

The rise of self-help consumer and advocacy groups suggests that those who are communicatively impaired are seeking other treatment and support alternatives. In the area of stuttering, our journals are musing over tired and failed therapy ideas while most clients are receiving basically the same motoric therapy techniques as 20 years ago. A purpose of professional journals is to rationally and empirically examine new ideas and findings so that we may better our professional services. The lack of new ideas regarding stuttering and alternative stuttering treatments found within our ASHA journals reflects a stagnated state of stuttering research and treatment.

We believe our journals have failed to promote the discussion of new ideas challenging our accepted treatment practices, causing the progression of our stuttering treatment to stand still. New ideas should be judged on their own merit through scientific research, clinical trials, and client approval. ASHA journals should consider revising their peer-review system with a new series of checks and balances designed to improve the review process, a practice already implemented in most other professional fields. We need to instigate changes in our field and our journals now to save our professional credibility.