhibited poor speech naturalness under all the altered auditory feedback and TOA conditions, although fluent speech segments were considered for rating whereas PWNS exhibited very natural sounding speech in all the eight conditions. This was in spite of considering different settings of DAF and FAF, MAF and TOA. This is surprising since AAF conditions are known to induce disfluencies in normals and fluent speech in PWS. Although the samples under different conditions and those of PWS and PWNS were completely randomized, SLPs could still differentiate the naturalness on different parameters which is quite significant. The study results do not support any one of the AAF procedures over the others in inducing natural sounding speech, although this is not based on training using AAF procedures. Although ratings were obtained on 7 naturalness parameters, for the sake of convenience they were averaged. Analyses based on individual parameters would have provided information regarding the importance of each in contributing to the naturalness under different conditions. The SLPs need to measure speech naturalness under the recommended conditions and train them in improving naturalness with respect to specific parameters that are affected. The clinicians should not only focus on the reduction in stuttering behavior but also aim at establishment of a natural sounding speech which results in the success of the intervention program.

Conflict of Interest: NIL

Source of Funding: The paper is the by product of 3 years project (No: SR/CSI/151/2011(G) dated 20/06/2017) funded by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

References

Armson, J., & Kiefte, M. (2008). The effect of SpeechEasy on stuttering frequency, speech rate and speech naturalness. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 33,* 120-134.

Armson, J., & Stuart, A. (1998). Effect of extended exposure to frequency altered feedback on stuttering during reading and monologue. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 41,* 479-490.

Block, S., Ingham, R. J., & Bench, R. J. (1996). The effects of the Edinburgh Masker on stuttering. *Australian Journal of Human Communication Disorders, 24,* 11-19.

Borsel, W., & Eeckhout, H. (2008). The speech naturalness of people who stutter speaking under delayed auditory feedback as perceived by different groups of listeners. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 33*(3), 241-251.

Costello-Ingham, J. C. (1993). Current status of stuttering and behavior modification-I: Recent trends in the application of behavior modification in children and adults. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 18,* 27-55.

Curlee, R. F. (1993). Evaluating treatment efficacy for adults: Assessing stuttering disability. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 18,* 319-331.

Franken, C. F., Boves, L., Peters, H. F. M., & Webster, R. L (1992). Perceptual evaluation of the speech before and after fluency shaping therapy. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 17,* 223-241.

Fukawa, T., Yoshioko, H., Ozawa, E., & Yoshida, S. (1988). Difference of susceptibility to delayed auditory feedback between stutterers and nonstutterers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 31,* 475-479.

Gracco, V. L. (1991). Sensorimotor mechanisms in speech motor control. In H.F.M. Peters, W. Hulstijn, & C.W. Starkweather (Eds.), Speech motor control and stuttering. New York: Elsevier.

Gracco, V. L., & Abbs, J. H. (1989). Sensorimotor characteristics of speech motor sequences. *Experimental Brain Research, 75,* 586-598.

Hargrave, S., Kalinowski, J., Stuart, A., Armson, J., & Jones, K. (1994). Effect of frequency altered feedback on stuttering frequency at normal and fast speech rates. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 37,* 1313-1319.

Howell, P. (1990). Changes in voice level caused by several forms of altered auditory feedback in fluent speakers and stutterers. *Language and Speech, 33,* 325-338.

Howell, P. (2004). Effects of delayed auditory feedback and frequency-shifted feedback on speech control and some potentials for future development of prosthetic aids for stammering. *Stammering Research, 1,* 31-46.

Howell, P., El-Yaniv, N., & Powell, D. J. (1987). Factors affecting fluency in stutterers when speaking under altered auditory feedback. In H. Peters & W. Hulstijin (Eds.), *Speech motor dynamics in stuttering* **(Please Provide page numbers)**. New York: Springer Press.

Howell, P., Wingfield, T., & Johnson, M. (1988). Characteristics of the speech of stutterers during normal and altered auditory feedback. *Proceedings Speech 88,* 3,1069-1076.

Ingham, R. J., Gow, M., & Costello, J. M. (1985). Stuttering and speech naturalness: Some additional data. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 50,* 217-219.

Ingham, R. J., Kilgo, M., Ingham, J. C., Moglia, R., Belknap, H., & Sanchez, T. (2001). Evaluation of a stuttering treatment based on reduction of short phonation intervals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 44,* 1229-1244.

Ingham, R. J., & Packman, A. C. (1978). Perceptual assessment of normalcy of speech following stuttering therapy. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 21,* 63-73.

Kalinowski, J., Noble, S., Armson, J., & Stuart A. (1994). Naturalness ratings of the pretreatment and post-treatment speech of adults with mild and severe stuttering. *American Journal of Speech Language Pathology, 3,* 61-66

Kalinowski, J., Stuart, A., Sark, S., & Armson, J. (1996). Stuttering amelioration at various auditory feedback delays and speech rates. *European Journal of Disorders of Communication, 31,* 259-269.

Kanchan, S. & Savithri, S. R. (1997). *Multi dimensional speech naturalness scale for stutterers.* Dissertation Abstracts of AIISH, Mysore.

Keyhoe, T. D. (1998). Computers and electronic devices for stuttering therapy. In E.C. Healey & H.F.M. Peters (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd World Congress on Fluency Disorders* (pp. 262-266). Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.

Lechner, B. K. (1970). The effects of delayed auditory feedback and masking on the fundamental frequency of stutterers and non-stutterers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 33,* 343-353.

Macleod, J., Kalinowski, J., Stuart, A., & Armson, J. (1995). Effect of single and combined altered auditory feedback on stuttering frequency at two speech rates. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 28,* 217-228.

Martin, R., Haroldson, S., & Triden, K. (1984). Stuttering and speech naturalness. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 49,* 53-58.

Natke, U., Grosser, J., & Kalveram, K. T. (2001). Fluency, fundamental frequency, and speech rate under frequency-shifted auditory feedback in stuttering and non stuttering persons. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 26*(3), 227-241.

Onslow, M., Costa, L., Andrews, C., Harrison, E., & Packman, A. (1996). Speech outcomes of a prolonged-speech treatment for stuttering. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 39,* 734-749.

Onslow, M., & Ingham, R. J (1987). Speech quality measurement and the management of stuttering. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 52,* 2-17.

Perkins, W. H. (1979). Psychoanalysis to disco ordination In Controversies about Stuttering Therapy, H. H. Gregory University Park: Baltimore.

Riley, G. (1994). The Stuttering Severity Instrument for adults and children (SSI-3) (3rd ed.). Austin, TX: PRO-ED

Runyan, C. M., & Adams, M. R. (1978). Perceptual study of the speech of 'successfully therapeutized' stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 3,* 25-39.

Runyan, C. M., & Adams, M. R. (1979). Unsophisticated judges perceptual evaluations of the speech of 'successfully treated' stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 4,* 29-38.

Sanders, W. C., Gramlich, C., & Levine, A. (1981). Naturalness of synthesized speech. In P. Suppes (Ed.). *University level computer assisted instructions at Stanford* (1968-80), 487-501. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Smith, A., Sadagopan, N., Walsh, B., & Weber-Fox, C. (2010). Phonological Complexity Affects Speech Motor Dynamics in Adults Who Stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 35,* 1-18.

Soderberg, G. A. (1959). *A study of the effects of delayed auditory side-tone on four aspects of stutterer's speech during oral reading and spontaneous speech.* Dissertation (Doctoral) - University Microfilms, The Ohio State University, Ohio.

Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., Armson, J., Stenstrom, R., & Jones, K. (1996). Fluency effect of frequency alterations of plus/minus one-half and one-quarter octave shifts in auditoryfeedback of people who stutter. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 39,* 396-401.

Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., & Rastatter, M. P. (1997). Effect of monaural and binaural altered auditory feedback on stuttering frequency. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 101,* 3806-3809.

Stuart, A., & Kalinowski, J. (2004). The perception of speech naturalness of post-therapeutic and altered auditory feedback speech of adults with mild and severe

stuttering. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica, 56,* 347-357.

Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., Rastatter, M., Saltuklaroglu, T., & Dayalu, V. (2004). Investigations of the impact of altered auditory feedback in-the-ear devices on the speech of people who stutter: Initial fitting and 4-month follow-up. International *Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 39,* 93-119.

Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., Saltuklaroglu, T., & Guntupalli, V. K. (2006). Investigations of the impact of altered auditory feedback in-the-ear devices on the speech of people who stutter: One-year follow-up. *Disability and Rehabilitation, 28,* 757-765.

Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., Rastatter, M. P., & Lynch, K. (2002). Effect of delayed auditory feedback on normal speakers at two speech rates. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 111,* 2237-2241.

Sutton, S., Roehrig, W.C., & Kramer, J. (1963). Delayed auditory feedback of speech in schizophrenics and normals. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 105*(15), 832-844.

Uthappa, A. G. V., Shailat, P., & Geetha, Y. V. (2010). *Effect of oral anesthetization on fluency.* Paper presented at the 42nd India Speech and Hearing Association conference held in Mangalore.

Van Borsel, J., & Eeckhout, H. (2008). The speech naturalness of people who stutter speaking under delayed auditory feedback as perceived by different groups of listeners. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 33,*241-251.

Van Borsel, J., Reunes, G., & Van den Bergh, N. (2003). Delayed auditory feedback in the treatment of stuttering: Clients as consumers. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 38*(2), 119-129.

Wingate, M. E. (1976). *Stuttering: Theory and Treatment.* Irvington: New York.