

Phonatory Vocal Tract Stability in Stuttering Children before and after Fluency – Enhancing Therapy

Dehqan A¹, ali Dashti G², Mirzadeh M³

^{1,2}Department of Speech Therapy,

³ Computer software engineer,

Zahedan University of Medical Sciences,
Zahedan, Iran

Corresponding Author

Ali Dehqan

Department of Speech Therapy,

Zahedan University of Medical Sciences,

Zahedan, Iran

Email. dehqan@usa.com

Kathmandu Univ Med J 2010;9(32):405-9

ABSTRACT

Background

Stuttering is a complex disorder. Essentially, it is a neuromuscular disorder whose core consists of tiny lags and disruptions in the timing of the complicated movements required for speech.

Objective

The purpose of the current study was to collect and compare jitters and shimmer values in children who stutter before and after fluency – enhancing therapy.

Methods

Subjects consisted of 15 Iranian preschool girls with stuttering, and 15 Iranian preschool girls without afflictions, matched according to age. Vocal jittering and shimmer measurements of the phonation of the children were compared before and after therapy. Each subject phonated vowels nine times in a random order. Each phonation was sustained for at least five seconds and was recorded. The middle three-second portion of each recorded vowel phonation was subjected to jitter and shimmer analysis.

Results

On shimmer measures between pre-treatment and post-treatment, significant differences were found in all sustained vowels of persons who stutter. Group means of shimmer in post-therapy were significantly lower than pre-treatment. Differences in jitter measurements were not significant between pre-treatment and post-treatment statuses and this parameter did not change after therapy.

Conclusion

The findings showed that therapy resulted in decreased irregularity in the amplitude of vibrations (shimmer). In other words, the therapy increases the steady-state of the laryngeal system. Moreover, this parameter may be used as an index for the effectiveness of therapy.

Key Words

children, jitter, phonation, shimmer, stuttering, voice

INTRODUCTION

Stuttering is a complex disorder and essentially it is a neuromuscular disorder whose core consists of tiny lags and disruptions in the timing of the complicated movements required for speech.^{1,2} Obvious disturbances in the speech production system of stuttering individuals might be related to generalized temporal incoordination between respiration, phonation and articulation.³

A large body of literature has accumulated in support of this view that individuals who stutter, differ from individuals who do not stutter in at least some of the neuromuscular processes involved in speech production.⁴⁻⁸ Several authors have proposed incoordination of these actions as a specific version of the general hypothesis that stuttering is a disorder of timing.^{9,10-15}

One of the most important factors that predict high precision temporal coordination is phonatory vocal tract stability. Vocal perturbation measures are short-term indices of the stability of the phonatory system and both may be associated with poor laryngeal control.³

Irregularity of the fundamental frequency or of the period of subsequent glottal cycles is called jittering. Shimmer is due to the overlapping of the fundamental frequency of the voice with a noise which leads to amplitude irregularities.¹⁶

Several studies that examined speech acoustics of persons who stutter (PWS) and Persons who do not stutter (PWDS) have found that PWS, as a group, show longer voice onset times (VOTs), vowel durations, stop gap durations, and consonant-vowel transition durations.¹⁷ Baer (1979) considered that stuttering children have weaker laryngeal neuromuscular control and greater disturbances in integrating respiratory and laryngeal control which justifies measurements of voice disturbances.¹⁸ On the other hand, few studies have examined the differences in vocal tract stability during speech production between (WS) or (PDS). Klich and May (1982) suggested that the stutterers were producing vowels using a neutral vocal tract posture as a means of controlling speech fluency.¹⁹ Most researchers have examined the possible differences in oral-laryngeal coordination between stuttering and non-stuttering individuals. Pesák and Urbánek (1993) studied incoordination of the phonation start in individuals with stuttering and found that in the group of children and adolescents with stuttering only less than 4% of the cases showed undisturbed regular phonation starts, whereas in the control group it was almost as much as 90 percent.²⁰ Falck, Lawler and Yonovitz, (1985) found that adults who stuttered exhibited measurable cycle-to-cycle temporal changes prior to moments of stuttering.²¹ Such changes were absent in the identical but fluent utterances of the same speaker. Newman, Harris and Hilton (1989)

found that PWS as a group showed higher amplitude irregularities during sustained vowel productions and their findings showed differences between stutterers and non-stutterers in the laryngeal behavior (i.e., F_0 perturbation). This finding was interpreted as maintaining a fixed laryngeal posture during vowel steady-state production.²² Bamberg, Hanley, and Hillenbrand (1990) also reported significantly higher vocal shimmer values in the fluent speech of PWS than their fluent peers. Hall and Yairi (1992) examined acoustic correlates of phonatory control in the speech of 10 preschool-aged boys who were stutterers and in the speech of 10 boys who were non-stutterers. Significant differences were found between the two groups for shimmer measures.³ Robb, Blomgren and Chen (1998) found that PWS enrolled in fluency-shaping therapy displayed the least formant frequency fluctuation (FFF) (most vocal tract stability) and the untreated PWS displayed the most FFF (least stability).²³ Salihović et al. (2009) compared the speech of 67 children who stutter with the speech of 46 fluent speakers and concluded that there were significant differences between the two groups for jitter and shimmer measures.²⁴

Unfortunately, research addressing laryngeal functioning in people who stutter has been primarily focused on adults. When children mature, they exhibit a greater control over laryngeal adjustments that is reflected in the increasing stability of vocal fold vibration.³ Similarly, data show that vocal jitter and shimmer decreases as \lg with age, as it is interpreted to have greater control.²⁵ All lower indices of magnitude on either jitter or shimmer indicate less vocal perturbation and greater stability in the fine motor control of phonatory behavior. If should the magnitude of voice or shimmer, in the fluent phonatory behaviours of PWS (either jitter or shimmer) was shown to be significantly greater than of PWNS, this it would provide additional support to the hypothesis that PWS may demonstrate generally less competent neurophysiologic regulation.²² Moreover, research has not documented the acoustic measures of jitter, or shimmer in the phonations of young children in pre-therapy and post-therapy. Data on the various aspects of laryngeal function in children who stutter may enhance the understanding of the disorder within the context of developmental processes of the speech.^{3, 22}

The current study was designed to gather and compare the jitter and shimmer values of PWS in two different conditions (i.e. pre-therapy and post-therapy) in order to gain a better understanding about the phonatory motor control of PWS population. The results of this study can be used in future therapy sessions and used as an index of the progression of therapy.

METHODS

Subjects: Subjected of fifteen 15 ss and ffteen 15 non-stutterers matched according to age and sex. The age range of the stutterers was from 67 to 79 months and of the ntutterers was ranged from 66 to 79 months with a mean age of 72.6 for both groups. All subjects were female.

The Study design was a quasi-experithat was done conducted at the rehabilitation clinic of Zahedan University of Medical was 8 months. study was carried out over eight months,

Several criteriawereemployedforsubjectclassification.to beregardedwereobservedbybothparentsandtwspeech therapistsasexhibitingastutteringproblem and had to demonstrate atleast six stuttering-like behaviours (SLDs)³ per 100 words during a 300-words sample of conversation with their mothers, and/or if people in their environments had expressed concern regarding their speech fluency.²⁶

The presence and magnitude of stuttering at the time of testing was verified using the Stuttering Severity Instrument.²⁷ All were moderate level in SSI-3 Scale. All subjects were perceptually assessed for normality of their voices with the GRBAS scale, By means of sound reproduction of each vocal sample, the following items were graded conjunctly by two professional experienced in vocal pathology, from 0 to 3 using the GRBAS method; (0 = normal, 1 = slight, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe): G (Grade), the global grade of vocal affliction. R (Roughness), the quality of the voice related to the impression of irregular glottic pulses from a noise component of low frequency, of roughness or vocal fry. B (Breathiness), the voice related to the noise that originates with the turbulence created by an incompetent glottis. A (Asthenia), the auditory impression of weakness in spontaneous phonation. Hypo kinetic or hypofunctional voice. S (Strain, vocal tension), the auditory impression of excessive effort and of tension associated with spontaneous phonation.²⁸ Those with ratings higher than 0, even if it was on one measure, were excluded. The rating was performed on a voice sample of one 1 minute of spontaneous speech. Subjects were also screened on former problems with breathing, their voice, neurological diseases, and structural abnormalities in the larynx, mouth, or throat with a questionnaire. The second author checked their vocal folds with a flexible laryngoscope to confirm that no one had organic lesions of the vocal folds.

The acoustic examination was performed in a soundproof room with the subjects in a sitting position. Subjects attended fluency reinforcement plus corrective feedback. The criterion of treatment success was less than 2% stuttering rate in all stages.²⁹ The number of sessions of therapy depended on the individual child and varied

from 26-90 hours. Data collection was performed before starting treatment protocols, using the Dr. Speech 4.0 software (subprogramme: vocal assessment version 4.0 from Tiger Electronics, USA) at the speech therapy clinic. The microphone (type: ECM-717 condenser microphone, Sony Corporation) was placed on a stand at the front of mouth. The same samples were recorded after termination of therapy.

Voices Sample taken consisted of the five sustained vowels of the Persian language, /â/, /a/, /e/, /o/ and /u/ in a comfortable and habitual way, and each subject phonated vowels nine times in random order. Each phonation was sustained for at least five seconds and was recorded. The mid-3-second portion of each recorded vowel phonation was subjected to jitter and shimmer analyzes.

Statistics data were analyzed with the statistics software SPSS 18.0 for Windows and data were subjected to a two-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) with repeated measures.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations of jitter of PWS and normal peers showed in the T table 1 and 2 for pre-treatment and post-treatment statuses. On the jitter measures in pre-treatment and post-treatment conditions of both groups there were not significant differences. Means and standard deviation of shimmer of PWS and normal peers were presented in table 4, respectively. On shimmer measures between pre- and post-treatment, significant differences were found in all sustained vowels of PWS group and means of shimmer in post-therapy were significantly lower than pre-treatment (p<0.05). As noted in T table there was not any significant difference on shimmer measures in control group.

DISCUSSION

A significant difference was found between pre-treatment and post-treatment statuses on measures of shimmer. However, the differences of jitter between the two statuses were not to be statistically significant. The M means of shimmer in all of the vowels in pre-treatment statuses were as larger than those measures in post-treatment status, indicating that the sustained phonations of the pre-treatment was less stable than those of the post-treatment in terms of vocal intensity. On the other hand, for shimmer measures, there was not any significant difference in the control group that we can conclude the changes in the measures of shimmer in post-treatment status results from therapy and it is not dependent on growing. Although the specific neuromuscular components of vocal jitter and shimmer have not been

identified, it is possible that shimmer reflects the greater difficulty of with integrating respiratory, laryngeal, and cortical control than jitter.³ Although, it is difficult to compare our acoustic data with the findings of other studies because past various researches has used the variety of methodologies that it limits comparisons across studies. However, it is interesting to note similarities between the present results and acoustic data from literature for children and adults who stutter.^{3,22,24} The direction of our finding differences were obtained, suggest that stutterers have less stable neuromuscular control over the events regulating the aerodynamics of the laryngeal and respiratory system during sustained fluent vowel articulations and fluency therapy increases steady-state in laryngeal and respiratory system and led to decrease irregularity in the amplitude of vibration (i.e. shimmer). The steady state, sustained phonation involves an even maintenance of such forces as vocal fold tension, mass, length, and subglottic pressures, while it also maintains the supralaryngeal articulatory adjustments required for production of the vowel. On the other hand, it was determined that stuttering individuals have variable, sometimes even chaotic subglottal pressure.³⁰ It is thought that this is caused by muscular incoordination of the tract.³¹ However, differences have been observed, however, between the two statuses which suggest that children are better able to control these forces after the termination of treatment. Therefore on the basis of the current study findings, measurements of amplitude perturbation of voices such as formant frequency fluctuation measures can be used as an index of vocal tract stability, as they have also been used in researches.^{23,32,33} Also, the study will also it can help clinician to pursue the process of therapy and can then be used as an index of effective narrow age range; it must be acknowledged that the study has presented with certain limitations, such as the number of participants which were used, and the narrow age group, thus, it is recommended that this study be replicated in the larger or wide age range samples of stuttering speakers. stuttering adults.

CONCLUSION

The findings from the present study showed that there aren't significant differences on jitter measures between pre-treatment and post-treatment conditions but on the other hand, there are significant differences on shimmer measures between pre-treatment and post-treatment conditions. So, the latter parameter or shimmer has an important role in the therapeutic process and can be used as an index of progression of therapy.

REFERENCES

1. Smith A. Stuttering: A unified approach to a multifactorial, dynamic, disorder. In: Ratner NB, Healey EC, editors. *Stuttering research and practice: Bridging the gap*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 1999. p.27-45.
2. Maassen B, Kent R, Peters H, Van Lieshout P, Hulstijn W. *Speech Motor Control in Normal and Disordered Speech*. 3rd Ed, New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2004. p.313.
3. Hall KD, Yairi E. Fundamental frequency, jitter, and shimmer in preschoolers who stutter. *J Speech Hear Res* 1992;35:1002-8.
4. Alfonso, PJ. Implications of the concepts underlying task-dynamic modeling on kinematic studies of stuttering. In Peters HFM, Hulstijn W, and Starkweather CW editors, *Speech motor control and stuttering*, Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1991. p.79-100.
5. Caruso AJ, Abbs JH, Gracco VL. Kinematic analysis of multiple movement coordination during speech in stutterers. *Brain* 1988;111:439-56.
6. Caruso AJ, Max, L, McClowry, MT. Perspectives on stuttering as a motor speech disorder. In Caruso AJ, Strand EA (Eds.), *Clinical management of motor speech disorders in children*. New York: Thieme; 1999. p.319-44.
7. Smith A, Luschei E, Denny M, Wood J, Hirano M, Badylak S. Spectral analyses of activity of laryngeal and/or facial muscles in stutterers. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1993;56:1303-11.
8. Zimmermann G. Articulatory dynamics of fluent utterances of stutterers and nonstutterers. *J Speech Hear Res* 1980;23:95-107.
9. Max L, Gracco VL. Coordination of oral and laryngeal movements in the perceptually fluent speech of adults who stutter. *J Speech Lang Hear Res* 2005;48:524-42.
10. Adams MR. A perspective on stuttering. *Contemp Issues Commun Sci Disord*. 1999;26:5-13.
11. Boutsen F. A comparative study of stress timing of stutterers and nonstutterers. *J Fluency Disord* 1995; 20:145-56.
12. Conture EG, Schwartz HD, Brewer DW. Laryngeal behavior during stuttering: a further study. *J Speech Hear Res* 1985;28:233-40.
13. Perkins W, Rudas J, Johnson L, Bell J. Stuttering: discoordination of phonation with articulation and respiration. *J Speech Hear Res* 1976;19:509-22.
14. St. Louis K. Linguistic and motor aspects of stuttering. In N. Lass (Ed.), *Speech and language: Advances in basic research and practice*. New York: Academic Press; 1979.
15. Van Riper C. *The nature of stuttering*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1982.

16. Colton RH, Casper JK, Leonard R. *Understanding Voice Problems: A Physiological Perspective for Diagnosis and Treatment*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2006.
17. Bloodstein O. *A Handbook on Stuttering*. 5th ed. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing; 1995.
18. Baer T. Vocal jitter: A neuromuscular Explanation. In Lawrence V, Weinberg B (editors), *Care of the professional voice: physical factors in voice, vibrato registers*. New York: The Voice foundation; 1979.
19. Blomgren M, Robb M, Chen Y. A note on vowel centralization in stuttering and nonstuttering individuals. *J Speech Lang Hear Res* 1998;41:1042-51.
20. Pesak J, Urbanek K. Incoordination of the phonation start in individuals with balbuties. *Folia Phoniatri (Basel)* 1993;45:62-7.
21. Falck FJ, Lawler PS, Yonovitz A. Effects of stuttering on fundamental frequency. *J Fluency Disord* 1985;10:123-35.
22. Newman P, Harris R, Hilton L. Vocal jitter and shimmer in stuttering. *J Fluency Disord* 1989;14:87-95.
23. Robb M, Blomgren M, Chen Y. Formant frequency fluctuation in stuttering and nonstuttering adults. *J Fluency Disord* 1998;23:73-84.
24. Salihović N, Junuzović-žunić L, Ibrahimagić A, Beganović L. Characteristic of voice in stuttering children. *Acta Med Sal* 2009;38:67-75.
25. Glaze LE, Bless DM, Milenkovic P, Susser R. Acoustic characteristic of children's voice. *J Voice* 1988;2:312-9.
26. Dehqan A, Bakhtiar M, Panahi SS, Ashayeri H. Relationship between stuttering severity in children and their mothers speaking rate. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2008;126:29-33.
27. Riley, G.D. *Stuttering Severity Instrument for Children and Adults*. (3rd ed.). Austin TX: PRO-ED; 1994.
28. Hirano M. *Clinical Examination of Voice*. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1981. p.83-4.
29. Hegde MN. *Treatment protocols for stuttering*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing; 2007.
30. Zocchi L, Estenne M, Johnston S, Del Ferro L, Ward ME, Macklem PT. Respiratory muscle incoordination in stuttering speech. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1990;141:1510-5.
31. Williams DF, Brutten GJ. Physiologic and aerodynamic events prior to the speech of stutterers and nonstutterers. *J Fluency Disord* 1994;19:83-111.
32. Gerratt BR. Formant frequency fluctuation as an index of motor steadiness in the vocal tract. *J Speech Hear Res* 1983;26:297-304.
33. Zwirner P, Barnes GJ. Vocal tract steadiness: a measure of phonatory and upper airway motor control during phonation in dysarthria. *J Speech Hear Res* 1992;35:761-8.