

A Comprehensive Rubric for Annotating Pathological Speech

Mario Corrales-Astorgano¹, David Escudero-Mancebo¹, Lourdes Aguilar²,
Valle Flores-Lucas¹, Valentín Cardeñoso-Payo¹, Carlos Vivaracho-Pascual¹
and César González-Ferreras¹

Universidad de Valladolid¹, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona²
mcorrales@infor.uva.es, descuder@infor.uva.es, Lourdes.Aguilar@uab.cat,
mariavalle.flores@uva.es, valentin.cardenoso@uva.es, cevp@infor.uva.es, cesargf@uva.es

Abstract

Rubrics are a commonly used tool for labeling voice corpora in speech quality assessment, although their application in the context of pathological speech remains relatively limited. In this study, we introduce a comprehensive rubric based on various dimensions of speech quality, including phonetics, fluency, and prosody. The objective is to establish standardized criteria for identifying errors within the speech of individuals with Down syndrome, thereby enabling the development of automated assessment systems. To achieve this objective, we utilized the PRAUTOCAL corpus. To assess the quality of annotations using our rubric, two experiments were conducted, focusing on phonetics and fluency. For phonetic evaluation, we employed the Goodness of Pronunciation (GoP) metric, utilizing automatic segmentation systems and correlating the results with evaluations conducted by a specialized speech therapist. While the obtained correlation values were not notably high, a positive trend was observed. In terms of fluency assessment, deep learning models like wav2vec were used to extract audio features, and we employed an SVM classifier trained on a corpus focused on identifying fluency issues to categorize PRAUTOCAL corpus samples. The outcomes highlight the complexities of evaluating such phenomena, with variability depending on the specific type of disfluency detected.

Keywords: Rubric-based Speech Quality Evaluation, Pathological Speech Assessment, Down syndrome

1. Introduction

The use of rubrics to assess speech quality is common in domains related to education, where it is necessary to determine the level attained by a particular speaker in acquiring specific competencies. In reading proficiency or L2 pronunciation training, specific rubrics have been developed to identify students' deficiencies in their educational process (see Section 2). The application of these rubrics is contributing to the development of automated systems that assess pronunciation quality, as demonstrated in studies like Bailly et al. (2022) and Prabhu and Seliya (2022).

In the field of pathological speech, progress towards automatic systems for identifying specific problems is not advancing as rapidly for various reasons. One of them is that it is not enough to simply annotate audio with a quality level that assesses the degree of nativeness or fluency of speech. In the case of pathological speech, it is important to diagnose the specific problem that the speaker has (from a long list of potential issues, such as dysarthria, stuttering, cluttering, ...) or the symptom that indicates a possible pathology (e.g. speech blocks, changes in pronunciation, repetitions, ...). Annotating audio to identify some types of problems is not the usual way of working in the field of speech therapy, which has unfortunately led to a shortage of linguistic resources that enable training automatic evaluation systems or automatic identification of language pathology.

In this paper we describe the annotation of a speech corpus called PRAUTOCAL (Escudero-Mancebo et al., 2022), which consists of a large number of utterances from individuals with Down syndrome (DS). The corpus was recorded using an educational game for training the speech of individuals with DS. People with DS have special characteristics that make the production of quality speech a challenge for them. When the game offers exercises to practice pronunciation, we must provide as informed and comprehensive feedback as possible. In order to train a system to perform this task automatically, it is necessary to have an annotated corpus. In this work, we present the annotation rubric and the initial results.

The corpus was annotated by an experienced speech therapist, possessing several years of expertise. This annotation encompasses details regarding phonetic pronunciation, fluency, and prosodic quality. Initial experiments were conducted using this annotated data to predict phonetic quality and fluency errors.

The structure of the paper is as follows. First, we present the state of the art regarding other rubrics used in other domains. Next, we describe the rubric and the process that has led to its development. Then, we present the initial results of using this rubric for the identification of features that indicate voice pathologies. We conclude with a discussion, conclusions, and future work.

2. State of the Art

We find references of rubrics for evaluating or characterizing speech pronunciation in the domains of second language learning and reading proficiency. The rubrics within the domain of pathological speech are also becoming common.

When it comes to evaluating reading proficiency, [Godde et al. \(2020\)](#) offer a valuable distinction between unidimensional and multidimensional scales. Unidimensional scales assign a single value to encompass various aspects such as decoding, phrasing intonation, and expressivity, as exemplified in works by [Pinnell \(1995\)](#) and [Zutell and Rasinski \(1991\)](#). These scales were primarily developed for assessing students by teachers, with the initial three levels emphasizing grouping skills and expressivity introduced at the fourth level. However, the term “expressivity” remains somewhat ambiguous, open to personal interpretation by assessors. To enhance the assessment, [Zutell and Rasinski \(1991\)](#) introduced a multidimensional scale designed for teacher use. Subsequently, [Rasinski et al. \(2005\)](#) further refined the assessment process by differentiating four essential features: pace, smoothness, phrasing, and expression, each rated on a 4-point scale ranging from poor to correct performance. More recently, [Haskins and Aleccia \(2014\)](#) have suggested focusing on the categories of phrasing and expression for a more comprehensive evaluation of reading proficiency.

In the domain of L2 pronunciation training, [Isaacs and Harding \(2017\)](#) show the timeline of how state of the art has been evolving. The definition of a standard has driven this timeline as the criteria for assessing pronunciation quality has been controversial (e.g., native like accuracy vs. intelligible/comprehensible speech). The appearing of automatic systems for the evaluation of pronunciation quality put the focus on the criteria used for labeling the training corpus of the automatic systems. This kind of systems are normally trained with recordings of manually assessed audios recorded during real tests ([Litman et al., 2018](#)). The rubrics in these cases are limited to setting a binary level or a grade in a scale like in the IELTS test ([Suzukida and Saito, 2022](#)). In spite there exist references that establish pronunciation requirements depending on the evaluated level (for example, Spanish Cervantes Institute recommends in [Santa-Cecilia, 2007](#) to consider intonation, stress, phonemes production, . . .), in practice, students are graded with single scales.

Concerning pathological speech, [Demenko et al. \(2004\)](#) use the GRBAS scale to annotate a speech corpora and correlate the scores with acoustic parameters – global Grade of dysphonia (G), Roughness (R), Breathiness (B), Asthenicity (A), and Strain (S). [Sáenz-Lechón et al. \(2006\)](#) use this

scale for training automatic evaluation systems. In [Bayerl et al. \(2022a\)](#) a corpus with stuttered speech was annotated with the identification of blocks and repetitions. In [Werle and Byrd \(2022\)](#) stuttering is cross-analyzed with the perception of good communication skills. In [Escudero-Mancebo et al. \(2022\)](#) the quality of oral productions of individuals with DS was annotated, and a comprehensive review of the currently available corpora was presented.

When several evaluators assess the same pronunciation profile, the inter-rater agreement is an important concern due to the need to validate the quality of the information provided by the evaluators. In that cases, a minimum level of agreement must be set for the test to be satisfactory (i.e. kappa-index > 0.80). That level is reached after appropriate group training (e.g., [Moser et al., 2014](#); [Paige et al., 2014](#); [Schwanenflugel and Benjamin, 2016](#); [Godde et al., 2017](#)). When pathological speech is analyzed, inter-rater agreements tend to be low (i.e. kappa-index = 0.35 for blocks in [Bayerl et al., 2022a](#)), due to the heterogeneity of the sample.

3. Rubric Description

Rubrics serve as valuable tools for assessment when they are thoughtfully designed, incorporating four essential criteria: validity, reliability, fairness, and efficiency. When a rubric is considered valid and reliable, it is capable of grading the work at hand objectively, minimizing the impact of any potential instructor biases. In this way, it ensures that anyone employing the rubric will arrive at the same grade for the assessed work.

So, we followed a three steps designing approach to the rubric. First, a draft was elaborated by the authors and validated by expert linguists and therapists. Then, it was used to conduct a controlled evaluation campaign in which a reduced number of samples and experts participated. Finally, from the conclusions in this step and after analyzing the main sources for inter-rater disagreement, a final version was delivered and used by an evaluator which had not participated in previous steps.

We have developed a website to support the evaluation process using the rubric. Additionally, a support page has been designed to provide a detailed rubric description, completed with illustrative examples, to aid evaluators in comprehending each aspect and section.

We have formulated an evaluation rubric that encompasses three dimensions: phonetics, fluency, and prosody. Each of them is presented below.

3.1. Phonetics

Identification of phonetic pronunciation errors at segmental level in words. When evaluating each word in the utterance, it is essential to identify whether the sequence of phonemes of the word correspond to what is expected for this particular word. The evaluator should mark articulation errors that may occur: substitution, omission, distortion, and addition (SODA) (Sreedevi and Mathew, 2022; Galardo and Gallego, 1995; Susanibar et al., 2016).

- Substitution: one phoneme is substituted for another. For example, /pwerte/ instead of /pwerta/ (door), where the phoneme /a/ is substituted for /e/.
- Omission: a phoneme is deleted. For example, /pjeða/ instead of /pjeðra/ (stone), where /r/ is omitted.
- Distortion: a phoneme is not replaced by another, but is not articulated according to what is expected.
- Addition: a phoneme is added to the word that does not belong to it, e.g., /baβjerta/ instead of /aβjerta/ (open), where /b/ is added in initial position.

Qualitative assessment. The evaluator must assess the overall phonetics quality of the sentence using the following three levels (where “sporadic” means that errors occur in 25% of the words or less within the utterance; and “frequent” if they are present in more than 25% of the words in the utterance):

1. Speech with frequent errors or distortions of sounds.
2. Errors are sporadic, appearing in some situations but not in others.
3. Pronunciation is correct without obvious pronunciation errors.

Observations. Optionally, any additional information considered relevant can be entered in a free-text field. For example, if the word is unintelligible or almost unintelligible, or if it is only understood with the aid of the context.

3.2. Fluency

Identification of fluency errors. For each category of fluency errors, the evaluator must indicate whether each deviation occurs once, more than once, or not at all.

- Block: An involuntary pause before a word or within a word, due to physiological reasons. Sometimes, a breath can be perceived, but in most cases, there is no breath or it is inaudible. These pauses are not linguistically motivated. For example: “¿Puedo comprar ... una linterna?” (Can I buy ... a flashlight?).
- Prolongation: An involuntary lengthening or prolongation of a syllable or sound. For example: “Una escalera de cue[eee]rda” (A str[iiii]ng ladder).
- Repetition of sounds/syllables. For example: “[que-que-]quería comprar una” (I [wan-wan-]wanted to buy one).
- Repetition of words/phrases. For example: “¿Sabes dónde vive la [la] [la] señora Luna?” (Do you know where Mrs. [Mrs.] [Mrs.] Luna lives?).
- Interjection: Filler words, which are used to buy time to find the right words to continue speaking. They are usually employed when the speaker has difficulties to pronounce a specific word, and fillers provide time to think of an alternative word that is easier to pronounce. For example: “¿Estás [eh] [um] enfermo?” (Are you [ehh] [uhmm] ill?).

Qualitative assessment. The evaluator should determine the overall quality of the fluency of the sentence using the following three levels (where “sporadic” means in 25% of the words of the utterance or less, and “frequent” means more than 25% of the words of the utterance):

1. Speech with frequent fluency errors.
2. Speech with sporadic fluency errors.
3. Speech without fluency errors.

3.3. Prosody

Identification of atypical prosody. For each type of deviation in prosody, the evaluator must indicate whether it occurs once, more than once or not at all.

- Errors in lexical accent. It is necessary to observe both the position of the accent in the framework of the word and the phonetic realization of the stressed-unstressed syllable contrast. What is expected is that the speaker appropriately places the lexical accents of the phrase (that is, differentiates between oxytone, paroxytone, and proparoxytone words) and performs them phonetically according to the prototypical acoustic indices in Spanish

(stressed syllables are longer and more intense than the unstressed ones).

Each time that there are changes in the position of the stressed syllable or in its acoustic manifestation, an error is counted.

- Errors in prosodic grouping. It is necessary to observe the maintenance of the form of the words and their grouping. What is expected is that the speaker appropriately groups the speech continuum and does not pronounce it as if the words appeared in isolation, in a list format. That is what we considered deviations on syllabification (dictation intonation): each syllable receives a lexical accent, and there is no prosodic modeling of the word, making it sound as if the syllables are separated. For example, “*al-cal-de*” (mayor).
- Errors in intonational modality. What is expected is that the speaker clearly produces the melodic variations that correspond to each of the sentence meanings (modalities): declarative, interrogative, exclamatory phrases.

Errors are considered when there is a lack of correspondence of the melodic curve with the expected modality, in the sentence as a whole, or in some parts of it, so that the intonational meaning cannot be adequately interpreted. For example, an absolute interrogative that is not produced with a rising ending cannot be interpreted as a question.

Qualitative assessment. The evaluator has to determine the overall quality of the prosody of the sentence using the following three levels:

1. Flat speech, without variations in tone, intensity or duration throughout the utterance.
2. The prosodic contours of the sentences do not follow the expected pattern, but in general, it does not affect comprehension.
3. The prosodic contours are varied and help understand the meaning.

3.4. Global Observations

The evaluator can indicate whether any of the following statements are true or not.

- Exaggeratedly deep (hoarse) or high-pitched (shrill) tone of voice. The tone is not in the expected range for the speaker’s voice type. There is excessive hoarseness or a tendency towards high-pitched tones.
- Decreased voice volume or with exaggerated variations. Overall, in the statement, the voice volume is too high or insufficient, which hinders understanding of the content.

Additional considerations. Optionally, any additional global information considered relevant can be entered in a free-text field.

4. Annotation of the PRAUTOCAL Corpus

In this section, we describe how the rubric presented in the previous section was used to label a subset of PRAUTOCAL corpus. We begin with a summary description of this corpus, to ease understanding of the rest of the section.

4.1. Description of the PRAUTOCAL Corpus

The PRAUTOCAL corpus is a corpus of Spanish speakers with Down syndrome from the northern/central Iberian Peninsula, which allows the analysis of specific aspects of the speech of individuals with Down syndrome. It also includes comparable recordings of typically developing (TD) users for reference. So far, the corpus has been used for prosodic studies. In the work described in this paper we aim to also use the corpus to evaluate phonetic pronunciation and fluency. The corpus was collected in six recording campaigns and contains 90 speakers, with 4,175 audio files and a total audio duration of 13,633.3 seconds. The corpus is balanced in terms of gender (49 men and 41 women) and speaker type (50 individuals with intellectual disabilities and 40 typically developing speakers). The age range for both speaker types is also similar, between 13 and 42 years for speakers with DS and between 6 and 68 years for TD speakers. In this paper, we describe the annotation of the corpus in three dimensions: phonetics, fluency and prosodic quality. The corpus also includes the transcription of the utterances, which has been used for automatic phonetic segmentation of the recordings. A detailed description of the PRAUTOCAL corpus can be found in (Escudero-Mancebo et al., 2022).

4.2. Annotation Statistics

A speech therapist with several years of experience has annotated part of the corpus using the rubric described in section 3. A total of 1,160 utterances (6,845 words in the phonetic part) have been annotated. The annotation was made using a web page in which the speech therapist could listen to the phrase to be tagged as many times as she wanted and in which the errors and the assessment had to be indicated. Figure 1 shows a screenshot of the phonetic section of the evaluation website.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of the assessment for phonetics, fluency and prosody. The distribution of scores for phonetics is quite balanced. However,




Figure 1: Screenshot of the phonetic section of the evaluation website. The sentence “*Tranquilo. Yo le ayudaré con mucho gusto.*” (Don’t worry. I will be happy to help you.) has to be evaluated.




Figure 2: Score distribution for phonetics, fluency and prosody.

Substitution	311 (4.5%)
Omission	624 (9.1%)
Distortion	1,799 (26.3%)
Addition	158 (2.3%)

Table 1: Errors in the phonetic part. The errors are marked at word level.

the distribution of scores for fluency and especially for prosody is clearly unbalanced. The errors are shown in tables 1, 2 and 3.

5. Experiments

In this section we describe the experiments used to compute baseline classification results. These preliminary experiments use common techniques for phonetic assessment and fluency evaluation.

	None	One	Multiple
Blocks	876	197	87
Prolongations	1,029	81	50
Sound repetitions	986	127	47
Word repetitions	1,022	89	49
Interjections	1,112	40	8

Table 2: Errors in the fluency part.

	None	One	Multiple
Accent	1,142	16	2
Grouping	1,069	33	58
Modality	1,094	38	28

Table 3: Errors in the prosodic part.

5.1. Phonetic Experiments

In this experiment we have used Goodness of Pronunciation (GoP) (Witt and Young, 2000) for automatic assessment of phonetic quality. GoP is a measure of the degree of similarity between produced and canonical pronunciation of phonemes. Although the GoP method is commonly utilized to assess the pronunciation of non-native (L2) speech, certain studies have also verified its applicability in evaluating speech disorders (Pellegrini et al., 2014; Yeo et al., 2023).

There are several GoP methods described in the bibliography. The first method described was GMM-GoP (Witt and Young, 2000), which, for a phone p is defined as an averaged log probability across the phone duration:

$$\text{GMM-GoP}(p) = \frac{1}{|F|} \sum_{f \in F} \log \frac{e^{L^f(p|f)}}{\sum_{q \in Q} e^{L^f(q|f)}} \quad (1)$$

where the duration of phone p in frames is F ; $P^f(p|f)$ is the frame-wise phone probability and $L^f(p|f)$ its logits; Q is the total phone set.

With the development of neural networks (NNs), variants of GoP which employ probabilities from the state-of-the-art neural networks have been suggested (Hu et al., 2015):

$$\text{NN-GoP}(p) = \log \bar{P}(p|F) - \max_{q \in Q} \log \bar{P}(q|F) \quad (2)$$

$$\bar{P}(p|F) = \frac{1}{|F|} \sum_{f \in F} P^f(p|f) \quad (3)$$

Finally, DNN-GoP (Hu et al., 2015) normalizes the phone probability with the phone prior:

$$\text{DNN-GoP}(p) = \frac{\bar{P}(p|F)}{P(p)} \quad (4)$$

In order to calculate the GoP measures, we employ a self-supervised learning approach to extract posterior probabilities from the widely adopted cross-lingual wav2vec 2.0 XLS-R model (Babu et al., 2022), in line with recent research (Xu et al., 2021; Yeo et al., 2023). The fine-tuning process uses the Common Phone dataset (Klumpp et al., 2022) to train a linear phone prediction head on top of the wav2vec model. Notably, this linear phone prediction head is incorporated above the convolutional layer rather than the transformer layer. This design choice serves to reduce the computational complexity of the model while preserving important phonetic characteristics in the convolutional features. The optimization is performed using the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019), employing a default learning rate of 0.001, and this process is repeated for four epochs.

The acoustic model has been trained on a collection of speech samples of typical healthy speakers drawn from the Common Phone dataset. This dataset was specifically chosen for its comprehensive coverage of phonemes and detailed phonetic annotations, making it a prime choice for encompassing a broad spectrum of Spanish phonemes. The Common Phone dataset is noteworthy for its gender balance and multilingual content, spanning six different languages. With over 11,000 speakers contributing to it, the dataset boasts approximately 116 hours of recorded speech.

We evaluated the efficacy of the model using the PRAUTOCAL corpus. First, in order to obtain the segmentation, Montreal Forced Aligner (MFA) (McAuliffe et al., 2017) is employed to extract

	3-level	4-level
GMM-GoP	0.2089	0.3109
NN-GoP	0.1852	0.3056
DNN-GoP	0.1344	0.3544

Table 4: Kendall’s rank coefficient between GoP measures and phonetic evaluation scores of the rubric.

phoneme-level alignments in the PRAUTOCAL corpus. Then, we calculated the average GoP score for each utterance and determined its correlation with the intelligibility score. We used the Kendall Rank Coefficient τ to measure the correlation between the average GoP scores and the phonetic quality assessments. Two different configurations were used:

- 3-level. We used 1,160 utterances from people with DS, evaluated with the 3-level assessment (1, 2 or 3) as described in section 3.1.
- 4-level. We added 380 randomly chosen utterances of typically developing (TD) speakers from the PRAUTOCAL corpus. As they are supposed to be correctly pronounced utterances, the assessment was set to 4.

The achieved results are shown in table 4, highlighting the performance of different configurations. In the 3-level setup, the best outcome is achieved by GMM-GoP, with a score of 0.2089. However, when employing the 4-level configuration, the best result is obtained by DNN-GoP, attaining a score of 0.3544. Notably, the 4-level configuration consistently outperforms the 3-level counterpart in all scenarios. Figure 3 offers an insight into the distribution of GMM-GoP measurements for scores 4, 3, 2 and 1 (similar graphics are observed for NN-GoP and for DNN-GoP). The highest GoP values are obtained for score 4 (TD speakers), as their speech is expected to be very similar to the canonical pronunciation of phonemes, while the lowest values are associated with score 1. Scores 2 and 3 exhibit intermediate values between score 1 and score 4. In summary, the results align with anticipated trends, despite the somewhat modest correlation values.

5.2. Stuttering Experiments

To evaluate the annotations for stuttering made on the sentences of the corpus, we used a similar approach to Bayerl et al. (2022b). As a reference corpus, we utilized the KSoF corpus (Bayerl et al., 2022), which is a corpus containing 5,597 3-second recordings obtained from stuttering therapy sessions. These recordings were labeled by three annotators for five types of disfluencies: blocks,




Figure 3: Distribution of the GMM-GoP for the four different score levels.

prolongations, sound repetitions, word repetitions, and interjections, in addition to other additional labels that we have not considered in this study. The distribution of labels in this corpus is highly unbalanced.

As feature extractor, we used the base model of wav2vec (Baevski et al., 2020), which is a model trained in an unsupervised manner with 960 hours of unlabeled speech data from the LibriSpeech corpus (Panayotov et al., 2015). This model was adapted for automatic speech recognition using transcriptions of the same audio. For each labeled audio, we extracted 768-dimensional speech representations every 20ms, and the mean was calculated to obtain representations for the entire audio. We used SVMs as classifiers because they have demonstrated effectiveness in delivering robust results even when working with a limited set of samples. The classification is a binary tasks of one specific disfluency against all other samples.

To obtain the optimal hyper-parameters of the classifier for each type of disfluency, we conducted classification using the embedding extracted from each of the layers provided by the model, employing principal component analysis (PCA) to obtain features that explain a minimum of 0.9 variance. The kernel parameters were selected from {0.1, 0.01, 0.001, 0.0001, 0.00001}, and the penalty parameter of error C was chosen from {1, 10, 100, 1000}. From the results obtained, we selected the parameters and layer that achieved the best results (F1 score) for each type of disfluency. Finally, an SVM classifier was trained using all the samples with the parameters obtained in the previous phase.

The classifier trained on the KSoF corpus was used to classify samples from our corpus and the results are shown in Table 5. As can be seen in Table 2, the labels used for the fluency evaluation are similar to those used in the KSoF corpus for the purpose of comparison. However, it is important to

	KSoF	PRAUTOCAL (id/nid)
Blocks	0.56	0.31 / 0.67
Prolongations	0.58	0.22 / 0.37
Sound repetitions	0.36	0.19 / 0.88
Word repetitions	0.44	0 / 0.93
Interjections	0.16	0.08 / 0.68

Table 5: F1 score of each disfluency label. KSoF column shows the best result in the optimization process (disfluency detection). PRAUTOCAL column shows the results obtained with the classifier trained with the KSoF samples and tested with the PRAUTOCAL corpus. Id means disfluency detection and nid means no disfluency detection

note that both the evaluators and their interpretation of the evaluation criteria may differ. As a result, we cannot establish an exact correspondence between the labels in both corpora, even if the disfluency to be detected is the same. This variation can impact on the classification results. Additionally, just like in the KSoF corpus, the labels for different disfluencies are highly unbalanced. In the PRAUTOCAL corpus, the identification of disfluencies is not binary, as the evaluator has three levels of assessment for each type of disfluency: no disfluency, one disfluency, or two or more disfluencies. To convert this assessment into a binary format, it is considered that there is disfluency if the label indicates one or more disfluencies.

For each of the labels, the F1 score for disfluency identification/non-identification has been calculated. For blocks, an F1 score of 0.31/0.67 is obtained; for prolongations, an F1 score of 0.22/0.37; for sound repetitions, an F1 score of 0.19/0.88; for word repetitions, an F1 score of 0/0.93; and for interjections, an F1 score of 0.08/0.68 is obtained.

6. Discussion

To demonstrate the efficacy of our rubric, a series of experiments were conducted. Within the realm of phonetic experimentation, we presented baseline machine learning trials, yielding results indicating a moderate correlation between the GoP values and assessment scores. This outcome was achieved through a straightforward approach of averaging GoP across all phonemes within an utterance. While this serves as an initial step for future research, there is potential to enhance results through the implementation of novel classification techniques. Moreover, it is imperative to conduct an in-depth examination of GoP values for each individual phoneme. Individuals with Down syndrome often face greater challenges in articulating specific phonemes while displaying relative proficiency in others. For instance, in the context of the Spanish language, individuals with DS encounter

heightened difficulty in acquiring the /rr/, /r/, and /z/ phonemes (Sánchez Marin, 2014).

The results in Table 5 show the difficulty of evaluating different disfluencies using automatic classifiers. The best results are obtained for blocks and prolongations, although they are still far from the results achieved in the KSoF corpus. Nonetheless, F1 values for the absence of disfluency are higher for all types of disfluencies. This is particularly important during therapy sessions, as an inaccurate classification of disfluency can lead to patient frustration. Labeling the corpus, even when considering the same disfluencies, is a complex process because the interpretation of different disfluencies can vary among evaluators. In the KSoF corpus used to train the classifier, there is not very high agreement among evaluators (Bayerl et al., 2022a), indicating the difficulty of applying the same criteria when evaluating speech disfluencies.

7. Conclusions

This paper introduces a rubric for identifying errors in phonetics, fluency and prosody in the speech of individuals with Down syndrome. Additionally, it presents two preliminary experiments aimed at assessing the quality of these annotations in automatic classification systems. While the initial results are subject to improvement, having a corpus annotated for individuals with Down syndrome across these three aspects of speech opens up the potential to enhance these outcomes, ultimately paving the way for the development of automatic systems that can be beneficial in speech therapy for individuals with Down syndrome.

Other aspects related to the collection of the corpus, such as the recording process and the phrases to be evaluated, can also influence labeling and the subsequent automatic evaluation of these disfluencies. As future work, it is important to consider the inclusion of new evaluators to improve the labeling. In addition, fine-tuning stuttering models can be applied, along with the implementation of other deep learning techniques that have the potential to improve the results.

8. Acknowledgements

This work was carried out in the Project **PID2021-126315OB-I00** that was supported by **MCIN / AEI / 10.13039/501100011033 / FEDER, EU**.

9. Bibliographical References

- Arun Babu, Changan Wang, Andros Tjandra, Kushal Lakhota, Qiantong Xu, Naman Goyal, Kritika Singh, Patrick von Platen, Yatharth Saraf, Juan Pino, Alexei Baevski, Alexis Conneau, and Michael Auli. 2022. [XLS-R: Self-supervised Cross-lingual Speech Representation Learning at Scale](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, pages 2278–2282.
- Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. 2020. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:12449–12460.
- G rard Bailly, Erika Godde, Anne-Laure Piat-Marchand, and Marie-Line Bosse. 2022. [Automatic assessment of oral readings of young pupils](#). *Speech Communication*, 138:67–79.
- Sebastian Bayerl, Alexander Wolff von Gudenberg, Florian H nig, Elmar Noeth, and Korbinian Riedhammer. 2022a. KSoF: The kassel state of fluency dataset – a therapy centered dataset of stuttering. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*, pages 1780–1787.
- Sebastian Peter Bayerl, Dominik Wagner, Elmar Noeth, and Korbinian Riedhammer. 2022b. [Detecting Dysfluencies in Stuttering Therapy Using wav2vec 2.0](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, pages 2868–2872.
- Grazyna Demenko, Andrzej Obrebowski, Antoni Pruszcwicz, Bozena Wiskirska-Woznica, Piotr Swidzinski, and Waldemar Wojnowski. 2004. Suprasegmental analysis for complex quality assessment in pathological voices. In *Speech Prosody 2004, International Conference*.
- David Escudero-Mancebo, Mario Corrales-Astorgano, Valent n Carde oso-Payo, Lourdes Aguilar, C sar Gonz lez-Ferreras, Pastora Mart nez-Castilla, and Valle Flores-Lucas. 2022. [Prautocal corpus: a corpus for the study of down syndrome prosodic aspects](#). *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 56(1):191–224.
- JR Gallardo and JL Gallego. 1995. Alteraciones de la articulaci n: dislalias. *JR Gallardo y JL Gallego, Manual de Logopedia Escolar. Un enfoque pr ctico*, pages 171–220.
- Erika Godde, G rard Bailly, David Escudero, Marie-Line Bosse, and Estelle Gillet-Perret. 2017. Evaluation of reading performance of primary school children: Objective measurements vs. subjective ratings. In *WOCCI 2017-6th Workshop on Child Computer Interaction*.
- Erika Godde, Marie-Line Bosse, and G rard Bailly. 2020. A review of reading prosody acquisition and development. *Reading and Writing*, 33(2):399–426.

Arun Babu, Changan Wang, Andros Tjandra, Kushal Lakhota, Qiantong Xu, Naman Goyal,

- Tara Haskins and Vincent Aleccia. 2014. Toward a reliable measure of prosody: an investigation of rater consistency. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 1(5):102–112.
- Wenping Hu, Yao Qian, Frank K Soong, and Yong Wang. 2015. [Improved mispronunciation detection with deep neural network trained acoustic models and transfer learning based logistic regression classifiers](#). *Speech Communication*, 67:154–166.
- Talia Isaacs and Luke Harding. 2017. Pronunciation assessment. *Language Teaching*, 50(3):347–366.
- Diane Litman, Helmer Strik, and Gad S Lim. 2018. Speech technologies and the assessment of second language speaking: Approaches, challenges, and opportunities. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(3):294–309.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Michael McAuliffe, Michaela Socolof, Sarah Mihuc, Michael Wagner, and Morgan Sonderegger. 2017. [Montreal Forced Aligner: Trainable Text-Speech Alignment Using Kaldi](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2017*, pages 498–502.
- Gary P Moser, Richard R Sudweeks, Timothy G Morrison, and Brad Wilcox. 2014. Reliability of ratings of children’s expressive reading. *Reading Psychology*, 35(1):58–79.
- David D Paige, Timothy Rasinski, Theresa Magpuri-Lavell, and Grant S Smith. 2014. Interpreting the relationships among prosody, automaticity, accuracy, and silent reading comprehension in secondary students. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46(2):123–156.
- Thomas Pellegrini, Lionel Fontan, Julie Mauclair, Jérôme Farinas, and Marina Robert. 2014. [The goodness of pronunciation algorithm applied to disordered speech](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2014*, pages 1463–1467.
- Gay Su Pinnell. 1995. *Listening to children read aloud: Data from NAEP’s integrated reading performance record (IRPR) at grade 4*. The Center.
- Yash Prabhu and Naeem Seliya. 2022. [A CNN-based automated stuttering identification system](#). In *2022 21st IEEE International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA)*, pages 1601–1605. IEEE.
- Timothy V Rasinski, Nancy D Padak, Christine A McKeon, Lori G Wilfong, Julie A Friedauer, and Patricia Heim. 2005. Is reading fluency a key for successful high school reading? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(1):22–27.
- Nicolás Sáenz-Lechón, Juan I Godino-Llorente, Víctor Osma-Ruiz, Manuel Blanco-Velasco, and Fernando Cruz-Roldán. 2006. Automatic assessment of voice quality according to the GRBAS scale. In *2006 International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, pages 2478–2481. IEEE.
- José Miguel Sánchez Marin. 2014. *Comparación del desarrollo fonético-fonológico de niños con síndrome de Down y desarrollo típico: influencia de los aspectos madurativos y cognitivos*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Murcia.
- Álvaro García Santa-Cecilia. 2007. Plan curricular del Instituto Cervantes: niveles de referencia para el español. *MarcoELE: Revista de didáctica*, 5:1.
- Paula J Schwanenflugel and Rebekah George Benjamin. 2016. The development of reading prosody and its assessment. *Linguistic rhythm and literacy*, pages 187–213.
- N. Sreedevi and Anusmitha Mathew. 2022. [Articulation errors in Malayalam speaking children with hearing impairment who use digital hearing aids: an exploratory study](#). *Journal of Hearing Science*, 12(2):49–59.
- Franklin Susanibar, Alejandro Dioses, and JC Tordera. 2016. Principios para la evaluación e intervención de los trastornos de los sonidos del habla–TSH. *Susanibar F, Dioses A, Marchesan I, Guzmán M, Leal G, Guitar B, Junqueira Bohnen. Trastornos del Habla. De los fundamentos a la evaluación. Madrid. EOS*.
- Yui Suzukida and Kazuya Saito. 2022. What is second language pronunciation proficiency? an empirical study. *System*, 106:102754.
- Danielle Werle and Courtney T Byrd. 2022. Professors’ perceptions and evaluations of students who do and do not stutter following oral presentations. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 53(1):133–149.
- S.M Witt and S.J Young. 2000. [Phone-level pronunciation scoring and assessment for interactive language learning](#). *Speech communication*, 30(2):95–108.
- Xiaoshuo Xu, Yueteng Kang, Songjun Cao, Binghuai Lin, and Long Ma. 2021. [Explore wav2vec 2.0 for mispronunciation detection](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, pages 4428–4432.

Eun Jung Yeo, Kwanghee Choi, Sunhee Kim, and Minhwa Chung. 2023. *Speech Intelligibility Assessment of Dysarthric Speech by using Goodness of Pronunciation with Uncertainty Quantification*. In *Proc. Interspeech 2023*, pages 166–170.

Jerry Zutell and Timothy V Rasinski. 1991. Training teachers to attend to their students' oral reading fluency. *Theory into practice*, 30(3):211–217.

10. Language Resource References

Sebastian Peter Bayerl and Alexander Wolff von Gudenberg and Florian Hönig and Elmar Nöth and Korbinian Riedhamer. 2022. *Kassel State of Fluency (KSoF) dataset*. Zenodo. PID <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6801844>.

Klumpp, Philipp and Arias-Vergara, Tomás and Pérez-Toro, Paula Andrea and Nöth, Elmar and Orozco-Arroyave, Juan Rafael. 2022. *Common Phone: A Multilingual Dataset for Robust Acoustic Modelling*. Zenodo. PID <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5846137>.

Panayotov, Vassil and Chen, Guoguo and Povey, Daniel and Khudanpur, Sanjeev. 2015. *Librispeech: an ASR corpus based on public domain audio books*. OpenSLR. PID <https://www.openslr.org/12>.