



Auditory attentional Set-shifting and Inhibition in Children who Stutter.

Journal:	<i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i>
Manuscript ID	JSLHR-S-16-0096.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Eggers, Kurt; Thomas More U College, Department of Speech, Language Therapy and Audiology; Turku University, Department of Psychology and Speech-Language Pathology Jansson-Verkasalo, E; University of Turku, Department of Psychology and Speech-Language Pathology
Keywords:	Stuttering, Children, Executive Functions

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

View

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4

5 RUNNING TITLE: AUDITORY ATTENTIONAL SET-SHIFTING AND INHIBITION
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Auditory attentional Set-shifting and Inhibition in Children who Stutter.**
22
23
24

25 Kurt Eggers ^{a, b}
26

27 Eira Jansson-Verkasalo ^b
28
29
30
31

32 ^a Dept. of Speech-Language Therapy and Audiology, Thomas More University College,
33 Antwerp, Belgium
34
35

36 ^b Dept. of Psychology and Speech-Language Pathology, University of Turku, Finland
37
38
39
40

41 kurt.eggerts@thomasmore.be, eira.jansson-verkasalo@utu.fi
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Corresponding author**

51 Kurt Eggers
52 Molenstraat 11
53 2018 Antwerp
54 Belgium
55 Phone: +32 491 56 36 11
56 Email: kurt.eggerts@thomasmore.be
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4

5 **Abstract**
6

7 *Purpose:* The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether previously reported
8 parental questionnaire-based differences in attentional shifting and inhibitory control (AS &
9 IC; Eggers, De Nil, & Van den Bergh, 2010) would be supported by direct measurement of
10 AS and IC using a computer task.
11
12
13
14
15

16 *Method:* Participants were 16 Finnish children who stutter (CWS; mean age = 7;06 years) and
17 16 Finnish children who do not stutter (CWNS; mean age = 7;05 years). Participants were
18 matched on age (\pm 8 months) and gender. AS and IC were assessed by the Auditory Set-
19 Shifting Task of the Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks (De Sonneville, 2009).
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Results:* No group differences were found for the speed of auditory AS or IC. However, CWS,
26 as a group, scored significantly lower on the accuracy (error percentage) of auditory AS. In
27 addition, CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error percentages under
28 AS and IC conditions.
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Conclusions:* The findings on error percentages partly corroborate earlier questionnaire-based
35 findings showing difficulties in CWS on AS and IC. Moreover, it also seems to imply that
36 CWS are less able to slow down their responses in order to achieve higher accuracy rates.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *Key words:* stuttering, children, attention, auditory set-shifting, flexibility, inhibition
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2 3 **1. Introduction**

4
5 Sheridan (2007) described attention as the process of focusing sensory, motor, and/or
6
7 mental resources to environmental aspects in order to acquire knowledge. Posner and Petersen
8
9 (1990) distinguished three anatomically separate functional networks in the attention system
10
11 (see also Corbetta & Shulman, 2002; Loberge, 1995; Rothbart & Posner, 2001; Rueda et al.,
12
13 2004), namely alerting (also named vigilance or sustained attention), which is responsible for
14
15 achieving and maintaining an alert state, orienting (or selective attention), responsible for the
16
17 selection of information from sensory input, and executive control (or conflict network).
18
19

20
21
22
23 Executive control processes are responsible for resolving conflict among responses,
24
25 coordinating and controlling skills and habits, allowing one to choose among tasks,
26
27 monitoring and adjusting one's performance, and changing tasks if needed (Logan, 2003).
28
29 Baddeley (1986) described executive control or executive functioning as those mechanisms
30
31 by which performance is optimized in situations requiring the simultaneous operation of a
32
33 number of different cognitive processes. Currently, executive functioning has become an
34
35 umbrella term, encompassing a number of subdomains derived from empirical studies, some
36
37 more consistently endorsed than others (Baron, 2004), such as attentional control, working
38
39 memory, attentional flexibility, inhibitory control, verbal fluency (not speech fluency),
40
41 planning and organization (Jurado & Roselli, 2007). While the exact nature and the
42
43 relationships between all of these processes are not yet completely understood (Collette,
44
45 Hogge, & Van der Linden, 2006), working memory, attentional flexibility, and inhibitory
46
47 control seem to be given central importance in some theoretical models of executive
48
49 functioning (Barkley, 1997; Garon, Bryson, & Smith, 2008; Miyake, Friedman, Emerson,
50
51 Witzki, & Howerter, 2000; Roberts & Pennington, 1996).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

Some of these key executive functioning processes have already been studied in CWS. There seems to be a growing body of evidence that relates working memory (Anderson & Wagovich, 2010; Bajaj, 2007; Reilly & Donaher, 2005), attentional regulation (Arends, Povel, & Kolk, 1988; Bernstein Ratner & Wijnen, 2006; Bosshardt, 1999, 2002, 2006; Chou, 2014; Felsenfeld, van Beijsterveldt, & Boomsma, 2010; Foundas, Corey, Hurley, & Heilman, 2004; Johnson, Conture, & Walden, 2012; Karrass et al., 2006; Ntourou, Conture, & Walden, 2013; Oomen & Postma, 2001; Schwenk, Conture, & Walden, 2007; Vasic & Wijnen, 2005; Webster, 1990), and inhibitory control (Eggers, 2012; Eggers, De Nil, & Van den Bergh, 2013) to the development and maintenance of stuttering. Moreover, these processes may also play a potential role in the treatment of stuttering because a recent study showed reduced stuttering severity in CWS after receiving attention training, oriented at enhancing executive functioning (Nejati, Pouretamad, & Bahrami, 2013).

Two of these executive functioning processes, i.e. attentional flexibility and inhibitory control, play an important role in emotion regulation. By actively shifting their attention away from stress-evoking situations, children are able to decrease their level of arousal (Harman, Rothbart, & Posner, 1997; Rueda, Posner, & Rothbart, 2004). IC allows children to successfully regulate their emotions by withholding responses long enough to engage appropriate social skills in specific situations (Carlson & Wang, 2007; Kochanska, Murray, Jacques, Koenig, & Vandegest, 1996; Walcott & Landau, 2004).

Several theoretical models of childhood stuttering have suggested that emotions contribute to the development of stuttering (Brutten & Shoemaker, Conture et al., 2006; Conture & Walden, 2012). This seems to be consistent with research findings indicating that a) the severity of stuttering symptoms is affected by anxiety or emotional reactions resulting

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 from situational stress (Alm, 2004; Ezrati-Vinacour & Levin, 2004; Menzies, Onslow, &
4
5 Packman, 1999) and b) CWS, as a group, seem to experience more emotional reactivity to
6
7 their environment (Eggers, De Nil, & Van den Bergh, 2010; Karrass et al., 2006; Schwenk et
8
9 al., 2007). The Communication-Emotional Model of Stuttering (CE-model; Conture et al.,
10
11 2006) is a recent model in which emotional reactivity and regulation play a significant role. In
12
13 this model, moments of stuttering appear as a result of the interaction between distal
14
15 contributors (i.e., genetic predisposition and environmental triggers) and proximal
16
17 contributors (i.e., problems with speech planning and production). Conture et al. hypothesized
18
19 that speech disruptions may be aggravated (e.g., more physically tense or more frequent
20
21 speech disruptions) or maintained (i.e., persistent stuttering vs. recovery) as a result of the
22
23 interaction with ‘exacerbation factors’, i.e. emotional reactivity (arousal) and regulation
24
25 (coping). The purpose of the present study is to investigate the ‘regulation component’ of this
26
27 model by evaluating two of its major contributors, namely attentional flexibility and
28
29 inhibitory control, in CWS.
30
31
32
33
34

35 Attentional flexibility, also labeled as attentional set-shifting (AS) or attention
36
37 switching, points to the switching between multiple tasks or mental sets where one has to
38
39 disengage from the irrelevant task set, shift one’s attention and engage to the relevant task set
40
41 (De Sonneville, 2014), or simply the ability to transfer attentional focus from one activity to
42
43 another (Rothbart, 1989). Research on the ability to adaptively shift attention started with the
44
45 ‘task switching’-paradigm (Jersild, 1927) and has been ongoing since. Different variations to
46
47 this paradigm, where one has to switch task or response-set depending on certain cues or
48
49 information, have been developed (De Sonneville, 2014; Proctor & Vu, 2006), such as the
50
51 Category Test (Reitan & Wolfson, 1985), the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (Heaton, 1981),
52
53 and the Stroop Color-Word Test (Golden, Freshwater, & Golden, 2002). Often, these tests are
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 multifactorial measures, assessing more abilities such as judgment, reasoning, AS, and
4
5 inhibition (Baron, 2004).
6
7
8
9

10 Inhibitory control (IC) is the ability to suppress, interrupt or delay an inappropriate or
11 prepotent response under instructions or in novel or uncertain situations (Rothbart, 1989) or to
12 ignore irrelevant information (Dagenbach & Carr, 1994; Rothbart & Posner, 1985). Specific
13 tests for measuring IC include Go/NoGo or stop-signal tasks, Stroop-like or card sorting
14
15 tests for measuring IC include Go/NoGo or stop-signal tasks, Stroop-like or card sorting
16
17 paradigms (Baron, 2004; Christ, White, Mandernach, & Keys, 2001).
18
19

20
21
22 While previous studies (Eggers et al., 2013; Piispala, Jansson-Verkasalo, & Kallio,
23 2016) already assessed IC abilities in CWS, no studies have aimed directly at measuring AS
24 in this population. Nevertheless, some of the findings of the studies mentioned above,
25 especially those from the dual-task studies (e.g., Bosshardt, 1999, 2002, 2006), can be
26 interpreted as individuals who stutter having difficulties in AS. In these dual task studies,
27 where participants had to shift their attentional set from one task (e.g., a word repetition task)
28 to another task (e.g., a concurrent calculation task), individuals who stutter seemed to perform
29 less proficient compared to nonstuttering individuals. In some of our own previous work,
30 based on parental questionnaires and neurocognitive computer paradigms, we found support
31 for a decreased ability in AS and IC in CWS. In the first studies (Eggers, De Nil, & Van den
32 Bergh, 2009, 2010) we used the Dutch version of the Children's Behavior Questionnaire
33 (Rothbart, Ahadi, Hershey, & Fisher, 2001; Van den Bergh & Ackx, 2003). This temperament
34 questionnaire is based on Rothbart's model of temperament, which she defines as
35 'constitutional differences in reactivity and self-regulation' (Rothbart, 2011). Reactivity refers
36 to motor, emotional, and attentional responses to internal and external stimuli. Self-regulation
37 are those processes serving to modulate this reactivity (e.g., Inhibitory Control, Attention
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2 Shifting). Parents of CWS scored their children significantly lower on the AS-scale than
3 parents of nonstuttering children (CWNS), which was in line with an earlier finding by
4 Embrechts, Ebben, Franke, and van de Poel (2000). In a second study we administered the
5 Attention Network Test (Fan, McCandliss, Sommer, Raz, & Posner, 2002), a computer task
6 evaluating the efficiency of the three attentional networks, to a group of CWS and age- and
7 gender-matched CWNS (Eggers, De Nil, & Van den Bergh, 2012). Although no significant
8 between group differences were found on the executive control network, the network under
9 which AS falls, a clear trend was noticeable for a lowered efficiency of this network ($p =$
10 .066); it was suggested there to use more specific tasks for evaluating certain subdomains of
11 executive control.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Therefore, it was the purpose of this study to assess AS and IC in CWS and CWNS
28 during a computer task directly aimed at measuring these two executive functions. Based on
29 the theoretical conceptualizations of the CE-model and previous findings of parent-reported
30 differences, we hypothesized CWS, as a group, to be less efficient in AS and IC compared to
31 CWNS. First, we anticipated that both groups would have a slower response speed and lower
32 response accuracy (i.e., more errors) during task conditions under which AS and IC was
33 required. Our second hypothesis was that CWS, compared to CWNS, would have
34 significantly lower accuracy rates and/or slower speed of responses during task conditions
35 under which AS and IC was required.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **2. Methods**

52 **2.1. Participants**

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

Participants were 32 monolingual Finnish-speaking children (28 boys and 4 girls) with ages between 6;04 and 9;10 years. Sixteen children were diagnosed with developmental stuttering, and 16 were nonstuttering, typically developing children, matched by age (± 8 months) and gender to the CWS. The mean age was 7;06 years ($SD = 1;03$ years) for the CWS and 7;05 years ($SD = 1;09$ years) for the CWNS, $t(30) = .24, p = .81$. Participants had no known or questionnaire-reported neurological, psychological, developmental or hearing problems. All participants had normal or corrected to normal vision and normal speech and language development. The development of all the children was followed-up in the health care system up to school-age. Since there were no standardized tests for school-aged children to assess morphology and syntax in the Finnish language at the time of the data collection, language production was assessed by a qualified speech and language therapist based on the spontaneous speech samples, and was found to be within normal range. In addition, all the children attended the normal pre-school or school system with no known learning problems.

To exclude cognitive group differences, two subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition Finnish (WISC-III; Wechsler, 2005), Vocabulary and Block Design, were administered. The WISC-III consists of 13 subtests, which can be divided in 6 verbal and 7 performal subtests. The verbal subtest Vocabulary and the performal subtest Block Design correlate highly with the WISC-III overall score (Groth-Marnat, 2009). The subtest Vocabulary requires participants to explain the meaning of single words. In the Block Design subtest, a visual reconstruction task, participants have to rebuild as quickly as possible a geometrical pattern, by using red and white cubes. Mean Vocabulary subtest raw scores were 10 for the CWS (range 5 - 19) and 12 (range 7 - 19) for the CWNS. Mean Block Design subtest raw scores were 11 for the CWS (range 5 - 16) and 13 for the CWNS (range 11 - 17).

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2
3 No significant between-group differences were found for either Vocabulary, $t(30) = -1.40$, p
4
5 = .175) or for Block Design, $t(30) = 1.11$, $p = .092$.
6
7

8
9
10 Hearing was screened by use of a bilateral screening tone-audiometry at 500, 1000,
11
12 2000, and 4000 Hz (SA 50, Entomed, Sweden). All participants had normal hearing.
13

14
15
16 Spontaneous speech samples were collected from all participants on two different days
17
18 and a reading task was included for those, who were able to read. Scores on the Stuttering
19
20 Severity Instrument-3 (SSI-3; Riley, 1994) were calculated based on a sample of minimum
21
22 300 words. The participating CWS produced at least three within-word disfluencies
23
24 (sound/syllable repetition, prolongation or blocks) and/or monosyllabic word repetitions in
25
26 100 words of spontaneous speech (Conture, 2001) and scored at least 'mild' on the SSI-3.
27
28 Eight CWS were classified as mild, 6 as moderate, and 2 were rated severe.
29
30
31

32 33 34 **2.2. Materials**

35 36 **2.2.1. Baseline Speed Task**

37
38 The baseline speed subtask of the Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks (De
39
40 Sonnevile, 2009) is a simple computer-based reaction time task. This task was administered
41
42 to all participants prior to the auditory shifting task in order to evaluate if possible between-
43
44 group reaction time differences existed, which could confound the results of the auditory
45
46 shifting task. Moreover, it allowed participants to get familiarized with the computerized
47
48 experimental setting. Trials began with a white fixation cross on a black background. When
49
50 the target signal, a white centralized square, appeared, participants had to press as soon as
51
52 possible the reaction button. Practice sessions of 10 trials, were followed by two experimental
53
54 blocks of 32 trials, one for the right index finger and one for the left index finger. Signal
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 duration was variable and ended with the response. Valid responses fell between 150 ms and
4
5 4000 ms after stimulus onset. Post response intervals varied randomly between 500 ms and
6
7 2500 ms.
8
9

10 11 **2.2.2. Experimental Task: Auditory attentional Set-Shifting Task**

12
13
14 The Auditory Set-Shifting Task of the Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks (De
15
16 Sonnevile, 2009) is a computer-based paradigm that measures AS and IC. De Sonnevile
17
18 (2014) defines AS as the ability to flexibly shift one's auditory attentional set, and IC as the
19
20 inhibition of prepotent responses (see also Mostert-Kerckhoffs, Staal, Houben, & de Jonghe,
21
22 2015; Serlier-van den Bergh & De Sonnevile, 2002). Figure 1 provides an overview of the
23
24 paradigm. The task consisted of 3 different parts: a) Part 1 had compatible stimulus-response
25
26 (SR) mapping; the stimulus was a single or a double tone with a low pitch (200 Hz); after
27
28 hearing a single tone the participant had to press the response button once, after hearing a
29
30 double tone the participant had to press twice; b) Part 2 had incompatible SR-mapping; the
31
32 stimulus was a single or a double tone with a high pitch (400 Hz) and after a single tone the
33
34 participant had to press the response key twice, after a double tone the participant had to press
35
36 once; c) Part 3 had mixed SR-mapping, which consisted of a random combination of low-
37
38 and high-pitched stimuli. The pitch (low or high) determined the required type of stimulus-
39
40 response mapping; a low pitch meant compatible SR-mapping (press once when 1 tone is
41
42 presented and twice when 2 tones are presented) while a high pitch meant incompatible SR-
43
44 mapping (press twice when 1 tone is presented and once when 2 tones are presented). Single
45
46 and double tone stimuli were presented randomly in all three task parts. Each part started with
47
48 a practice session of 10 trials followed by an experimental block of 40 trials for part 1 and 2,
49
50 and 80 trials for part 3. Prior to the practice session, children were explained what they had to
51
52 do. When task requirements were clear, the practice session was started. The goal of each
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 practice session was to get the children acquainted with the task. Each trial started with a
4
5 fixation period during which a central white cross was presented on a black computer screen
6
7 background. This period had a fixed duration of 500 ms and was followed by the auditory
8
9 presentation of the stimulus via the headphones and simultaneous presentation of a picture of
10
11 a musical note on the computer screen. Children were instructed to respond as fast and as
12
13 accurately as possible. The response button was either the right or left mouse button (below
14
15 the touchpad of the laptop), depending on whether the child responded with the index finger
16
17 of the left or right hand (based on hand preference). The auditory stimulus duration was 100
18
19 ms and the intertone interval (in case of a double tone stimulus) was 100 ms. As part of the
20
21 standard procedure of this auditory AS-task, valid responses fell between 200 ms and 6000
22
23 ms after stimulus onset. The post response interval was fixed at 1500 ms. The overall duration
24
25 of the task was about 11 to 15 minutes (part 1: 2-3 min., part 2: 3-4 min., and part 3: 6-8
26
27 min.).
28
29
30

31
32 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE
33

34 For each of the 3 parts of the auditory AS-task, the following variables were
35
36 automatically recorded and stored for each participant: a) 'mean reaction time (RT)' for both
37
38 compatible and incompatible SR-coupling (when a stimulus was followed by a correct
39
40 response falling between 200 and 6000 ms after stimulus onset), and b) 'number of errors' for
41
42 both compatible and incompatible SR-coupling (when a stimulus was followed by an
43
44 incorrect response).
45
46
47
48

49 This auditory AS-task measures both inhibition and attentional flexibility by
50
51 measuring and comparing the speed and accuracy of response organization processes. During
52
53 the compatible SR-coupling of part 1 (see Figure 1), no inhibition of responses is required.
54
55 Because of the incompatible SR-coupling during part 2, it is necessary to inhibit one's
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 prepotent responses since a single tone here should result in pressing the response button
4
5 twice and vice versa. Inhibition in this task is evaluated by comparing the results of part 2
6
7 with the results of part 1 (De Sonneville, 2014). Also the condition of the SR-coupling differs
8
9 between different parts of the task: SR-coupling is set during part 1&2, requiring no
10
11 attentional set-shifting. During part 3 SR-coupling is random (combination of compatible and
12
13 incompatible SR-coupling) and requires attentional flexibility to continuously shift between
14
15 response-sets. Therefore, attentional set-shifting in this task is evaluated by contrasting the
16
17 results of the compatible condition of part 3 with the results of the compatible condition of
18
19 part 1 (De Sonneville, 2014). It is expected that inhibiting prepotent responses (part 2) will
20
21 lead to slower RTs and/or higher error percentages. Also the demand to switch flexibly
22
23 between response sets (part 3) will usually also impact RTs and accuracy.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **2.3. Procedure**

31
32 Participants and parents were all paid volunteers that were recruited after initial
33
34 contact with their speech and language therapist (for the CWS) or through their schools or
35
36 daycare centers (for the CWNS). All tests were conducted in a quiet setting during two test
37
38 sessions by the second author. During test session A, the baseline speed task was
39
40 administered, followed by the auditory AS-task and collection of a speech sample. During test
41
42 session B, we administered WISC, followed by the tone audiometry and speech sample
43
44 collection. Speech samples were always collected during the two test sessions in order to get a
45
46 better representation of the overall stuttering severity.
47
48
49
50

51
52 Stimuli were presented on a HP Probook 4520s with a 15-inch screen, placed on a
53
54 table. The distance between child, seated on a chair, and computer screen was approximately
55
56 18 inches. Distracting visual stimuli were avoided by placement of the computer to a wall.
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2 Headphones (Sennheiser HD 25 SP) were applied to give the auditory stimuli and to reduce
3 possible distracting auditory stimuli.
4
5
6
7
8

9 **2.4. Data analyses**

10
11 Before the hypotheses were tested, a t-test was used to evaluate possible between-
12 group differences in simple RT (Baseline Speed Task), which could confound the results of
13 the auditory shifting task.
14
15
16
17

18
19
20 The efficiency of IC was evaluated by comparing differences in mean RTs and error
21 percentages between Part 1 (compatible) and Part 2 (incompatible) for CWS and CWNS,
22 using mixed ANCOVAs. Group classification was the between-subjects variable and mean
23 RT and error percentages for each part were within-subjects variables or factors;
24
25 chronological age was set as a covariate. Mixed ANCOVAs were also used to evaluate the
26 efficiency of AS. Mean RTs and error percentages for the compatible conditions in Part 3 and
27 Part 1 were compared for CWS and CWNS. Participant group as between-subjects variable
28 and respectively mean RT and error percentages as within-subjects variable or factor;
29
30 chronological age was set as a covariate. Based on our first hypothesis, we anticipated main
31 effects for Part. Based on our second hypothesis, we anticipated significant Part x Group
32 interactions.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Outliers, i.e. mean RTs and error percentages that deviated more than 3 standard
48 deviations from the mean of all group participants for that specific condition, were excluded
49 (Warner, 2013). From the dataset of 256 values, 8 outliers were removed (CWS: $n = 5$;
50 CWNS: $n = 3$): Part 1 compatible RT (CWS: $n = 1$; CWNS: $n = 1$), Part 1 compatible error
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 percentage (CWS: $n = 3$), Part 2 incompatible error percentage (CWS: $n = 1$; CWNS: $n = 1$),
4
5 Part 3 incompatible error percentage (CWNS: $n = 1$).
6
7
8

9
10 Normality was checked by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality and all RTs were
11 normally distributed. This was not the case for the distribution of error percentages;
12 nevertheless we opted for this test since several authors (e.g., Glass, Peckham, & Sanders,
13 1972; Lix, Keselman, & Keselman, 1996) have demonstrated that the ANOVA procedure is
14 robust enough under lack of normality. Corrections for sphericity are not needed for within-
15 subjects factors with only two levels; in this case SPSS reports a chi-squared of .000 and no p -
16 values.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 3. Results

29
30 Preliminary analysis employing a t-test showed no significant between-group
31 differences in the baseline speed RT: $t(30) = .43, p = .67$; the mean RT was 425 ms ($SD =$
32 124) for CWS and 408 ms ($SD = 93$) for CWNS. Table 1 and table 2 provide respectively an
33 overview of the mean RT and error percentages for both participant groups in the three parts
34 and specific conditions of the auditory AS-task.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

46 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

47 3.1. Findings on Inhibition

48
49 Analyses of RTs showed significant within-subjects effects for Part, $F(1, 27) = 23.10$,
50 $p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .46$, observed power = .99, pointing to an increase in RT in Part 2 ($M = 1047$,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
 $SD = 355$) compared to Part 1 ($M = 561, SD = 103$) (Table 1). The Part x Age interaction was also significant, $F(1, 27) = 10.66, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .28$, observed power = .88. The Part x Group interaction was not significant, $F(1, 27) = 0.26, p = .61, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .08 (Figure 2a). Tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effect of group classification, $F(1, 27) = 0.19, p = .67, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .07.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Analyses of error percentages showed no significant within-subjects effects for Part, $F(1, 24) = 0.273, p = .61, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .08, or Part x Age interaction, $F(1, 24) = 0.00, p = .99, \eta_p^2 = .00$, observed power = .05 (Table 2). The Part x Group interaction however was significant, $F(1, 24) = 5.32, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .18$, observed power = .60 (Figure 2b). Tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant effect of group classification, $F(1, 24) = 0.21, p = .65, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .07.

3.2. Findings on Auditory Attentional Set-Shifting

For the analysis of RTs, tests of within-subjects effects showed a significant effect for Part, $F(1,27) = 13.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34$, observed power = .95, pointing to a significant increase in mean RT in Part 3, with the mean RT for Part 3 ($M = 1318, SD = 434$) being significantly higher than the mean RT for Part 1 ($M = 561, SD = 103$) (Table 1). A significant effect was also found for Part x Age interaction, $F(1, 27) = 4.32, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .14$, observed power = .52. The Part x Group interaction was not significant, $F(1, 27) = 0.22, p = .64, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .07 (Figure 3a). Tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant group effect, $F(1, 27) = 0.17, p = .68, \eta_p^2 = .01$, observed power = .07.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

For the analysis of error percentages, tests of within-subjects effects showed no significant effect for Part, $F(1, 26) = 0.03, p = .86, \eta_p^2 = .00$, observed power = .05, and Part \times Age interaction, $F(1, 26) = 0.51, p = .48, \eta_p^2 = .02$, observed power = .10 (Table 2). In contrast, the Part \times Group interaction did show a significant effect, $F(1, 26) = 12.04, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .32$, observed power = .92 (Figure 3b). Also the test of between-subjects effects showed a significant group effect, $F(1, 26) = 6.61, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .20$, observed power = .70. Pairwise comparisons showed a significant difference in error percentage in Part 1 between CWS ($M = 0,00, SD = 0,00$) and CWNS ($M = 1,16, SD = 1,73$), $p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .16$, observed power = .57; a significant difference in error percentage was also found in Part 3 between CWS ($M = 10,76, SD = 11,65$) and CWNS ($M = 1,06, SD = 1,16$), $p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .27$, observed power = .89.

4. Discussion

Earlier studies revealed a lower efficiency in certain subcomponents of attentional functioning in CWS, more specific, in the subdomain of AS (Eggers et al., 2010 & 2012). Likewise, a lower efficiency was found for IC (Eggers et al., 2010, 2013; Piispala et al., 2016). In the current study the Auditory Set-Shifting Task was used to evaluate whether these earlier parent report-based findings could be corroborated experimentally.

4.1. Attentional set-shifting and inhibition take time

Our first hypothesis was that both groups would have a slower response speed and a higher error percentage during task conditions under which AS and IC (see De Sonneville, 2014) was required. Both CWS and CWNS showed a significant increase in mean RT when they had to inhibit their prepotent responses (incompatible SR-coupling, Part 2) and even

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 more when they had to shift their attentional set (mixed SR-coupling, Part 3). With regard to
4
5 accuracy we did not find an increase in error percentages in Part 2 and Part 3 when both
6
7 groups were collapsed but different interaction patters emerged in CWS and CWNS (see
8
9 below).
10

11
12
13
14 The increase in RTs, a consistent finding in attentional flexibility studies (Pashler,
15
16 2000) labeled as the ‘switch cost’, was apparent in both CWS and CWNS. This switching cost
17
18 is caused by task-set reconfiguration. Monsell, (2003) describes it as a sort of mental ‘gear
19
20 changing’ necessary before appropriate task-specific processes can proceed. Task-set
21
22 reconfiguration can include shifting attention between stimulus characteristics, retrieving goal
23
24 states (what to do) and action rules (how to do it) into procedural working memory (or
25
26 deleting them), enabling a different response set and adjusting response criteria. Moreover, it
27
28 also involves inhibition of elements of the preceding task-set as well as activation of the
29
30 required task-set (Vandierendonck, Liefoghe, & Verbruggen, 2010; Verbruggen, Liefoghe,
31
32 Szmalec, & Vandierendonck, 2005; Schuch & Koch, 2003).
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 The age effects found for RTs in CWS and CWNS in both inhibition and AS-findings
40
41 are in line with maturation of response organization processes such as response selection and
42
43 preparation (Luna et al., 2001; McKay, Halperin, Schwartz, & Sharma, 1994).
44
45
46
47

48 *4.2. CWS experience general difficulty in responding adaptively to errors*

49

50 Our second hypothesis was that CWS, compared to CWNS, would react differently,
51
52 i.e. slower speed of responses and/or lower accuracy rates, during task conditions requiring
53
54 AS and IC. In other words, we expected interactions between task manipulation and group
55
56 classification. For speed of responding, similar patterns emerged in CWS and CWNS; both
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 groups had a comparable increase in RTs from Part 1 to Part 2 (IC) and from Part 1 to Part 3
4
5 (AS). Also no between-group differences on RTs were found. This was not what we were
6
7 expecting and clearly shows that, with regards to speed of responding, both groups act alike.
8
9 For accuracy rates a clearly different pattern emerged for the groups: whereas in CWNS error
10
11 percentages were rather stable, CWS's error percentages clearly increased and resulted in the
12
13 AS-condition in as much as than 10 times more errors (error percentage = 11%) than the
14
15 nonstuttering children (error percentage = 1%).
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 Parts of our findings seem to be in line with results from previous studies employing
23
24 parent questionnaires (Eggers et al., 2010; Embrechts et al., 2000) and computer paradigms
25
26 (Eggers et al., 2012, 2013). A study using the computerized Attention Network Test (Eggers
27
28 et al., 2012) revealed a lower efficiency in attentional orienting in CWS and, although
29
30 nonsignificant, a noticeable trend for a lower efficiency of the executive control network. This
31
32 is the attentional network that is responsible for AS (Posner & Peterson, 1990). Moreover,
33
34 these findings get support from dual-task experiments that have consistently shown less
35
36 efficient performances of individuals who stutter (Bajaj, 2007; Bosshardt, 1999, 2002, 2006;
37
38 Bosshardt et al., 2002; Vasic & Wijnen, 2005) because during these paradigms participants
39
40 have to shift their attentional resources flexibly between the different simultaneous tasks.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 The observation that both groups of children responded more slowly during AS and IC
48
49 conditions but that only the CWNS benefitted (i.e., were more accurate) as a result is
50
51 intriguing. Apparently, CWS and CWNS both showed attentional flexibility with different
52
53 implications for accuracy level. In other words, in the group of CWNS the speed-accuracy
54
55 trade-off was more successful (for description see Förster, Higgins, & Bianco, 2003; Magill,
56
57 2011). Furthermore, one might argue that CWS were less able to adapt their response style,
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 that is, slowing down their responses even more in order to analyze the stimulus, apply the
4
5 correct rule, and execute the correct response in order to increase the response accuracy. This
6
7 seems to be in line with recent findings on an ERP study by Piispala et al. (2016) suggesting
8
9 atypical mechanisms of stimulus evaluation and response selection and execution in CWS.
10

11
12
13
14 No significant between group differences in error percentage were found for IC.
15
16 However, for AS a significant between group difference was encountered which was due to
17
18 the higher error percentage in Part 3. Moreover, similar interaction patterns emerged under
19
20 AS & IC conditions: CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error
21
22 percentages with increased task complexity. This might be linked to difficulties in motor
23
24 learning in CWS as shown by several studies (e.g., Smits-Bandstra & De Nil, 2007). Motor
25
26 learning involves the interaction between the pre-existing capacities and the to-be-learned
27
28 movement patterns (Kelso, 1995). This means that, with practice, muscle execution becomes
29
30 increasingly dependent on an internal representations rather than external sensory feedback
31
32 (Schmidt, 2004). Such learning will result into decreased sensory and attentional demands
33
34 (Schmidt & Lee, 2005). In case children have difficulties in motor learning, they may need to
35
36 pay more attention to stimulus evaluation and response selection, as shown by recent studies
37
38 (Piispala et al. 2016, 2017) which further result into more errors.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Difficulties in auditory-motor integration have also commonly been found in
46
47 individuals who stutter (e.g., Loucks, Chon, Kraft, & Ambrose, 2013). In addition, Chang and
48
49 Zhu (2013) showed that CWS aged 3-9 years had attenuated connections between both
50
51 auditory-motor and cortical-basal ganglia areas on the left side compared to controls. The
52
53 stimuli used in this study were auditory, and the response motor response. Therefore, there is
54
55 a possibility that our results are due atypical auditory-motor integration.
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4
5

6 **4.3. Theoretical and clinical implications**
7

8 In our study, CWS were not able to slow down their speed of response to such a
9 degree that it resulted in a decrease of errors. This fits well with theoretical accounts that
10 implicate sensorimotor control deficits in developmental stuttering, such as the hypothesis
11 that stuttering results from a speech motor strategy that is biased towards auditory feedback
12 control due to poor feedforward commands (Max, Guenther, Gracco, Ghosh & Wallace,
13 2004). The DIVA model of speech production (Tourville & Guenther, 2011) integrates both
14 feedforward and feedback control systems and a monitoring system (Bernstein Ratner &
15 Wijnen, 2006; Civier, Tasko, Guenther, 2010; Postma & Kolk, 1993; Vasic & Wijnen, 2005).
16 Speech motor commands are prepared before movement onset and then executed by a
17 feedforward controller. These movements are controlled by a feedback system, comparing
18 auditory and somatosensory information with the expected target position. In case errors are
19 detected, corrective motor velocity commands are generated. When during early childhood
20 (speech) movements become more automatic, CWNS evolve from a feedback-driven motor
21 control strategy to one that is biased more toward feedforward control (Max et al., 2004). It is
22 hypothesized that in CWS, this feedforward control of speech is impaired, possibly because of
23 a dysfunction of the basal ganglia (Alm, 2004) and/or problems with motor sequence skill
24 learning (Smits-Bandstra & De Nil, 2007), making them more dependent on auditory and
25 sensorimotor monitoring (see also under 4.2). This overreliance on auditory afferent feedback
26 (Civier, Tasko, & Guenther, 2010) has its limitations since a time-lag exists between a motor
27 command and its auditory and somatosensory consequences. This may render the system to
28 become unstable, particularly during fast movements, resulting in moments of stuttering.
29 Simulations by Civier et al. (2010) showed that slowing down movement speed reduced the
30 size of the auditory errors and consequently the frequency of the moments of stuttering.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4

5 Second, AS and IC are considered a central aspect of the executive control of
6
7 cognitive processes (Rushworth, Passingham, & Nobre, 2002) and might also play a role in
8
9 stuttering-triggering situations, both linguistically as well as environmentally determined.
10
11 Stuttering was found to increase in situations with increased syntactical complexity (Bernstein
12
13 Ratner & Sih, 1987) and perceived environmental stress (Ezrati-Vinacour & Levin, 2004;
14
15 Menzies et al., 1999). In both situations, there is a higher demand to flexibly shift one's
16
17 attentional resources between concurrent tasks, including speech planning and execution.
18
19 Additionally, earlier studies have shown the speech of people who stutter to be sensitive to
20
21 interference from concurrent attention-demanding tasks (e.g., Bosshardt, 2006). Also more
22
23 recent publications seem to pinpoint emotions and temperament - both AS and IC are
24
25 components of Rothbart's temperament model (Rothbart et al., 2001) as a) causal contributors
26
27 to developmental stuttering (Conture, Kelly, and Walden, 2013) and b) responsible for
28
29 influencing the variation of stuttering observed in different speaking situations (Jones, Choi,
30
31 Conture, & Walden, 2014).
32
33
34
35

36 Interestingly, Jones et al (2014) state that children with attentional regulation
37
38 difficulties may be at risk for both developing stuttering as well as persistence because of less
39
40 resilience in coping with stuttering over time. Since AS plays a significant role in one's ability
41
42 to respond flexibly in a changing environment (Miller & Cohen, 2001) and in decreasing
43
44 levels of arousal by shifting attention away from stress-evoking situations (Harman et al.,
45
46 1997; Rueda, Posner, & Rothbart, 2004), CWS, as a group, are less able to regulate their
47
48 emotional reactivity and control their levels of distress. In other words, children with a
49
50 lowered AS ability, may be more at risk for persistence due to maladaptive responses to their
51
52 moments of stuttering.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2
3 Although speculative, our findings might also shed some light on the reason for the
4 effectiveness of some clinical approaches or used techniques. Earlier we discussed that the
5 'switch cost', i.e. the increase in RT, although apparent in both CWS and CWNS, only
6 resulted in better accuracy in CWNS. Switch cost is linked to task-set reconfiguration and
7 includes retrieving goal states, action rules, inhibition of elements of preceding tasks. Monsel
8 (2003; Monsell, Yeung, & Azuma, 2000) also described that if advance knowledge is given
9 on the upcoming task and time allowed to prepare for it, the average switch cost is usually
10 reduced or results in less errors (preparation effect). During the cancellations of Van Riper's
11 modification approach (Van Riper, 1982), clients stop immediately after a stuttered word,
12 built in a pause for reposturing, say the word silently in pantomime, and finish with saying the
13 word out loud with the learned modification. These different steps might be considered as
14 'inhibiting the preceding task', preparing for the motor goal that needs to be achieved, and
15 executing the new motor command. The repeated production of the fluent word contributes
16 also to motor memory consolidation, in line with shifting towards a feedforward motor
17 control strategy of the earlier discussed DIVA model. Similarly, in the Lidcombe program
18 (Onslow, Packman, & Harrison, 2003), as part of the parental verbal contingencies, parents
19 acknowledge to the child that a stutter has occurred and can request the child to repeat the
20 same word fluently.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***4.4. Additional considerations and future research***

46
47 Due to the lack of standardized speech and language tests for school-age children in
48 Finnish, language production was assessed based on spontaneous speech samples. Although
49 these were found to be within normal range, this type of assessment did not allow for a
50 between-group comparison. There is evidence that early language skills relate to executive
51 functions (e.g., Ezrine, 2010; Müller, Jacques, Brocki, & Zelazo, 2009) but the exact nature of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 this relationship is far from clear. Therefore, it may be the case that found differences in
4
5 executive functions, i.e. AS, were influenced by between-group differences in language skills.
6
7 However, a recent study by Gooch, Thompson, Nash, Snowling and Hulme (2016) seems to
8
9 indicate that although there is a strong concurrent relationship between language and
10
11 executive skills, it is unlikely that language difficulties would cause deficits in executive
12
13 functioning or that executive functions would provide strong constraints on language
14
15 development.
16
17
18
19
20

21 While both the administration of the auditory set-shifting task and the measurements
22
23 of AS and IC were identical to De Sonneville (2014), a procedure also used by others
24
25 (Mostert-Kerckhoffs, et al., 2015; Serlier-van den Bergh & De Sonneville, 2002), a possible
26
27 influence of other response organization processes cannot be fully ruled out. One might argue
28
29 that the found differences between CWS and CWNS on AS could also reflect possible
30
31 differences in underlying auditory signal processing. Especially because the existing literature
32
33 has shown auditory processing differences between stuttering and nonstuttering individuals
34
35 (Foundas et al., 2004; Hall & Jerger, 1978; Hampton & Weber-Fox, 2008; Jansson-Verkasalo
36
37 et al., 2014; Kaganovich, Wray, Weber-Fox, 2010; Liotti et al., 2010). In Part 3 one is
38
39 confronted with a mix of high and low tones and in case of auditory signal processing
40
41 difficulties, this might become more difficult because one first needs to decide if it is a high or
42
43 a low tone. This is however not the case for IC since in Part 2 only high tones are presented.
44
45 Nonetheless, in our view, it is not likely that this aspect had a major impact on the results
46
47 because previous studies (Corbera, Corral, Escera, & Idiazábal, 2005; Kaganovich, Wray, &
48
49 Weber-Fox, 2010) showed that CWS did not have any difficulties in processing non-speech
50
51 sounds, which were also used in this experiment. To clearly rule this out, it might be a good
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 suggestion to compare the results of this task to an AS-paradigm using visual stimuli instead
4
5 of auditory stimuli.
6
7
8

9
10 The current study and various previous studies (Eggers et al., 2010, 2012, 2013;
11 Johnson et al., 2012; Karrass et al., 2006; Ntourou et al., 2013; Schwenk et al., 2007) have
12 focused on finding possible differences between CWS and CWNS in terms of attention,
13 executive functions, and inhibitory control. These studies have contributed to a better
14 understanding of their possible causal or exacerbating role in the development of stuttering.
15
16 Important questions remain to what extent these processes a) influence specific quantitative
17 and/or qualitative stuttering characteristics, b) can predict or play a role in spontaneous
18 recovery or stuttering chronicity, c) can help tailor stuttering treatments to the individual
19 needs of clients, d) can predict or play a role in treatment outcome.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 A noteworthy observation during the test sessions was that many of the CWS,
33 compared to the CWNS, seemed to respond in a somewhat different manner when mistakes
34 were made. The complexity of the task gradually increased resulting in more errors towards
35 the end of the task. While many CWNS verbally responded with statements like ‘Oops, ... a
36 mistake.’, ‘High tone ... double-click.’, ‘High tone ... opposite’, the verbalizations of many
37 of the CWS were more in the range of ‘Wrong again.’ or ‘It’s difficult.’ Research in this area
38 has shown that overt verbalizations can enhance children’s attention to task-relevant features,
39 can help to maintain a positive task outlook and cope with difficulties, and ultimately,
40 improve the learning process (Schunk, 1986). CWS also seemed to have more difficulty
41 coping with their mistakes and became more easily frustrated. From a research perspective, it
42 might be interesting to study whether CWS, as a group, actually do become more easily
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 frustrated or have a lower frustration tolerance, as already referred to by some authors
4
5 (Amster & Klein, 2008; Hill, 1999; Starkweather, 2002).
6
7
8
9

10 **5. Conclusions**

11 In conclusion, the results of the current study showed differences in AS and IC
12 between CWS and CWNS, using an auditory AS paradigm. CWS were less accurate in a)
13 flexibly shifting their attention between different response-sets and b) inhibiting their
14 responses when needed. These findings support earlier questionnaire-based findings and were
15 linked to a possible role for AS and IC in developmental stuttering.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Acknowledgments**

26 The present study was supported by Thomas More University College and Turku
27 University. We also would like to thank the children and parents who participated in this
28 study, and student Katri Aro for her assistance in processing some of the data.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2

3 **References**
4

5
6
7 Alm, P. A. (2004). Stuttering, emotions, and heart rate during anticipatory anxiety: A critical
8 review. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 29, 123–133.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Amster, B. J., & Klein, E. R. (2008). Perfectionism in people who stutter: Preliminary
15 findings using a modified cognitive-behavioral treatment approach. *Behavioral and*
16 *Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 36, 35–40.
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 Anderson, J. D., & Wagovich, S. A. (2010). Relationships among linguistic processing speed,
24 phonological working memory, and attention in children who stutter. *Journal of*
25 *Fluency Disorders*, 35, 216–234.
26
27
28

29
30
31
32 Arends, N., Povel, D. J., & Kolk, H. (1988). Stuttering as an attentional phenomenon. *Journal*
33 *of Fluency Disorders*, 13, 141–151.
34
35
36

37
38 Baddeley, A. D. (1986). *Working memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
39

40
41
42
43 Bajaj, A. (2007). Working memory involvement in stuttering: Exploring the evidence and
44 research implications. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 32, 218–238.
45
46
47

48
49
50 Barkley, R. A. (1997). Behavioral inhibition, sustained attention, and executive functions:
51 Constructing a unified theory of ADHD. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 65–94.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Baron, I. S. (2004). *Neuropsychological evaluation of the child*. New York: Oxford
4
5 University Press.
6
7
8
9
10 Bernstein Ratner, N., & Sih, C. C. (1987). Effects of gradual increases in sentence length and
11
12 complexity of children's dysfluency. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*,
13
14 52, 278–287.
15
16
17
18 Bernstein Ratner, N., & Wijnen, F. (2006, July). *The Vicious Cycle: Linguistic Encoding,*
19
20 *Self-Monitoring and Stuttering*. Seminar presented at the Fifth World Congress of the
21
22 International Fluency Association, Dublin.
23
24
25
26
27 Bosshardt, H. G. (1999). Effects of concurrent mental calculation on stuttering, inhalation and
28
29 speech timing. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 24, 43–72.
30
31
32
33
34 Bosshardt, H. G. (2002). Effects of concurrent cognitive processing on the fluency of word
35
36 repetition: Comparison between persons who do and do not stutter. *Journal of Fluency*
37
38 *Disorders*, 27, 93–114.
39
40
41
42
43 Bosshardt, H. G. (2006). Cognitive processing load as a determinant of stuttering: Summary
44
45 of a research programme. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 20, 371–385.
46
47
48
49
50 Bosshardt, H. G., Ballmer, W., & De Nil, L. (2002). Effects of category and rhyme decisions
51
52 on sentence production. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 45,
53
54 844–857.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Brtten, E., & Shoemaker, D. (1967). *The modification of stuttering*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
4
5 Prentice Hall.
6
7
8
9
10 Carlson, S., & Wang, T. (2007). Inhibitory control and emotion regulation in preschool
11
12 children. *Cognitive Development*, 22, 489–510.
13
14
15
16 Chang, S. E. & Zhu, D. C. (2013). Neural network connectivity differences in children who
17
18 stutter. *Brain*, 3709-3726.
19
20
21
22
23 Chou, F. C. (2014). *Behavioral and electrophysiological observations of attentional control*
24
25 *in children who stutter*. Doctoral thesis, University of Iowa. Retrieved from
26
27 <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/4593>.
28
29
30
31
32 Christ, S. E., White, D. A., Mandernach, T., & Keys, B. A. (2001). Inhibitory control across
33
34 the life span. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 20, 653–669.
35
36
37
38
39 Civial, O., Tasko, S. M., & Guenther, F. H. (2010). Overreliance on auditory feedback may
40
41 lead to sound/syllable repetitions: Simulations of stuttering and fluency-inducing
42
43 conditions with a neural model of speech production. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*,
44
45 35, 246–279.
46
47
48
49
50 Collette, F., Van der Linden, M., Delfiore, G., Degueldre, C., Luxen, A., & Salmon, E.
51
52 (2001). The functional anatomy of inhibition processes investigating the hayling task.
53
54 *Neuroimage*, 14, 258–267.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Conture, E. G. (2001). *Stuttering: Its nature, diagnosis and treatment*. Boston: Allyn &
4
5 Bacon.
6
7
8
9
10 Conture, E. G., Kelly, E. M., & Walden, T. A. (2013). Temperament, speech and language:
11
12 An overview. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 46, 125–142.
13
14
15
16 Conture, E. G., & Walden, T. A. (2012). Dual diathesis-stressor model of stuttering. In Y. O.
17
18 Filatova (Ed.), *Theoretical Issues of Fluency Disorders* (pp. 94–127). Moscow:
19
20 National Book Centre, ISBN: 978-5-4441-0005-9.
21
22
23
24
25 Conture, E. G., Walden, T. A., Arnold, H. S., Graham, C. G., Hartfield, K. N., & Karrass, J.
26
27 (2006). Communication-emotional model of stuttering. In N. Bernstein & J. Tetnowski
28
29 (Eds.), *Current issues in stuttering research and practice* (pp. 17–46). Mahwah, NJ,
30
31 US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
32
33
34
35
36 Corbera, S., Corral, M., Escera, C., & Idiazábal, M. (2005). Abnormal speech sound
37
38 representation in persistent developmental stuttering. *Neurology*, 65, 1246–1252.
39
40
41
42
43 Corbetta, M. & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention
44
45 in the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3, 201–215.
46
47
48
49 Dagenbach, D., & Carr, T. H. (1994). *Inhibitory processes in attention memory and language*.
50
51 San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2
3 Derryberry, D., & Rothbart, M. K. (1988). Arousal, affect, and attention as components of
4
5 temperament. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 958–966.
6
7

8
9 De Sonnevile, L. M. J. (2009). *Amsterdamse Neuropsychologische Taken*. □Amsterdam
10
11 *Neuropsychological tasks*□. Amsterdam: Boom Test Publishers.
12
13

14
15 De Sonnevile, L. (2014). *Handboek ANT: Amsterdamse Neuropsychologische Taken*.
16
17 □*Handboek ANT: Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks*□. Boom test Publishers,
18
19 Amsterdam.
20
21

22
23
24 Eggers, K. (2012). Responsinhibitie bij volwassen personen die stotteren versus niet stotteren
25
26 [Response inhibition in adults who stutter versus adults who do not stutter]. *Logopedie*
27
28 [*Logopedics*], July-August Issue, 76–83.
29
30
31

32
33
34 Eggers, K., De Nil, L., & Van den Bergh, B. (2009). Factorial Temperament Structure in
35
36 Stuttering, Voice Disordered, and Normal Speaking Children. *Journal of Speech,*
37
38 *Language, and Hearing Research*, 52, 1610–1622.
39
40
41

42
43 Eggers, K., De Nil, L., & Van den Bergh, B. (2010). Temperament dimensions in stuttering
44
45 and typically developing children. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 35, 355–372.
46
47
48

49
50 Eggers, K., De Nil, L., & Van den Bergh, B. (2012). The efficiency of attentional networks in
51
52 children who stutter. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 55, 946–
53
54 959.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Eggers, K., De Nil, L. F., & Van Den Bergh, B. R. H. (2013). Inhibitory control in childhood
4
5 stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 38, 1–13.
6
7
8
9
10 Embrechts, M., Ebben, H., Franke, P., & van de Poel, C. (2000). Temperament: A comparison
11
12 between children who stutter and children who don't stutter. In H. G. Bosshardt, J. S.
13 Yaruss, & H. F. M. Peters (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Third World Congress on*
14
15 *Fluency Disorders: Theory, research, treatment, and self-help* (pp. 557–562).
16
17 Nijmegen, The Netherlands: University of Nijmegen Press.
18
19
20
21
22
23 Ezrati-Vinacour, R., & Levin, I. (2004). The relationship between anxiety and stuttering: A
24
25 multidimensional approach. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 29, 135–148.
26
27
28
29
30 Ezrine, G. A. (2010). *Effects of Language on the Development of Executive Functions in*
31
32 *Preschool Children*. Dissertation, Georgia State University.
33
34 http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cps_diss/41
35
36
37
38
39 Fan, J., McCandliss, B. D., Sommer, T., Raz, A., & Posner, M. I. (2002). Testing the
40
41 efficiency and independence of attentional networks. *Journal of Cognitive*
42
43 *Neuroscience*, 14, 340–347.
44
45
46
47
48 Felsenfeld, F., van Beijsterveldt, C. E. M., & Boomsma, D. I. (2010). Attentional regulation
49
50 in young twins with probable stuttering, high nonfluency, and typical fluency.
51
52 *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53, 1147–1166.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Förster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Bianco, A. T. (2003). Speed/accuracy decisions in task
4
5 performance: Built-in trade-off or separate strategic concerns? *Organizational*
6
7 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 90, 148–164.
8
9
10
11 Foundas, A. L., Corey, D. M., Hurley, M. M., & Heilman, K. M. (2004). Verbal dichotic
12
13 listening in developmental stuttering: subgroups with atypical auditory processing.
14
15 *Cognitive Behavioral Neuroscience*, 17, 224–232.
16
17
18
19
20
21 Garon, N., Bryson, S., & Smith, I. M. (2008). Executive function in preschoolers: A review
22
23 using and integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 31–60.
24
25
26
27
28 Glass, G. V., Peckham, P. D., & Sanders, J. R. (1972). Consequences of failure to meet
29
30 assumptions underlying fixed effects analyses of variance and covariance. *Review of*
31
32 *Educational Research*, 42, 237–288.
33
34
35
36
37 Golden, C. J., Freshwater, S. M., & Golden, Z. (2002). *Stroop color and word test: Children's*
38
39 *version for ages 5-14*. Wood Dale, Illinois: Stoelting.
40
41
42
43 Gooch, D., Thompson, P., Nash, H. M., Snowling, M. J., & Hulme, C. (2016). The
44
45 development of executive function and language skills in the early school years.
46
47 *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57, 180–187.
48
49
50
51
52 Groth-Marnat, G. (2009). *Handbook of psychological assessment (5th ed.)*. Hoboken, New
53
54 Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Guenther, F. H., & Hicoock, G. (2015). Role of the auditory system in speech production. In G.
4
5 G. Celesia & G. Hicoock (Eds.), *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, Vol. 129 (3rd
6
7 series) (pp. 161–175). Elsevier B. V.
8
9
10
11
12 Hall, J., & Jerger, J. (1978). Central auditory function in stutterers. *Journal of Speech and*
13
14 *Hearing Research*, 21, 324–337.
15
16
17
18 Hampton, A., & Weber-Fox, C. (2008). Non-linguistic auditory processing in stuttering:
19
20 Evidence from behavior and event-related brain potentials. *Journal of Fluency*
21
22 *Disorders*, 33, 253–273.
23
24
25
26
27 Harman, C., Rothbart, M. K., & Posner, M. I. (1997). Distress and attention interactions in
28
29 early infancy. *Motivation and Emotion*, 21, 27–43.
30
31
32
33
34 Heaton, R. K. (1981). *Wisconsin Card Sorting Test*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment
35
36 Resources.
37
38
39
40
41 Hill, D. (1999). Evaluation of child factors related to early stuttering: A descriptive study. In
42
43 N. Bernstein Ratner & E. C. Healey (Eds.), *Stuttering research and practice: Bridging*
44
45 *the gap* (pp. 145-174). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
46
47
48
49
50 Jansson-Verkasalo, E., Eggers, K., Järvenpää, A., Suominen, K., Van den Bergh, B., & De
51
52 Nil, L., & Kujala, T. (2014). Central auditory processing in children who stutter as
53
54 indexed by the mismatch negativity. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 41, 1–11.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Jersild, A. T. (1927). Mental set and shift. *Archives of Psychology*, 89, 5–82.
4
5
6
7 Johnson, K. N., Conture, E. G., & Walden, T. A. (2012). Efficacy of attention regulation in
8 preschool-age children who stutter: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of*
9 *Communication Disorders*, 45, 263–278.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Jones, R., Choi, D., Conture, E., & Walden, T. (2014). Temperament, emotion, and childhood
17 stuttering. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 35, 114–131.
18
19
20
21
22 Jurado, M. B., & Roselli, M. (2007). The elusive nature of executive functions: A review of
23 our current understanding. *Neuropsychological Review*, 17, 213–233.
24
25
26
27
28
29 Kaganovich, N., Wray, A., & Weber-Fox, C. (2010). Non-linguistic auditory processing and
30 working memory update in pre-school children who stutter: an
31 electrophysiological study. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 35, 712–736.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Karrass, J., Walden, T. A., Conture, E. G., Graham, C. G., Arnold, H. S., Hartfield, K. N., &
39 Schwenk, K. A. (2006). Relation of emotional reactivity and regulation to
40 childhood stuttering. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 39, 402–423.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Kelso, J. A. S. (1995). *Dynamic patterns: The self-organization of brain and behavior*.
48 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Kochanska, G., Murray, K., Jacques, T. Y., Koenig, A. L., & Vandegest, K. A. (1996).
4
5 Inhibitory control in young children and its role in emerging internalization.
6
7 *Child Development*, 67, 490–507.
8
9
10
11
12 Laberge, D. H. (1995). *Attentional processing: The brain's art of mindfulness*. Cambridge,
13
14 MA: Harvard University Press.
15
16
17
18
19 Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, 14, 41–104.
20
21
22
23 Liotti, M., Ingham, J., Takai, O., Kothmann Paskos, D., Perez, R., & Ingham, R. (2010).
24
25 Spatiotemporal dynamics of speech sound perception in chronic developmental
26
27 stuttering. *Brain and Language*, 115, 141–147.
28
29
30
31
32
33 Lix, L. M., Keselman, J. C., & Keselman, H. J. (1996). Consequences of assumption
34
35 violations revisited: A quantitative review of alternatives to the one-way
36
37 analysis of variance F test. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 579–619.
38
39
40
41
42
43 Logan, G. D. (2003). Executive control of thought and action: In search of the wild
44
45 homunculus. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 2, 45–48.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Loucks, T., Chon, H., Kraft, S. J., & Ambrose, N. A. (2013). Individual differences in
52
53 auditory-motor integration revealed by speech fluency manipulations. *The*
54
55 *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 133, 3518
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4

5
6 Luna, B., Thulborn, K. R., Munoz, D. P., Merriam, E. P., Garver, K. E., Minshew, N. J.,
7
8 Keshavan, M. S., Genovese, C. R., Eddy, W. F., & Sweeney, J. A. (2001).
9
10 Maturation of Widely Distributed Brain Function Subserves Cognitive
11
12 Development. *NeuroImage* 13, 786–793.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19 Magill, R. A. (2011). *Motor learning and control: Concepts and applications*. New York:
20
21 McGraw-Hill.
22
23

24
25 Max, L., Guenther, F. H., Gracco, V. L., Ghosh, S. S., & Wallace, M. E. (2004). Unstable or
26
27 insufficiently activated internal models and feedback-biased motor control as
28
29 sources of dysfluency: A theoretical model of stuttering. *Contemporary Issues in*
30
31 *Communication Science and Disorders*, 31, 105–122.
32
33

34
35
36
37
38 McKay, K. E., Halperin, J. M., Schwartz, S. T., & Sharma, V. (1994). Developmental
39
40 analysis of three aspects of information processing: Sustained attention,
41
42 selective attention, and response organization. *Developmental Neuropsychology*,
43
44 10, 121–132.
45
46

47
48
49
50 Menzies, R., Onslow, M., & Packman, A. (1999). Anxiety and stuttering: Exploring a
51
52 complex relationship. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 8, 3–10.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Miller, E. K. & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An integrative theory of prefrontal function. *Annual*
4
5 *Review of the Neurosciences*, 24, 167–202.
6
7
8
9
10 Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., & Howerter, A. (2000). The
11
12 unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex ‘frontal
13
14 lobe’ tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 49–100.
15
16
17
18
19
20 Monsell, S. (2003). Task switching. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 134–140.
21
22
23
24 Monsell, S., Yeung, N., & Azuma, R. (2000). Reconfiguration of task-set: Is it easier to
25
26 switch to the weaker task? *Psychological Research*, 63, 250–264.
27
28
29
30
31 Mostert-Kerckhoffs, M. A. L., Staal, W. G., Houben, R. H., & de Jonghe, M. V. (2015). Stop
32
33 and change: Inhibition and flexibility skills are related to repetitive behavior in
34
35 children and young adults with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and*
36
37 *Developmental Disorders*, 45, 3148-3158.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Müller, U., Jacques, S., Brocki, K., & Zelazo, D. (2009). The executive functions of language
45
46 in preschool children. In A. Winsler, C. Fernyhough, and I. Montero (Eds.), *Private*
47
48 *Speech, Executive Functioning, and the Development of Verbal Self-Regulation*
49
50 (pp.53–68). New York: Cambridge University Press.
51
52
53
54
55 Nejadi, V., Pouretamad, H. R., & Bahrami, H. (2013). Attention training in rehabilitation of
56
57 children with developmental stuttering. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 32, 297–303.
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3
4
5 Ntourou K., Conture, E. G., & Walden, T. A. (2013). Emotional reactivity and regulation in
6
7 preschool-age children who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 38, 260–274.
8
9
10
11
12 Onslow, M., Packman, A., & Harrisson, E. (2003). The Lidcombe program of early stuttering
13
14 intervention: A clinician's guide. Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed, Inc.
15
16
17
18 Oomen, C. C. E., & Postma, A. (2001). Effects of divided attention on the production of filled
19
20 pauses and repetitions. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 44, 997–
21
22 1004.
23
24
25
26
27 Pashler, H. (2000). Task switching and multitask performance. In S. Monsell, and J. Driver
28
29 (Eds.), *Attention and Performance XVIII: Control of mental processes* (pp. 277–307).
30
31 Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
32
33
34
35
36 Piispala, J., Jansson-Verkasalo, E., & Kallio, M. (2016). Delayed N2 response in Go
37
38 condition in a visual Go/Nogo ERP study in children who stutter. *Journal of Fluency*
39
40 *Disorders*, 48, 16–26.
41
42
43
44
45 Posner, M. I. (1980). Orienting of attention. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*,
46
47 41, 19–45.
48
49
50
51
52 Posner, M. I., & Petersen, S. E. (1990). The attention systems of the human brain. *Annual*
53
54 *Review of Neuroscience*, 13, 25–42.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Postma, A., & Kolk, H. H. J. (1993). The covert repair hypothesis: Prearticulatory repair
4
5 processes in normal and stuttered disfluencies. *Journal of Speech and Hearing*
6
7 *Research*, 36, 472–487.
8
9
10
11 Proctor, R. W., & Vu, K. L. (2006). *Stimulus-response compatibility principles: Data, theory,*
12
13 *and application*. New York: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group
14
15
16
17
18 Riley, G. D. (1994). *Stuttering Severity Instrument for Children and Adults – Third Edition.*
19
20 Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
21
22
23
24
25 Reilly, J. & Donaher, J. (2005). Verbal working memory skills of children who stutter: a
26
27 preliminary investigation. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and*
28
29 *Disorders*, 32, 38–42.
30
31
32
33
34 Reitan, R., & Wolfson, D. (1985). *The Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery.*
35
36 Tucson, AZ: Neuropsychological Press.
37
38
39
40
41 Roberts, R. J., & Pennington, B. F. (1996). An interactive framework for examining
42
43 prefrontal cognitive processes. *Developmental Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 12, 105–
44
45 126.
46
47
48
49 Rothbart, M. K. (2011). *Becoming who we are. Temperament and personality in development.*
50
51 New York, NY: Guilford.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Rothbart, M. K. (1989). Temperament and development. In G. Kohnstamm, J. Bates, & M. K.
4
5 Rothbart (Eds.), *Temperament in childhood* (pp. 187–248). Chichester, England:
6
7 Wiley.
8
9
10
11 Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., Hershey, K. L., & Fisher, P. (2001). Investigation of
12
13 temperament at three to seven years: The Children's Behavior Questionnaire. *Child*
14
15 *Development*, 72, 1394–1408.
16
17
18
19
20 Rothbart, M. K., & Posner, M. I. (1985). Temperament and the development of self-
21
22 regulation. In L. C. Hartlage, & C. F. Telzrow (Eds.), *The neuropsychology of*
23
24 *individual differences: A developmental perspective* (pp. 93–123). New York: Plenum.
25
26
27
28
29 Rothbart, M. K., & Posner, M. I. (2001). Mechanisms and variation in the development of
30
31 attentional networks. In C. A. Nelson & M. Luciana (Eds.), *Handbook of*
32
33 *developmental cognitive neuroscience* (pp. 353–363). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
34
35
36
37
38 Rueda, M. R., Fan, J., McCandliss, B. D., Halparin, J. D., Gruber, D. B., Lercari, L. P., &
39
40 Posner, M. I. (2004). Development of attentional networks in childhood.
41
42 *Neuropsychologica*, 42, 1029–1040.
43
44
45
46
47 Rueda, M. R., Posner, M. I., & Rothbart, M. K. (2004). Attention control and self-regulation.
48
49 In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation:*
50
51 *Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 283–300). New York, NY: Guilford.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Rushworth, M.F.S., Passingham, R.E., & Nobre, A.C. (2002). Components of switching
4
5 intentional set. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 14, 1139–1150.
6
7
8
9 Schmidt, R. A. & Lee, T. D. (2005). *Motor control and learning (5th ed.): A behavioral*
10
11 *emphasis*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
12
13
14
15
16 Schwenk, K. A., Conture, E. G., & Walden, T. A. (2007). Reaction to background stimulation
17
18 of preschool children who do and do not stutter. *Journal of Communication Disorders*,
19
20 40, 129–141.
21
22
23
24
25 Serlier-van den Bergh, A. H. M. L., & De Sonnevile, L. M. J. (2002). Auditory and visual
26
27 attention flexibility in children with NLD. In AMHL Serlier-van den Bergh,
28
29 *Development and Validation of the Dutch Nonverbal Learning Disabilities Scale and*
30
31 *Dutch Preschool Nonverbal Learning Disabilities Scale (pp. 153-169)*. Phd Thesis,
32
33 Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Tilburg.
34
35
36
37
38 Sheridan, T. B. (2007). Attention and its allocation: fragments of a model. In A. F. Kramer,
39
40 D. A. Wiegmann, & A. Kirlik (Eds.), *Attention: from theory to practice* (pp. 16–26).
41
42 New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
43
44
45
46
47 Schuch, S., & Koch, I. (2003). The role of response selection for inhibition of task sets in task
48
49 shifting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*,
50
51 29, 92–105
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition
2
3 Schunk, D. H. (1986). Verbalization and children's self-regulated learning. *Contemporary*
4
5 *Educational Psychology*, 11, 347–369.
6
7
8
9
10 Smits-Bandstra, S., & De Nil, L. F. (2007). Sequence skill learning in persons who stutter:
11
12 Implications for cortico-striato-thalamo-cortical dysfunction. *Journal of Fluency*
13
14 *Disorders*, 32, 251–278.
15
16
17
18 Starkweather, C. W. (2002). The epigenesis of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 27,
19
20 269–288.
21
22
23
24
25 Van den Bergh, B., & Ackx, M. (2003). Een Nederlandse versie van Rothbarts 'Children's
26
27 Behavior Questionnaire'. [The Dutch version of Rothbart's Children's Behavior
28
29 Questionnaire]. *Kind en Adolescent*, 24, 77–84.
30
31
32
33
34 Vandierendonck, A., Liefoghe, B., & Verbruggen, F. (2010). Task switching: Interplay of
35
36 reconfiguration and interference control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 601–626.
37
38
39
40
41 Verbruggen, F., Liefoghe, B., Szmalec, A. & Vandierendonck, A. (2005). Inhibiting
42
43 responses when switching: Does it matter? *Experimental Psychology*, 52, 125–130.
44
45
46
47 Vasic, N., & Wijnen, F. (2005). Stuttering as a monitoring deficit. In R. J. Hartsuiker, R.
48
49 Bastiaanse, A. Postma, & F. Wijnen (Eds.), *Phonological encoding and monitoring in*
50
51 *normal and pathological speech* (pp. 226–247). Hove (East Sussex): Psychology
52
53 Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

2
3 Van Riper, C. (1982). *The nature of stuttering (2nd ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

4
5
6
7 Walcott, C. M., & Landau, S. (2004). The relation between disinhibition and emotion

8
9 regulation in boys with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Clinical*
10
11
12 *Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33, 772–782.

13
14
15
16 Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques (2nd*
17
18 *edition)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

19
20
21
22
23 Webster, W. G. (1990). Evidence in bimanual finger-tapping of an attentional component to
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
stuttering. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 37, 93–100.

30 Wechsler, D. (2005). Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Derde Editie NL. [*Wechsler*
31
32 *Intelligence Scale for Children Third Edition Dutch*]. London: Harcourt Assessment.

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Schematic overview of the Auditory attentional set-shifting test.

Figure 2. Speed (a) and accuracy (b) of inhibition for CWS and CWNS.

Figure 3. Speed (a) and accuracy (b) of attentional set-shifting for CWS and CWNS.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

Table 1

Mean reaction times in ms for CWS and CWNS.

Group	Part 1		Part 2		Part 3			
	Compatible		Incompatible		Compatible		Incompatible	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
CWS	559	117	1056	398	1273	486	1357	458
CWNS	563	90	1125	378	1364	385	1510	488

For Peer Review

Auditory attentional set-shifting and inhibition

Table 2

Error percentages for CWS and CWNS.

Group	Part 1		Part 2		Part 3			
	Compatible		Incompatible		Compatible		Incompatible	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
CWS	0,00	0,00	3,49	4,20	10,76	11,65	12,76	12,78
CWNS	1,16	1,73	2,00	1,94	1,06	1,16	1,88	0,48

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Schematic overview of the Auditory attentional set-shifting test.

142x132mm (72 x 72 DPI)

review




Figure 2. Speed (a) and accuracy (b) of inhibition for CWS and CWNS.

384x127mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Speed (a) and accuracy (b) of attentional set-shifting for CWS and CWNS.

379x128mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3 Dear Dr. Liss,
4 Dear Dr. Bosshardt,

5
6 We would like to thank you for the additional comments on our manuscript 'Auditory attentional Set-
7 shifting in Children who Stutter' by K. Eggers and E. Jansson-Verkasalo. We have reworked the
8 manuscript and have taken into account the comments that were made by the associate editor. The
9 reviewers suggested accepting the paper for publication.

10 We would like to ask you to reconsider the manuscript for publication.

11 In what follows we will describe the changes to the manuscript:
12
13

14 **Editor's comments (Liss, Julie)**

15 Reviewers, the Associate Editor, and I have reviewed your revised manuscript. All agree that your
16 efforts so far have been outstanding, however further revision is necessary.
17

18 *We thank the editor for the positive comment about our revision. We have made further*
19 *revisions in line with the suggestions.*
20
21

22 **Associate Editor's comments (Bosshardt, Hans-Georg)**

23 Summary

24 The ms has been reviewed by one of the reviewers who had already reviewed the previous version of
25 the ms and was thoroughly read again by myself. The reviewer suggested to accept the paper. From
26 my own reading I still have serious reservations against the discussion of the results in its present
27 form.

28 General comments

29 I am very grateful that the authors have taken pains to explain their procedure and its rationale in
30 greater detail to me. Although their description of the procedure in the paper had not much changed
31 over time I have now the impression to understand it. I suggest to leave it as it is because I cannot
32 make any suggestions how its comprehension could be facilitated.
33

34 *We thank the associate editor for the positive comment about the revision. As suggested, we*
35 *have left the description of the procedure as it was.*
36
37

38 I am still concerned about the discussion of the results because the second hypothesis as formulated
39 on p. 7 is clearly not supported by the results: The groups did not significantly differ with respect to
40 response speed for AS as well as for IC and similarly the two groups did also not differ in the
41 accuracy of IC, but they did differ in accuracy of AS.

42 In the discussion I missed **a clear statement** referring to the fact that several results do not correspond
43 to the expectations as originally formulated (p.7, 2nd par.). Similarly the theoretical consequences of
44 this fact were not discussed.
45

46 *Our second hypothesis was that CWS, compared to CWNS, would have significantly lower*
47 *accuracy rates and/or slower speed of responses during task conditions under which AS and*
48 *IC was required. So we did not specifically anticipate both RT and accuracy differences but*
49 *one or the other or both. In our view, cf. also the 2nd reviewer, the most important finding is*
50 *the interaction effect in both AS and IC conditions.*

51 *It is correct that no interaction effects or between-group differences were found re. RTs. In*
52 *the first paragraph of section 4.2, we have therefore now clearly stated: "Also no between-*
53 *group differences on RTs were found. This was not what we were expecting and clearly shows*
54 *that, with regards to speed of responding, both groups act alike. For accuracy rates a clearly*
55 *different pattern emerged..." We also changed the second paragraph of that section into*
56 *"Parts of our findings seem to be in line with results..." This now jells better with the 3rd*
57 *paragraph stating that "both groups responded more slowly during AS & IC conditions but*
58 *only CWNS benefitted..."*
59
60

1
2
3 *Also the fourth paragraph now starts with a more clear statement that no between group*
4 *differences were found for accuracy of IC. This now reads as follows: “No significant*
5 *between group differences in error percentage were found for IC. However, for AS a*
6 *significant between group difference was encountered which was due to the higher error*
7 *percentage in Part 3. Moreover, similar interaction patterns emerged under AS & IC*
8 *conditions: CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error percentages*
9 *with increased task complexity. This might be linked to difficulties in motor learning in*
10 *CWS...”*

11
12 Additionally, I find it misleading that on p. 19 on (l. 9 and 53) AC/IC (?) were lumped together as if
13 the corresponding results were identical.

14
15 *We agree that this was not optimally formulated. We have now rewritten both sections and*
16 *tried to tease out the different results. The original line 9 now reads as follows: “No*
17 *significant between group differences in error percentage were found for IC. However, for AS*
18 *a significant between group difference was encountered which was due to the higher error*
19 *percentage in Part 3. Moreover, similar interaction patterns emerged under AS & IC*
20 *conditions: CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error percentages*
21 *with increased task complexity. This might be linked to difficulties in motor learning in*
22 *CWS...”*

23 *Line 53 has been changed into “In our study, CWS were not able to slow down their speed of*
24 *response to such a degree that it resulted in a decrease of errors. This fits well with*
25 *theoretical accounts that ...”*

26 *We have also changed the results and conclusion section in the abstract to comply with this*
27 *and earlier comments (see below in this response letter).*

28
29 The picture is even more complicated because in the introduction attention shifting (AS) and on p. 6
30 inhibitory control (IC) were defined. How does this terminology in the introduction, method, and
31 result sections relate to the similar but different one in the discussion?

32
33 *We have looked at how we have defined AS and IC at the different places throughout the*
34 *introduction, methods, results and discussion section. In the introduction section we have*
35 *defined the concepts more broadly, since we find it important for the readers of JSLHR to*
36 *have insight in how these terms are being used throughout the literature. However in the*
37 *methods section we have narrowed down both concepts and have described clearly a) how*
38 *they are defined by De Sonneville (2014) and b) how they are being operationalized in this*
39 *manuscript. We have slightly changed the formulation under 2.2.2: “The Auditory Set-*
40 *Shifting Task of the Amsterdam Neuropsychological Tasks (De Sonneville, 2009) is a*
41 *computer-based paradigm that measures AS and IC. De Sonneville (2014) defines AS as the*
42 *ability to flexibly shift one’s auditory attentional set, and IC as the inhibition of prepotent*
43 *responses (see also Mostert-Kerckhoffs, Staal, Houben, & de Jonghe, 2015; Serlier-van den*
44 *Bergh & De Sonneville, 2002).”*

45 *In the discussion section, the same definitions were applied. Now, we have however split up*
46 *the discussions on AS and IC, which were previously sometimes clustered, in order for a more*
47 *correct/concise use of terminology.*

48
49 Accuracy of AS shows significant group differences but not that of IC.

50
51
52 We have stated this more clearly. The 4th paragraph of section 4.2 now reads as follows: “No
53 significant between group differences in error percentage were found for IC. However, for AS
54 a significant between group difference was encountered which was due to the higher error
55 percentage in Part 3. Moreover, similar interaction patterns emerged under AS & IC
56 conditions: CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error percentages
57 with increased task complexity. This might be linked to difficulties in ...”

1
2
3 It is highly misleading to summarize this pattern of results in a statement as on p. 19, l. 52: “The
4 current findings of inefficient auditory attentional flexibility and inhibition fit ...”. This and similar
5 formulations throughout the discussion section do inadequately reflect the results of the present study.
6

7 *We have meticulously reviewed the whole discussion for places where AS and IC were taken*
8 *together, teased out the differences between AS and IC, and have removed the perhaps too*
9 *generalized statements. We have made changes to the following lines:*

10 a) *Original p.19 line 52 p.19: We have deleted the statement “the current findings of*
11 *inefficient AS and IC” here and changed the paragraph so we focus on the most important*
12 *finding (in line with the comment by the 2nd reviewer) i.e. “In our study, CWS were not able to*
13 *slow down their speed of response to such a degree that it resulted in a decrease of errors.”*

14 b) *Original p.20 line 54: “Second, AS and IC are...” This has not been changed since it is*
15 *defining and describing the possible role of both processes.*

16 c) *Original p21 line 32: “Interestingly, Jones et al....” In this paragraph we have deleted ‘IC’*
17 *and also the sentence on “withholding responses long enough to consider...” The paragraph*
18 *now reads as follows: “Interestingly, Jones et al (2014) state that children with attentional*
19 *regulation difficulties may be at risk for both developing stuttering as well as persistence*
20 *because of less resilience in coping with stuttering over time. Since AS plays a significant role*
21 *in one’s ability to respond flexibly in a changing environment (Miller & Cohen, 2001) and in*
22 *decreasing levels of arousal by shifting attention away from stress-evoking situations*
23 *(Harman et al., 1997; Rueda, Posner, & Rothbart, 2004), CWS, as a group, are less able to*
24 *regulate their emotional reactivity and control their levels of distress. In other words,*
25 *children with a lowered AS ability, may be more at risk for persistence due to maladaptive*
26 *responses to their moments of stuttering.”*

27 d) *Original p23 line 28: “One might argue that the found differences between CWS and*
28 *CWNS on AS/IC could also reflect possible...” Here we have taken out IC since the possible*
29 *differences in underlying auditory signal processing could only have an impact in Part 3,*
30 *where one continuously needs to shift between low and high tones. The section now reads as*
31 *follows: “One might argue that the found differences between CWS and CWNS on AS could*
32 *also reflect possible differences in underlying auditory signal processing. Especially because*
33 *the existing literature has shown auditory processing differences between stuttering and*
34 *nonstuttering individuals (Foundas et al., 2004; Hall & Jerger, 1978; Hampton & Weber-*
35 *Fox, 2008; Jansson-Verkasalo et al., 2014; Kaganovich, Wray, Weber-Fox, 2010; Liotti et*
36 *al., 2010). In Part 3 one is confronted with a mix of high and low tones and in case of*
37 *auditory signal processing difficulties, this might become more difficult because one first*
38 *needs to decide if it is a high or a low tone. This is however not the case for IC since in Part 2*
39 *only high tones are presented. Nonetheless, in our view, it is not likely that this aspect had a*
40 *major impact on the results because previous studies (Corbera, Corral, Escera, & Idiazábal,*
41 *2005; Kaganovich, Wray, & Weber-Fox, 2010) showed that CWS did not have any difficulties*
42 *in processing non-speech sounds, which were also used in this experiment. To clearly rule*
43 *this out, it might be a good suggestion to compare the results of this task to an AS-paradigm*
44 *using visual stimuli instead of auditory stimuli.”*

45 e) *Original p25 line 3: “In conclusion, the results of the current study showed differences in*
46 *AS and IC.” This has not been changed since the statement is correct.*
47

48
49
50 Detailed comments

51 p. 2: Conclusions: It is highly questionable that the results of the present study really “corroborate”
52 earlier questionnaire-based findings since the majority of the expectations (second hypothesis) which
53 were derived from these earlier findings were not supported by the present results.
54

55 *Our second hypothesis was that CWS, compared to CWNS, would have significantly lower*
56 *accuracy rates and/or slower speed of responses during task conditions under which AS and*
57 *IC was required. So we did not specifically anticipate both RT and accuracy differences but*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *one or the other or both. In our view, cf. also the 2nd reviewer, the most important finding is*
4 *the interaction effect in both AS and IC conditions.*

5 *In the abstract section, we have changed both the results & conclusions. They now read as*
6 *follows “Results: No group differences were found for the speed of auditory AS or IC.*

7 *However, CWS, as a group, scored significantly lower on the accuracy (error percentage) of*
8 *auditory AS. In addition, CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error*
9 *percentages under AS and IC conditions. Conclusions: The findings on error percentages*
10 *partly corroborate earlier questionnaire-based findings showing difficulties in CWS on AS*
11 *and IC. Moreover, it also seems to imply that CWS are less able to slow down their responses*
12 *in order to achieve higher accuracy rates.”*

13
14 p. 19, l. 10: In which ways IC results are “atypical” for CWS? . See also general comments.
15

16 We have changed this formulation. *The original line 10 on p.19 now reads as follows: “No*
17 *significant between group differences in error percentage were found for IC. However, for AS*
18 *a significant between group difference was encountered which was due to the higher error*
19 *percentage in Part 3. Moreover, similar interaction patterns emerged under AS & IC*
20 *conditions: CWS, compared to the CWNS, showed a higher increase in error percentages*
21 *with increased task complexity.”*
22

23 Recommendation

24 In my view the results of the present study were inadequately discussed. In particular it has to be
25 explained in which way the original assumptions must be modified by the present results and which of
26 the present findings corroborate previous assumptions from which the present hypotheses were
27 derived. In its present form I cannot recommend the paper for publication in JSLHR.
28

29 *Throughout the discussion section, we have made several changes to clarify which results*
30 *corroborate previous findings and are in line with our hypotheses and which ones are not*
31 *(see above). In places where we had clustered AS & IC together, we have taken them apart so*
32 *it becomes clearer to the readers what we exactly mean. Once again, we would like to thank*
33 *the associate editor for his comments since we think they have considerably contributed to a*
34 *better manuscript.*
35

37 Reviewers' Comments to the Author:

38 Reviewer: 1

39
40 *The comments of the first reviewer were addressed in the first revision.*
41
42

43 Reviewer: 2

44 The authors have revised the discussion of their results substantially; this was the main suggestion I
45 offered in my previous review. They now offer a reasonable interpretation of their findings and
46 provide food for thought for readers of the paper. I suspect that some will question the validity of their
47 conclusions, and the discussion is now fleshed out enough to provide a platform for scholarly debate.
48

49
50 *We would like to thank the reviewer for these constructive comments.*
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60