

## SIG 4

## Research Article

# Anticipatory Completions in Conversations Between People Who Stutter and People Who Do Not Stutter

Sergey M. Kondrashov<sup>a</sup>  and John A. Tetnowski<sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>Vero Beach, FL <sup>b</sup>Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article History:

Received March 22, 2021

Revision received May 26, 2021

Accepted August 6, 2021

Editor-in-Chief: Brenda L. Beverly

[https://doi.org/10.1044/2021\\_PERSP-21-00058](https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_PERSP-21-00058)

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study was to explore the following topics. (a) What are the specific stuttering moments that trigger anticipatory completions? (b) How do people who stutter (PWS) perceive anticipatory completions of their turn by people who do not stutter (PWNS)? (c) What are the expectations of PWS from PWNS in a conversation between them?

**Method:** In this qualitative study, the researchers used grounded theory to help analyze the collected data. The data sources were 26 observations, conversations, and interviews. A similar version could be used in the body of the text when the study is described.

**Results:** Five out of six participants experienced anticipatory completions during stuttering moments. Hypothesis 1, “Anticipatory completions by PWNS occur at specific stuttering moments,” was accepted. Hypothesis 2, “PWS have negative perceptions and feelings of anticipatory completions by PWNS,” was not verified during interviews with three participants; therefore, the researchers revised Hypothesis 2 into “PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of anticipatory completions by PWNS.” Five out of six participants expected PWNS to let them finish what they are saying; therefore, the researchers accepted Hypothesis 3, “PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying.”

**Conclusion:** The main findings of this study include verification that the participants used anticipatory completions at specific stuttering moments and non-stuttering moments in one case, PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings about anticipatory completions by PWNS, and PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying.

The hypothesis of this study was that, in conversations between people who stutter (PWS) and people who do not stutter (PWNS), it is possible that PWNS do not wait for PWS who are struggling to complete their turn to talk and having blocks or repetitions to finish their ongoing speaking turns, but they complete PWS's current turns themselves. PWS's stuttering moments such as repetitions, prolongations, or blocks may trigger the anticipatory

completion (AC) by a nonstuttering conversational partner. PWNS may consider this AC as “help” to PWS by completing their turn in progress, whereas PWS may get a feeling of being insulted by the recipient's rush-in and completion of their turn.

An AC in conversations between PWS and PWNS may lead to a more negative communication attitude, increasing social phobia and an unwillingness to interact socially. A preemptive completion (AC) in conversations between PWS and PWNS is thought to be a dispreferred action (Pomerantz, 1984), which should be avoided by PWNS. Here lies the purpose of this study; that is, the investigator explored the AC used by PWNS when conversing with PWS at the time of the AC.

One reaction to stuttering by listeners may be the listeners' finishing an utterance for the PWS. These are called

Correspondence to Sergey M. Kondrashov: [sergiokond@gmail.com](mailto:sergiokond@gmail.com).

**Disclosure:** John A. Tetnowski is an editor for *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, SIG 4: Fluency and Fluency Disorders*. Sergey M. Kondrashov has declared that no other competing financial or nonfinancial interests existed at the time of publication.

ACs. An AC is defined as “the preemptive completion of one speaker’s turn-constructural unit (TCU) (Sacks et al., 1974) by a subsequent speaker...a TCU completion that is addressed to the original recipient of the turn-so-far” (Lerner, 2004). This may adversely affect communication attitudes in PWS that they may have already developed, aggravating their fear of speech, unwillingness to continue to interact, and ability to socialize. Also, that may potentially lead to social phobia and other conditions that hinder communication.

In conversations between PWNS, an AC is a phenomenon in which a single turn constructional unit is jointly constructed by two speakers when the first speaker begins the TCU and the second speaker completes it. ACs demonstrate understanding, empathy, and affiliation between parties in conversation (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2008). A participant can show his association with the prior speaker through the AC of that participant’s uncompleted utterance (Lerner, 1993).

In conversations between PWS and PWNS, on the contrary, an AC may demonstrate PWNS’s impatience when they do not want to wait for PWS to finish what they are saying, unwillingness to see PWS’s struggle to get a word out, and willingness to help in PWS’s struggle. ACs in conversations between PWNS may occur due to a relationship between syntax and social organization (Lerner, 1991) or when the ongoing speaker may speak to the point where another speaker is able to recognize what the first speaker wants to say and then the second speaker stops, letting the first speaker say it, and completes the first speaker’s TCU. ACs in conversations between PWNS indicate understanding, empathy, and affiliation between parties in conversation (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2008). Completing the sentence of a person who stutters, although this may be a common experience for PWNS, is not recommended by professionals in the area of stuttering (Stuttering Foundation of America, n.d.). Further research is needed in PWS and in PWNS as PWS’s conversational partners to investigate whether ACs could occur to express understanding, empathy, and affiliation between PWS and PWNS, as with conversational parties in conversations between PWNS.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the AC used by PWNS when conversing with PWS at the time of the AC. The research questions proposed by this study were as follows: (a) What are the specific stuttering moments that trigger ACs? (b) How do PWS perceive ACs of their turn by PWNS? (c) What are the expectations of PWS from PWNS in a conversation between them?

## Materials and Method

### Design

In this qualitative study, the researchers used grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to help analyze

the collected data. The data sources were 26 observations, conversations, and interviews.

The goal of qualitative data analysis was to uncover emerging themes, patterns, concepts, and insights (Patton, 2002). Grounded theory defines codes, categories, patterns, themes, and eventually a theory. The goal of data analysis was to transform data into results, which examined, described, and explained the phenomena that the researchers had studied.

The process of grounded theory began with codes, categories, and themes, which led to an emerging theory. Each explored pattern/category was compared to the emerging theory.

A major strategy that Glaser and Strauss (1967) emphasized for grounded theory was a general method of comparative analysis. The goal was to compare the emerging information to the information at hand until a pattern becomes whole and coherent. The primary step of grounded theory was to discover what concepts and hypotheses were relevant for the research and the theory from the data obtained during the research.

Generating an emerging theory from the collected data meant that most hypotheses are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the research. Every concept brought into the study or discovered in the research was at first considered provisional. Each concept was developed into the theory by being *frequently* present in interviews, observations, and conversations. Grounded theory explained the phenomena, as well as described it (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

### Participants

Participants for this study were six PWS above the age of 12 years old, with the following pseudonyms, EB, FW, BL, LA, JS, and MT, and a parent, family member, friend, or personal contact who served as their conversational partner (see Table 1). Initially, 11 PWS were recruited and agreed to participate in the study, but five of them did not have ACs in a conversation with a person who does not stutter even though all five claimed that ACs occurred during their conversation with PWNS. Two of the participants regularly attended the Lafayette Chapter of the National Stuttering Association (NSA) meetings together with the authors; the other three attended the NSA conference together with one of the authors of this study. The study was approved by the University of Louisiana at Lafayette Institutional Review Board. The number of participants was sufficient for the analysis. Data saturation has been reached; additional interviews did not result in identification of new codes, categories, or themes.

At the time of conducting this study, one of the authors was a professor in communicative disorders at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, a fluency specialist,

**Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of participants.

PWS	PWS's age (years)	PWS's gender	PWNS	PWNS's age (years)	PWNS's gender	Relationship	Nationality	Region
Emily Blunt	22	F	L	23	F	Roommate	American	Northeastern United States, urban
Frank Wolf	15	M	M	69	F	Grandmother	American	Southwestern Louisiana, rural
Bob Love	49	M	C	49	M	Classmate	American	A major city in California, urban
Lazaro Arbos	16	M	A	20	F	Sister	American	Southwestern Louisiana, urban
John Stossel	19	M	A	20	M	Friend	Russian	Moscow, Russia, urban
Mel Tillis	25	M	J	62	F	Mother	American	Northern Louisiana, urban

Note. PWS = people who stutter; PWNS = people who do not stutter; F = female; M = male.

and an American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) Fellow. He has published over 75 articles that have appeared in journals, book chapters, and proceedings papers with a concentration on fluency disorders and research designs. He has delivered over 250 presentations at state, national, and international conferences on five continents. He is also an active clinician treating children and adults who stutter and holds the board certification of “stuttering specialist.”

The other author was a doctoral student in applied language and speech sciences with concentration in stuttering at the Department of Communicative Disorders at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Before conducting this study, he took a doctoral class on qualitative research, *Qualitative Analysis of Social Action*, with Dr. Jack Damico, an ASHA Fellow, the editor of the *Journal of Interactional Research in Communication Disorders*, the foremost qualitative research journal in communication disorders. Also, before conducting this study, the author conducted a qualitative research in which the design was based on ethnographic, phenomenological, and grounded theory approaches to research. The primary method for data collection was interviews with graduate students and instructors at the Department of Communicative Disorders, which were transcribed and analyzed. He used training to conduct interviews that he received while taking the *Qualitative Analysis of Social Action* class.

The primary participants in this study were six individuals diagnosed with stuttering. The diagnosis was either self-diagnosis or confirmed by a speech-language pathologist (SLP). Exclusion criteria for this study included that (a) PWS or their conversational partners had documented psychological, emotional, cognitive, or social disorders that would not allow a person to participate in the study without undo harm or discomfort and (b) a person who stutters has reported a lack of ACs in conversations with a person who does not stutter. Conversational partners were selected from PWS's friends, acquaintances, or family members who have used ACs in conversations with the PWS in the

past. The PWS and their conversational partners will be referred to throughout this study using pseudonyms in order to maintain their anonymity. Participants were de-identified through a coding procedure that allows the use of pseudonyms instead of names. De-identification procedures also included changing the names of the cities where the participants reside and other information that could give clues to their true identity.

## Method

Personal information about PWS's stuttering was gathered during initial interviews. The participants' stuttering was confirmed by their SLPs and the PWS themselves. Clinical confirmation of stuttering was accomplished through administration and scoring of the Stuttering Severity Instrument—Fourth Edition (SSI-4; Riley, 2009). The SSI-4 is a stuttering assessment that measures stuttering severity in both children and adults through frequency and duration of stuttering events, physical concomitants, and naturalness of speech.

After the SSI-4, the Wright and Ayre Stuttering Self-Rating Profile (WASSP; Wright & Ayre, 2000) was administered to each PWS to gain insights into their self-perception of stuttering. The WASSP is a 7-point scale self-rating profile on an equal-appearing interval scale where 1 indicates *none* and 7 indicates *very severe*. The WASSP consists of five subscales and measures. The subscales are perceptions of stuttering behaviors, thoughts and feelings about stuttering, and avoidance and disadvantage due to stuttering. The total rating is calculated by summing up ratings in the five sections; the higher the total rating, the more negative the perceptions of stuttering, the feeling about stuttering, and the avoidance behaviors due to stuttering are. The WASSP was administered as part of the assessment procedures but was not used as part of the analysis for this study.

The methods for this study required that participants engage in two different speaking samples. The speaking

samples consisted of reading a one-paragraph written narrative and completing a 5-min conversation on a topic of interest. All samples were audio-recorded for later analysis. These samples were collected either through Skype or in person (the researcher and the participant).

The purpose of the inquiry into the phenomena of ACs allowed for the investigation of the following: (a) What are the specific stuttering moments that trigger ACs? (b) How do PWS perceive ACs of their turn by PWNS? (c) What are the expectations of PWS from PWNS in a conversation between them? These were accomplished by the researchers encouraging a conversation on a topic of mutual interest to the participants. Following the completion of the conversation, the researchers conducted interviews first with the PWS and after with their conversation partner who did not stutter.

### Data Collection Procedure

The participants were selected through their association with the local chapter of the NSA, through association with the University of Louisiana at Lafayette's Speech and Language Clinic, or through a reference of their SLPs. The researchers contacted participants and explained the procedures of administering the SSI-4 and the WASSP, setting up a conversation, and conducting interviews. In the case of those participants over the age of 18 years, the researchers asked for the consent of a participant in order to gain participation in the study. For those under 18 years of age, both their assent and the consent from a parent were obtained in order to participate in the project. Once permission was obtained, the researchers administered the SSI-4 and the WASSP, set up a conversation on a topic of mutual interest to the participants, and then conducted interviews with both of them separately, first with a person who stutters and then after with a person who does not stutter. If the participants or parents had questions, the consent was delayed until the participants or parents could talk with the researchers.

Participants for this study, both PWS and their conversational partners, took part in ethnographic interviews on their feelings, anticipations, expectations, and behaviors during ACs. The ethnographic interview, which was audio-recorded for future analysis, lasted approximately 20 min and occurred within a short temporal proximity of the conversation between a person who stutters and a person who does not stutter. The interviews were conducted either through Skype or in person between the researchers and the participants after the conversation, first with a person who stutters and then after with a person who does not stutter. The format of the ethnographic interview was open-ended and informant driven. Rather than using a predetermined list of questions, the interviewer followed the content provided by the informant. In other words, questions evolved out of what the informant said.

The questions were grand tour questions that encouraged the PWS and the PWNS being interviewed to talk about their broad experiences and mini tour questions that followed responses to the grand tour questions. Examples of the grand tour questions are as follows: "How do you feel when you talk with a person who does/does not stutter and they/you complete your/their sentence during your/their stuttering moment?" "What would be your expectations from a person who does/does not stutter in a talk with you?" "What would be your behaviors during an AC of your turn by a person who does not stutter?" "What would be your behavior during your AC of a person who stutters' turn?" The mini tour questions were used to gather more information about a particular situation or experience that is of great importance to the research. Some examples are as follows: "Can you give some more examples of how the experiences are different?" "Give me some examples." "Tell me more about this." The researchers transcribed the digital audio record.

### Data Analysis

The goal of data analysis was to transform data into research results, which described, examined, explained, or predicted the phenomena that the researchers had studied. Data analysis allowed for the emergence of recurring patterns and themes in the collected data and determined how those patterns helped the researchers answer the research questions. As a result of this comparison and verification, the researchers were able to verify the hypotheses for the study and answer the research questions.

The main goal of the researchers during data collection and data analysis was to maintain an open stance as they engaged in inductive processes to verify the hypotheses during the constant process of comparison and verification of the collected data. After the data had been collected, it was categorized in the process of coding in order to identify data that represented general phenomena. Categorization involved labeling portions of similar data with specific labels representing the same data category. A word or short phrase was assigned for text segments as a code and an attribute. For example, some data grouped together as types of negative affect. Such subcategories were then classified into key areas or larger categories such as behavior, contexts, people, and feelings. By reviewing the categories and subcategories, the researchers began to identify recurring topics or overarching "themes" that seem to describe this individual's life (Simmons-Mackie & Damico, 2001).

The most fundamental operation in the analysis of data was to discover significant classes of things, persons, events, and the properties that characterized them. The researchers named classes and linked one to another with simple statements that expressed the linkages and continued this process until these statements fell into sets. The researchers





of the two words “your eye” and is declarative because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L.

## AC 4

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Yeah. But I-I have some really pretty kids that sent to you and like-like-like-like I have this new-new-new-new-new-new-new-new-new-new-new-

L: new-new-[n]  
[client?]

EB: Yeah.

AC 4 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a long repetition of the one-syllable word “new” for 13 s. The completion consists of the word “client” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation and a question. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L.

## AC 5

Conversation of EB and L

EB: I-I-I-I am not I am not I am not sh-sh-sh-sh-sh-sh-sh-sh I am not sh-sh sure I wanted another long-distance relationship because the la-la-la-last last w-w-w-w-one you know like you know like-like-like-like=

L: =didn't  
last.

EB: Yeah.

L: Didn't work out.

AC 5 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a repetition of the one-syllable word “like” for 3 s. The completion consists of the two words “didn't last” and is declarative because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement and verifying phrase “Didn't work out.” EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L. Also, EB referenced shared knowledge with “you know” that contributed to L's confident completion.

## AC 6

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Oh (.) so-so-so-so-[so]

L: [so] he is out of my peripheral (laughs).

EB: What?

AC 6 occurs within a repetition of the one-syllable word “so” for 2 s. The completion consists of a phrase “so he is out of my peripheral” and is declarative because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting a state of being surprised.

## AC 7

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Stop (.) are you w-w-w-w-w-wo-wo-wo-wo-wo-work out and w-w-w-w-watching N-N-N-N-N-Net=

L: =Leg curls and Netflix are not working out.  
Ew (.) I put my leg on the ground. Stop it (both laugh).

EB: I am chasing children all day.

AC 7 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a long repetition of the /w/ and /n/ sounds for 8 s. The completion consists of a sentence “Leg curls and Netflix are not working out” and is declarative because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. The referent had been provided earlier in EB's turn, guaranteeing their intersubjectivity. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L by laughing.

## AC 8

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Do-do-do-do-do-do you think that he-he-he just wo-wo-wo-wo-wasn't like like-like-like-like he wasn't like ex-ex-ex he wasn't like he wasn't like ex=

L: =plaining?

EB: No (.) uh no.

AC 8 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within the phrase where the one-syllable word “like” and a part of the word “ex” were repeated. The completion consists of a part of a word “plaining” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. The presence of the prefix “ex” created a condition for an AC due to the relationship between transitional relevant places and syntax. EB verbally exhibited disagreement with the completion by saying “No.”

## AC 9

Conversation of EB and L

EB: No (.) uh no. He wasn't like ex-ex-ex-ex-expe-expe-experi=

L: =experience?

EB: Yeah.

AC 9 occurs within a repetition of the parts of the word “experience.” The completion consists of the word “experience” following an 8.5-s stuttering event and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally exhibited agreement with the completion by saying “Yeah.”

AC 10

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Wa-wa-wa-wa-why did-did-did you s-s-s-s-s:-s:-[s]

L: [stay?]

EB: Yeah.

AC 10 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a prolongation of the /s/ sound for 2 s. The completion consists of the word “stay” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L by saying “Yeah.”

AC 11

Conversation of EB and L

EB: So the guy you had today, w-w-w-w-w-will he-he b-b-be your new-new-new-new-[new]

L: [yes], he’ll be my new trainer. Is that what you were gonna say?

EB: Yeah.

AC 11 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a repetition of the one-syllable word “new” for 6 s. The completion consists of a declarative sentence “Yes, he’ll be my new trainer,” followed by a question, “Is that what you were gonna say?” because L is not confident that her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L by saying “Yeah.”

AC 12

Conversation of EB and L

EB: But yeah, but if you f-f-f-f-f-f-[f]

L: [I ignore him?]

I don’t know. But I don’t want to be like a child and ignore him though so I need to respond back to him. I was thinking about just ghosting him but then I’m like no somebody has ghosted me before and I didn’t like that, it’s not a good feeling so I should not do that - just disappear//

EB: //Es-es-especially because//

AC 12 occurs within a long repetition of the /f/ sound for 2 s. The completion consists of a declarative sentence “I ignore him,” because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L with the phrase “Es-es-especially because.”

AC 13

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Mhm, es-es-especially where-where-where the last-last one was so-so-so-so-so-so=

L: =angry?

EB: Nnhmm.

L: (Laughs) Sorry.

AC 13 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a long repetition of the one-syllable word “so” for 6 s. The completion consists of the word “angry” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally acknowledged the rejection of the completion, exhibiting disagreement with L by saying “Nnhmm.”

AC 14

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Definitely not that one. So e-e-e-e-e-ex-ex-ex-ex-ex=

L: =abnormal? (laughs)

EB: No. You’re not even hearing the words that’s on my face! (got angry, starts crying, wipes out tears).

AC 14 occurs within a long repetition of a part of a word “ex” for 7 s. The completion consists of the word “abnormal” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally acknowledged the rejection of the completion, exhibiting disagreement with L by saying “No,” getting angry and crying because of L’s “not hearing the words that was on EB’s face.”

AC 15

Conversation of EB and L

EB: Like like-like-like-like you pa-pa-pa-pa-pa-pa-pa paid a lot-a lot-a lot of mo-mo-mo-[mo]

L: [for] his ticket. Yeah. I paid for my own ticket.

EB: Oh, never mind.

AC 15 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a repetition of a part of a word “mo” for 2 s. The completion consists of a phrase “for his ticket” and is declarative

because L is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. EB aborted the conversation with the phrase “Oh, never mind.” L paid a lot of money for the tickets. Both knew that indicating sharing of knowledge.

## AC 16

Conversation of EB and L

EB: You-you-you-you don't o you don't you don't o-o-o-o-o-[o]

L: [owe?]

EB: Yeah.

AC 16 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a long repetition of the /o/ sound for 3 s. The completion consists of the word “owe” and is interrogative because L is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with L by saying “Yeah.”

## AC 17

Conversation of EB and L

EB: I mean yeah you should-should- should t-t-t-t-tell him w-w-w-w-w-why you don't-don't-don't=

L: =Why does dating never get easier?

EB: I don't know I'm in//

AC 17 occurs during multiple stuttering moments within a repetition of the one-syllable word “don't” for 2 s. The completion is not declarative but interrogative and consists of a question “Why does dating never get easier?” because L is not confident that her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. The completion does not include the exact word/phrase of the prior speaker (EB) but implies what she intended to say. L revealed her completion in a special way (Lerner, 1991). EB verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion by orienting to the forward progressivity of the conversation, exhibiting agreement with L with the phrase “I don't know I'm in.”

ACs in the conversation between EB and her conversational partner L typically took place during multiple stuttering moments within prolongations of sounds, repetitions of sounds, one-syllable word repetitions, and part-word repetitions. The ACs were either interrogative consisting of a question when EB's conversational partner was not confident that her completion was correct or declarative when EB's partner was confident that her completion was correct. It is possible that her response was simply a politeness marker; however, the remaining context led the researchers to believe that it was a question.

In an interview with the researcher (R), EB stated that ACs often occurred in her conversations with PWNS

when she has stuttering moments. One of these PWNS was her roommate L.

R: What did you feel when L finished your phrases and sentences?

EB: I felt annoyed because I was trying real hard and she didn't let me. It's like threw me off because I was focusing so hard trying to get this word out and when it was done for me I didn't expect this because like I was processing a lot of things and then I had to think about next thing I was gonna say. It's just threw me off. A lot of times when I didn't finish, she assumed that the word I was trying to say was like end but it wasn't necessarily. I didn't like to say a word I wasn't gonna say like. It irritated me but I kind of get it because like I like was avoiding controlling my stutter really wanted to try to communicate and so like I know they are usually severe. And so I kind of get it because I take a long time. So I kind of feel bad but usually I compensate by using techniques or avoiding because of this. I know how much it's a burden to people and so like to avoid them doing something like this I avoid like usually I hide my stutter. This is terrible but I guess this is all this so. Probably a bit of all of this may be more frustrated than angry. It makes me feel she thinks I can't even though that I know I can. I think I don't feel helpless but like but I feel that this message was sent to me. I don't feel helpless because I still know what I am gonna say and she doesn't. I feel frustrated but I feel less helpless.

R: Do you consider it help when she completes the right word for you?

EB: I think it does communicatively but it doesn't. It helps me because it helps them feel better because like taking less time so that's “better” but it doesn't help me out like that. When they do it and enjoy it, I feel disempowered.

R: What are your expectations from a person who does not stutter in a conversation with you?



EB: I would say that I would like to be treated like someone else like a person who doesn't stutter. But I know it's not easy because in natural conversation people interrupt others you know but it's not the same. Because when I have not stuttered a word and she would interrupt me, I would not feel bad about it because that's like a normal thing. But interrupting to fill in a word is different. That's what I expect I just basically expect to let me finish. And I try to advocate myself with my friends and tell them that. But I know when I have a severe stutter when I cannot control, it it's really hard to talk to me. If I stutter as severely as I do, people never let me finish and so I almost feel bad if I don't control it. I almost expect them to do it if I am like truly talk like this all the time.

In this section, the researchers summarized the major themes that emerged from the data collected from the semi-structured interviews. Once again, this analysis will follow the transcript for each individual participant before moving to the next participant. The data will then be analyzed through the lens of grounded theory and presented in group results.

Within the interview, EB said that she felt annoyed during ACs because she was trying really hard and her partner did not let her. She stated that she was more frustrated than angry that completions threw her off because she was focusing so hard trying to get a word out when it was done for her. She did not expect a completion because she was processing a lot of things and had to think about the next thing she was going to say. Completions irritated her, but she was ready to get them because she was avoiding/controlling her stutter and really wanted to try to communicate and knew her stutters are usually severe. She felt irritated, but usually, she compensated by using techniques or avoiding because of this. She knew how much it was a burden to people, and so she avoided and hid her stutter. She felt more frustrated than angry. Completions made her feel that her partner thought that she cannot even though that she knew she can complete her turn. She did not feel helpless but felt that the message was sent to her. She did not feel helpless because she still knew what she was going to say and her partner did not. EB felt frustrated but felt less helpless.

EB stated that she would like to be treated like someone else—like a person who does not stutter. But it is not easy because, in natural conversation, people interrupt others, “but it is not the same.” Because when she has not stuttered a word and a partner would interrupt her, she

would not feel bad about it because that is “like a normal thing,” but interrupting to fill in a word is different. That is what she expected; she just basically expected to let her finish, but she knows when she has a severe stutter and when she cannot control it, it is really hard to talk to her. She said that if she stutters as severely as she does, people never let her finish, and so she almost feels bad if she does not control it. She almost expects them to do it if she truly speaks like this all the time. She thinks completions help her because they help PWNS feel better because talking less is “better,” but it does not help her out. When they do it and enjoy it, she feels disempowered.

## Participant 2

The second participant was a male individual with a pseudonym as FW, who was 15 years of age at the time of the study, and his native language was English. At the time of the interview, he resided in a town in Southwestern Louisiana and was a homeschooled ninth grader. His conversational partner was his grandmother who lived in a nearby town. Before the study, FW's father confirmed that FW's grandmother completed phrases, sentences, or filled in words for FW.

During a conversation with his conversational partner M, FW stuttered 35 times. FW's conversational partner produced seven ACs during FW's stuttering moments.

### AC 1

Conversation of FW and M

FW: And then p-p-put them on the (2) =

M: =grill?

FW: Stove. And then we (.) I forgot (.) we fix the bun and also we put the French Powder and-and-and liaison.

M: Yeah.

AC 1 occurs during a stuttering moment, a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the word “grill” and is interrogative because M is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. FW verbally acknowledged the rejection of the completion, exhibiting disagreement with M by saying the word “stove.”

### AC 2

Conversation of FW and M

FW: Probably um (.) helping my dad cooking and make also the-the boudin and put them-put them-put them in the pot and (2)=

M: =cooking?

FW: Boiling. Yeah.

AC 2 occurs during a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the word “cooking” and is interrogative because

M is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M with the phrase “Boiling. Yeah.” It is also possible that he is using “yeah” as an agreement. He first corrects her professed completion and then may be orienting to her elder respected status in the relationship by using “yeah” as a tag. However, the researcher chose to identify “boiling” as a synonym for “cooking.” This is based upon knowledge of their full conversation.

## AC 3

Conversation of FW and M

FW: A-a-a-a-and also (3)=

M: =got on the horses to get something to eat.

FW: Yeah.

AC 3 occurs within a block for 3 s. The completion consists of the phrase “got on the horses to get something to eat” and is declarative because M is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M by saying “Yeah.”

## AC 4

Conversation of FW and M

FW: And a-a-a-after that we would come back to your house to-to talk a little bit and also ah ahah and also uh (.) and also (2)=

M: =Y'all would pick with Daddy who would sleep on the sofa.

FW: Yeah.

AC 4 occurs within a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the sentence “Y'all would pick with Daddy who would sleep on the sofa” and is declarative because M is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M by saying “Yeah.”

## AC 5

Conversation of FW and M

FW: Ah (.) first, she would take meet, rice, cook it and my Mom would take notes and (2)=

M: =and the corn bread dressing.

FW: Yeah. Corn bread.

AC 5 occurs during a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the phrase “and the corn bread dressing” and is declarative because M is confident that her completion

is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M by saying “Yeah.”

## AC 6

Conversation of FW and M

FW: Um (.) they had um (.) Siril Powder and mixed with it (.) and that was good a-a-a-and (3)=

M: =bake the turkey?

FW: Yeah.

AC 6 occurs during a block for 3 s. The completion consists of the phrase “bake the turkey” and is interrogative because M is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M by saying “Yeah.”

## AC 7

Conversation of FW and M

FW: And also um (.) doing (3) um (3)=

M: =make pecan pie.

FW: And (.) they were good.

AC 7 occurs during a block for 3 s. The completion consists of the phrase “make pecan pie” and is declarative because M is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. FW verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with M with the phrase “And they were good.”

All ACs occurred during blocks. Three of the ACs were interrogative, consisting of a question when FW's conversational partner was not confident that her completion was correct; the other four were declarative when FW's partner was confident that her completion was correct.

In an interview with the researcher (R), FW stated that ACs occurred in his conversations with PWNS when he has stuttering moments.

R: I have heard your grandmother completed for you when you had stuttering moments. So tell me what you feel when a person who does not stutter completes for you.

FW: Feel bad in a way and then I can get mad if they do it too much. And a few times not today but a few times when I was in the house. They completed a lot while I was talking.

R: Tell me more about it.

FW: It's my grandmother and people in the boy scout's camp. They complete

often for me and when they do it, sometimes they are laughing like I talk to three or four people and they laugh (.) try to.

- R: Tell me more about it. When they laugh at you, what do you feel?
- FW: Um I always turn around and go to good friends.
- R: When they laugh at you, what are your feelings. Can you describe them?
- FW: Um it was maybe like two times I felt bad I said that's enough and I may have stopped talking to that person.
- R: So what would be your expectations of people who do not stutter while they talk to you?
- FW: Um probably um wait for me to complete. Sometimes I do not care when they complete and sometimes I care. I expect them not to finish my sentences and let me finish myself.

Within the interview, FW said that he feels bad when PWNS complete for him and that he can get mad if they do it too much. He stated that three or four people often complete for him in the boy scout's camp, and sometimes they were laughing while he was talking. He felt bad, may have turned around and gone to good friends, or stopped talking to a person (persons) who completed for him. He expects PWNS in a conversation with him not to finish his sentences and let him finish himself.

### Participant 3

Participant 3 was a male individual with a pseudonym as BL, who was 49 years of age at the time of the study, and his native language was English. At the time of the interview, he resided in a major city in California and had a full-time job. His conversational partner was his colleague. Before the study, BL confirmed that his colleague and a friend completed phrases, sentences, or filled in words for him.

During a conversation with his conversational partner C, BL stuttered 101 times. His conversational partner produced four ACs during BL's stuttering moments.

- AC 1  
Conversation of BL and C
- BL: Ah okay. A-a-a-a-a-a-a aka a-a-a-a aka a-a-a-a-a-a-a ah ah aka you-you-you sound ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka kind of ah wary a little bit on=
- C: =Yeah. Yeas I am.=
- BL: =on-on-on you.

AC 1 occurs during multiple stuttering moments for 24 s within the phrase where sounds \a\ and \ka\ were repeated and the one-syllable word "you" was repeated. The completion consists of the phrase "Yeah. Yes I am" and is declarative because C is sure that his completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. The completion does not include the exact word/phrase of the prior speaker (BL) but implies what he intended to say. C revealed his completion in a special way (Lerner, 1991). BL verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with C with the phrase "on you."

- AC 2  
Conversation of BL and C
- BL: Okay. So-so-so-so-so C., aka yo-yo-yo-yo-you said that-that-that-that-that-that you- you-you-you aka um hired the guy ah because he-he-he had been harassing you for a-a-a=
- C: =Yeah=
- BL: = a-a-a-a aka lo-lo-lo-lo a-a-a-a aka lo-lo-lo a long time?

AC 2 occurs during a stuttering moment within a repetition of the /a/ sound for 2 s. The completion consists of the word "Yeah" and is declarative because C is sure that his completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. BL acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with C. The completion does not include the exact word/phrase of the prior speaker but implies what he intended to say. C revealed his completion in a special way (Lerner, 1991). BL verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with C with the phrase "for a long time."

- AC 3  
Conversation of BL and C
- BL: Hey C., so aka-ah-aka the aka-aka the so aka the-the-the-the-the aka there's aka I-I-I-I-I-I-I-I-I-I aka I-I-I-I example aka-aka of-of-of how aka of-how aka per of-how per-per I how her per-per I how per - I how per s-s-s-s aka-aka-aka how per I how per=
- C: =stutters?
- BL: No.

AC 3 occurs during multiple stuttering moments for 15 s within the phrase where one-syllable words "the," "I," "of," and "how" and a part of the word "per" were repeated. Also, there was a repetition of the \s\ sound. The completion consists of the word "stutters" and is interrogative because C is not sure whether his completion

is correct, as noted by his rising intonation. BL verbally acknowledged the rejection of the completion, exhibiting disagreement with C by saying “No.”

## AC 4

Conversation of BL and C

BL: No. Aka-aka-aka per s-s-s assistance.

A-a-a=

C: =persistence?=  
=ka-aka-aka-aka

BL: p-p-p-p aka-aka persistence pays off, ha?

AC 4 occurs during a stuttering moment within a repetition of the /a/ sound for 2 s. The completion consists of the word “persistence” and is interrogative because C is not sure whether his completion is correct, as noted by his rising intonation. BL verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with C with the phrase “persistence pays off, ha?”

ACs typically occurred during multiple stuttering moments within sound repetitions, one-syllable word repetitions, and part-word repetitions. Two of the ACs were interrogative, consisting of a question when BL’s conversational partner was not confident that his completion was correct; the other two were declarative when BL’s partner was confident that his completion was correct.

In an interview with the researcher, BL stated that ACs occurred in his conversations with PWNS when he has stuttering moments.

R: What do you feel when a person who does not stutter completes for you or, as you say, cuts in?

BL: I feel frustrated.

R: Is it the only feeling you have?

BL: I think like aka like aka what it is-is that is that is that is that ka-ka I-I-I-I put a lot of effort I put a-a-a-a-a lot of effort you know aka-aka-ka so let’s say in wo-wo-wo-wo-what I wanna say like aka-aka and then w-w-when aka s-s-s-someone when-when-when s-s-someone ka-ka-ka-ka-aka-aka-ka-ka-ka-ka cuts in or-or-or ka-ka or ka-ka-ka complete my sentence ka-ka-ka is-is-is frustrating because because because I-I-I-I-I w-w-w-w-w really wanted to-to-to-to-to finish ah ahahah s-s-s-s-saying the word you know.

I got you. When a person who does not stutter cuts in and completes for you and you get frustrated, what are the feelings you may have? What else do you feel

except frustration? Do you want to continue talking with that person?

What are your feelings?

I-I-I-I-I-I ka-ka-ka I-I-I-I-I definitely aka-ka it makes it makes aka-ka-ka-

BL: ka it makes ka-ka-ka-ka-ka it makes ka-ka-ka-ka-ka conti-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka continuing the-the-the-the-the-ka-the-ka-the-the-aka-the-aka-ka-the-aka-ka-ka the-the ka-ka-the-ka-ka-the-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-ka-the-the-ka-ka-ka-the-ka-ka-ka-ka-the-ka-ka-ka-the-con-the-

confession more difficult. You know and so-so-so like aka and so like aka

yo-yo-yo-you aka-ka a-a-a-a-a-aka a-a-aka-ka a-a-a-a-a-a-a I frustrated I

can’t relieve finish finish aka-ka-ka-ka a-a-a-a-a-a-a-a-ka-ka-ka ex-

pressing. Ma-ma-ma-ma-ma-ma-ma-ma-ma-my I-I-I-I-I-I like I like-

like-like-like my-my-my-myself you know. And-and-and-and also like

aka the-the-the person like aka is going to cut in a lot I-I-I-I-I-I don’t like

ah ahahah talking to that person.

Okay. So is it different when you talk with a friend or a family member

R: who completes for you rather than a stranger, unfamiliar person. How your feelings might be different?

The thing is the-the-the-the thing is like aka-ka-ka s-s-s-s-s-s-some of my

BL: friends aka of course they know that I stutter you know so-so-so aka-ka-

aka-ka a-a-a-a like aka m-m-m-m-most of the time w-w-w-when-w-w-w-

whenever we are talking, aka-ka-ka the-the-the-the-aka-aka my aka my-

my-my-my-might finish aka s-s-s-s-s like aka s-s-s-s-s like aka like aka s-s-

s-s-s-s-s like aka s-s-s-s-s sa-sa-sa-sa-saying the word you know and so i-i-i-i-

it’s frustrating you know definitely aka-ka-ka because I-I-I-I-I-I know that

that they are aka-aka-aka ch-ch-ch-ch trying to help. But in years w-w-w-

whenever you have I mean aka-aka w-w-where aka w-w-where is

someone who aka-ka who I know aka-ka-aka-ka-ka-ka-ka or a stranger

the thing is-is that is that aka-aka-ka-ka-ka i-i-i-i-i-it is frustrating because

the thing is ka-ka-ka-ka-aka because the thing is that is that aka a-a-a-a-a-a-a-I know that-that-that aka-ka-ka that aka-ka-ka-ka a-a-a-a-a-a-a that-that aka-ka-ka-ka-ka a-a-a-a-a-I just say the word you know. The thing is people aka-ka the-the-the-the they will ah aka-they-aka-the-aka-the-aka-the-ka the-the-the-the they will ah will finish for me. You know what's more frustrating aka-ka-ka-ka-ka i-i-is that aka is-is-is-is-is-is-is-is-is that ah aka-aka-ah-ah-aka-ah w-w-w-why it's frustrating more more is-is-is-is-is cutting in aka and-and-and aka-ka and aka not aka a-a-allow me to-to-to-to finish saying aka-aka-aka w-w-w-w-w-what I am trying to say. Okay. What would be your expectations from a person who does not stutter in a conversation

R: with you? What would be your ideal conversational partner?

Oh, oh! Like aka-aka j-j-j-just for-for-for them to get listen aka-ka and-

BL: and to listen and-and-and-and-and-and that to-to-to-to aka let-let-let-let me finish saying ah w-w-w-w-wo-wo-wo-wo-what I am saying aka-ka-ka-ka-a-ka-ka-eka like and-and-and-and-and-and-and aka then aka the-the-the-the-the-hey speak when I am done.

In the interview with the researcher, BL stated that he feels frustrated when a person who does not stutter completes for him. He said that he puts a lot of effort in what he wants to say when someone cuts in and completes his sentence. He also stated that it is frustrating because he really wanted to finish saying the word. He gets frustrated because he cannot relieve and finish expressing. He does not like talking to a person who completes for him. Some of his friends know that he stutters; they might finish for him saying the word, and it is frustrating for him because they want to help. What is more frustrating for him is cutting in and not allowing him to finish saying what he was trying to say. His ideal conversational partner is one who would listen and let him finish saying what he was saying, and then they would speak when he is done.

#### Participant 4

The fourth participant was a male individual with a pseudonym as LA, who was 16 years of age at the time of the study, and his native language was English. At the

time of the interview, he resided in a city in Southwestern Louisiana and was a homeschooled 11th grader. His conversational partner was his sister. Before the study, LA's father confirmed that LA's sister completed phrases, sentences, or filled in words for LA.

During a conversation with his conversational partner A, LA stuttered 69 times. His conversational partner produced three ACs.

#### AC 1

Conversation of LA and A

LA: I might um work at (3) um (.)=

A: =I could not see you doing anything in business. But it's just me. You just think like to be a chef? Just asking if you do. I could see you being like someone who does lot of talking.

LA: Uhu.

The AC 1 occurs during a filled pause. A jumps in when LA produces a filled pause, not on a stuttered word but afterward. The completion consists of the sentence "I could not see you doing anything in business" and is declarative because A is sure that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. LA verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with A by saying "Uhu."

#### AC 2

Conversation of LA and A

LA: Um well do you have any tips on-on driving cause I just recently finished dr- finished driving classes and I start my first driving session b-be-behind the wheel on um Tuesday (.) so=

A: =You

don't want our drive ah? (laughs)

LA: No, I am just saying.

The AC occurs as latching (no perceptible delay) to the discourse marker "so." The completion consists of the sentence "You don't want our drive ah?" and is interrogative because A is not sure whether her completion is correct, as noted by her rising intonation. LA verbally exhibited disagreement with the completion by saying "No."

#### AC 3

Conversation of LA and A

LA: Um dad one thing that told me was "don't slow down" whenever I tried to pass someone with the lane or not pass but merging to another lane that's kind of what I did so=



A: =You had to go.  
 LA: I think I think that when I'll get better eyes, I'll get better driving and once I do my driving sessions, I think that will help a lot.

The AC occurs immediately following the discourse marker "so" as latching. The completion consists of the sentence "You had to go" and is declarative because A is sure that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement.

All three ACs occurred contiguous to nonstuttering moments, one filled pause and two discourse markers. One AC was interrogative, consisting of a question when LA's conversational partner was not confident that her completion was correct; another two were declarative when LA's partner was confident that her completion was correct.

In an interview with the researcher, LA stated that ACs occurred in his conversations with PWNS when he has stuttering moments. LA's father said that LA's sister completes for LA.

R: When do people who do not stutter complete (finish) for you? At what moments exactly? During your stuttering moments or hesitation or always?  
 LA: When people complete my sentences, they do it whenever I stop for a long period of time and know what I'm about to say. It is only during my stuttering moments.  
 R: What do you feel (disappointment/embarrassment/anger/helplessness) when your sister or another person WNS completes a phrase/sentence for you?  
 LA: Whenever my sister or my dad does it, I don't feel upset or angry because they know I stutter and they're just my sister and my dad. If a friend who doesn't know I stutter does it, I feel a little embarrassed because I don't want them to think I'm stupid.  
 R: If a person who does not stutter cuts in and completes for you and you get frustrated, what are other feelings you may have? What else do you feel except frustration? Do you want to continue talking with that person? What are your feelings?  
 LA: I might feel a little embarrassment. I still want to talk to that person though because it's not their fault that I stutter.  
 R: Do you consider it as help when people complete for you the right word?

LA: If I seriously cannot get a word out, I might feel a little relieved if a person finishes for me, at least the right word.  
 R: If you consider a completion as help, what are other feelings except gratitude to people who complete for you?  
 LA: Maybe a little embarrassment for seriously getting stuck on that word.  
 R: Is it different when you talk with a friend or a family member who completes for you rather than to a stranger or an unfamiliar person. How your feelings might be different?  
 LA: If it's someone who knows I stutter, then I may feel a little frustrated (not embarrassment) because they know I stutter and should let me finish. For someone who doesn't know I stutter, I will feel embarrassed and a little frustrated at myself. It's not their fault.  
 R: What about PWNS who are not your parents or family members?  
 LA: It depends on if they know I stutter, for instance friends. Friends who know I stutter will understand and probably give me more time. Friends who don't know I stutter might wonder why I talk like this.  
 R: What would be your expectations of people who do not stutter while they talk to you?  
 LA: That could depend if they are in a hurry to go somewhere or not. If they are in a hurry, then I could understand why they would cut in and finish for me. I might feel a little frustrated at myself though for holding that person back. If they're not in a hurry and they do it, then a little embarrassment and frustration might kick in.  
 R: Okay. If you talk to an unfamiliar person who does not know that you stutter and both of you are not in a hurry and have plenty of time for a talk, what would you prefer him to do wait for you to finish what you are going to say or finish for you at your stuttering moments?  
 LA: That's a good question! I feel like if he sees I'm on the verge of getting it out, he should let me finish. If I'm really stuck on something, then he could finish it for me.  
 R: What would be your ideal conversational partner?  
 LA: Someone close to me, like a family member or a really close friend.

In the interview with the researcher, LA stated that he does not feel upset or angry when his sister or his dad complete for him, but if a friend who does not know he stutters does it, he feels a little embarrassed because he does not want them to think he is stupid. Although he might feel a little embarrassed when a person who does not stutter completes for him, he still wants to talk to that person because it is not their fault that he stutters. If he seriously cannot get a word out, he might feel a little relieved if a person finishes for him the right word. If someone who knows that he stutters completes for him, he may feel a little frustrated because they know he stutters and should let him finish. For someone who does not know he stutters, he will feel embarrassed and a little frustrated at himself because it is not their fault. He would expect PWNS in conversation with him to let him finish.

### Participant 5

Participant 5 was a male individual with a pseudonym as JS, who was 19 years of age at the time of the study, and his native language was Russian. At the time of the interview, he resided in Moscow, Russia, and was a college student. His conversational partner was his friend. Before the study, JS confirmed that his friend completed phrases, sentences, or filled in words for him.

During a conversation with his conversational partner A, JS stuttered 38 times. His conversational partner produced two ACs during JS's stuttering moments.

#### AC 1

##### Conversation of JS and A

- JS: Ну она такая «привет», я – «привет».  
«МНЕМНЕОПЯТЬНУЖНАТВОЯ  
She said hi, I said hi. She said I again need  
your  
п(2)=  
h(2)=
- A: =помощь  
=help
- JS: Помощь.  
Help.
- A: Она за нами не следила?  
She didn't spy on us?
- JS: No.

AC 1 occurs during a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the word "help" and is declarative because A is orienting to JS's production of the first phoneme, and so he feels confident that his completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. JS acknowledged the acceptance of the completion through a repetition of the conversational partner's utterance, exhibiting agreement with A by saying the word "help."

#### AC 2

##### Conversation of JS and A

- JS: Аккаунт знают, а вот, а вот п-п-п-п-п-  
па-а-а-а-а-а-п(5)=  
They know the login but but the p-p-p-p-  
p-па-а-а-а-а-а-с(5)=
- A: =пароль  
=password
- Пароль не знают.
- JS: Don't know the password.

AC 2 occurs during a block for 5 s. The completion consists of the word "password" and is declarative because A is orienting to JS's production of the part of the word, and he feels confident that his completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. JS acknowledged the acceptance of the completion through a repetition of the conversational partner's utterance, exhibiting agreement with A with the phrase "Don't know the password."

All ACs occurred during blocks; they were declarative because JS's partner was confident that his completions were correct.

In an interview with the researcher (R), JS stated that ACs often occurred in his conversations with PWNS when a person who does not stutter completes his phrase or sentence.

- R: You said it occurs often when a person who does not stutter completes for you. When does it happen? At what moments exactly? During your hesitation, or do they just continue any of your phrases?
- JS: No, they happen during a stuttering moment. My best friend, who is here, often completes for me. I have positive emotions when he does this, because I understand that my friend knows me very well, even better than my parents.
- R: You don't have a feeling of disappointment/embarrassment when you start a phrase/sentence and want to say something, but your friend completes for you?
- JS: No, I do not have such a feeling.
- R: Do the parents complete for you?
- JS: Parents do not complete.
- R: So parents are waiting until you//
- JS: //I, yes.
- R: Complete?
- JS: Yes, I complete.
- R: So they want you to finish a phrase yourself?

- JS: Yes.
- R: You don't have a feeling of disappointment when your best friend A completes for you?
- JS: No, I don't have such a feeling.
- R: Let's talk about some kind of analogy, for instance, if someone started doing something, let's say, as in the case of cars, changing a tire, and another person came up and said that he was not doing it right, and started doing it himself; if this happened to me, I would be embarrassed with such an intervention.
- JS: Well, me too. But here we are talking about a conversation (.) a conversation, well, a conversation for me is a little different. That is, how I (.) for me (.) that is, I do not consider it (an anticipatory completion) as some kind of nightmare or something, for me it is quite normal.
- R: Who else does finish for you? Is there someone else?
- JS: Yes. There is one more person, his name is V.
- R: Who is he?
- JS: He is my classmate, and he (.) well, he also finishes (.) for me.
- R: A is your best friend, V is your classmate. Do you have different feelings when V completes for you, rather than A?
- JS: No, I would not say that.
- R: So they are absolutely the same feelings, you have no embarrassment, anger, irritation//
- JS: //no, no.
- R: That is you are thankful to a person who completes for you for knowing you so well?
- JS: Yes.
- R: So well that he can continue your speech. Look, if there was such a situation, you would not be interrupted - no one, neither A, nor V.
- JS: Well, it would be a little more complicated.
- R: Complicated, right?
- JS: At completion (.) on the other hand (.) I am not sure.
- R: Well, just imagine that you yourself would finish all your phrases, no one would finish for you. Would it be harder for you?
- JS: The same way.
- R: The same way. And what would you like more to finish a sentence yourself, or as it is happening now, V and A//
- JS: //Well, I can't tell you this, no, that is, what I would like more (.) well I am not sure.
- R: That is, no negative//
- JS: //absolutely.
- R: You do not have any negative feelings?
- JS: No.
- R: About completion your sentence by another person?
- JS: No.
- R: That is, you do not consider a completion as an intervention with your speech?
- JS: No, no, no.

According to the interview, ACs in conversations between JS and PWNS occurred during his stuttering moments. His best friend and his classmate often complete for him. JS has positive feelings when PWNS complete for him because he appreciates that they know him so well that they are able to complete for him. JS does not have any kind of negative feelings, such as embarrassment, frustration, disappointment, or anger, about the completions; completions for him are "quite normal." He does not have different feelings about completions of different people, whether it is his best friend or a classmate. JS does not consider an AC as an intervention with his speech.

### Participant 6

Participant 6 was a male individual with a pseudonym as MT, who was 25 years of age at the time of the study, and his native language was English. At the time of the interview, he resided in a major city in the Northern Louisiana and was a college student. His conversational partner was his mother. Before the study, MT confirmed that his mother completed phrases, sentences, or filled in words for him.

During a conversation with his conversational partner J, MT stuttered 35 times. His conversational partner produced one AC during MT's stuttering moments.

#### AC 1

Conversation of MT and J

- MT: Um I am I am not sure that is(2)=
- J: =suckheads.
- MT: Yeah you know like//
- J: // Yeah.

AC 1 occurs during a block for 2 s. The completion consists of the word "suckheads" and is declarative because J is sure that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement. MT verbally acknowledged the acceptance of the completion, exhibiting agreement with J with the phrase "Yeah you know like."

The ACs occurred during a block for 2 s. The AC consists of the word “suckheads” and is declarative because J is confident that her completion is correct, as noted by a declarative statement.

In an interview with the researcher (R), MT stated that ACs often occurred in his conversations with PWNS when a person who does not stutter completes his phrase or sentence.

R: I've noticed a few of J's completions for you. What did you feel when she completed for you?

MT: I didn't really see it but I have bad feeling about it.

R: Do you have feelings like anger, frustration, embarrassment when PWNS complete for you?

MT: Not anger, not frustration, not embarrassment all of that comes from understanding I just may have them feel weird about my stutter. I am embarrassed that I cannot communicate well.

R: It's not because of other people's completions but because of stuttering itself?

MT: Yes.

R: Do you accept an AC more like help from other people?

MT: Yeah sometimes it's more like help, sometimes it's like “I don't have time hear you struggle so I am gonna finish for you.” And that's fine for me too, people are busy they don't have like the most time like hear me trying to stutter out a word. Sometimes it gets my nerve because it's my mom she has known me for 25 years (.) you should know it's just gonna be just a second. That's what embarrass me and insult me when someone so close to you really just blows off your entire communication.

R: What about PWNS who are not your parents or family members?

MT: Well it's sort of help. I don't know those people they don't own me nothing. I mean thank you I guess for helping me finish. I mean it's a tense moment for me and if you step in and help me get the tense moment done with, that's good for me, to be honest. I don't like being tense and feel weird talking to people. So and they

don't like feeling weird having to react to somebody who is so different.

R: Are there other feelings except gratitude to people?

MT: It's always sucks that you always have to be reminded, right? Stuttering makes people quite sad. Whenever someone completes for you, it's kind of reminding you that you are a stutterer. And I personally spend a lot of time trying to forget that so I can move on with my life. I hate to be reminded. It's kind of sad, you know, sort of just sad.

R: Tell me what kind of feelings you may have when you are reminded of your stuttering when someone completes for you.

MT: Anxiety is a big one. They complete communication line when they got completing for me. Like over the phone calls sometimes people don't even know what I am trying to say, that a whole lot worse than being completed. That's when frustration and anxiety and all of that shoot up like at the highest level. There is no communication.

In the interview with the researcher, MT stated that he has bad feelings about ACs even though he does not have feelings of frustration or anger. Bad feelings come from understanding that he may have PWNS “feel weird” about his stutter. He is embarrassed that he cannot communicate well. Sometimes he perceives completions more like help, sometimes it is like “I don't have time hear you struggle so I am gonna finish for you,” sometimes it gets on his nerves because it is his mom who has known him for 25 years. She should know “it's just gonna be just a second.” That is what embarrasses and insults him when someone so close, like his mom, “just blows off” his entire communication. He considers completions made by strangers as sort of help and is thankful for helping him finish—for stepping in and helping him get the tense moment done with.

Whenever someone completes for him, it is reminding him that he is a stutterer, and he personally spends a lot of time trying to forget that so he can move on with his life. He hates to be reminded. PWNS “complete communication line” when they got completing for him. Like over phone calls, sometimes people do not even know what he is trying to say, and that is much worse than being completed. That is when frustration and anxiety and all of that “shoot up at the highest level.” There is no communication.

## Group Results

To analyze the data, the researchers developed abstract conceptual ideas and reflections, first embedded in codes and then in categories. Categorization allows comparisons at all stages of the study when the next explored category is compared to a theory (Ruppel & Mey, 2017).

Constant comparative analysis was used by the researchers for coding and category development. Incidents were identified in the data and coded. The analysis compared incident to incident in each code. Codes were compared to other codes. After developing codes, the researchers identified categories. In this process, the researchers compared incidents in a category with previous incidents within and between categories. Constant comparative analysis generated more abstract concepts and theories (Chun et al. 2019). After collecting data, coding, and categorizing, the researchers attached concepts to the categories, linked and combined abstract concepts, and eventually developed a theory from emerging themes.

## Hypotheses for the Study

The researchers formulated descriptive research questions, which could be developed and refined as the study progressed. Hypotheses for the study, which were derived from the research questions, included the following:

1. ACs by PWNS occur at specific stuttering moments.
2. PWS have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS.
3. PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying.

The goal of the researchers was to analyze the collected data, which were observations, conversations, and interviews; discover patterns; themes; and eventually a theory that has been developed during the process of coding and categorization, constantly comparing and verifying data being obtained during the course of study.

## Study Results

### First Result

The researchers accepted Hypothesis 1: ACs occur at specific stuttering moments. During an interview with the first participant, EB, after she stated that ACs often occur in her conversations with PWNS when she has stuttering moments, the researchers identified the code: “stuttering moment.” After the interviews with five other participants were conducted and all of them stated that ACs occur in their conversations with PWNS when they have stuttering moments, the researchers defined a category, “Completions occur at a stuttering moment,” and then a theme “ACs by PWNS occur when PWS have stuttering moments.”

In the course of analysis of the participants’ conversations with their conversational partners, the researchers verified that five of the participants, EB, FW, BL, JS, and MT, had ACs during their stuttering moments. LA experienced ACs at nonstuttering moments, either a filled pause or a transition relevance place marked by “so” (see Table 2).

Within the analysis of ACs that the participants had during their conversations with their conversational partners, the researchers identified the specific stuttering moments for each participant at which ACs occurred. Specific stuttering moments for EB were (a) sound prolongations, (b) sound repetitions, (c) one-syllable word repetitions, and (d) part-word repetitions; for BL, they were (a) sound repetitions, (b) one-syllable word repetitions, and (c) part-word repetitions; for FW, JS, and MT, it was blocks; and for LA, they were a filled pause and discourse markers, which are not stuttering-like disfluencies (SLDs).

Although only five out of six participants experienced completions during stuttering moments, the researchers accepted Hypothesis 1, “ACs by PWNS occur at specific stuttering moments,” due to a small sample of participants. Further research is needed. The hypothesis is viable to be tested. Therefore, the hypothesis “ACs by PWNS occur at specific stuttering moments” became the theory and was accepted.

### Second Result

The researchers did not verify Hypothesis 2, “PWS have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS” and revised it into “PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS.” The researchers hypothesized that PWS in their conversations with PWNS would have negative perception and feelings of ACs made by PWNS. In an interview with the researcher, Participant 1, EB, stated that she felt annoyed when her conversational partner completed for her because EB was trying really hard and the partner did not let her finish. “Annoyed” was the first code identified under this hypothesis. Later on in the interview, EB stated that completions just threw her off. The researchers defined another code, “throws off.” EB also said that completions irritated her. Another code was “feels bad” due to EB’s utterance that she kind of felt bad but usually compensated by using techniques or avoiding because of a completion. EB stated that she felt frustrated and disempowered when her partner completed for her; the next two codes were “frustrated and disempowered.”

Participant 2, FW, in an interview with the researcher stated that he feels bad when PWNS complete for him and that he can get mad if they do it too much. “Feels bad” code has been already identified during the analysis of EB’s interview so the next code was “get mad.” FW also stated that he could stop talking to a person (persons) who completed for him. The next code was “can stop talking.”

In the interview with the researcher, the third participant, BL, stated that he feels frustrated when a person



who does not stutter completes for him. He also stated that it is frustrating because he really wanted to finish saying the word. He gets frustrated because he cannot relieve and finish expressing. He admitted that he does not like talking to a person who completes for him. The new codes that were identified by the researchers are the following: “cannot relieve and finish” and “does not like talking.”

Participant 4, LA, stated that he does not feel upset or angry when his sister or his dad completes for him, but if a friend who does not know that he stutters does it, he feels a little embarrassed because he does not want them to think he is stupid. Although he might feel a little embarrassment when a person who does not stutter completes for him, he still wants to talk to that person because it is not their fault that he stutters. If he cannot get a word out, he might feel a little relief if a person finishes for him with the right word. If someone who knows he stutters completes for him, he may feel a little frustrated (not embarrassment) because they know he stutters and should let him finish. For someone who does not know that he stutters, he will feel embarrassed and a little frustrated at himself because it is not their fault. The codes that were identified by the researchers were the following: “not upset or angry with a family member,” “little embarrassed,” “stupid,” “still wants to talk,” “little relieved,” “little frustrated,” and “embarrassed and a little frustrated at himself.”

Participant 5, JS, has positive feelings when PWNS complete for him because he appreciates that they know him so well that they are able to complete for him. JS does not have any kinds of negative feelings, such as embarrassment, frustration, disappointment, or anger, about the completions. ACs for him are “quite normal”; he is thankful to a person who does not stutter who completes for him. Two identified codes were “no negative feelings” and “gratitude.”

Participant 6, MT, stated that he has bad feeling about ACs even though he does not have feelings of frustration or anger. Sometimes he perceives completions more like help. That is what embarrasses and insults him when someone so close, like his mom, really just “blows off his entire communication.” He considers completions made by strangers as sort of help and is thankful for helping him finish—for stepping in and helping him get the tense moment done with. Anxiety is a big negative feeling at a completion. PWNS complete communication lines when they complete for him. “There is no communication.” The codes that were defined are as follows: “help,” “blows off communication,” “anxiety,” and “no communication.”

The following codes were identified during the interviews with six participants: “annoyed,” “throws off,” “feels bad,” and “frustrated and disempowered” (EB); “get mad” and “can stop talking” (FW); “cannot relieve and finish” and “does not like talking” (BL); “not upset or angry with a family member,” “little embarrassed,” “stupid,” “still wants to talk,” “little relieved,” “little frustrated,” and “embarrassed

and a little frustrated at himself” (LA); “no negative feelings” and “gratitude” (JS); and “help,” “blows off communication,” “anxiety,” and “no communication” (MT).

Within the next step of analysis, the researchers developed codes into the following categories: negative feelings about completions, getting mad at a completion, a completion throws off, a completion blows off entire communication, embarrassed and frustrated at himself at a completion, do not want them to think I’m stupid, there is no communication, no desire to talk after completion, no negative feelings about completions, a completion is help, gratitude for a completion, not upset or angry at a family member’s completion, still want to talk after a completion, and a little relieved when a completion is the right word.

After developing categories, the researchers defined major themes under the first hypotheses in the study: A person who stutters feels annoyed at completion, a completion irritates a person who stutters, a person who stutters feels bad at a completion, a person who stutters feels frustrated at a completion, a person who stutters feels disempowered at a completion, anxiety is a big negative feeling at a completion, a person who stutters can get mad at a completion, PWS can stop talking to PWNS who complete for them, a person who stutters cannot relieve and finish expressing, a person who stutters does not like talking to a person who does not stutter who completes for them, a person who stutters is embarrassed and frustrated at himself at a completion, PWS do not want PWNS to think they are stupid, a completion blows off entire communication, a completion throws a person who stutters off, there is no communication if PWNS Complete for PWS, PWS do not have negative feelings about completions, PWS are thankful to PWNS who complete, sometimes a completion is more like help, PWS are not upset or angry at a family member’s completion, PWS still want to talk after a completion, and PWS are a little relieved when a completion is the right word.

Out of 21 themes, 15 are negative, which represents 71%. Six positive themes represent 29%. One of the six participants, JS, had no negative feelings about completions; two other participants, LA and MT, had both negative and positive feelings. According to Corbin and Strauss (1990), hypotheses should be verified during the research process. A key feature of grounded theory is that hypotheses are constantly revised during the research until they hold true for all of the evidence under study.

Hypothesis 2, “PWS have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS,” was not verified during interviews with three participants. Therefore, the researchers revised Hypothesis 2 into “PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS.”

The theory that has been developed is a revised Hypothesis 2 after analyzing 21 emerged themes, among which six were positive: PWS do not always have negative feelings about completions, PWS are thankful to PWNS

**Table 2.** Types of disfluencies during anticipatory completions.

No.	Participant	Severity equivalent	No. of completions	Shortest stuttering moment at a completion (s)	Longest stuttering moment at a completion (s)	Types of disfluencies during completions
1	Emily Blunt	Very severe	17	2	13	(1) Sound prolongations (2) Sound repetitions (3) One-syllable word repetitions (4) Part-word repetitions
2	Frank Wolf	Severe	7	2	3	Blocks
3	Bob Love	Severe	4	2	24	(1) Sound repetitions (2) One-syllable word repetitions (3) Part-word repetitions
4	Lazaro Arbos	Moderate	3			(1) Filled pause (2) Discourse markers
5	John Stossel	Moderate	2	2	7	Blocks
6	Mel Tillis	Mild	1	2	2	Block

who complete, sometimes a completion is more like help, PWS are not upset or angry at a family member's completion, PWS still want to talk after a completion, and PWS are a little relieved when a completion is the right word. The theory that emerged after the analysis is "Although some PWS have positive feelings about ACs by PWNS, most of them have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs."

### Third Result

The researchers accepted Hypothesis 3: "PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying." Participant 1, EB, said that she would like to be treated like a person who does not stutter. In natural conversation, people interrupt others, but it is not the same because when she has not stuttered a word and a person who does not stutter would interrupt her, she would not feel bad about it because it is a normal thing, but interrupting to fill in a word is different. That is what she expects; she just basically expects to let her finish. "Let her finish" became the first code.

Participant 2, FW, said that he expects PWNS not to finish his sentences and let him finish himself. The code identified was "let him finish." Participant 3, BL, stated that his ideal conversational partner is that who would get to listen and let him finish saying what he was saying and then they would speak when he is done. The code identified was "speak when he is done." Participant 4, LA, would expect PWNS in conversation with him to give him more time and let him finish. Participant 5, JS, does not have negative feelings about completions. He was not able to answer what he would like more to finish himself or let a person who does not stutter finish for him. He was uncertain. The code was "uncertain." Participant 6, MT, asked PWNS not to blow off his entire communication and let him finish because "it is just going to be a second." The code was "let me finish."

The researchers developed the emerged codes into the following categories: "let PWS finish what they are saying" and "no negative feelings when PWS finish for

PWNS." The themes that have been defined are "PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying" and "PWS do not always expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying."

Although only five out of six participants expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying, the researchers accepted Hypothesis 3, "PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying," due to a small sample of participants. Further research is needed. The hypothesis is viable to be tested. Therefore, the hypothesis "PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying" became the theory and was accepted.

Most of the time, the participants either rejected or accepted a completion verbally, verifying or rejecting it with particular words or phrases. EB verified completions with the word "Yeah" and rejected them with the words or phrases "No," "Nnhmm," "Well in my..." and "Oh, never mind." FW verified completions with the word "Yeah" and once with the phrase "And they were good." BL verbally verified completions with the phrases "on you," "for a long time," and "persistence pays off" and rejected a completion once with "No." JS made two verifications of completions, the first with the word "ПОМОЩЬ" (help) and the second with the phrase "пароль не знают" (do not know the password). MT accepted and verbally verified the only one completion that he had with the phrase "Yeah you know like."

The analysis of ACs of the participants revealed that participants with the highest severity equivalents (EB, very severe; FW, severe; and BL, severe) had the highest number of ACs (17, seven, and four, respectively; see Table 2). BL and EB had the longest stuttering moments at a completion (24 and 13 s, respectively).

The analysis also revealed that the participants had ACs during specific SLDs: EB had completions during sound prolongations, sound repetitions, one-syllable word repetitions, and part-word repetitions; FW, JS, and MT had completions during blocks; BL had completions during

sound repetitions, one-syllable word repetitions, and part-word repetitions; and LA had ACs only during a filled pause and discourse markers, which are not SLDs.

Based on the research questions, the researchers developed three hypotheses, which had been analyzed during the constant process of comparison and verification of the collected data. The sources of the data were observations, conversations, and interviews. Also, the researcher developed codes, categories, themes, and eventually a theory that have been defined during the process of coding and categorization, constantly comparing and verifying data being obtained during the research process. Hypothesis 2: *PWS Have Negative Perceptions and Feelings of ACs by PWNS* was not verified during the research process and was revised into *PWS Do Not Always Have Negative Perceptions and Feelings of ACs by PWNS*. Two of the hypotheses (Hypothesis 1: ACs by PWNS occur at specific stuttering moments and Hypothesis 3: PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying) were accepted and became theories.

## Discussion

Within the analysis of ACs that the participants had during their conversations with their conversational partners, the researchers identified the specific stuttering moments for each participant at which ACs occurred. Specific stuttering moments for EB were (a) sound prolongations, (b) sound repetitions, (c) one-syllable word repetitions, and (d) part-word repetitions; for BL, they were (a) sound repetitions, (b) one-syllable word repetitions, and (c) part-word repetitions; for FW, JS, and MT, it was blocks; and for LA, there were no SLDs.

Hypothesis 2, “PWS have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS,” was not verified during interviews with three participants; therefore, the researchers revised Hypothesis 2 into the following: “PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS.” The data analysis has shown that, out of 21 themes, 15 themes were negative that represents 71% of the completions. Six positive themes represent 29% of the completions. One of the six participants, JS, had no negative feelings about completions. Two other participants, LA and MT, had both negative and positive feelings.

The third hypothesis that was accepted was Hypothesis 3, “PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying.” During the analysis of the participants’ interviews with the researchers, the researchers defined that five out of six participants in conversations with PWNS expect PWNS to give them more time and let them finish what they are going to say and start speaking when they are done. In the course of the study, the researchers revised Hypothesis 2 and verified and accepted two other hypotheses derived from the research questions.

This study has indicated that PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS. This finding is consistent with the finding of Klompas and Ross (2004), who studied life experiences of PWS and the perceived impact of stuttering on quality of life. Among the emerged themes in the study was the issue of patience in PWS’s perceptions of PWNS’s reactions to stuttering. In terms of listeners demonstrating patience, one of the participants in the study stated that PWNS used to be impatient in conversations with him. Positive attitudes toward conversations with PWNS were also expressed by another participant who stated that PWNS would wait for him to finish what he is saying. However, most participants emphasized the lack of PWNS’s patience.

The third finding of our study was that the majority of PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying. This finding is also consistent with the Klompas and Ross (2004) finding, which implicitly suggested that PWS expect that PWNS will wait for them to finish what they are saying until they respond. In 9.09% of the responses in the study of Klompas and Ross (2004), participants expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that PWNS finish sentences for them.

## Implications

### Clinical Implications

The findings of this study have several significant clinical implications. One clinical implication is that the results of this study might be useful to educate PWNS, families, friends, colleagues of PWS, and all other individuals who may interact with PWS to better communicate with PWS. Another clinical implication is education of teachers and SLPs at K–12 schools, instructors, professors, and other personnel at higher education institutions on communication with PWS.

The third clinical implication of the study could be joint therapy sessions in which both a person who stutters and a person who does not stutter would participate in the sessions and educate each other on their perceptions, feelings, and expectations that are present when ACs occur in conversations. The fourth clinical implication of the study is education of PWS about ACs in normal conversations, that ACs occur in conversations between PWNS, about the similarities of completions in both types of conversations and their differences. Instructions and/or manuals based on the research should be published and distributed among interested parties and become part of intervention programs.

Training parents, teachers, and other communication partners should include directions for the conversational partner that explains the differences between completing conversations as an act of kindness and simply being rude to a person who stutters. An example of such a comment to a teacher could be, “when a student who stutters in your class gets stuck on a word, you should wait until they finish.” It would be a

great idea to in-service the rest of the classmates and let them know that they should do the same. For education purposes, role-playing activities or videos from the NSA, the Stuttering Foundation of America, and other sources may be used. The bottom line is that most listeners do not know what to do when a person stutters. The education strategy focuses on replacing myths about stuttering with facts.

### Research Implications

The findings of this study have several significant research implications. The discovery that ACs may occur at interjections, which are not SLDs, may contribute to future research in determining types of disfluencies at which ACs in conversations between PWS and PWNS could occur.

Hypothesis 2, “PWS always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS,” was not verified during interviews with two participants; therefore, the researcher revised Hypothesis 2 into the following: “PWS do not always have negative perceptions and feelings of ACs by PWNS.” One of the six participants, JS, had no negative feelings about completions; two other participants, LA and MT, had both negative and positive feelings. Another implication for future research is to have a big enough sample of participants determine whether Hypothesis 2 could be generalized for all PWS, and JS, LA, and MT, who had positive feelings, are not outliers.

The third implication is a generalization of the hypothesis that “PWS expect PWNS to let them finish what they are saying.” In this study, the researcher defined that five out of six participants in conversations with PWNS expect PWNS to give them more time and let them finish what they are going to say and start speaking when they are done. The future research may either accept or reject it based on the greater sample of participants that would allow to generalize the hypothesis.

### Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The major limitation of this study is a small and underrepresented sample of participants. This limitation is related to an issue of recruiting participants who should satisfy the inclusion criteria to be a person who stutters and have ACs by PWNS in conversations with PWNS. Although many potential participants claimed that PWNS complete for them in conversations, in the research setting, the conversations that were recorded did not have ACs. Besides the unnatural setting that may have affected PWNS behaviors during a conversation, there was another reason why PWNS may have not completed for PWS. There were several participants who stated that they were taught not to finish for PWS but instead give them more time and let them finish themselves. As a result, in five recorded conversations between PWS and PWNS, not a single AC occurred. Because of the small and underrepresented sample of participants, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all PWS.

Another limitation is that all participants received stuttering therapy, and four of them are active members of the NSA self-help groups. The researchers can hypothesize that PWS with no history of treatment or self-help groups experience may have responded differently to the interview questions that would result in different outcomes of the study.

The third limitation is demographic and cultural differences of the participants. Research indicated that cultural differences affect the process and results of research, emphasizing that cultural differences should be taken in consideration in order to obtain valid and reliable results (Aykin, 2007). Gender differences may also impact research results. Research reported that men are more likely than women to be directive and dominate in groups, whereas women are likely to be more expressive, supportive, and cooperative (Aries, 1998). Power, authority, and influence of the participants may have impacted the research results. Senior participants and senior family members may have exercised power, authority, and influence in conversations, impacting the results of the study.

It is also possible that the Hawthorne effect may have been at play during these interactions. For example, the PWS may have been using excessive techniques to limit or alter stuttering as they knew they were being recorded. In addition, the PWNS may have attempted to be polite and not complete thoughts for the PWS in the research setting because they knew they were being studied. In nonresearch settings, the PWNS may have used many more and different types of ACs. Studies in more natural settings or controlled settings where the PWNS were blinded as to the purpose of the study could limit the Hawthorne effect.

One direction for future research is a potential mixed-methods study of whether age; sex; a severity equivalent; perceptions of stuttering; therapy/no therapy received; affiliation/no affiliation with self-help groups; and number, types, and length of stuttering moments are related to the number of ACs that a person who stutters would have in conversations with a person who does not stutter.

Another direction for future research is the study of a difference between ACs in conversations between PWNS and ACs in conversations between PWS and PWNS, particularly the study of the reasons why and when participants in the both types of conversations perform ACs and also perceptions and feelings of ACs of PWNS that PWNS have about ACs and the reasons why they complete for PWS.

The third direction is the research of why PWNS perform an AC at a particular stuttering moment and do not perform a completion at the similar stuttering moment that both are of the same type of SLD and equal in length. The most interesting questions to answer would be



why PWNS do not perform ACs at PWS's stuttering moments all the time, why they would perform a completion at a stuttering moment that is not so long (for instance, in this study, there were 2-s stuttering moments at which ACs occurred), and why they would not perform a completion at longer stuttering moments (for instance, in this study, there were several stuttering moments lasting up to 15 s [E.B. and B.L.] at which a person who does not stutter did not perform an AC). The fourth direction of the future research could be a study with a larger sample of participants that would enable to generalize the hypotheses of this study to more PWS.

The fifth direction is the research of the types of ACs that occur under controlled conditions when a person who stutters would intentionally produce various types of disfluencies such as blocks of various lengths (for instance, lasting from 2 to 7 s), prolongations, and repetitions of various lengths and when these ACs would occur. What would impact production of ACs? These would be PWS's secondary movements, gaze shifts, or any other kinds of physical signals. It is also possible that nonverbal or paralinguistic behaviors such as gaze/gesture/facial expression and intonation or pausing, respectively, impact the production of ACs. Future studies could make use of high-quality video recordings to study this phenomenon. Finally, the future researcher could figure out if PWS may have ACs in conversations between themselves; when and why the completions would occur; whether they would occur at stuttering moments as in conversations between PWS and PWNS; and would they serve as demonstrations of understanding, empathy, and affiliation between parties in conversations as with conversational parties in conversations between PWNS.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to explore ACs in conversations between PWS and PWNS. The main findings include verification that these participants use ACs at specific stuttering moments and nonstuttering moments in one case. The researchers proposed clinical and research implications and directions for the future studies. According to the best of the researchers' knowledge, this is the first study that has systematically examined how and why ACs occur in conversations between PWS and PWNS. The limitations of this study are those typical for small populations and qualitative methodologies. However, the results have opened the door to many future studies, which will help in the understanding of stuttering. Finally, the authors would like to emphasize the recommendations from the Stuttering Foundation of America on how to communicate with someone who stutters and the six tips for speaking with someone who stutters (Stuttering Foundation of America, n.d.).

## References

- Aries, E. (1998). Gender differences in interaction: A reexamination. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction*. Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315805870-3>
- Aykin, N. (2007). *Usability and Internationalization, Part I, HCII 2007, LNCS 4559*. Springer.
- Chun, T. Y., Birks, M., & Francis, K. (2019). Grounded theory research: A design framework for novice researchers. *SAGE Open Medicine*, 7, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312118822927>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13, 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00988593>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Aldine.
- Klompas, M., & Ross, E. (2004). Life experiences of people who stutter, and the perceived impact of stuttering on quality of life: Personal accounts of South African individuals. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 29(4), 275–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2004.10.001>
- Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society*, 20(3), 441–458. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500016572>
- Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text—Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 13(2), 213–246. [Reprinted in Asa Kasher (Ed.). (1999). *Pragmatics—Critical assessments*. Routledge].
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.12ler>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Sage.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Riley, G. D. (2009). *Stuttering Severity Instrument—Fourth Edition*. Pro-Ed.
- Ruppel, P. S., & Mey, G. (2017). *Grounded theory methodology*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved October 4, 2019, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.522>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4(Pt. 1)), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>
- Schatsman, L., & Strauss, A. L. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology*. Prentice-Hall.
- Simmons-Mackie, N., & Damico, J. (2001). Intervention outcomes: Clinical applications of qualitative methods. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 21(4), 21–36.
- Stuttering Foundation of America. (n.d.). *6 Tips for speaking with someone who stutters*. <https://www.stutteringhelp.org/6-tips-speaking-someone-who-stutters>
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2008). Using conversation analysis in feminist and critical research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 555–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00049.x>
- Wright, L., & Ayre, A. (2000). *Wright and Ayre Stuttering Self-Rating Profile*. Bicester.