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DISCUSSION
A therapist treating a human being for any problem, be it physical or psychological, has to treat the whole personality and not an isolated problem. This becomes all the more true in the case of a speech therapist treating a stutterer. Where the services of a speech therapist are not available, a stutterer is referred to a psychiatrist or a psychologist for help. This is an obvious indication of the consensus of opinion in the medical profession that stuttering is a psychological problem. Speech pathology, in fact, is a branch of psychology as is indicated by the 'psychological abstracts' including research on stuttering as a part of its publications.
When the profession of speech pathology had not seen the light of the day in India, many a stutterer has been helped by psychiatrists and psychologists. The Mental Health Institutes of Bangalore and Ranchi were loaded with patients of this type. With the establishment of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing at Mysore and the consequent availability of qualified speech therapists in different parts of the country, the psychiatrists and psychologists, particularly those in Bangalore and Ranchi, were relieved of this additional responsibility. Having recognised the importance of speech therapy in a mental health institute, the National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences of Bangalore appointed a speech therapist as soon as one was available in India and recently has established an independent department of speech pathology.

Whether stuttering is purely a psychological problem appears to be a bone of contention even today but whether psychological problems are associated with stuttering, there has not been many difference of opinion. In the present investigation, an attempt was made to study some of the psychological factors and it was found that a few of them are significantly associated with stuttering.
Whether these psychological differences have caused stuttering or whether stuttering has caused these psychological differences or whether these two simply coexist is a difficult question indeed and the present study does not really purport to answer that.

On the basis of this study, one could only say that there are certain psychological differences in stutterers as compared to normals. They probably just co-exist with or may be contributing towards the maintainance of this challenging problem. A knowledge of these factors would be very handy for a professional worker who wants to help stutterers.

As already stated the purpose of the study was to find out the psychological differences in stutterers as compared to normal speakers. This knowledge may profitably be applied in planning therapy for this handicapping communication problem.

A review of literature indicates that many investigators have explored this area. Most of our knowledge about the personality of stutterers comes from the West which has an entirely different social and cultural milieu. The few Indian attempts have used tools standardised elsewhere (Malhotra, 1971), studied an isolated variable (Bharatraj and Pranesh
Rao, 1970) or have concentrated on treating the problem (Basavalingappa, 1980; Srinivas, 1982; Nandur, 1982) rather than the individual. Hence a holistic study of the psychological variables of Indian stutterers was felt. A review of literature indicates that parent-child relationship, parental attitudes towards stuttering, self concept, neuroticism and anxiety are some of the important factors responsible for development and maintenance of this speech problem. The study, therefore, was planned to investigate these variables. In addition, intelligence on which there are conflicting findings, oral fixation behaviour of the stutterers which is reported by many a psychoanalyst, aspiration level which has been studied earlier in a different context and using different tools and the feeling of insecurity which appeared logical to be associated with a speech problem as this were also studied.

**Stuttering and Child-Parent Relationship**

Child-rearing practices, in general, are reported to be contributing to the development of stuttering (Stewart, 1960). Parent-child relationship is an important factor in the development of speech and language in the child. The personality of an individual itself
could be said to be moulded by the early childhood experiences.

In the present study it was found that the stutterers had a less affectionate relationship with their parents, the mean score of the stutterers on the family syntality scale was 86.4533 and that of the normals was 97.1466. This difference was found to be statistically significant at .01 level. It was also observed that there was no significant difference between the younger and the older stutterers on this aspect while there was a significant difference between the younger and the older normals, older ones reporting a more affectionate relationship. The difference between the stutterers and nonstutterers with respect to their parent-child relationship was significant both in the younger as well as in the older ones, the stutterers being less affectionate than the normals.

It was further observed that there was no significant difference between the stutterers belonging to the low socio-economic status (an income of $999 and below) and those belonging to the higher socio-economic status. The difference between normal speakers of the low socio-economic status and a higher socio-economic status was also not significant.
The stutterers were found to be having significantly less affectionate relationship with their parents as compared to the nonstutterers belonging both to the lower and the higher socio-economic status.

The urban subjects in both the groups tended to be less affectionate towards their parents than the rural subjects. This difference, however, was not significant in the group of stutterers while it turned out to be significant in the control group. The urban subjects being less affectionate could be explained in terms of a more mechanical and a busy urban life as compared to the more care-free and relaxed rural life.

No significant difference was found with reference to the child-parent relationship between the stutterers of different severity ratings.

The results, in general, indicated that the stutterers as a group were less affectionate towards their parents. Goldman and Shames (1964b) reported that parents of stutterers set a higher goal for their children. When the expectations are high, the parents tend to deny the child of the usual care-free life. It is also reported (Monsur 1992) that stutterers have domineering parents. A child is not likely to be affectionate towards a domineering, disciplinarian parent.
whose expectations of his child are too high. The present study indicated that it is true and that the stutterers as children had been less affectionate towards their parents as compared to the normals.

Stuttering and Parental Attitudes

According to Diagnosogenic Theory of Stuttering (Johnson 1953), stuttering literally does not exist until it has been 'named'. It is the parents who usually 'name' the normal disfluencies of their children as stuttering. The parents whose knowledge about and the attitudes towards stuttering are poorer are likely to be more concerned about such nonfluencies and tend to label them wrongly as stuttering. Parental attitudes towards stuttering, having been reported to be significant factors in the onset and development of stuttering (Bloodstein 1973), were one of the variables in this study.

It was found that the parents of stutterers had a significantly poorer attitude towards stuttering than the parents of normals, the difference in the mean scores being nearly 7 points. The parents of the older subjects scored higher than those of the younger ones in the control group and the difference was statistically
significant while there was no significant difference between the parents of younger and older stutterers. Parents of stutterers scored consistently lower than the parents of nonstutterers of both the younger and the older subjects.

It was also observed that the parents of higher socio-economic status tended to score higher than those of the lower socio-economic status. The difference, however, was not found to be significant. The urban parents scored higher than the rural parents and the difference in the control group was significant while that in the experimental group was not. It was further observed that the parents of severe stutterers scored most and those of mild stutterers scored least, the parents of moderate stutterers scoring in between. The differences observed, however, were not found to be statistically significant. The parents of stutterers with no secondaries scored least followed by the parents of stutterers with many secondaries and those with few secondaries. This difference was also not found to be significant.

The attitude of a person towards a thing is likely to be influenced by his knowledge, exposure and the personal biases and prejudices. The stutterer's parents
have their own biases and prejudices and hence show poorer attitude towards stuttering. More educated and experienced a man is, the more desirable his attitudes would be. This trend was observed in this study wherein the urban parents had a better attitude towards stuttering than the rural parents but there was no difference between the parents of an urban stutterer and a rural stutterer since both tended to share the common prejudices and biases. This was true of the parents belonging to different socio-economic status too. Higher the income, better the attitudes were found to be. The parents of severe stutterers had a better attitude towards stuttering probably because they had gained more knowledge of and experience with stuttering and have had frequent consultations with the specialists while the parents of mild stutterers had poor attitudes. The attitudes of the parents of moderate stutterers were found to be midway between those of the parents of mild and severe stutterers.

**Stuttering and Intelligence**

The level of intelligence of stutterers has been a frequent topic of the studies for quite some time now and different investigators have observed different
relationship between intelligence and stuttering. Some (Johnson, 1955; Andrew and Harris, 1964; Wohl, 1951) have reported that stutterers as a group are less intelligent than the normals while others (Travis, 1959) have reported that stutterers are slightly better than their normal counterparts in their intelligence level. There are also studies that have concluded that there is no difference between stutterers and nonstutterers with respect to this variable (McDowell, 1928). Intelligence being an integral part of the personality, and for that matter, a very important one, this was studied as one of the variables in this study. It was observed that the stutterers tended to score less on the Raven's Progressive Matrices Test but the difference was not found to be statistically significant. No significant difference was found between the younger subjects and the older ones with reference to the scores on the Raven's Progressive Matrices nor was there any significant difference between the rural and the urban subjects. Mild stutterers score highest followed by the moderate and the severe stutterers but the difference was not found to be statistically significant. No significant difference, in a similar way, was observed between the stutterers with no secondaries, those with few secondaries and the ones with many, though
the stutterers with no secondaries tended to be slightly better than the other two groups.

**Stuttering and Self Concept**

The term self concept, as commonly used, refers to the "self as the individual who is known to himself" (English and English, 1951). The self concept, according to Rainy, (1) is a learned perceptual system which functions as an object in the perceptual field, (2) not only influences behaviour but is itself altered and restructured by behaviour and unsatisfied needs and (3) may have little or no relation to external reality.

Haney (195 ), using TAT and Rorschach inferred that the stutterers are spatially disoriented, structurally confused and have contradictory self concepts. Fiedler and Wepman (1951) using the Q technique, reported no significant difference between the stutterers and the control group.

In this study, a significant difference was found both in the private and the social self of the stutterer as compared to that of the nonstutterer, subjects in the control group rating themselves better than those in the experimental group. A significant difference was also observed between the private and the social self of the
stutterers. Stutterers rated themselves higher than what they thought others would rate them. No such significant difference was found among the normals. No significant difference was found between the younger and the older subjects in both the experimental and the control groups. A significant difference between the stutterers belonging to the low socio-economic status and normal speakers of this status was observed with reference to the social self while there was no significant difference with respect to the private self. A similar relationship was found in the subjects belonging to higher socio-economic status in the social self. The rural subjects tended to rate themselves higher than their urban counterparts on both the private and the social self. This difference, however, was not found to be significant in the experimental group, for both the private and the social self while it was significant for the control group. Mild stutterers tended to rate themselves higher on the private self followed by the moderate and the severe stutterers. The difference, however, was not significant and there was no significant difference with respect to social self also in these three groups of stutterers. Stutterers with no secondaries rated themselves high on both the private and the social self and
The difference was found to be significant only for the private self between the stutterers with no secondaries and those with many secondaries.

The present study indicated that stuttering affects the self concept adversely—both the private and the social. The difference between the social and the private self concept is marked in these people who have a communication problem. They always tend to feel that the society fails to recognise their real abilities and potentialities on account of the obvious speech problem. This, in turn, probably makes them underestimate themselves. This process of underestimation to match the "society's perception" becomes perennial, forming a vicious circle. The fact that more severe stutterers rated themselves considerably lower than the less severe ones is an evidence for this postulate. Further support for this assumption comes from the observation that the stutterers were significantly more neurotic than normals and that their functioning intelligence was slightly lower though not statistically significant.
Stuttering and Neuroticism

Bender (1942) reported that his 249 college stutterers were significantly less confident and less sociable than a matched control group. Richardson (1944) found her stutterers to be more socially introverted, more depressed and less happy-go-lucky than the nonstutterers while Shames (1949) did not find such a difference.

That stuttering is a maladaptive neurotic response was implicit in many psychological theories regarding the etiology of stuttering. Saikowski (1894) described stuttering as a type of psychoneurosis. Coriat (1913) wrote "the neurotic basis of stammering was first noted in the analysis of stammerers in 1913 and 1914... as a result of these investigations, it was finally concluded that stammering is not a speech defect but consists essentially of a persistence into adult life of infantile nursing activities. It could be shown that stammering is one of the severest forms of psychoneurosis, and not merely, a tic, an obsession, an auditory amnesia spasm of coordination..." However, Johnson (1932), using Woodworth House Mental Hygiene Inventory, found that stutterers' scores were more like those of the normals than those of neurotics.
The traits of extraversion and neuroticism were assessed in this study administering an Inventory. No significant difference was found between the stutterers and the nonstutterers on extraversion while there was a significant difference between them with reference to neuroticism, the stutterers tending to score higher. However, no significant difference was noticed on neuroticism between the younger and the older subjects in both the groups. It was further observed that there was no significant difference between younger stutterers and their normal counterparts while there was a significant difference between the older stutterers and the older nonstutterers. No significant difference was observed between the subjects belonging to the lower socio-economic status and the higher socio-economic status in both the control and the experimental groups. A significant difference on neuroticism was observed between the stutterers with the low income and the normals with a comparable income, the stutterers scoring higher. There was no significant difference between the rural and the urban subjects in both the experimental and the control groups. It was further observed that while there was no significant difference between the urban stutterers and
the urban normals, the difference between the rural stutterers and the rural nonstutterers was significant, stutterers tending to be more neurotic. No significant difference was observed between the stutterers of different categories.

The results and the review of earlier studies indicate that, by and large, the stutterers are more neurotic than the normal speakers. An obvious handicap in social interaction, stuttering breeds a feeling of guilt and inferiority which grows with the individual. This postulate is based on the finding that older stutterers were found to be significantly more neurotic. The difference between the stutterers belonging to lower economic stratum and the comparable normal speakers being significant and this being not significant in the case of subject belonging to a higher stratum may probably be explained on the basis of a 'double pressure' hypothesis. The individuals belonging to the lower stratum show struggle for upward mobility. The stutterers, in general, have a feeling of inferiority. The stutterer belonging to a lower stratum has to live under the pressure from both of these factors.
Stuttering and Anxiety

Many of the recent studies have focussed on anxiety mainly in terms of situation anxiety and word anxiety which are thought to influence the stutterer's general level of anxiety. Boland (1952) measured the general level of anxiety in the stutterers with the help of two inventories and reported that his stutterers had a significantly higher level of anxiety. Santostefano (1960), using a projective test, found stutterers to have a generally higher level of anxiety than non-stutterers. Karmen (1964) found that her moderate stutterers had a significantly higher anxiety scores than both the "high" and "low" stutterers, while she did not find a significant difference between the stutterers and normal speakers.

The anxiety in this study was measured using Sharma's Scale (1973). Only the trait anxiety was assessed. The stutterers scored significantly higher than the nonstutterers indicating the presence of a higher level of general anxiety in the stutterers. The level of anxiety was not found to be significantly different between the younger and the older subjects belonging to the two groups. The younger stutterers
scored significantly higher than their normal speaking counterparts while such a trend was not observed with reference to the older stutterers. The subjects belonging to better-off families tended to score higher on the anxiety scale. The difference, however, was not found to be significant. Stutterers with a low family income had a significantly higher level of anxiety than the normal speaking subjects of comparable income while this trend was not observed in the stutterers belonging to a well-to-do family. No significant difference was found between the urban and the rural subjects in the control group while the difference between the urban and the rural stutterers was significant, rural stutterers scoring higher. Mild stutterers scored highest on the anxiety scale followed by the moderate and severe stutterers. The stutterers with no secondaries, similarly, scored highest followed by those with few and many secondaries and the difference between stutterers with no secondaries and stutterers with many secondaries was found to be statistically significant.

It is generally agreed that the stutterers have a higher level of anxiety than the normals and the findings of this study do not contradict this view. The interesting observations in this study were that (1) the
older stutterers scored less than the younger ones and
(2) the stutterers with many secondaries scored signifi-
cantly less than those with no secondaries. Probably
a stutterer who lives with the problem for a considerable
length of time learns to 'endure' the 'insurable' and
hence the reduction in the level of explicit anxiety;
implied anxiety gets converted into neuroticism.

Stuttering and Reaction to Frustration

Frustration behaviour can be defined as non-goal
oriented, relatively non-logical behaviour accompanied
by an intensity of feelings as a reaction to need
deprivation. A stutterer experiences frustration in
nearly all the speaking situations. According to
Sheehan (1956) the stutterer wants to speak but is
ashamed to do, wants to be silent but feels frustrated
and guilty should he be so. Reaction to frustration
which usually lacks goal orientation can be classified
into four categories as Aggression, Fixation, Resignation
and Regression. Though there are no studies in the
literature using a test that measures reaction to
frustration, per se, there are frequent references to
aggression and fixation behaviour of stutterers.
Sheehan (1956) for example, feels that stuttering could be an aggressive act and that the act of stuttering serves to reduce the need for aggression temporarily. Wilson (1951) reported that stutterers were more aggressive than their normal siblings on the basis of a Rorschach and TAT study. Douglas and Quarrington (1952) reported that exteriorized stutterers (those who have an overt speech abnormality using avoidance devices to facilitate speech) tended to be aggressive while the interiorized stutterers (characterized by a constant vigilance to avoid stuttering) tended to be submissive. Lewinger (1952), on the other hand, found no significant difference between stutterers and nonstutterers with reference to either aggression or orality. Coriat (1943) concluded that stuttering was a persistence into adult life of infantile nursing behaviour (fixation, regression).

Hence a test that measures aggression, fixation, resignation and regression as reaction to frustration was decided to be used in the present study. No significant difference was found between the stutterers and the nonstutterers on any of the modes of reaction to frustration except on fixation which was marginally
significant and turned out to be significant on a one tail t test. The findings in this study do not tend to support Sheehan's stand that stuttering is an aggressive behaviour since there was no significant difference between the stutterers and the nonstutterers on this variable. There appears to be a tendency among stutterers to be fixating as is seen in their scoring significantly higher on this variable. Coriat's conclusion that stuttering is a persistence into adult life of infantile nursing behavior appears to be logical in the light of the findings in the study.

No significant difference between the younger and older subjects was found on any of the modes of reaction to frustration in both the experimental and the control group. The older stutterers tended to be significantly more regressive while younger stutterers tended to be significantly more resignative as compared to normal speakers of the respective age group.

The normal speaking subjects belonging to a better off family tended to be significantly less regressive and resignative as compared to the subjects belonging to families with lower income while there was no significant difference between the stutterers
belonging to low socio-economic status. Stutterers with a low family income tended to be significantly more fixative.

The observations in the present study do not substantiate considerably the conclusions of the earlier investigators. It is imperative to note that many of the studies reported have concluded that the stutterers are aggressive and fixative using projective techniques. If a non-projective test is used, as is done in the present study, the differences between the stutterers and the nonstutterers tend to disappear. A projective test (Rorschach) was also used in the present study and there were indications that the stutterers had oral fixation as revealed by their giving significantly more food responses.

**Stuttering and Achievement Values**

There have been quite a few studies in stuttering that have reported a consistently significant difference between the stutterers and the nonstutterers, stutterers tending to underestimate their abilities. Sheehan and Zelen (1955), using the Rotter Level of Aspiration Board,
reported a significantly lower discrepancy between aim and accomplishment in stutterers. Level of aspiration discrepancy in stutterers was studied by Mast (1951) who reported a significantly lower scores for stutterers. Goodstein, Martire and Spielberger (1955) did not find any significant difference between stutterers and nonstutterers on achievement motivation.

In the present study a tool that simultaneously measures the subject's achievement related behaviour and task-related behaviour was used. This is the inventory known as Achievement Values and Anxiety Inventory, developed and standardised by Mehta (1960). It was found that the stutterers got significantly higher achievement related scores and significantly lower task-related scores as compared to the normals. No significant difference was observed between the stutterers and the nonstutterers on scores unrelated to achievement. No significant difference or any of the scores was found between the younger and the older subjects belonging to the control group while there was a significant difference between the younger and the older stutterers, younger ones tending to score significantly lower on achievement related behaviour.
and higher on unrelated behaviour. No significant difference was observed between the young stutters and the normals of comparable age while there was a significant difference between older stutters and their normal speaking counterparts with respect to both the achievement related and the task related scores, stutters scoring significantly higher on the former and lower on the latter. No significant difference was found between the stutters belonging to higher and lower economic status on any of the scores while the normal speakers belonging to better-off homes scored significantly higher on non-achievement related behaviour. No significant difference was found between urban and rural subjects of both the experimental and control group on all the three aspects of achievement. A significant difference was observed between the urban stutters and their normal speaking counterparts with reference to both the achievement related and task related behaviour, the stutters scoring higher on achievement related behaviour and lower on task related behaviour. The difference between the rural stutters and the rural nonstutters was not significant. Severe stutters scored highest on
achievement related behaviour and lowest on task related behaviour followed by the moderate and the mild stutterers and the difference between the mild and the severe stutterers for both the aspects was found to be significant. Stutterers with many secondaries scored highest on achievement related behaviour and lowest on task related behaviour followed by those with few and no secondaries and the difference between the stutterers with no secondaries and those with many secondaries and the difference between the stutterers with few secondaries and those with many secondaries was found to be significant for both the aspects.

On the basis of these results it can be surmised that the stutterers, who have a feeling of inadequacy, tend to give more achievement-related responses projecting their phantasies of accomplishment. It is also likely that they give relatively less number of task-related responses because of a fear of failure.
Insecurity

A review of literature indicated that there are no studies focusing on this aspect of the personality. In this study, therefore, it was proposed to study the feeling of insecurity in the stutterers. The inventory developed and standardised by Tiwari and Singh (1975) was used for this purpose.

The stutterers were not found to be significantly different from normal speakers with reference to their feeling of insecurity. No significant difference was found between stutterers belonging to different income groups, age groups and areas of residence. The difference between the mild and the severe stutterers, however, was found to be significant, severe stutterers tending to have greater feeling of insecurity. The stutterers with many secondaries, similarly, scored higher than those with no and few secondaries and the difference between the stutterers with no secondaries and those with many was found to be statistically significant.

The stutterers, as a group, can be said to be comparable to the nonstutterers with reference to the feeling of security-insecurity. The severe stutterers
and those with secondaries scoring significantly higher than the mild stutterers and those with no secondaries tends to indicate that the feeling of insecurity is a function of the handicap.

**Stuttering and the Rorschach**

The Rorschach, as a projective test, is essentially a procedure for revealing the personality of an individual as an individual, as against rating or assessing him in terms of his likeness or conformity to the social norms of action and speech (Frame 1939; Beck, 1937; Klopfer, 1939). The extent to which the personality of an individual can be assessed through this technique is limited only by the ingenuity of the clinician and its validity is limited only by his experience. This has been a tool quite frequently used in the study of the personality of stutterers too (Meltzer, 1944; Richardson, 1944; Krigman, 1946; Malhotra, 1971).

In this study, the Rorschach was used on a limited number of stutterers and an equal number of nonstutterers. These groups were comparable in terms of age and family income. The mean reaction time and the mean response time were longer for the stutterers
as compared to the normals but the mean number of responses were less. None of these differences, however, were found to be statistically significant. The stutterers, in other words, were found to be intellectually as rich and productive as normal speakers. Maltzer (1944) found his stutterers to be more productive while Krugman (1946) reported that his stutterers were less productive.

Stutterers, in this study, tended to analyse minor details more often than normal speakers but the difference was not found to be significant. Richardson (1944) reported similar findings.

A significant difference between stutterers and nonstutterers observed in this study with respect to their perception of F, M, Tf, Fv, Cf and Fe was indicative of the stutterers emotional unstability, greater need for love and affection and achievement motivation (being particular about the quality of their responses). These findings are in keeping with the findings on the other tests and inventories, i.e., they were found to be less affectionate towards their parents (they want to be loved rather than loving), they scored higher on neurotism and anxiety scale and gave more number of achievement related responses.
The stutterers' responses based on animal details being significantly higher and the human responses being significantly lower is suggestive of their being less social, though this was not confirmed by the personality inventory where their scores on extraversion were not different. The food responses were significantly more in the stutterers suggesting that they had a greater concern about their oral needs. Also on the frustration test, they tended to show fixation behaviour as a characteristic reaction to frustration. On the basis of these two findings, it appears that the stutterers have an oral fixation.

A significantly lower affective ratio and higher card rejection and turning observed in the stutterers indicated that they were intro-tensive and relatively more neurotic, confirming some of the earlier observations.

**Discriminating Factors in Stuttering**

The factor analysis revealed that the variables that were the subject matter of this study could be grouped into six factors. Social inadequacy, emotional stability and fixation were the first three factors. The stutterers could be said to be socially inadequate and emotionally unstable individuals who had been
fixated at the oral stage. Other tests and inventories that were used also supported this conclusion.

Nine of the variables on which a significant difference was found between the stutterers and the nonstutterers were really discriminating; given the scores of an individual on the variables, one could predict whether he was a stutterer or not. Fully agreeing with Murphy and Fitzsimons (1960), one could say that these variables are present in varying patterns and degrees in the stutterers, though they might not be different "kind" of people.

Berry and Eisenson (1956) have observed that the clinicians are apt to make the following differing statements:

1. Stutterers as a group, are perfectly normal persons who happen to have speech handicaps. If they have maladjustments, it is because stutterers are human beings and as such may have maladjustments.

2. Stutterers are maladjusted persons for whom stuttering is a manifestation of maladjustment.

3. Stutterers, because of their stuttering, tend to be maladjusted.
4. Stutterers are anxiety-ridden persons who concretize their anxieties and insecurities in their speech.

5. Stutterers are infantile persons who revert to infantile oral behaviour because of their anxieties and insecurities.

6. Stutterers are severely maladjusted, passive, schizoid persons, who require psycho-analytic therapy if they are to recover.

The findings of this study can not be said to be supporting or disputing any of these six categories of clinicians. They only indicated that there were certain psychological differences among stutterers as compared to normal speakers. These might have caused the problem or might be contributing towards maintaining the problem but in either case they need the attention of the clinician who wants to treat the person rather than the problem.