

**DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS  
"LISTENERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUTTERERS"  
(LATS)**

**GOPEE KRISHNAN  
Register No. 02SH0009**

A dissertation submitted in part fulfillment for  
the degree of M. Sc, (Speech and Hearing),  
University of Mysore,  
Mysore.

**ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF SPEECH AND HEARING,  
MANASAGANGOTHRI,  
MYSORE-570006.**

MAY- 2004

*Dedicated to*

**MY AMMA**

*for her support and affection*

**&**

**MY GUIDE**

*for his unmatched guidance*

## **CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled '**DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS "LISTENERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUTTERERS" (LATS)**' is a bonafide work in part fulfillment for the degree of Master of Science (Speech and Hearing) of the student (**Reg. No. 02SH0009**).



**Prof. M. Jayaram**

**DIRECTOR**

All India Institute of Speech and  
Hearing  
Mysore-570006

Mysore  
May, 2004.

## **CERTIFICATE**

This is **to** certify that the dissertation entitled '**DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS "LISTENERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUTTERERS" (LATS)**' has been prepared under my supervision and guidance. **It is also** certified that this has not been submitted earlier in any other University for **the award** of any diploma or degree courses.



**GUIDE**

**Prof. M. Jayaram**

**DIRECTOR**

All India Institute of Speech and  
Hearing, Mysore-570006

Mysore

May, 2004.

## **DECLARATION**

This dissertation entitled '**DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS "LISTENERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUTTERERS" (LATS)**' is **the** result of my own study under the guidance of **Prof. M. Jayaram**, Director, All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore and not been submitted earlier at any other University for the award of any degree or diploma.

**Mysore**

**May, 2004.**

**Reg. No 02SH0009**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*/ extend my sincere thanks to **Prof M. Jayaram**, Director, All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, for guiding me in this study. Sir, you make me 'wordless' to convey my gratitude to you. But I know that I mean it from my heart. I'm proud to be a student of yours and thank you for everything.*

*I thank all **my subjects** for kindly and patiently participating in this study.*

*I thank **Dr. S. Venkatesan** for his valuable support and guidance throughout the course of this project.*

*Thanks to **Dr. S. R. Savithri, Dr. Y. V. Geetha** and all **other staff** in the Dept. of Speech Pathology and Speech Language Sciences who helped me in the initial phase of my study.*

*I thank **Dr. G. Jayaram, Mr. Keerthi, and Mr. Ganeshiah** for their translation work.*

***Amma, Achan** and **P.K**, I know that **I need not** mention your names here. Your all are well above this to me to be mentioned here. Thank you for your affection and inspiration which is driving me forward everyday.*

*At last the day and time have come, dear **Seetha**, as you were waiting for! **I need not write much about you here, since it's beyond the scope of this chapter!** Thank you **for all** your affection and inspiration.*

*Now, it's my time to thank all the **22 'senses'** and the other **2 'nons'** in my class. Thank you all.*

*Special thanks to **Varghese, Bina(!) Kant, Shivu** and **Vijay** for your kind co-operation and friendship. Thank you very much..*

*I thank **all my friends** in **AllSH** for making me feel that I was 'one among you'. Thank you all.*

*I just cannot afford to forget my dear **friend** whom **I drive** everyday! (Hey, it's none but my bike, ok!). She needs a special mention here for carrying me wherever I wanted to be..*

*Finally, I thank that **Devine Power** whom I trust with for making me what I'm today. Thank you.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	CONTENTS	PAGE NUMBER
I	INTRODUCTION	1-5
II	REVIEW	6-12
III	METHOD	13-18
IV	RESULTS	19-25
V	DISCUSSION	26-30
VI	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	31-32
VII	REFERENCE	33-35
	APPENDIX-A	
	APPENDIX-B	
	APPENDIX - C	

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Table 3.1	Subject groups, number (N), mean age and duration of interaction with stutterers.	<b>14</b>
Table 3.2	Categorization of raw data into interpretive norms using normalized (Z) scores.	<b>18</b>
Table 4.1	Number of subjects (N), mean scores, and standard deviation of Part 'A' & 'B' of the Instrument.	<b>19</b>
Table 4.2	Cronbach's alpha coefficient for Part 'A' of the Instrument.	<b>21</b>
Table 4.3	Cronbach's alpha coefficient for Part 'B' of the Instrument.	<b>22</b>
Table 4.4	Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient for test-retest reliability for Part 'A' & 'B' of the Instrument.	<b>23</b>
Table 4.5	Number of subjects (N), mean scores, standard deviation, and t-value for total population, relatives, teachers & friends.	<b>24</b>
Table 4.6	Independent and dependent subject groups, F-ratios and significance levels for Part 'A' of the Instrument.	<b>24</b>
Table 4.7	Independent and dependent subject groups, F-ratios and significance levels for Part 'B' of the Instrument.	<b>25</b>
Table 4.8	Interpretive Norms for total population	<b>25</b>



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

'Attitudes' are one of the most useful concepts that psychologists have evolved to deal with organization of experiences and behaviour. Attitudes, being hypothetical constructs, refer to something that cannot be directly observed, and are inferred indirectly from their effects on behavioural actions which are directly observable. In simple terms, attitudes are not directly observable, but their effects are observable and measurable. It is a system of organization of experience and behaviour related to a particular object or event. According to McDavid & Harari (1974), every attitude includes three components; a cognitive component (idea), an affective component (feelings and emotions), and a behavioural component (judgments or actions).

The act of communication happens always in the social context, involving one or more listeners. Hence, communication disorders are always entangled with the attitudes of listeners towards that disorder and the person who possesses the disorder. Such attitudes are influenced by the level of adequacy of communication. People with communication disabilities, such as hearing impairment or cerebral palsy, may arouse discomfort in their listeners (Yurker, 1988). Stuttering, as a communication disability, elicits an especially negative personality stereotype maintained by different groups of people (Weisel & Spektor, 1998).

Attitudes of different group of listeners towards stuttering has been a major area of study in the field of stuttering research. The literature shows that stutterers are stereotyped as submissive, nonassertive, persons who are tense, insecure and fearful

(Woods, 1978). Attribution of such negative personality traits seems to be correlated with the degree of observed stuttering behaviour (Silverman, Gazzalo & Peterson, 1990). Perters and Guitar (1991) have indicated that changing the negative attitudes of people who stutter could be a major focus in the treatment for stuttering as listeners seems to play a vital role in shaping the attitudes of people who stutter about themselves as people and communicators. Equally important is to identify the rampant misinformation and bias among potential conversational partners of stutterers including speech-language pathologists and to bring change in these persons (Cooper & Cooper, 1985).

From a practical point of view, it is plausible that the attitude of listeners towards stutterers and stuttering can be a primary factor in precipitating maintenance of stuttering behaviour (Van Riper, 1982). This is true not only for persons who have undergone stuttering intervention program, but also for those who have successfully achieved fluency levels of more than 95% in clinical settings. The listeners' negative attitudes can remain a threat to clients and their problem. Therefore, stuttering intervention programs should focus not only on achieving a desired rate of fluency in the client's speech, but also on changing the negative attitudes of significant others who interact with stutterers.

Stuttering is a speech problem in the social context. Though the attitudes of speech pathologists, parents, employees and other sections of the society towards stutterers have been investigated, not much attention has been focused on the attitudes and the feelings of the normal listeners, in general, towards stutterers in a speaking context. Normal listeners react to stuttering in a speaking situation in different ways.

The reactions could be verbal or nonverbal in their manifestations. Clinical experience suggests that one of the conspicuous ways in which normal speakers react to stutterers is to suggest to the stutterers to speak slowly. Other suggestions include asking the stutterers to think before they speak, to take a deep breath before speaking etc. Some normal speakers avoid talking to stutterers, or will be indifferent to communication situations with stutterers. The nonverbal expressions could range from 'turning away' to a show of an 'expression of concern' to an 'expression of annoyance'. Information on the attitude of normal speakers to a communication situation with stutterers will go a long way not only in guiding stutterers develop coping strategies, but also to educate the public on the best ways of dealing with the stutterer's speech.

### **Purpose of the Study**

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers in a speaking situation.

### **Need for the Study**

It is clear from the introduction above that stuttering, as a communication disability, is perceived negatively by a majority of people who do not stutter. Stutterers, as a group, are perceived to be different from nonstutterers (Shapiro, 1999). Lass et al (1989) suggest that speech-language pathologists themselves view stutterers somewhat negatively. While the speech-language pathologists' opinion will have a significant bearing on the management strategy they adopt for stutterers, the negative opinion that nonstutterers have for stutterers or stuttering will be a significant impediment for the stutterers in coping with their problem in their day-to-day life situations.

Quite different from the above, but related to, is the perception of nonstutterers of a speaking situation with stutterers. The reactions of nonstutterers to stutterers in a speaking situation would have significant impact on the ways stutterers are able to handle the speaking situation. A negative attitude, or reaction on the part of the normal speakers to stutterers' speech, in any situation, may mean more disruption in the speech of stutterers and breakdown of the communication situation. Speech-language pathologists need information on the reactions and feelings of normal speakers towards stutterers' speech in a speaking situation for several reasons:

1. Such information guide speech-language pathologists on some of the variables to be attended to in the management process.
2. Such information will help speech-language pathologists to train their stutterers on what to expect in a given speaking situation and more importantly, on how best to resolve these. In other words, speech-language pathologists can train their stutterers on coping strategies.
3. Such information will help speech-language pathologists to educate the public on stuttering and the problems their stutterers have in a speaking situation. After all stuttering is a problem in the social context.

Though some studies have been reported in the Western literature on the attitudes of different group of people have on stutterers and stuttering, such studies have not been carried out in the Indian context. Stutterers as well as normal speakers need to be educated on the attitudes each group has about the other. Such information is very valuable in the management of stutterers particularly in counselling them.

## **Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the present study were to

- a) develop an instrument to investigate the attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers in a speaking situation,
- b) compare the attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers with their perception of the attitudes of others, and
- c) to develop normative data on the attitude of normal subjects towards stutterers in a speaking situation.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Stuttering has been and continues to remain as the most enigmatic entity in the field of speech pathology. Stuttering is just more than dysfluent speech. It involves the listeners' and the stutterers' perception of the stuttered speech. This is evident from Bloodstien's (1990) definition of stuttering. He reported that stuttering has traditionally been defined in three ways. The first definition pertains to the observers' perceptions, that is, stuttering is whatever observers or the conversational partners hear or see it to be. The second definition is a straight forward and standard dictionary definition including the descriptive terms such as repetition, prolongation, struggle etc. The third definition emphasizes the perceptions of people who stutter. Bloodstien's tri-modal definition is quite noteworthy. A close look at this definition reveals how important the perceptions of people in characterizing the phenomenon of stuttering, no matter it be a listener or a stutterer himself

Zanna and Rempel (1988) defined attitude as a positive or negative evaluation of an object or an event. So it essentially contains perceptions as one of its elementary components. In one way, our perceptions are influenced by our attitudes, In this context, Bloodstien's definition of stuttering needs to be considered in further detail. The first and third definitions essentially focus on the attitudes of listeners and stutterers towards stuttering.

There have been a large number of studies in the literature to support this viewpoint. Woods (1978) and Bloodstien (1995) reported that listener attitudes are

particularly important for people who stutter because stuttering behavior is affected by listeners' reactions. This fact is even supported by stutterers themselves (Turnbridge, 1994). In the light of these findings, it can be inferred that a significant amount of reduction in stuttering behavior can be achieved by changing the attitude of listeners who interact with stutterers.

There are reports in the literature of a large number of studies carried out on diverse populations which show the necessity for change in attitude towards stuttering. La Follette (1956) studied certain traits and attitudes of mothers and fathers of stuttering children to those of non-stuttering children, using a battery of self-administered tests. The results showed a greater submissive tendency in parents of stuttering children. Compared to mother, the father of stuttering children showed less satisfaction, personal adjustment, greater tendencies towards submissiveness and greater reaction against stuttering.

Crowe and Cooper (1977) conducted a study on parental attitudes towards and knowledge of stuttering using the Parental Attitude Towards Stuttering (PATS) Inventory and the Alabama Stuttering Knowledge (ASK) Test. The results showed that the parents of non-stuttering children displayed more desirable attitude towards stuttering and more accurate knowledge about stuttering than did the parents of stutterers.

Feldman (1976) investigated 'disclosure' pattern in parents of stuttering children and reported that parents of stuttering children differed from those of non-stuttering

children. The study also revealed that parents of stuttering children were unwilling to disclose certain items.

McDonald and Frick (1975) studied the store clerks' reaction towards stuttering. They reported that though the feelings of impatience, amusement, and repulsion were only rarely encountered, feelings of surprise, embarrassment, pity, curiosity and sympathy were often experienced by the listeners with varying degrees of frequency.

Stuttering is also found to have significant effect on employment (Hurst and Cooper, 1983a). Their results revealed that though the employers rejected the opinion that stuttering interferes with job performance, they agreed that stuttering decreases employment opportunity and interferes with promotion possibilities. The employees with stuttering were considered to be occupationally less competent than nonstutterers in the same occupation (Silverman & Paynter, 1990).

Hurst and Cooper (1983b) investigated the vocational rehabilitation counsellors' attitude towards stuttering. The results revealed that counselors were found to perceive stuttering as being significantly vocationally handicapping, but amenable to therapy. The authors believed that stutterers were good candidates for vocational rehabilitation.

Dorsey and Guenther (2000) conducted a study on the attitudes of college professors and students toward college students who stutter. The results of the study indicated that though the participants rated the students who stutter more on **the** personality trait than they rated the average college student, the professor participants rated the students more negatively than did the student participants.



Amazingly, speech-language pathologists are also found to have certain negative attitude towards stuttering and stutterers. This has been reported in a large number of studies. Silverman (1982) studied the speech-language clinicians' and University students' impressions of women and girls who stutter, using a 47-scale semantic differential form. The clinicians were found to have a strong stereotype of 'a girl who stutters' and the University students had 'a male who stutters'.

Cooper and Cooper (1985 & 1996) evaluated the changes in attitudes towards stuttering over a period of two decades. They reported in their first study (1985), that the clinicians were less likely to perceive stutterers as possessing psychologic disorders, or to any misconception about their problem or of their interpersonal relationships. However, a significant number of clinicians continued to entertain unsubstantiated beliefs on the personality of stutterers, their parents and the efficacy of early intervention with very young stutterers. From their second study, they reported several changes in attitudes over a period of 18 years. This included the rejection of concepts about parental casualty, dangers of early intervention and the possession of characteristic personality traits by the stutterers.

A cross-cultural study on clinicians' attitude towards stuttering was conducted by Cooper & Rustin (1985). Speech-language clinicians were included from United States and United Kingdom. The results showed that a significant number of both groups perceived stutterers as having characteristic personality traits, a feeling of inferiority, distorted perceptions of self and social situations.

Very recently, Crichton-Smith, Wright and Stackhouse (2003) compared the changing attitudes of speech-language therapists towards stuttering between 1985 and 2000. Though the results revealed that the therapists were positive towards some aspects of stuttering, the treatment remained a complex issue.

From the above review, it is quite apparent that normal listeners belonging to different professions and cultures hold very distinct negative attitudes and stereotypes about the personalities and competencies of the stutterers. These attitudes have a widespread influence on every phase of the stuttering, including intervention for it. Kraaimaat, Varnryckeghem and Dam-Baggen (2002) reported that people who stuttered displayed significantly higher levels of emotional tension or discomfort in social situations. They also reported a significantly lower frequency of social responses in stutterers compared to their non-stuttering peers. All these studies point to the necessity for changes in stuttering intervention strategies. Even after successful completion of stuttering therapy, the subject is exposed to the same social context which he had been exposed to prior to treatment. The attitudes and stereotypes of the listener would still be unfavorable to the stutterer. This further puts him into a difficult condition. Literature on relapse of stuttering indicates that many factors contribute to the outcome of formal treatment, negative reactions by listeners being one important factor.

### **Instruments Available in Western Context**

Over the past few decades, researchers have developed a variety of instruments to assess the attitudes of different sections of the community towards stutterers and stuttering in the Western culture. Ammons and Johnson (1944) developed an instrument (Test of Attitude Toward Stuttering) containing 45 items. This instrument used a Likert-

type rating ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' on a 5-point scale. Cooper in 1975, developed an inventory (Clinician Attitudes Toward Stuttering - CATS) to assess the attitudes of speech-language pathologists. This instrument consisted of 50 attitudinal statements regarding stuttering, stutterers, speech-language pathologists, parents of stutterers, and related issues. It used a 5-point Likert-type rating, ranging from strongly agree through undecided through strongly disagree. Woods and Williams (1976) developed a questionnaire consisting of 25 bipolar adjectives arranged in a semantic differential format. This bipolar scale was divided into seven intervals captioned 'very much, quite a bit, slightly, neutral, slightly, quite a bit, and very much' from the left to the right. Parental Attitude Towards Stuttering (PATS) Inventory developed by Crowe & Cooper (1977) consisted of 45 statements designed to assess parental attitudes towards stuttering. It uses a 5-point Likert-type rating ranging from strongly agree through undecided through strongly disagree. Hurst and Cooper (1983a) developed an instrument to assess the employers' attitudes towards stuttering (EATS). This included 7 items, using a 5-point Likert-type rating. Hurst and Cooper (1983b) developed an instrument to assess the attitudes of rehabilitation counsellors towards stuttering. Of the 40 items, the first 25 items were borrowed from Alabama Stuttering Knowledge (ASK) Test of Crowe & Cooper (1977) while the remaining were specifically designed for the target population. The items in the first part are designed to elicit 'true-false' type of responses while the second part uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' with 'undecided' in center.

### **Need for the Study**

The literature on attitudes towards stuttering shows the existence of negative attitudes in diverse populations. Though the attitudes are universal, they differ to some extent with different cultures (Cooper & Rustin, 1985). There have been no reported studies on the attitudes of normal speakers towards stutterers in the Indian context. A direct extrapolation of the results of similar studies from the Western population may result in erroneous conclusions. In addition to the investigation of attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers, it is also important to find out the attitudes of different subgroups of people towards stutterers because any stutterer lives with these people. Hence, the present study was undertaken.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

The main objective of the present study was to develop an instrument to investigate the attitude of normal listeners towards stutterers in a speaking situation.

The additional objectives of the study were to

- Ø compare the attitudes of subjects towards stutterers with what they perceive as the attitude of other normal listeners towards stutterers, and
- Ø develop normative data on the attitudes of normal subjects towards stutterers in a speaking situation.

#### **Subjects**

Three sets of subjects were selected for the study.

1. Set 1: The first set of subjects included ten speech-language pathologists, ten students of speech-language pathology and ten normal laymen. The speech-language pathologists had a minimum of five years of experience in diagnosing and treating individuals with stuttering. The students of speech-language pathology had four years of exposure to the field. The normal laymen had a minimum of three or more years of interaction with stutterers.
2. Set 2: The second set of subjects included ten speech-language pathologists and five students of speech-language pathology who fulfilled similar criteria as those in the first group.
3. Set 3: The third set of subjects were seventy-six normal listeners in the age range of twenty to fifty years having a minimum of three or more years of interaction with stutterers. All these subjects had minimum education of SSLC.

These subjects were classified into three subgroups, as shown in Table 3.1, based on their relationship with the stutterers.

Subject categories	Number (N)	Mean Age	Mean duration of interaction with stutterers
Relatives	14	37 years	12 years
Teachers	15	42 years	4 years
Friends	47	23 years	4 years
Total	76	34 years	7.1 years

Table 3.1: Subject groups, number (N), mean age and duration of interaction with stutterers

## **Procedure**

### **Development of the Instrument**

The instrument was developed in two phases. In the first phase, the instrument was developed by consulting subjects in Set 1 and through literature survey. The subjects were asked to list out the attitudes that speakers have towards stutterers in a speaking situation. The draft profile of the instrument was compiled following their suggestions and the literature survey. The initial instrument compiled had 25 items in it

In the second phase, the draft instrument of the first phase was presented to subjects in Set 2 who were asked to

- a) suggest additions and deletions to the instrument,
- b) judge the adequacy of the questions compiled in the instrument, and
- c) comment on the adequacy of the phrasing of the sentences and their understandability.

Following the suggestions of the subjects in Set 2, five questions were discarded, phrasing of some questions was modified, and a 20-item final instrument was arrived at (Appendix A). The face and content validity of the items was established in this manner.

The instrument was also made available in Kannada (Appendix B). The instrument, initially developed in English, was translated into Kannada by a linguist who was also a native speaker of the language. Both the English and Kannada versions of the instrument developed were given to 5 normal speakers of Kannada, who were proficient in both the languages (as determined from their educational level and professional employment) for their opinion on the translation of English items into Kannada. None of these subjects reported any variability in the content / meaning of the items in the two languages.

The emphasis of the instrument developed here was to focus on the attitudes that normal speakers have towards stutterers. There is an element of doubt in the validity of such reports because the person reporting brings certain subjectivity into his reports (perceived attitudes of others), and therefore, the intrinsic validity of such reports is somewhat suspect. Therefore, a second question was added to each item wherein the subjects were asked to report their personal opinion on the items. Thus each item in the instrument had two parts; part 'A' - wherein the speaker had to indicate what he perceives as the attitudes of other normal subjects towards stutterers; and part 'B', wherein the subjects had to report their own attitudes. The first part of the instrument measured the respondents' perceived attitude of other normal listeners towards stutterers in a speaking situation while the second part of the instrument

measured the respondent's own attitude towards the same. On the other hand, if the subjects had been asked to report only their attitudes (Part B), then there was the likelihood of subjects being more positive, because no one would accept, in the open, ones negative attitudes. Therefore, it was decided to get the responses of subjects on both parts. The subjects were asked to indicate their responses on both parts of each item on a 5-point rating scale as shown here:

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

Depending on the direction of the questions, 'strongly disagree' was given 5 points while 'strongly agree' was assigned 1 point on all but two items. As the directionality of item 3 & 15 were different with respect to the rest of the items in the instrument, the scoring was opposite ('strongly agree'- 5 points and 'strongly disagree'-1 point).

### **Administration of the Instrument**

The 20-item instrument was administered to 76 individuals who had interacted with stutterers for at least 3 years. Personal particulars of the respondents were recorded on a separate sheet (Appendix C). The respondents were instructed as follows:

"Please read each item carefully and answer to the same by putting an "X" mark in any of the boxes provided. An "X" mark in the boxes corresponding to the "strongly agree" means that you are totally agreeing with the given statement and a mark in the box corresponding to the "strongly disagree" means that you are totally disagreeing with the given statement A mark in the box corresponding to the "undecided" means that you are unable to decide whether you agree or



disagree with the particular statement, though you are aware of the fact presented in the statement. The box corresponding to "no opinion" should be marked only if you do not have any opinions on the given statement, or you do not want to answer".

The respondents were encouraged to ask questions or seek clarifications to make sure that they understand the items. There was no time limit imposed on the subjects to answer the items. Clarifications were also given if sought by the respondents while they were answering the items.

### **Scoring**

The instrument used a Likert method of scoring, from 1 to 5, on a 5-point rating scale, that varied from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' at the extremes with 'undecided' in the center. The scale also included a separate answer 'no opinion' to be used only if the subjects were unaware of, or did not want to comment about the given statement. The items rated as 'no opinion' were not assigned any points and such items were not considered in the statistical analysis.

### **Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of the instrument was estimated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is the most widely used measure of reliability. This describes how much each item is correlated with the other items in the instrument and thus reflects on the overall consistency of the instrument.

### **Test - Retest Reliability**

The instrument was readministered on 20 subjects after a period of a minimum 15 days from the date of initial administration. These subjects were randomly selected

from the original set of respondents (Set 3). The obtained data was compared with the results of the initial administration on the same subjects. A positive correlation indicates that the test-retest reliability of the instrument is high.

### **Concurrent Validity**

The subjects' scores on perceived attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers were compared with the ratings of his or her own attitudes towards stutterers.

### **Analysis**

The data was analyzed in two ways:

- a) Data of all the subjects as a group, and
- b) analysis of data from relatives, friends and teachers separately to see if the perception of any of these groups differed from the other.

### **Establishment of Norms**

Norms were established using the conventional criterion of converting raw scores to Z scores through normalization. The obtained Z scores were categorized into different groups using the conventional criteria as shown in Table 3.2.

Interpretive Description	SD Range (Z score)
Superior Attitude	> +2.00 (4.55%)
Above Average Attitude	+1.00 to+2.00 (27.18%)
Average Attitude	-1.00 to+1.00 (68.27%)
Below Average Attitude	-2.00 to-1.00 (27.18%)
Inferior Attitude	< -2.00 (4.55%)

Table 3.2: Categorization of raw data into interpretive norms using normalized (Z) scores.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

#### Experimental Version of the Instrument

A 25-item draft instrument was compiled based on a literature survey as well as the opinion of subjects in Set 1 (speech-language pathologists, students of speech-language pathology and laymen). However, based on the suggestions of subjects in Set 2, five items were deleted, and a final 20-item instrument was arrived at.

The instrument was administered on 76 subjects who had a minimum interaction of 3 years with stutterers. The ratings of the instrument were scored by assigning a value of 5 to 'strongly disagree', 4 to 'moderately disagree', 3 to 'undecided', 2 to 'moderately agree', and 1 to 'strongly agree' on all but two items. As the directionality of items 3 & 15 was different with respect to the rest of the items in the instrument, the scoring was opposite ('strongly agree'- 5 points and 'strongly disagree'- 1 point). The mean ratings of entire group are shown in Table 4.1 for part 'A' and part 'B' of each item.

	Part A	Part B
Total Number of Subjects (N)	76	76
Mean	51.02	63.88
Standard Deviation	10.03	11.02

Table 4.1: Number of subjects (N), mean scores, and standard deviation of part 'A' and 'B' of the Instrument

The results of Table 4.1 showed that normal speakers seem to have significantly different attitudes compared to what they perceive as the attitude of others. Normal speakers tend to think that others in their context have a more negative attitude than they themselves.

The items rated as 'no opinion' were not assigned any points. There were only 25 instances of 'no opinion' (out of 20 items x 76 subjects = 1520) and had almost negligible effect on mean scores. However, items on which subjects had given a rating of 'no opinion' were excluded from statistical analysis as they had significant effect on the responses of a given subject. Hence, while calculating the individual respondent's average score, the sum of items was divided by the total number of items which were scored from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', excluding the 'no opinion' ratings.

### **Reliability of the Instrument**

The reliability of the instrument was tested by establishing internal consistency and test-retest reliability.

### **Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of the instrument was established by computing Cronbach's alpha coefficient as this is the most widely used measure of the reliability. Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show the item-to-total correlation and the alpha values of the instrument when an item is deleted, for Part 'A' and 'B' of the instrument, respectively.

Items	Item-to-total correlation	Alpha coefficient if item deleted	Difference between alpha and item-to-total correlation
Question 1	0.41	0.59	0.18
Question 2	0.37	0.59	0.22
Question 3	-0.07	0.65	0.72*
Question 4	0.52	0.57	0.05
Question 5	0.28	0.61	0.33
Question 6	0.47	0.58	0.11
Question 7	0.31	0.60	0.29
Question 8	0.19	0.62	0.43
Question 9	0.30	0.60	0.30
Question 10	-0.03	0.65	0.68*
Question 11	-0.01	0.64	0.65*
Question 12	0.01	0.64	0.63
Question 13	0.43	0.59	0.16
Question 14	0.27	0.61	0.34
Question 15	-0.06	0.65	0.71*
Question 16	0.38	0.59	0.21
Question 17	-0.04	0.64	0.68*
Question 18	0.17	0.62	0.45
Question 19	0.10	0.63	0.53
Question 20	0.39	0.60	0.21

\* Negatively correlated items      Overall alpha = 0.63

Table 4.2: Cronbach's alpha coefficient for Part 'A' of the Instrument

Items	Item-to-total correlation	Alpha coefficient if item deleted	Difference between alpha and item-to-total correlation
Question 1	0.21	0.63	0.42
Question 2	0.35	0.61	0.26
Question 3	-0.23	0.68	0.91*
Question 4	0.31	0.62	0.31
Question 5	0.35	0.61	0.26
Question 6	0.17	0.63	0.46
Question 7	0.34	0.61	0.27
Question 8	0.40	0.61	0.21
Question 9	0.63	0.57	0.06
Question 10	0.13	0.64	0.51
Question 11	0.07	0.64	0.57
Question 12	0.10	0.64	0.54
Question 13	0.50	0.59	0.09
Question 14	0.26	0.62	0.36
Question 15	-0.12	0.67	0.79*
Question 16	0.46	0.67	0.21
Question 17	-0.11	0.67	0.78*
Question 18	0.46	0.59	0.13
Question 19	0.31	0.61	0.30
Question 20	0.11	0.64	0.53

\* Negatively correlated items Overall alpha = 0.63

Table 4.3: Cronbach's alpha coefficient for Part 'B' of the Instrument

### Test-Retest Reliability

The instrument was readministered on 20 subjects after a period of a minimum 15 days from the date of initial administration to find out the test-retest reliability. Pearson's Product Moment correlation was calculated for the two ratings (Table 4.4).

Parts	N	Administration	Mean	S.D	r	't'
A	20	First	59.4	12.41	0.73	0.907 <sup>NS</sup>
		Second	56.9	11.58		
B	20	First	67.4	8.86	0.80	0.178 <sup>NS</sup>
		Second	67.7	7.42		

NS - not significant

Table 4.4: Pearson's Product Moment Correlation coefficient for test-retest reliability for Part 'A' and 'B' of the Instrument

The results show that the average scores between the initial and the second administrations were highly correlated ( $r = 0.73$  for Part 'A';  $r = 0.8$  for Part 'B').

### Correlation Between Listeners' Own Attitudes to Their Perception of Others' Attitudes Towards Stutterers

The scores obtained from the total population as well as the subgroups on both part 'A' and 'B' were subjected to paired sample t-test. The results, summarized in Table 4.5 show that normal speakers' own attitudes were significantly different from their perception of the attitudes of other subjects.

Subject group	N	Part	Mean	S.D	't'
Total Population	76	A	51.02	10.03	8.53**
		B	63.88	11.02	
Relatives	14	A	52.64	11.47	3.26*
		B	62.64	12.85	
Teachers	15.	A	54.07	10.82	3.37**
		B	66.60	8.93	
Friends	47	A	49.97	9.17	7.23**
		B	64.00	11.00	

\*\*p < 0.01 \*p < 0.05

Table 4.5: Number of subjects (N), mean, standard deviation (S.D), and t-value for total population, relatives, teachers and friends

### Comparison of the Attitudes of Relatives, Teachers, and Friends

A comparison was made between relatives, friends and teachers in their attitudes towards stutterers. The level of relationship with stutterers as also the duration of interaction being different, it was hypothesized that the attitudes of these groups towards stutterers could be different. The results of the F-ratio test, summarized in Table 4.6 and 4.7, for part 'A' & 'B' respectively, showed that there was no significant difference between any group in their attitudes towards stutterers and stuttering.

Independent subject group	Dependent subject groups	F-ratio	Significance level
Friends	Relatives	1.21	0.54 <sup>NS</sup>
	Teachers	0.29	0.94 <sup>NS</sup>
Relatives	Friends	4.97	0.18 <sup>NS</sup>
	Teachers	0.90	0.64 <sup>NS</sup>
Teachers	Friends	5.46	0.09 <sup>NS</sup>
	Relatives	0.79	0.68 <sup>NS</sup>

NS - not significant

Table 4.6: Independent and dependent subject groups, F-ratios and significance levels for part 'A' of the Instrument



Independent subject group	Dependent subject groups	F-ratio	Significance level
Friends	Relatives	1.32	0.45 <sup>NS</sup>
	Teachers	0.38	0.62 <sup>NS</sup>
Relatives	Friends	0.18	0.98 <sup>NS</sup>
	Teachers	1.07	0.58 <sup>NS</sup>
Teachers	Friends	0.84	0.66 <sup>NS</sup>
	Relatives	2.38	0.47 <sup>NS</sup>

NS - not significant

Table 4.7: Independent and dependent subject groups, F-ratios and significance levels for part 'B' of the Instrument

### Development of Interpretive Norms

Based on the data obtained from 76 subjects, norms were developed for the total population. The raw scores of both Part 'A' and 'B' of the instrument obtained from the total population were normalized to Z scores in order to derive interpretive norms. It was derived by using the conventional criteria of the population which is as shown in Table 3.2.

Based on this convention, interpretive norms were developed for both 'A' and 'B' scores. The results are summarized in Table 4.8.

Interpretive Description	SD Range	Raw 'A' Score	Raw'B'Score
Superior Attitude	> + 2.00	>72	>87
Above Average Attitude	+ 1.00 to+ 2.00	62-72	76-87
Average Attitude	- 1.00 to+1.00	41-61	53 - 75 .
Below Average Attitude	-2.00 to-1.00	30-40	41-52
Inferior Attitude	<-2.00	<30	

Table 4.8: Interpretive Norms for Total Population

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

The main objective of the present study was to develop an instrument to investigate the attitudes of normal listeners towards stutterers in a speaking situation. The additional objectives of the study were to compare the attitudes of subjects towards stutterers with what they perceive as the attitude of other normal listeners towards stutterers, and to develop normative data on the attitudes of normal subjects towards stutterers in a speaking situation.

An initial 25-item draft instrument was compiled based on a literature survey as well as the opinion of a group of subjects consisting of speech-language pathologists, students of speech-language pathology and laymen (Set 1). Based on the suggestions of subjects in Set 2, some items were deleted and a final 20-item instrument was arrived at. The instrument, initially developed in English, was translated into Kannada by a linguist who was also a native speaker of the language. Both the English and Kannada versions of the instrument developed were given to 5 normal speakers of Kannada, who were proficient in both the languages (as determined from their educational level and professional employment) for their opinion on the understandability and content of the Kannada version. None of these subjects reported any variability in the content / meaning of the items in the two languages.

For each of the 20-items in the instrument, two scales (Part 'A' & 'B') were provided for rating. Part 'A' measured the respondents' perception of others' attitudes towards stutterers and part 'B' measured their own attitudes towards stutterers in a

speaking situation. The instrument was administered on 76 subjects who had a minimum interaction of 3 years with stutterers. The subjects to whom this instrument was administered were either relatives, or friends, or teachers of stutterers.

### **Reliability of the Instrument**

The construct validity of the instrument could not be established as there were no comparable tools available in Indian context. However, the reliability of the instrument was tested by establishing internal consistency and test-retest reliability.

### **Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of the instrument was established using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Generally, a coefficient value of 0.5 and above for a single item in the instrument indicates good internal consistency of that item (Nunally, 1978). Both 'A' and 'B' scores were subjected to this analysis and the results revealed high overall alpha coefficient values (0.63 and 0.64 respectively). The item-to-total correlation was less than 0.5 for all the items except for one item (Question 4) in Part 'A' and two items (Questions 9 & 13) in Part 'B' which indicated that the items were sufficiently heterogeneous in nature except for these two items. However, questions 3, 10, 11, 15 & 17 in Part 'A' and questions 3, 15 & 17 in Part 'B' were negatively correlated to the rest of items in the instrument. Therefore, the results of this study on evaluation of attitudes warrants caution.

### **Test-Retest Reliability**

Test-Retest Reliability was found to be high for both part 'A' and 'B' of the instrument (Part 'A';  $r = 0.73$  & Part 'B';  $r = 0.80$ ). Therefore, the instrument can be

considered a reliable tool. However, the test-retest gap was only 15 days. Ideally, test-retest reliability should be established after a longer gap.

### **Performance of Normal Speakers on the Instrument**

It has been reported in the Western literature that different group of speakers have somewhat negative attitude about stutterers and their stuttering (Woods & Williams, 1971; Lass et al., 1989; Cooper & Cooper, 1996; Weisel & Spektor, 1998). The results of the present study showed that Indian subjects are more likely to have a positive attitude about stutterers (Mean = 51.02 on Part 'A' of the scale; Mean = 63.88 on Part 'B': Table 4.1) than their Western counterparts.

Majority of the Indian subjects think that while normal speakers other than themselves are likely to have "just about average" (undecided) attitudes about stutterers, they themselves have more positive than others (Mean = 63.88 points).

This study followed an interview format in obtaining the responses of normal speakers' attitudes towards stuttering. It followed a 'third person' approach in eliciting subjects' responses. All the items (Part A) seek to obtain information on the subjects' perception of the attitudes of others towards stutterers. Therefore, all items were phrased in the 'third person' format. For example, item 5 reads "Normal speakers tend to make fun of stutterers when the latter speaks to them". On the other hand, if the same item had been phrased in the second person format like "Do you make fun of stutterers when they speak to you?", the responses would have been more positive because no one would like to show that he/she has a negative attitude towards stutterers.

## **Correlation Between Listeners' Own Attitudes to Their Perception of Others' Attitudes Towards Stutterers**

### **Concurrent Validity**

There was a significant difference between the listeners' own attitudes to their perception of others' attitudes towards stutterers. Each normal speaker thinks that other listeners in the society are likely to have 'just about average' (undecided) attitude towards stutterers. But, they themselves have more positive attitudes towards stutterers. This particular result validates the method adopted in framing the items of the instrument developed here.

### **Comparison of the Attitudes of Relatives, Teachers, and Friends**

Comparison of scores in Part 'A' of all three subject groups did not reveal any significant difference between them. This was true for 'B' scores as well. This finding indicated that all the subject groups were similar in their attitudes towards stutterers in spite of the difference in their relationships with a given stutterer. This is in accordance with the finding of Klassen (2002) who reported that stutterers may face fewer negative reactions from persons with whom they had long-term intimate relationships than from strangers. This was attributed to the 'equal status' of these intimate relationships (Stiles & Kaplan, 1996). However, a close examination of the duration of interaction that the subjects of this study had with stutterers does not justify the explanation. Relatives had, on an average, 12 years of interaction with stutterers while friends and teachers had, on an average, 3 years of interaction. Besides, the level and quality of the interaction that these subjects had with stutterers is also an influencing factor in addition to the duration of interaction.

### **Development of Interpretive Norms**

The interpretive norms established for Part A & B provide a quick comparison of individual's obtained scores with that of the total population. Based on this comparison, a given individual can be judged to have a superior, above average, average, below average or inferior attitude towards stutterers in a speaking situation. This is likely to have direct implications for the implementation of public education programs on stuttering, as well as counselling strategies to be adopted for significant ones in the subjects' environment. These scores can also be used to compare the subjects' pre- and post-education changes in attitudes towards stutterers.

## CHAPTER 6

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Attitudes of different groups of listeners towards stuttering have been a major area of study in the field of stuttering research. Stuttering, as a communication disability, elicits an especially negative personality stereotype maintained by different groups of people (Weisel & Spektor, 1998). Listeners' attitudes towards stutterers and stuttering can be a primary factor in precipitating maintenance of stuttering behaviour (Van Riper, 1985). Therefore, a comprehensive stuttering intervention program should aim on changing the negative attitudes of significant others who interact with stutterers in addition to achieving a desired rate of fluency in the client's speech.

There have been a variety of instruments developed in Western countries to measure the attitudes of different sections of the society towards stutterers. However, such tools are not available in Indian context. Hence, an instrument was developed to measure the listeners' attitudes towards stutterers (Listeners' Attitudes Towards Stutterers - LATS) and it was administered to a diverse sample of subjects. The reliability was checked using measures of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The LATS included two parts (Part A & B). Part A gives us information about what normal listeners think about the 'attitudes of other normal listeners' towards stutterers while Part B provides information about normal listeners' 'own attitudes' towards stutterers. Thus, it allows a two-way comparison which in turn, alleviates the subjectivity in reported attitudes of individuals towards stutterers.

It can be inferred from the present study that, on an average, different subsections of subjects did not differ significantly in their attitudes towards stutterers and they are more likely to have positive attitudes towards stutterers than their Western counterparts.

It was also evident from this study that majority of the Indian subjects think that while normal speakers other than themselves are likely to have somewhat negative attitudes about stutterers, they themselves are more positive than others. This particular results validated the format of the study followed here particularly the framing of each items in two parts.

The LATS can successfully be used to counsell patients with stuttering on what to expect in a given speaking situation and more importantly, how to resolve these. In other words, speech-language pathologists can train their stutterers on coping strategies. The LATS is also expected to play a significant role in the implementation and pre- and post-evaluation of public education programs.

### **Future Directions**

- Ø The LATS, though developed for normal speakers, could be administered on stutterers to find out their perception of normal speakers' attitudes towards stutterers and their own altitudes towards others with stuttering. These findings would help in stuttering intervention program by changing the stutterers' perception of others' attitudes towards them. This, in fact, heightens the confidence of stutterers and their speech fluency.
- Ø The LATS could be administered on a more diverse and large number of population to obtain more reliable and comparable data particularly for development of norms.



## REFERENCE

- Ammons, R., & Johnson, W.** (1944). Studies in the psychology of stuttering. XVIII. The construction and application of a test of attitude towards stuttering. *Journal of Speech Disorders, 9*, 39-49.
- Bloodstein, O.** (1995). *A handbook on stuttering* (5<sup>th</sup> ed). London: Chapman & Hall.
- Bloodstien, O.** (1990). On pluttering, skivering, & flogging: A commentary. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 55*, (3), 392-394.
- Cooper, E. B., & Cooper, C. S.** (1985). Clinician attitudes towards stuttering: A decade of change (1973-1983). *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 10*, 19-23.
- Cooper, E. B., & Cooper, C. S.** (1996). Clinician attitudes towards stuttering: two decades of change. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 21*, 119-135.
- Cooper, E. B., & Rustin, L.** (1985). Clinician attitudes towards stuttering in the United States and Great Britain: a cross cultural study. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 10*, 1-17.
- Crichton-Smith, I., Wright, J., & Stackhouse, J.** (2003) Attitudes of speech and language therapists towards stammering: 1985 and 2000. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 38*, (3), 213-234.
- Crowe, T. A., & Cooper, E.B.** (1977). Parental attitudes toward and knowledge of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 10*, 343-357.
- Dorsey, M., & Guenther, R. K.** (2000). Attitudes of professors and students towards college students who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 25*, 77-83.
- Feldman, R. L.** (1976). Self-disclosure in parents of stuttering children. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 9*, 227-234.
- Hurst, M. I., & Cooper, E. B.** (1983 a). Employer attitudes towards stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 8*, 1-12.

- Hurst, M. I., & Cooper, E. B.** (1983b). Vocational rehabilitation counselors' attitudes toward stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 8, 13-27.
- Klassen, T. R.** (2002). Social distance and the negative stereotype of people who stutter. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 26, (2), 90-95.
- Kraalmaat, F. W., Vanryckeghem, M., & Dam-Baggen, R. V.** (2002). Stuttering and social anxiety. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 27, 319- 331.
- LaFollette, A. C.** (1956). Parental environment of stuttering children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 21, (2), 306-311.
- Lass, N. J., Ruscello, D. M., Pannbacker, M. D., Sell mitt, J. F., & Everly-Mayers, D.S.** (1989). Speech-language pathologists' perceptios of child and adult female and male stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 14, 127-134.
- McDavid, R., & Harari, W.** (1974). *Psychology and social behaviour*. New York, Harper & Row publishers, Inc.
- McDonald, E. T., & Frick, J. V.** (1954). Store clerks' reaction to stuttering. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 19, 306-311.
- Nunally, J. C.** (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Peters, T., & Guitar, B.** (1991). *Stuttering: An integrated approach to its nature and treatment*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Shapiro, D. A.** 1999. Stuttering intervention: a collaborative journey to fluency freedom (10 Ed.) Texas, Pro - Ed, Inc.
- SHverman, E. M.,** (1982). Speech-language clinicians' and university students' impressions of women and girls who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 7, 469-478.
- Silverman, F. H., & Paynter, K. K.** (1990). Impact of stuttering on perception of occupational competence. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 15, 87-91 .

- Silverman, F. II., Gazzolo, M., & Peterson, Y.** (1990) Impact of T-shirt message on stutterer stereotypes. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 15*, 35-37.
- Stiles, B. L., & Kaplan, H. B.** (1996). Stigma, deviance and negative social sanctions. *Social Science Quarterly, 77*, 685-696.
- Turnbridge, N.** (1994). *The stutterer's survival guide*. Sydney: Addison-Wesley.
- Van Riper, C.** (1982). *The nature of stuttering* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Weisel, A., & Spektor, G.** (1998). Attitudes toward own communication and toward stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 23*, 157- 172.
- Woods, C. L.** (1978). Does the stigma shape the stutterer. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 11*, 483-487.
- Woods, C. L., & Williams, D. E.** (1971). Speech clinicians' conceptions of boys and men who stutter. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 36*, (2), 225-234.
- Yuker, H. E.** (1988). The effect of contact on attitudes towards disabled persons. Some empirical generalizations. In Yuker, H. E. (Ed.), *Attitudes towards persons with disabilities* (pp. 262-274). New York. Springer Publishing Company.
- Zanna, M. P., & Rempel, J. K.** (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D. Bar - Tal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds), *The social psychology of knowledge* (pp.315 - 334). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**APPENDIX - A**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GENERAL POPULATION**

"Please read each item carefully and answer to the same by putting an "X" mark in any of the boxes provided. An "X" mark in the boxes corresponding to "strongly agree" means that you are totally agreeing with the given statement and a mark in the box corresponding to "strongly disagree" means that you are totally disagreeing with the given statement. A mark in the box corresponding to the "undecided" means that you are unable to decide whether you agree or disagree with the particular statement, though you are aware of the fact presented in the statement. The box corresponding to "no opinion" should be marked only if you do not have any opinions on the given statement, or you do not want to answer".

- 1 a. Normal speakers think that stutterers would be better off being silent when they cannot control their stuttering.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

- b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

2. a. Normal speakers think that they should be less talkative when stutterers speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

- b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

3. a. Normal speakers think that stutterers do not have any inferiority complex in front of others who speak fluently.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

4. a. Normal speakers prefer to speak to a nonstutterer than to a stutterer.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

5. a. Nonnal speakers tend to make fun of stutterers when the latter speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

6. a Normal speakers tend to believe that they eventually will develop stuttering if they continue to speak to stutterers.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

7. a. Normal speakers find it 'not so enjoyable' to talk to stutterers.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

8. a. Normal speakers think that stutterers are jealous that others speak fluently.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

9. a. Normal speakers feel embarrassed when a stutterer talks to them in a public place.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

10. a. Normal speakers do not ignore stuttering in the speech of stutterers who speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

11. a. Normal speakers tend to prompt with words when stutterers are speaking to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

12. a. Normal speakers pay special attention to stutterers than they would do to other normal speakers in a speaking situation.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

13. a. Normal speakers tend to make stutterers aware that stutterers are different from others.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

14. a. Normal speakers are put off on watching the stutterers struggle while speaking.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion



15. a. Normal speakers do not avoid looking into the eyes of a stutterer while talking.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

16. a. Normal speakers tend to get impatient when stutterers speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

17. a. Normal listeners are conscious of the excessive body movements of stutterers when they speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

18. a. Normal speakers, though sympathetic to stutterers, can't really tolerate them in their heart.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

19. a. Normal speakers tend to speak slowly with stutterers when the latter speak to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

20. a. Normal speakers often interrupt stutterers in a speaking situation when the latter talk to them.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

b. What is your personal opinion?

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Undecided	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion

## APPENDIX-B

### ಉಗ್ಗುವಿಕೆ /ತೊದಲುವಿಕೆಯ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನಾವಳಿ

ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಎರಡು ಭಾಗಗಳಿವೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಭಾಗ ತೊದಲು ಇರುವವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅಥವಾ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯಾಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅನಿಸಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಚೌಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಗುರುತು ಹಾಕಿ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

೧. ಎ) ಉಗ್ಗು/ತೊದಲುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದಾಗ "ಇವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಬದಲು ಸುಮ್ಮನಿರುವುದು ಮೇಲೆಂದು" ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಯೋಚಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

- ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೨. ಎ) ತೊದಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಜೊತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ತಾವು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

- ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೩. ಎ) ಸರಾಗವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರ ಜೊತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ತೊದಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕೀಳರಿಮೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಯೋಚಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

- ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೪. ಎ) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ತೊದಲಿರುವವರಿಗಿಂತ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವವರ ಜೊತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬಯಸುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

- ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೫. ಎ) ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಹಾಸ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನಿಸುವ ಭಾವನೆಯಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

- ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೬. ಎ) ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಕ್ರಮೇಣ ತಮಗೂ ತೊದಲುಂಟಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೭. ಎ) ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸಂಭಾಷಿಸುವುದು "ಅಷ್ಟೇನು ಸಂತೋಷದಾಯಕವಲ್ಲ" ಎಂಬುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರ ಅನಿಸಿಕೆ.

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೮. ಎ) ಸರಾಗವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೊದಲುವವರಿಗೆ 'ಅಸೂಯೆ' ಎಂಬುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರ ಅನಿಸಿಕೆ.

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಿಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೯. ಎ) ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೊದಲುವವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಮುಬುಗರಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೦. ಎ) ತೊದಲುವವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಅವರ ತೊದಲನ್ನು ಕಡೆಗಣಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೧. ಎ) ತೊದಲುವವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಿ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೨. ಎ) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಬೇರೆಯವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗಿನದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೩. ಎ) "ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗಿಂತ ಅವರು ಭಿನ್ನ" ಎಂಬ ಅರಿವನ್ನು ತೊದಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಮೂಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೪. ಎ) ತೊದಲುವವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ತೋರುವ ಒದ್ದಾಟವನ್ನು ನೋಡಲು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಸೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಫೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೫. ಎ) ತೊಡಲುವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಕಣ್ಣಲ್ಲಿ ಕಣ್ಣೆಟ್ಟು ನೋಡಲು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಹಿಂಜರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೬. ಎ) ತೊಡಲುವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಹನೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೭. ಎ) ತೊಡಲುವರರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾಡುವ ಅನಗತ್ಯ ಶಾರೀರಿಕ ಚಲನವಲನಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅರಿವು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರ	ಫೂರ್ಕ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ



೧೮. ಎ) ತೊದಲಿರುವವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೈತ್ರ್ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಸಹಿಸಲಾರರು

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೧೯. ಎ) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

೨೦. ಎ) ತೊದಲಿರುವವರೊಡನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರು ಅನೇಕ ಸಲ ಸಂಭಾಷಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

ಬಿ) ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಸುಮಾರಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ	ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ	ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಯಾವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ

## APPENDIX-C

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Name :

Age/Sex :

Education :

Occupation :

Address :

Phone Number:

Are you aware of stuttering?

What all do you know about stuttering?

Does anyone in your family stutter?

How long they have been stuttering?

Have you ever interacted with stutterers?

How long you have interacted with them?

How is the stutterer related to you?

Have you seen any movies wherein actor/s is/are stutterers?

How severe is the problem in those stutterers whom you know?