

Capítulo 1

Assessment and intervention for children with speech sound disorders

Sharynne McLeod^a, Sarah Verdon^a & Nicole McGill^a

^aCharles Sturt University, Australia

Speech-language pathologists frequently work with children with speech sound disorders (SSD) to increase their perception and production of speech sounds and intelligibility so that they enhance their participation in society. Most children with SSD have no known cause. There are a number of theories regarding children's speech acquisition. Children's speech acquisition begins at birth and researchers have demonstrated that most children's speech is intelligible by 5 years of age. A range of assessment and intervention tools are available for monolingual speakers of languages such as English and Portuguese. Bilingual speakers may demonstrate cross-linguistic transfer, which should not be interpreted as SSD.

1 Introduction

Children are the future leaders, citizens, and shapers of our world. Underpinning children's current and future ability to participate effectively in daily life are the foundational skills of communication. To communicate is a basic human right (McLeod 2018) underlying children's ability to learn and become literate, interact with others within their communities, obtain employment and build a career, and contribute effectively to society into the future.

Who are children with SSD?

Early childhood is a time of rapid growth and development when children learn to intelligibly speak the sounds and words of the languages they are exposed to,



Sharynne McLeod, Sarah Verdon & Nicole McGill. 2022. Assessment and intervention for children with speech sound disorders. In Maria João Freitas, Marisa Lousada & Dina Caetano Alves (eds.), *Linguística clínica: Modelos, avaliação e intervenção*, 3–22. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7233213

enabling them to become competent communicators. For some children, however, this process does not come easily, and they have difficulty learning to pronounce sounds and words. The umbrella term used to describe the speech difficulties experienced by these children is speech sound disorders (SSD).

What is SSD?

SSD is a type of communication impairment, where children present with a combination of difficulties in any of the following areas of their speech (International Expert Panel on Multilingual Children's Speech 2012):

- Perception: the ability to perceive differences between speech sounds and words (e.g., *pin* vs *bin*).
- Production: the articulation or motor production of speech sounds (e.g., interdental lisp /s/ → [θ]).
- Phonological representation: the ability to organise sounds in their minds to produce groups of speech sounds.
- Phonotactics: the ability to produce syllable and word shapes, such as multisyllabic words (e.g., *hospital*).
- Prosody: the use of appropriate stress, tones, rhythm, and intonation during speech.

SSD may impact children's intelligibility and listeners' perceptions regarding the acceptability of children's speech productions (International Expert Panel on Multilingual Children's Speech 2012). For most children with SSD, there is no known cause or origin for their speech difficulties. Some sources such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (American Psychiatric Association 2013) exclude children with a known cause from the definition of SSD. For the purposes of this chapter, these children are included under the umbrella definition of SSD. Some children may only have SSD and others might experience challenges in other areas of their development, such as language or motor skills.

Types of SSD

According to McLeod & Baker (2017), types of SSD stem from two main etiologies: (1) impairment of the phonological system (2) impairment of the motor speech

Table 1.1: Types of speech sound disorders

Basis	Name of SSD	Description	Example
Phonological (difficulties with organizing speech into patterns of sounds)	Phonological impairment	Multiple production errors that follow predictable patterns	Replacement of one group of sounds with another (e.g., replacing velars with alveolars)
	Inconsistent speech disorder	Inconsistent phonological errors	Inconsistent productions of words
Motor speech (difficulties with coordinated movements of the lips, tongue, teeth, palate and respiratory system)	Articulation impairment	Difficulty with production of specific consonants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interdental lisp /s/ → [θ] • lateral lisp /s/ → [ɬ] • /ɹ/ → [w]
	Childhood apraxia of speech (CAS)	Difficulty planning and programming movement sequences and controlling prosody	Difficulty with motor planning and stress, imitation, and production of consonants and vowels
	Childhood dysarthria	Difficulty with sensorimotor control in planning and executing speech	Weakness, incoordination, difficulty with phonation, stress, accuracy.

and there are five different types of SSD, each with their own unique characteristics. Table 1.1 provides a description of these categories.

For most children, SSD is of unknown origin (Shriberg et al. 2005). However, for some SSD the cause is known. This includes SSDs that accompany hearing

loss (Crowe & McLeod 2014), congenital conditions and craniofacial anomalies such as cleft lip \pm palate (Cronin & McLeod 2019), and SSD that result from syndromes such as Fragile X syndrome and Down syndrome (Barnes et al. 2009). Children may possess characteristics of multiple SSD types of both known and unknown origin.

Prevalence of childhood SSD

SSD is a prevalent condition in childhood (Law et al. 2000). Prevalence rates vary among international research studies due to differences in participant samples (e.g., age, population vs probability sampling), data collection methods, definitions, and testing cut point/criteria. However, the reported prevalence of childhood SSD ranges from 1.06% (McKinnon et al. 2007) to 20.5% (Tuomi & Ivanoff 1977). Children with SSD form a high proportion of speech-language pathologists (SLPs') caseloads throughout the world (Broomfield & Dodd 2004, Mullen & Schooling 2010, Oliveira et al. 2015).

Impact of SSD on children's lives

Children often demonstrate resilience and persistence in social interactions and become skilled in using nonverbal forms of communication (e.g., gestures) to help express their wants and needs. They can make friends and successfully and happily participate in daily life (McLeod & Baker 2017). However, SSD can have negative impacts on children especially if timely SLP support is not received in early childhood. For example, children may have difficulty with social interaction and making and keeping friends, experience bullying/teasing, and feel sad and frustrated with their SSD (McCormack et al. 2011, McLeod et al. 2013). For example, BJ stated: "I often felt left out because I wasn't able to talk with other people, I wasn't able to tell other people my thoughts or if I needed something. It was heartbreaking because I knew what I wanted to say, but I couldn't say it" (Carrigg et al. 2015: 46).

Children with SSD may also experience difficulties in literacy and mathematical thinking, are more likely than their typically developing peers to drop out of school, and may go on to have difficulty acquiring and maintaining employment (Anthony et al. 2011, Felsenfeld et al. 1994, Robertson et al. 1998, Ruben 2000, Tambyraja et al. 2020).

SSD can also impact the lives of family members. Siblings may act as interpreters for children with SSD in the community, and parents may "battle" to obtain services and support for their children (Barr et al. 2008, McCormack et al.

2012, McGill et al. 2020). However, all children and families are unique with individual strengths, values, and interests. It is important to listen to and consider their experiences and perspectives when working with children with SSD and their families.

2 Theoretical models underpinning work with children with SSD

There are multiple theories that have been proposed to explain how children develop their sound systems and thus what may be occurring when children experience SSD. Many theories draw upon the following concepts in relation to sounds, and features of speech such as syllable shapes and stress patterns:

- *Naturalness*: Easier, earlier developing sounds or features that are more common across languages. Sometimes referred to as unmarked.
- *Markedness*: More difficult, later acquired sounds or features that are less common across languages.

Generative phonology

First proposed by Chomsky & Halle (1968), generative phonology is a theory of human sound structures that suggests that there is an abstract underlying representation of the target phonology of the ambient language in the brain and that the surface representation, that is, the realization of phonemes in speech is influenced by two key concepts:

- Underlying phonological rules (e.g., voice, manner, place, naturalness, markedness)
- Information from other linguistic levels (i.e., the context of the production such as semantics and syntax)

The way phonological representations are stored in the brain may be different from how these phonemes are physically realized in speech. The theory of generative phonology has led to the common notation of placing the target phoneme in slashes / / while the realization of the phoneme in speech is represented using square brackets []. For example, when a child is fronting the word *keep* in English, this production would be written as: /kip/ → [tip]

Table 1.2: Phonological patterns in speech acquisition

Phonological pattern	Example	Typical/ atypical	Age when resolves
Fronting (e.g., velars produced as alveolars)	<i>casa</i> /kaze/ → [taze]	Typical in Pt & En	3.5 years
Backing (e.g., alveolars produced as velars)	<i>doce</i> /dos/ → [gos]	Atypical in Pt & En	Uncommon, may be indicative of SSD
Stopping (e.g., fricatives produced as plosives/stops)	<i>sumo</i> /sumu/ → [tumu]	Typical in Pt & En	3–5 years depending on sound
Cluster reduction (1–2 elements are deleted)	<i>flor</i> /flor / → [for]	Typical in Pt & En	4–5 years
Reduplication (repetition of a syllable)	<i>bolo</i> /bolu/ → [bobo]	Typical in Pt & En	3 years
Weak syllable deletion (unstressed syllable(s) are deleted from a polysyllabic word)	<i>banana</i> /bə'nene/ → [nene]	Typical in Pt & En	4 years
Final consonant deletion (the final consonant is deleted)	<i>dog</i> /dog/ → [do]	Typical in En Uncommon in Pt	3 years in English
Initial consonant deletion (the initial consonant is deleted)	<i>bola</i> /bɔle/ → [ɔle]	Atypical in En & Pt	May be indicative of SSD

Natural phonology

Stampe (1979) proposed that children follow similar natural developmental patterns of producing sounds in easier ways during early speech development. This means that children may substitute more difficult sounds with easier sounds or omit sounds altogether while they are still learning their language. This theory is called natural phonology because processes are observed to be a common feature of typical development among children and often resolve naturally as children's speech matures. These patterns are often referred to as phonological processes or phonological patterns (Bowen 2011, Hodson 2007). Many speech-language pathologists use these patterns as a way to classify speech sound errors and to diagnose SSD (e.g., Hodson 2007). These patterns can vary depending on the language(s) that the child speaks. Some phonological processes are not typical within certain languages and may be an indicator of SSD. Additionally, if a phonological process persists past a certain age it may be an indicator of SSD. See Table 1.2 for a description of some common phonological patterns, whether they are typical/atypical in Portuguese and English and the age at which these patterns typically resolve. Data for Portuguese children are based on Jesus et al. (2015) and data for English speaking children are based on Bowen (2011). These data are based on monolingual children, not bilingual speakers of Portuguese and English.

Nonlinear phonology

Generative and natural phonology are considered to be theories of linear phonology. In contrast, nonlinear phonology, as described by Bernhardt & Stemberger (2000) considers the phonological system as a whole, examining the hierarchical nature of the relationships between phonological units in the sound system rather than just looking at speech sounds. The hierarchy consists of the *prosodic tier* (encompassing the phrase tier, the word tier, the foot tier, the syllable tier, the onset-rime tier, the skeletal tier, the timing tier) and the *segmental tier* (encompassing features of the different segments being produced). Difficulties can occur at any one of these tiers. Analysis of speech using nonlinear phonology looks at patterns of errors that occur on each tier in the hierarchy to identify targets for intervention.

In nonlinear phonology, unmarked features of speech including sounds, syllable shapes and stress patterns are considered default elements of the sound system. This means they are likely to remain intact. Whereas marked features such as sounds, syllable shapes and stress patterns are considered non-default

and are more likely to differ from the target production. The theory of nonlinear phonology recognizes that children's speech development is additive (that children increase accuracy of target features over time), as opposed to other theories that suggest children learn speech in an errored way using less marked sounds and then unlearn these errors to achieve target accuracy as their speech systems mature.

Optimality theory

Prince & Smolensky (1993) proposed optimality theory on the basis that there are two levels of sound representation: input (underlying representation) and output (surface realization). In contrast to generative phonology where rules determine surface representation, in optimality theory, constraints determine surface representation:

Type 1: *Markedness constraints* – Marked features may be excluded from the surface realization or deviate from the underlying representation as they are less common or more difficult to produce.

Type 2: *Faithfulness constraints* – Unmarked sound features are preserved in speech and remain faithful to the target production.

Optimality theory proposes that as the speech system of typically developing children matures their faithfulness to the adult target production increases.

3 Typical speech acquisition

Children's speech acquisition begins at birth and most aspects of speech production are mastered by 5 years of age. Many elements are considered when describing children's speech acquisition: "oral mechanism, perception, intelligibility, phonetic inventory, syllable and word shape inventory, mastery of consonants and vowels, percentage of consonants/consonant clusters/vowels correct, common mismatches, phonological processes, syllable structure, prosody, metalinguistic and phonological awareness skills" (McLeod & Baker 2017: 191). Children's speech acquisition is influenced by age, and some studies have shown that sex (gender), maternal education, socio-economic status, and language spoken, may have an influence (whereas, other studies have shown these factors do not have an influence) on the rate of speech acquisition (McLeod & Baker 2017). There is cross-linguistic evidence that input frequency, functional load, and articulatory complexity influence children's speech acquisition across a range of languages (Ingram 2012). Consequently, consonants that are more difficult to pronounce

(e.g., fricatives) that are rarely produced in a language may be later to be acquired. The emergence approach to speech acquisition (Davis & Bedore 2013) provides a theory to summarize the influences of (1) biologically-motivated intrinsic capabilities (maturation, cognition, perception and production), (2) socially-motivated interactional capabilities with communication partners (e.g., turn taking and intention) and (3) the influence of the extrinsic context (e.g., ambient phonology).

One of the most commonly researched areas of children's speech acquisition is the age of acquisition of consonants. McLeod & Crowe (2018) reviewed typical consonant acquisition across 27 languages and more than 26,000 children. They found that regardless of the language spoken, 5-year-old children had acquired the majority of the consonants within their ambient language and produced at least 93 percent of consonants correctly. Difficult consonants were trills, flaps, fricatives, and affricates; whereas plosives and nasals, typically were acquired earlier. However, "there was an interaction between place and manner where plosives and nasals produced with anterior tongue placement were acquired earlier than anterior trills, fricatives, and affricates" (McLeod & Crowe 2018: 1546). Their cross-linguistic review included two studies of Brazilian Portuguese. The first study was by Salviano Santini (1995) who researched consonant and consonant cluster production of 192 monolingual Brazilian Portuguese speakers aged 2;0-6;8 years. The second study was by Silva et al. (2012) who studied two groups of 240 children in Brazil aged 3;0 to 7;9 months. Both of these studies also provided normative data for the percentage of consonants correct (PCC). Recently, two additional studies of Brazilian Portuguese consonant acquisition have been published (Ceron et al. 2017, 2020). These papers reported on different aspects of a study of 733 typically developing Brazilian Portuguese-speaking children (3;0-8;11 years), using the spontaneous naming task from the Phonological Assessment Tool (Instrumento de Avaliação Fonológica INFONO). They indicated that common phonological processes in younger children were: "cluster reduction, liquid gliding, fricative deletion-coda, and weak-syllable deletion"; and that /r/ and complex onsets were acquired later than other consonants. They also confirmed the findings of McLeod & Crowe (2018) that nasals and stops/plosives were acquired before fricatives and liquids.

Multilingual acquisition

Children's language background plays an important role in the accurate identification of SSD. When children speak more than one language their speech production will be different from a monolingual speaker. This is because different language systems influence each other. For example, if a child learns to

speak Portuguese first, and then learns to speak English as a second language, their speech development and production will likely be different from what is observed in a monolingual Portuguese-speaking child. In particular, sounds that are not shared between the languages, such as /ʁ/, may be more difficult for the multilingual child to produce or may develop later than by a monolingual child (McLeod & Crowe 2018). Children may also use different stress patterns in their speaking if these are different between their first and additional languages. These differences are known as *cross-linguistic transfer* and are not indicative of SSD, but rather a language difference arising from being a multilingual speaker. Multilingual children's speech acquisition is influenced by:

extrinsic factors from their language environment

- ambient phonology
- cross-linguistic/cross-dialectal transfer

intrinsic factors

- development/Maturation
- assimilation
- error productions (related to SSD) (McLeod et al. 2021)

Therefore, when working with multilingual children, differential diagnosis is needed when determining whether children's productions are a result of SSD or a (typical) language difference.

4 Assessment and analysis of children's speech

When a child is suspected to have SSD there are many different aspects to consider during an assessment. A speech assessment typically includes: referral, case history, assessment of speech production, intelligibility, stimulability, speech perception, phonological processing, language, hearing, oral structure and function, nonverbal intelligence, participation and can also include pre-literacy skills (McLeod et al. 2017). After the assessment, the speech-language pathologist undertakes analysis of the speech sample, discusses the results with the child, family and others (e.g., teachers) to formulate a diagnosis, and if relevant sets goals for intervention. Considering families' worldviews and cultural frames of reference is essential for service provision that is meaningful and relevant.

Assessments should target all of the child's languages because languages differ phonologically and phonotactically, and children may not exhibit the same skills

in each language due to differences in use, proficiency and cross-linguistic transfer (McLeod et al. 2017). Across the world, there are many different assessments that have been created to consider children's speech production. Two websites contain lists of speech assessments for children in many different languages:

- Multilingual Children's Speech:
<https://www.csu.edu.au/research/multilingual-speech/speech-assessments>
- Crosslinguistic Project Assessment Tools:
<http://blogs.ubc.ca/crosslinguisticprojectmaterials/>

McLeod & Verdon (2014) considered children's speech assessments in 17 languages and found that most were developed for monolingual children, particularly English-speaking children. Some of the speech assessments and analyses available in Portuguese that have been created for Portuguese-speaking children in Portugal or Brazil include:

- Teste de Linguagem infantil: Nas áreas de fonologia, vocabulário, fluência e pragmática (ABFW) (Furquim Andrade et al. 2000);
- Avaliação Fonológica da criança (AFC) (Yavas et al. 1991);
- Teste Fonético-Fonológico-ALPE (TFF-ALPE) (Mendes et al. 2009);
- Automatic Phonological Analysis Tools (APAT) (Saraiva et al. 2017) for use with ALPE;
- Portuguese Phonology Test plus Nonlinear Scan Analysis form (Bunney & Bernhardt 2012).

The Intelligibility in Context Scale (ICS) (<https://www.csu.edu.au/research/multilingual-speech/ics>) is a 7-item parent-report scale that can be used as a screening tool to consider children's intelligibility with different communication partners. Four-to-five-year-old children who achieve a score below 4 out of 5 may be considered for further speech assessment. The ICS has been translated into over 60 languages including European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese (Escala de Inteligibilidade em Contexto). The validity and reliability of the ICS has been reported in 18 studies of over 4235 children from 14 countries and 14 languages (McLeod 2020) including Portuguese-speaking children in Portugal (Lousada et al. 2019).

5 Interventions for children with SSD

There are a range of intervention (or therapy) approaches that SLPs use when working with children with SSD. A survey of 88 Portuguese SLPs (Oliveira et al. 2015) found that commonly used intervention approaches include:

- Articulation interventions;
- Minimal pairs intervention;
- Phonological awareness intervention.

Other intervention approaches used by some Portuguese SLPs include: non-linear intervention, cycles therapy and the core vocabulary approach. A number of intervention approaches are summarized in Table 1.3. Information is included about suitable sub-types of SSD for each approach. References for further reading are also included, reflecting the highest level of evidence available supporting the intervention (e.g., meta-analysis, systematic review, randomized controlled trial). Where multiple studies were available with the same level of evidence, more recent studies were referenced. More details about these and other intervention approaches for children with SSD can be found in (Williams et al. 2021).

The use of evidence (evidence-based practice) is important when selecting appropriate intervention approaches to use. Lousada et al. (2013) indicated that SLPs in Portugal favoured articulation-based approaches, so undertook a randomized controlled trial to compare phonological and articulation-based approaches for 14 Portuguese children (4;0–6;7 years) with phonologically based SSD. Both intervention approaches resulted in increased (PCC); however, greater gains were achieved from the phonological intervention approach that combined expressive phonological tasks, phonological awareness, listening and discrimination activities.

Baker et al. (2018) developed a taxonomy of the different elements of phonological interventions. Similarities and differences exist across intervention approaches regarding goals, teaching moments, contexts, and procedural issues (Baker et al. 2018). There is flexibility in the implementation of some interventions, and it remains unclear exactly which elements actively contribute to treatment effects for children with SSD (Baker et al. 2018). However, intensity is an important factor and higher intensity intervention is generally recommended (e.g., regular sessions and high doses of teaching moments per session; Baker 2012). Parents are often involved in intervention with children with SSD (Oliveira et al. 2015). If parents are trained to undertake home practice with children, this can increase intervention intensity and may improve children's outcomes (Sugden et al. 2018).

Table 1.3: Intervention approaches for children with SSD

Intervention approach (example)	Sub-type of SSD	Suggested reference
Articulation Interventions	Articulation impairment	Skelton (2004)
Biofeedback (ultrasound, electropalatography)	Articulation impairment	Preston et al. (2014)
Complexity Approach (maximal oppositions)	Phonological impairment	Rvachew & Nowak (2001)
Core Vocabulary	Inconsistent SSD	Broomfield & Dodd (2011)
Cycles Approach	Phonological impairment	Almost & Rosenbaum (1998)
Digital Tools (T2T Speech and Language Therapy)	All	Jesus et al. (2019)
Phonological Awareness Intervention	All	Hesketh et al. (2007)
Minimal Pairs Intervention	Phonological impairment	Dodd et al. (2008)
Multiple Oppositions Intervention	Phonological impairment	Ceron & Keske-Soares (2013)
Nuffield Centre Dyspraxia Programme	CAS	Murray et al. (2015)
Prompts for Restructuring Oral Muscular Phonetic Targets	CAS	Namasivayam et al. (2021)
Psycholinguistic Intervention	All	Speake et al. (2012)
Speech Motor Programming (Rapid Syllable Transition Treatment ReST)	CAS	Murray et al. (2015)
Speech Perception (Speech Assessment and Interactive Learning System SAILS)	Phonological impairment	Rvachew et al. (2004)
Stimulability Approach	Phonological impairment	Miccio & Elbert (1996)

Note: CAS, childhood apraxia of speech

There is a lot of evidence to indicate that intervention for children with SSD can be successful resulting in intelligible speech (Baker & McLeod 2011) enabling children to be the future leaders, citizens, and shapers of our world. As one child stated:

I believe that even though we are only children we can still really make a difference in the world ... (McCormack et al. 2018: 147)

Referências

- Almost, D. & Peter Rosenbaum. 1998. Effectiveness of speech intervention for phonological disorders: A randomized controlled trial. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology* 40(5). 319–325.
- American Psychiatric Association. 2013. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*. 5th. Washington D. C.: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Anthony, Jason L., Rachel Greenblatt Aghara, Martha J. Dunkelberger, Teresa I. Anthony, Jeffrey M. Williams & Zhou Zhang. 2011. What factors place children with speech sound disorders at risk for reading problems? *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 20(2). 146–160. DOI: 10.1044/1058-0360(2011/10-0053).
- Baker, Elise. 2012. Optimal intervention intensity. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 14(5). 401–409. DOI: 10.3109/17549507.2012.700323.
- Baker, Elise & Sharynne McLeod. 2011. Evidence-based practice for children with speech sound disorders: Part 1 narrative review. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 42(2). 102–139. DOI: 10.1044/0161-1461(2010/09-0075).
- Baker, Elise, Lynn Williams, Sharynne McLeod & Rebecca McCauley. 2018. Elements of phonological interventions for children with speech sound disorders: The development of a taxonomy. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 27. 906–935. DOI: 10.1044/2018_ajslp-17-0127.
- Barnes, Elizabeth, Joanne Roberts, Steven H. Long, Gary E. Martin, Mary C. Berni, Kerry C. Mandulak & John Sideris. 2009. Phonological accuracy and intelligibility in connected speech of boys with fragile X syndrome or Down syndrome. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 52. 1048–1061. DOI: 10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0001).
- Barr, Jacqueline, Sharynne McLeod & Graham Daniel. 2008. Siblings of children with speech impairment: Cavalry on the hill. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 39. 21–32. DOI: 10.1044/0161-1461(2008/003).

- Bernhardt, Barbara M. & Joseph P. Stemberger. 2000. *Workbook in nonlinear phonology for clinical application*. Austin, TX: Pro-ed.
- Bowen, Caroline. 2011. *Phonological processes*. <http://www.speech-language-therapy.com/>.
- Broomfield, Jan & Barbara Dodd. 2004. Children with speech and language disability: Caseload characteristics. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 39(3). 303–324. DOI: 10.1080/13682820310001625589.
- Broomfield, Jan & Barbara Dodd. 2011. Is speech and language therapy effective for children with primary speech and language impairment? Report of a randomized control trial. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 46(6). 628–640. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-6984.2011.00039.x.
- Bunney, M. & Barbara M. Bernhardt. 2012. *Portuguese (Brazilian) Phonology Test plus Nonlinear Scan Analysis form for Portuguese*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia.
- Carrigg, Bronwyn, Elise Baker, Louise Parry & Kirrie J. Ballard. 2015. Persistent speech sound disorder in a 22-year-old male: Communication, educational, socio-emotional, and vocational outcomes. *SIG 16 Perspectives on School-Based Issues* 16. 37–49. DOI: 10.1044/sbi16.2.37.
- Ceron, Marizete I., Marileda Barichello Gubiani, Camila Rosa de Oliveira & Márcia Keske-Soares. 2017. Factors influencing consonant acquisition in Brazilian Portuguese-speaking children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 60(4). 759–771. DOI: 10.1044/2016_JSLHR-S-15-0208.
- Ceron, Marizete I., Marileda Barichello Gubiani, Camila Rosa de Oliveira & Márcia Keske-Soares. 2020. Normative features of phoneme acquisition in Brazilian Portuguese. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica* 72(3). 228–241. DOI: 10.1159/000499690.
- Ceron, Marizete I. & Márcia Keske-Soares. 2013. Mudanças fonológicas obtidas no tratamento pelo modelo de oposições múltiplas [Phonological changes obtained in the treatment based on the multiple oppositions approach]. *Revista CEFAC* 15(2). 314–323. DOI: 10.1590/S1516-18462012005000083.
- Chomsky, Noam & Morris Halle. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cronin, Anna & Sharynne McLeod. 2019. Cleft lip and palate: Speech effects. Em Jack S. Damico & Martin J. Ball (eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of human communication sciences and disorders*, 347–350. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Crowe, Kathryn & Sharynne McLeod. 2014. A systematic review of cross-linguistic and multilingual speech and language outcomes for children with

- hearing loss. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17(3). 287–309. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.758686.
- Davis, Barbara L. & Lisa M. Bedore. 2013. *An emergence approach to speech acquisition: Doing and knowing*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Dodd, Barbara, Sharon Crosbie, Beth McIntosh, Alison Holm, Cynthia Harvey, Maureen Liddy, Kylie Fontyne, Bernadette Pinchin & Helen Rigby. 2008. The impact of selecting different contrasts in phonological therapy. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 10(5). 334–345. DOI: 10.1080/14417040701732590.
- Felsenfeld, Susan, Patricia A. Broen & Matt McGue. 1994. A 28-year follow up of adults with a history of moderate phonological disorder: Educational and occupational results. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 37. 1341–1353. DOI: 10.1044/jshr.3706.1341.
- Furquim Andrade, Cláudia Regina, Débora M. Befi-Lopes, Fernanda Dreux Miranda Fernandes & Haydée F. Wertzner. 2000. *ABFW – Teste de linguagem infantil: Nas áreas de fonologia, vocabulário, fluência e pragmática [Portuguese]*. Carapicuíba: Pró-Fono.
- Hesketh, Anne, Evgenia Dima & Veronica Nelson. 2007. Teaching phoneme awareness to pre-literate children with speech disorder: A randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 42(3). 251–271. DOI: 10.1080/13682820600940141.
- Hodson, Barbara W. 2007. *Evaluation and enhancing children's phonological systems: Research and theory to practice*. Greenville, SC: Thinking Publications.
- Ingram, David. 2012. Cross-linguistic and multilingual aspects of speech sound disorders in children. Em Sharynne McLeod & Brian A. Goldstein (eds.), *Multilingual aspects of speech sound disorders in children*, 3–12. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- International Expert Panel on Multilingual Children's Speech. 2012. *Multilingual children with speech sound disorders: Position paper*. Bathurst, Australia: Charles Sturt University.
- Jesus, Luis M., Marisa Lousada, Diana Domingues, Andreia Hall & David Tomé. 2015. Phonological processes in Portuguese children with speech sound disorders. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 51(1). 75–88. DOI: 10.1515/psicl-2015-0003.
- Jesus, Luís M., Joana Martinez, Joaquim Santos, Andreia Hall & Victoria Joffe. 2019. Comparing traditional and tablet-based intervention for children with speech sound disorders: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 62. 4045–4061. DOI: 10.1044/2019_JSLHR-S-18-0301.

- Law, James, James Boyle, Frances Harris, Avril Harkness & Chad Nye. 2000. Prevalence and natural history of primary speech and language delay: Findings from a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 35(2). 165–188. DOI: 10.1080/136828200247133.
- Lousada, Marisa, Luís M. Jesus, S. Capelas, C. Margaça, D. Simões, A. R. Valente, A. Hall & V. Joffe. 2013. Phonological and articulation treatment approaches in Portuguese children with speech and language impairments: A randomized controlled intervention study. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 48(2). 172–187. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-6984.2012.00191.x.
- Lousada, Marisa, Pedro Sá-Couto, Diogo Sutre, Catarina Figueiredo, Marisa Fazenda, Maria João Lousada & A. Rita Valente. 2019. Validity and reliability of the intelligibility in context scale: European Portuguese version. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics* 33(12). 1125–1138. DOI: 10.1080/02699206.2019.1589579.
- McCormack, Jane, Elise Baker & Kathryn Crowe. 2018. The human right to communicate and our need to listen: Learning from people with a history of childhood communication disorder. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 20(1). 142–151. DOI: 10.1080/17549507.2018.1397747.
- McCormack, Jane, Linda J. Harrison, Sharynne McLeod & Lindy McAllister. 2011. A nationally representative study of the association between communication impairment at 4–5 years and children’s life activities at 7–9 years. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research* 54(5). 1328–1348. DOI: 10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0155).
- McCormack, Jane, Lindy McAllister, Sharynne McLeod & Linda J. Harrison. 2012. Knowing, having, doing: The battles of childhood speech impairment. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy* 28(2). 141–157. DOI: 10.1177/0265659011417313.
- McGill, Nicole, Kathryn Crowe & Sharynne McLeod. 2020. “Many wasted months”: Stakeholders’ perspectives about waiting for speech-language pathology services. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 22(3). 313–326. DOI: 10.1080/17549507.2020.1747541.
- McKinnon, David H., Sharynne McLeod & Sheena Reilly. 2007. The prevalence of stuttering, voice and speech-sound disorders in primary school students in Australia. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 38(1). 5–15. DOI: 10.1044/0161-1461(2007/002).
- McLeod, Sharynne. 2018. Communication rights: Fundamental human rights for all. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 20(1). 3–11. DOI: 10.1080/17549507.2018.1428687.
- McLeod, Sharynne. 2020. Intelligibility in Context Scale: Cross-linguistic use, validity, and reliability. *Speech, Language and Hearing* 23(1). 9–16. DOI: 10.1080/2050571x.2020.1718837.

- McLeod, Sharynne & Elise Baker. 2017. *Children's speech: An evidence-based approach to assessment and intervention*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- McLeod, Sharynne & Kathryn Crowe. 2018. Children's consonant acquisition in 27 languages: A cross-linguistic review. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 27. 1546–1571. DOI: 10.1044/2018_AJSLP-17-0100.
- McLeod, Sharynne, Graham Daniel & Jacqueline Barr. 2013. "When he's around his brothers ... he's not so quiet": The private and public worlds of school-aged children with speech sound disorder. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 46(1). 70–83. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2012.08.006.
- McLeod, Sharynne, Kate Margetson, Cen Wang, Van H. Tran, Sarah Verdon, Katherine White & Ben Pham. 2021. Speech acquisition within a 3-generation Vietnamese-English family: The influence of maturation and ambient phonology. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*. 1–24. DOI: 10.1080/02699206.2020.1862915.
- McLeod, Sharynne & Sarah Verdon. 2014. A review of 30 speech assessments in 19 languages other than English. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 23(4). 708–723. DOI: 10.1044/2014_ajslp-13-0066.
- McLeod, Sharynne, Sarah Verdon & International Expert Panel on Multilingual Children's Speech. 2017. Tutorial: Speech assessment for multilingual children who do not speak the same language(s) as the speech-language pathologist. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 26(3). 691–708. DOI: 10.1044/2017_ajslp-15-0161.
- Mendes, Ana P., Elisabete Afonso, Marisa Lousada & Fátima Andrade. 2009. *Teste Fonético-Fonológico-ALPE (TFF-ALPE) [Phonetic-Phonological Test] [Portuguese]*. Aveiro, PT: Edubox.
- Miccio, Adele W. & Mary Elbert. 1996. Enhancing stimulability: A treatment program. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 29. 335–351. DOI: 10.1016/0021-9924(96)00016-0.
- Mullen, Robert & Tracy Schooling. 2010. The National Outcomes Measurement System for paediatric speech-language pathology. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 41(1). 44–60. DOI: 10.1044/0161-1461(2009/08-0051).
- Murray, Elizabeth, Patricia McCabe & Kirrie J. Ballard. 2015. A randomized controlled trial for children with childhood apraxia of speech comparing Rapid Syllable Transition Treatment and the Nuffield Dyspraxia Programme – Third Edition. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 58(3). 669–686. DOI: 10.1044/2015_JSLHR-S-13-0179.
- Namasivayam, Aravind K., Anna Huynh, Francesca Granata, Vina Law & Pascal van Lieshout. 2021. PROMPT intervention for children with severe speech

- motor delay: A randomized control trial. *Pediatric Research* (89). 613–621. DOI: 10.1038/s41390-020-0924-4.
- Oliveira, Carla, Marisa Lousada & Luís M. Jesus. 2015. The clinical practice of speech and language therapists with children with phonologically based speech sound disorders. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy* 31(2). 173–194. DOI: 10.1177/0265659014550420.
- Preston, Jonathan L., Patricia McCabe, Ahmed Rivera-Campos, Jessica L. Whittle, Erik Landry & Edwin Maas. 2014. Ultrasound visual feedback treatment and practice variability for residual speech sound errors. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 57(6). 2102–2115. DOI: 10.1044/2014_JSLHR-S-14-0031.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Rel. téc. CU-CS-696-93. Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University.
- Robertson, Laurel M., Meri S. Harding & Gale M. Morrison. 1998. A comparison of resilience indicators among Latino/a students: Differences between students identified as at-risk, learning disabled, speech impaired and not at-risk. *Education and Treatment of Children* 21(3). 333–354.
- Ruben, Robert J. 2000. Redefining the survival of the fittest: Communication disorders in the 21st century. *Laryngoscope* 110. 241–245. DOI: 10.1097/00005537-200002010-00010.
- Rvachew, Susan & Michele Nowak. 2001. The effect of target-selection strategy on phonological learning. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 44. 610–623. DOI: 10.1044/1092-4388(2001/050).
- Rvachew, Susan, Michele Nowak & Genevieve Cloutier. 2004. Effect of phonemic perception training on the speech production and phonological awareness skills of children with expressive phonological delay. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 13(3). 250–263. DOI: 10.1044/1058-0360(2004/026).
- Saraiva, Daniela, Marisa Lousada, Andreia Hall & Luís M. Jesus. 2017. Paediatric Automatic Phonological Analysis Tools (APAT). *Logopedics Phoniatrics Vocology* 42(4). 153–159. DOI: 10.1080/14015439.2016.1237544.
- Shriberg, Lawrence D., Barbara A. Lewis, J. Bruce Tomblin, Jane L. McSweeney, Heather B. Karlsson & Alison R. Scheer. 2005. Toward diagnostic and phenotype markers for genetically transmitted speech delay. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 48. 834–852. DOI: 10.1044/1092-4388(2005/058).
- Silva, Monica K., Carla Ferrante, John Van Borsel & Monica M. Pereira. 2012. Phonological acquisition of Brazilian Portuguese in children from Rio de Ja-

- neiro. *Jornal da Sociedade Brasileira de Fonoaudiologia* 24(3). 248–254. DOI: 10.1590/s2179-64912012000300010.
- Skelton, Steven L. 2004. Concurrent task sequencing in single-phoneme phonologic treatment and generalization. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 37(2). 131–155. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2003.08.002.
- Speake, Jane, Joy Stackhouse & Michelle Pascoe. 2012. Vowel targeted intervention for children with persisting speech difficulties: Impact on intelligibility. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy* 28(3). 277–295. DOI: 10.1177/0265659012453463.
- Stampe, David. 1979. *A dissertation on natural phonology*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Sugden, Eleanor, Elise Baker, Natalie Munro, A. Lynn Williams & Carol M. Trivette. 2018. Service delivery and intervention intensity for phonology-based speech sound disorders. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 53(4). 718–734. DOI: 10.1111/1460-6984.12399.
- Tambyraja, Sherine R., Kelly Farquharson & Laura Justice. 2020. Reading risk in children with speech sound disorder: Prevalence, persistence, and predictors. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 63(11). 3714–3726. DOI: 10.1044/2020_JSLHR-20-00108.
- Tuomi, S. & P. Ivanoff. 1977. Incidence of speech and hearing disorders among kindergarten and grade 1 children. *Special Education in Canada* 51(4). 5–8.
- Williams, A. Lynn, Sharynne McLeod & Rebecca J. McCauley. 2021. *Interventions for speech sound disorders in children*. 2^a ed. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Yavas, Mehmet, Carmen Matzenauer-Hernandorena & Regina R. Lamprecht. 1991. *Avaliação fonológica da criança: Reeducação e terapia [Portuguese]*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artes Médicas.