

## **Evolving and Evaluating a Spelling Tool in Malayalam For Identifying Learning Disabilities In Children**

**\*Dr. N. Dhanya<sup>1</sup>, Jyothi. S<sup>2</sup>**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Home Science (Child Development), St. Teresa's College, Ernakulam – 682 035.*

*Post Graduate Student, Department of Home Science (Child Development), St. Teresa's College, Ernakulam – 682 035.*

*Corresponding Author: \* Dr. N. Dhanya*

---

Date of Submission: 10-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 26-07-2017

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Learning is acquisition of new knowledge, skills or attitude. Children during their early years of development learn to understand the spoken language first and then learn to speak. Subsequently during their school years they learn to read, write and do arithmetic according to their age and intellectual capacity. But some children may not be able to learn one or more of these skills as per their age and intellectual capacity. There are some children, who, in spite of having normal intellectual capacity and unimpaired visual, hearing or physical abilities are unable to acquire one or more age appropriate language and/or arithmetic skills, even when adequate opportunities for learning are provided. These children have Specific Learning Disorder (SpLD) or Learning Disability. Inability to learn certain skills is not restricted only to reading, writing and arithmetic. Children may have difficulty in understanding and expressing age appropriate communication due to which they may not be able to abstract the meanings of phrases or tell a story in an organized manner. Similarly, some children may not develop age appropriate motor coordination as a result of which they may not be able to learn certain skills like skating or dancing requiring high level of coordination. In spite of having average or above average intelligence many children perform poorly in academics. These children may face difficulties in one or several areas of academics such as reading, arithmetic, spelling, and writing. Some of these children excel in many areas other than the problem area. Others are merely slow in acquiring school related skills. These children are described by a wide variety of labels such as dyslexics, learning disabled, slow learners, minimally brain damaged and educationally handicapped. The mid-twentieth century witnessed a shift from this early medical approach to specific learning disabilities to a more comprehensive educational approach largely because of the pressure brought about by the parents of these children who were understandably more concerned about remedial services than medical diagnoses and labels. (Reddy &Ramar, 2006 )

### **Relevance of the Study**

Standardized tools for testing are not easily available in India, nor are indigenous tools for identification of processing deficits, intelligence testing and testing for proficiency in reading and writing available. Over the past decade there has been an increase in the identification of individual children with learning disability and a consequent demand for services. So far the process of identification is largely confined to children enrolled in urban schools with English as the medium of instruction. The language of the testing instruments is occasionally unsuitable to Indian students who may not be proficient in English. Language based tests are not yet fully developed in Kerala which will be very useful for the identification of learning disabled children. Thus preparing a spelling tool in Malayalam for the identification of learning disabled children is very relevant in the present scenario.

### **Objectives of the study**

The main objectives of the present investigation are as follows :

- To evolve a spelling tool in Malayalam for identifying learning disabilities in children.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the spelling tool prepared.

## II. METHODOLOGY

### Nature of the Study

The present study is an applied research by nature. As learning disability is one of the major problems seen in children today, there is a need for diagnostic screening tools in regional languages to identify such children.

### Selection of Area

The area selected for the present study was Ernakulam district. Around ten percent of students in every school in Ernakulam district are learning disabled. Earlier the people living in Ernakulam district were quite unfamiliar with the term 'Learning Disability'. But today, most of the people are aware of this and many parents have started realizing the importance of identifying learning disability and giving appropriate remedial measures. The increase and focus given on resource rooms in schools at Ernakulam may also be an indicator of the rate of learning disabled children to a large extent.

### Selection of Sample

The sample selected for the present study included sixty school going girls in the age range of six to fifteen years from St. Antony's Convent School, Ernakulam at the preparatory stage of the tool. Wide age range of sample was selected because earlier there was no identification tool available in Malayalam for finding Learning Disability in children. From each class six students were selected in such a manner that it consisted of two above average, two average and two below average students classified on the basis of their academic records.

Twenty learning disabled students studying at Vigyan Valley Learning Centre, Kaloor of eighth to tenth classes were also selected as sample for evaluating the finalized tool. The sample was selected using purposive sampling.

### Determination of the Size of the Sample

The population proportion of Learning Disabled children were calculated using the test of population proportion.

Population proportion = 10%

Confidence = 95%

Error (d) = 8%

$$n > Z^2 PQ/d^2 = n > .1 * .9 (1.96)^2 / .0064 = n > 54$$

Where Z is the Confidence Coefficient, P is the Population Proportion, d the difference between estimated value and true value and n the sample size.

The calculated value is less than the sample size. So the selected sample size is appropriate for the present study.

### Tool Construction

A spelling tool in Malayalam for the identification of learning disabled children between the age range of six to fifteen years was constructed by the researcher. The procedure involved in the tool construction is explained under the following phases.

Phase 1- Identification of Gaps in Existing Tools of Learning Disability

Phase 2- Preparation of the Tool

Phase 3- Field Testing of the Constructed Tool

Phase 4- Finalization of the Tool

Phase 5- Evaluation of the Tool

### Phase 1- Identification of Gaps in Existing Tools of Learning Disability

Dearth of a proper tool in the regional language for identifying students with learning disability in schools instigated the researcher to develop a tool. Most of the tests used in India for identification of learning disability are either Western tools or adaptations of Western tools. The language of the testing instruments is occasionally unsuitable to Indian students who may not be proficient in English. Although there are several tests developed for the identification of learning disability in India, there are no such identification tools in Malayalam. Language-based tests are not yet fully developed in Kerala which will be very useful for the identification of learning disabled children. Preparing a spelling tool in Malayalam for the identification of learning disabled will be really useful for the special educators also to find the area of disability and to give appropriate intervention programs as early as possible.

Information pertaining to the topic was collected by referring to various books, journals, periodicals, newspapers which provide lots of information and knowledge on various topics.

### **Phase 2- Preparation of the Tool**

The researcher referred the Malayalam text books of Kerala State Syllabus of first to tenth standard for preparing the tool. Three hundred commonly used words were selected at the first stage of tool development. The initial item pool consisting of three hundred items was further put through detailed scrutiny and selection. Elimination of items which were so difficult to the user is the inclusion/exclusion criteria of the items. By applying the inclusion/exclusion criteria, one hundred and twenty words (120/300) were rejected outright due to their difficulty. Hence a total number of one hundred and eighty words were included into the main pool of the tool which begin with two letter words and ends with difficult high school words. The words were then arranged in their order of difficulty with the help of a Malayalam teacher. Consonant –vowel combination words were selected for the primary class students as they are considered the simplest words and the starting point of many phonics programs. For first, second and third standard students words according to their writing ability level were only included in the tool.

The prepared tool was named as Informal Spelling Assessment Tool-Malayalam (InSAT-M).The InSAT-M initially consisting of one hundred and eighty items were administered to a total of twenty students of one to tenth standard of St.Antony’s Convent School, Ernakulam as a pilot study. The pilot study helped in finalizing the structure and sequencing of items. It also helped to familiarize with the administration of the tool.

### **Phase 3- Field Testing of the Constructed Tool**

Consent was obtained from the Principal, St. Antony’s Convent School, Ernakulam and the respective class teachers by approaching and explaining them about the purpose of the study. Help was solicited from the class teacher throughout the field testing. The background information of the children was collected using a self constructed questionnaire which is given in the Appendix. Before administering the test, it was explained that this is a test of spelling and they should do their best to spell all the words that were read out. They were also informed that they may find some words to be easy but that some much harder words have been included deliberately. Some of these are words which even very good spellers sometimes get wrong, so they should not be concerned if they find parts of the test difficult. The students were then made to sit comfortably and were requested to write down the dictation. The researcher called out the words one by one. The students wrote the words on a sheet of paper. The students of classes first to third standard were given words only according to their ability level. An extra time was also given to students who did not finish. Papers were collected and corrected for identifying and analyzing their writing errors.

### **Phase 4- Finalization of the Tool**

The number of students who made errors for each word in a class was tabulated. The words which were correctly written by all the students were finalized for the inclusion in the tool. The words correctly written by up to three students out of six students were also included in the tool. Finally the tool consisted of one hundred and twenty three words.

### **Phase 5- Evaluation of the Tool**

One hundred and twenty three Malayalam words which were included in the tool were given to twenty learning disabled children of eight to ten classes studying in Vigyan Valley Learning Centre at Kaloor for evaluation. Higher number of errors were made in Secondary school level words by Learning Disabled students. The items included in the InSAT-M were categorised under primary, middle and secondary school sections. The primary section consisted of forty nine items, middle section consisted of thirty three items and forty one items for secondary school section.

## **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

For the ease of understanding as well as for convenience, the results and discussion are presented in four sections.

### **Socio-Economic Background of the Respondents**

Sl.No	Statements	Responses	
		Number, N=60	%
1	<b>Age in Years</b>		
	6-15 Years	60	100
2	<b>Ordinal Position</b>		
	First	28	47
	Second	25	42
	Third	6	10
	Fourth	1	1

<b>3</b>	<b>Type of Family</b>		
	Joint	4	7
	Nuclear	56	93
<b>4</b>	<b>Family Size</b>		
	Small	56	93
	Medium	3	5
	Large	1	2
<b>5</b>	<b>Place of Residence</b>		
	Rural	8	13
	Urban	52	87
<b>6</b>	<b>Religion</b>		
	Hindu	25	42
	Christian	21	35
	Muslim	14	23
<b>7</b>	<b>Total Family Income (In Rupees)</b>		
	Low (10,000-20,000)	10	17
	Middle (20,001-30,000)	30	50
	High (30,001-40,000)	20	33
<b>8</b>	<b>Academic Status</b>		
	Above Average	20	33
	Average	20	33
	Below Average	20	33

As regards the ordinal position of the selected sample, it is clear from Table.1 that nearly half of them (47%) were first born followed by 42 percent who were second. Respondents who were third born constituted just around ten percent and only one child was fourth born.

Majority of the respondents (93%) hailed from nuclear families as compared to joint families. As both the parents are working today, parental guidance is less in academics of children. Also, as most of the children are living in nuclear families they do not get help in their studies from other elders in the family. Concerning family size, about fifty six percent were from small sized, three percent from medium sized and only two percent were from large sized families. Most of the respondents (87%) were from urban area when compared to rural area (13%). Majority of the respondents (42%) were Hindus followed by Christians (35%) and Muslims (23%).

Regarding their economic status, half of the respondents (50%) belonged to middle income group and thirty three percent were from high income group. While only seventeen percent of the respondents were from the low income category. Ahmeduzzaman (1992) reported that family income was the chief variable associated with different dimensions of father's involvement with children. An equal number of average, above average and below average respondents were drawn for the purpose of the study. Students labeled as having a learning disability are by the codified federal definition of a learning disability deemed intellectually superior or privileged compared to their peers because they are reported to have average or above intelligence, which sets them aside from students identified with developmental disabilities, who are reported to have significantly lower levels of intellectual ability (National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY), 2009)

### **Description of the Tool**

The In SAT-M (Informal Spelling Assessment Tool - Malayalam) is a spelling tool developed in Malayalam for the identification of Learning Disabled children. The tool is designed to be used for children aged between six to fifteen years. The tool consist of one hundred and twenty three words which begin with two letter words and ends with difficult high school words.

An initial item pool of three hundred commonly used words in Malayalam were selected at the first stage of tool development. The words were selected by referring Malayalam text books of Kerala State Syllabus of first to tenth standard. The range of words started from the simplest consonant-vowel combinations to most difficult ones. The initial item pool consisting of three hundred items was further put through detailed scrutiny and selection. Elimination of items which were so difficult to the user was the inclusion/exclusion criteria of the items. By applying the inclusion/exclusion criteria, one hundred and twenty words (120/300) were rejected outright due to their difficulty. Hence a total number of one hundred and eighty words were included into the main pool of InSAT-M.

The InSAT-M initially consisting of one hundred and eighty items were administered to a total of twenty students of one to tenth standard of St.Antony’s Convent School, Ernakulam as a pilot study. The pilot study helped in finalizing the structure and sequencing of items. It also helped to familiarize with the administration of the tool. From each class six students were selected in such a manner that it consisted of two above average, two average and two below average students. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling. The items which were correctly written by all the students were finalized for inclusion in the tool. The items correctly written by up to three students out of six students were also included in the tool. Finally, the tool consisted of one hundred and twenty three items.

One hundred and twenty three Malayalam words which were included in the tool were given to twenty Learning Disabled children of eight to ten classes studying in Vigyan Valley Learning Centre at Kaloor. Higher number of errors was made in Secondary school level words by Learning Disabled students.

The items included in the InSAT-M were categorized under primary, middle and secondary school sections. The primary section consisted of forty nine items, middle section consisted of thirty three items and forty one items for secondary school section. For first, second and third standard students items according to their writing ability level should be administered. From fourth to tenth standard students all items should be administered. Printed or photocopies of the InSAT-M can be used for subsequent assessments. Results are likely to be misleading unless test conditions are observed. It is important, therefore, that tests are completed without discussion, collaboration or copying. The spelling tool can be administered to any number of children at one time. However, smaller numbers are preferable so that the tester can further assess the learner through observation. The children must write their names at the top of the page and should be asked to write the words vertically, one word per line. The administration of the tool should always begin with the first words on the spelling tool. Reasons for this are that some students can spell longer, more difficult words but have difficulty with simple two or three letter words. Grade levels are indicated on the test only as a suggestion and may vary from school to school.

**Comparison of Number of Errors made by the Respondents using Chi- square Test**

	<b>Observed Frequency O</b>	<b>Expected Frequency E</b>	<b>O-E</b>	<b>(O-E)<sup>2</sup>/E</b>
<b>Primary School Students</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>-235</b>	<b>72.568</b>
<b>Middle School Students</b>	<b>1051</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>110.512</b>
<b>High School Students</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>-54</b>	<b>3.831</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>186.91</b>

The collected data were compiled for the number of mistakes committed by primary, middle and secondary students taken under study and for drawing inferences, Chi-square test for goodness of fit was employed. For testing the observed frequency data, the apt test is Chi-square test. Calculated value of  $X^2 = (O-E)^2/E = 186.91$  has degrees of freedom ‘two’. The calculated value of  $X^2$  is highly significant ( $P < .001$ ) indicating that there is significant difference in number of mistakes committed by primary, middle and secondary students. Significantly lower number of mistakes were observed in primary school children and significantly higher number of mistakes were observed in middle school children. One reason for the higher number of error may be due to difficulty in attempting the secondary school level words. Slight disability in the field of learning can also be suspected as higher number of errors are made in simple primary school words by middle school children.

**Evaluation of Informal Assessment Tool- Malayalam (InSAT-M)**

<b>Particulars</b>	<b>N=20</b>	<b>No. of errors made by Learning Disabled Children</b>
Primary School Level Words	20	263
Middle School Level Words	20	327
Secondary School Level Words	20	500

The results obtained shows that writing errors were more prevalent in secondary school level words followed by middle school level words. Even simplest consonant combination two letter words were wrongly written by the respondents. It was observed that most of the respondents made errors with the consonant blend

words. Comparatively less number of errors were made in primary school level words. Among the children with high level of difficulties, they showed symptoms of inversions and reversals an indication of severe Learning Disability. The difficulty in spelling can be improved by giving appropriate intervention at the right time. A study by Graham et.al (2008) indicated that instruction in spelling had a positive impact on childrens ability to write sentences.

#### **Reliability and Validity of the Constructed Tool**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation SD</b>	<b>Coefficient of Variation CV</b>
Normal children	55.55	242.13	435.87
Learning Disabled children	57.3	249.76	435.89

Reliability means consistency and consistency is compared by calculating the Coefficient of Variation ,  $C.V = SD/mean*100$ . The coefficient of Variation for normal children and the learning disabled children are almost equal indicating that inter rater reliability is more or less same between the groups. Predictive validity was measured by coefficient of correlation  $r$  which is 1 and coefficient of determination  $r^2$ . Correlation means degree of association between two variables  $x$  and  $y$ . correlation can be positive or negative. As one variable increases the other variable also increases, correlation is positive, as one variable decreases the correlation is negative. Maximum value for correlation is +1 and minimum value is -1. When  $r$  is +1 or -1, it means perfect correlation. When the variables are correlated, predictive equations can be formulated called regression equations which is used for predicting the value of another variable. Here, as the scores of normal children increases the scores of learning disabled children also increases. Hence, there is perfect correlation between the scores of normal children and learning disabled children.

Coefficient of determination,  $r^2 = 1^2 = 1$ , there is 100% validity between the two groups, which shows that all the points in the scattered diagram lie on the same line.

#### **IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

- The calculated value of Chi-square  $X^2$  is highly significant ( $P < .001$ ) indicating that there is significant difference in number of mistakes committed by primary, middle and secondary students.
- Significantly higher number of mistakes was observed in middle school children and lower in primary school children.
- The results obtained from evaluation of Learning Disabled children shows that writing errors were more prevalent in secondary school level words followed by middle school level words.
- Comparatively less number of errors were made in primary school level words by learning disabled children
- The coefficient of Variation for normal children and the learning disabled children are almost equal indicating that inter rater reliability is more or less same between the groups. Predictive validity was measured by coefficient of correlation ' $r$ ' which is 1 and coefficient of determination  $r^2$ . It means that there is perfect correlation between normal children and learning disabled children. There is 100% validity between the two groups.

#### **Limitations of the Study**

- The study has been limited to a small population and hence the results obtained are not applicable for the general population.
- Sample was drawn from only one school due to lack of time.

#### **Suggestions**

- The present study can be expanded with a larger sample population.
- Comparison of prevalence of learning disability in different schools with vernacular medium of instruction other than English using the prepared tool.
- Evaluation and standardization of the prepared tool using large population.
- Further diagnostic criteria to identify the types of spelling errors.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1]. American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2000). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorder-Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- [2]. Ahmeduzzaman, M. (1992). Socio-demographic Factors, Functioning, Style, Social Support and Father's Involvement with Preschoolers in African-American Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol.54, 699-707

- [3]. Agarwal, K.N., Agarwal, D.K., Upadhyay, S.K., & Singh, M. (1991). Learning Disability in Rural Primary School Children. *Indian Journal of Medical Research*. Vol.94, 89-95
- [4]. Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to Read-Thinking and Learning about Print*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [5]. Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (2006). *Research in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [6]. Bower, G.H. (1981). Mood and Memory. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 36, 129-148.
- [7]. Bruce, B.C. (1977). *Plans and Social Actions*. Urbana: University of Illinois, Centre for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 149 328)
- [8]. Chatterji, M. (1991). Attention, Coding and Speech Related Process of Skilled and Less skilled Readers. Cited from M.bBuch, Fifth Survey of Research in Educatio. New Delhi: NCERT.
- [9]. Chopra, S. (1997). A Handbook for Parents and Teachers of Children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. M.Ed (Spl.Edu) Dissertation. Mumbai: SNDT Women's University,
- [10]. Dunn, M. (1997). *Remediation of Children with Developmental Language*. England: Cambridge University Press.
- [11]. Denkla, M. (1994). *Progress in Pediatric Neurology II*. Chicago: PNB
- [12]. Department of Education. July 2001. Education White Paper 6. Special Needs Education. Pretoria. Triple CCC.
- [13]. Donald, D., Lazarus, D., & Lolwana, P. (1997). *Educational Psychology in Social Context*. Cape Town: Oxford University.
- [14]. EDRRWDPS. (1999). Early detection and remediation of reading and writing difficulties in preschoolers. In : Venugopal, K. Report of workshop on early detection and remediation of reading and writing difficulties in pre-schoolers, Chennai: Chennai Publishers.
- [15]. Fletcher, M.J, Lyon, R.G, Lynn, F.S & Barner, A.M (2007). *Learning Disabilities: From Identification to Intervention*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- [16]. Fleischner, J. (1995). *Educational Management of Students with Learning Disabilities*. Fairport, NY: Verbal Images Press.
- [17]. Graham, S., Morphy, P. Harris, K.r., Chorzempa, B., Saddler, B. & MoRAN, S. (2008). Teaching Spelling in the Primary Grades: A National Survey of Instructional Practices and Adaptations. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol.43,796
- [18]. Geschwind, N & Galaburda, A.M. (2000). Cerebral Lateralization: Biological Mechanisms, Associations and Pathology: A Hypothesis and a Programme for Research. *Achieves of Neurology*. Vol.42, 428-459
- [19]. Gillman, M., Heyman, B. AND Swain, J. ( 2000), What's in a name ? The implication of diagnosis for people with learning difficulties and their family carers. *Disability and Society*, Vol.15,389-409.
- [20]. Hallahan, D.P and Kauffman, J.M (2006). *Exceptional Learners: An Introduction to Special Education*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- [21]. Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) H.R 1350. Retrived November 20 (2006) from <http://thomas-loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/zc108:h.1350.cnr>
- [22]. John, P (2010). Learning and other Developmental Disorders in India. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol.52, 224-228
- [23]. Johnson, D., & Myklebust, H. (1967). *Learning Disabilities: Educational Principles and Practices*. New York: Grune and Stratton
- [24]. Kress, G. (2000). *Early Spelling. Between Convention and Creativity*. London: Routledge.
- [25]. Kamhi, A.G., & Hinto, L.N. (2000). Explaining Individual Differences in Spelling Ability. *Topics in Language Disorders*, Vol. 20,37-49.
- [26]. Krishnaswami, O.R & Ranganatham, M. (2009). *Methodology of Research in Social Scienses*. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
- [27]. Karanth, P., & Rozario, J. (2003). *Learning Disabilities in India-Willing the Mind to Learn*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [28]. Kapur, M., John, A., Rozario, J., & Oomen, A. (1991). NIMHANS Index of Specific Learning Disabilities. NIMHANS Bangalore: Department of Clinical Psychology.
- [29]. Kapp, J.P. (1996). Children with Problems. An Orthopedogogical Perspective. Pretoria: J Schaik.
- [30]. Kirk, S.A (1963). *Behavioral Diagnosis and Remediation of Learning Disabilities*. Proceedings of the Conference on Exploration into Problems of the Perceptually Handicapped Children. Chicago.
- [31]. Learning Disabilities Round Table (2002). Specific Learning Disabilities: Finding Common Ground. Washington DC: US. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programmes, Office of Innovation and Development
- [32]. Lewis, C, Hitch, G.J, Walker, P. (2005). The Prevalence of Specific Arithmetic Difficulties and Specific Reading Difficulties in 9 to 10 year Old Boys and Girls. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Vol.35, No.2, 283-292

- [33]. Lindamood, P. (1997). *Journal of Developmental and Learning Disorders*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
- [34]. Lyon, G.R. (1996). Learning Disabilities. In Mash, E.J & Barkely, R.A. *Child Psychopathology*. New York: Guilford Press.
- [35]. Learning Disabilities Association (LDA). (1996). About LDA. Retrieved August 29, 1996 from <http://ldanatl.org/lda>
- [36]. Mehta, H. (2000). A Low Cost Diagnostic Test of Mathematics Disability (TMD) in Children Aged 7 to 10 Years, M.Ed. (Spl.Edu) Dissertation. Mumbai: SNDT Women's University.
- [37]. McMillan, D.L., Gresham, F.M., & Bocian, K.M. (1998). Discrepancy between Definitions of Learning Disabilities and School Practices- An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol.31*, 314-326
- [38]. McLoughlin, J.A., & Lewis, R.B. (1990). *Assessing Special Students*. New York: Macmillan International.
- [39]. Mohapatra, S. (1991). Reading Memory and Attention Processes of Normal and Reading Disabled Children. M.Phil Dissertation. Utkal University.
- [40]. Meyer, B.J.F. (1979). Organisational Pattern in Prose and their Use in Reading. In M.L Kamil and A.J. Moe, *Reading Research: Studies and Applications* (107-117). 28<sup>th</sup> Year Book of the National Reading Conference.
- [41]. National Dissemination Centre for Children with Disabilities (2009). Retrieved December 19, 2009 from <http://www.nichcy.org/Disabilities/specific/Pages/LD.aspx>
- [42]. National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (2001). In Wong, *Making Sense of all the Definitions of Learning Disabilities*. In B.Y.L Wong, *The ABC'S of Learning Disabilities*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- [43]. Nagliere, J.a& Das, J.P. 919850. Mtrix Analogy Test, Expanded Fprm. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- [44]. Omotosho, J.A. (2001). Learning Disability Problems Prevalent among Elementary School Age Children in Illorin Metropolis: Implications for Special Education and Counselling IFE Psychologia. *International Journal, Vol.9*, 128-133
- [45]. Prema, K.S and Karanth, P. (2003). *Assessment of Learning Disability: Language based Tests*, in Karanth. P and Rozario. J, *Learning Disabilities in India: Willing the Mind to Learn*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [46]. Paushikar, A. (2004). Adaptation of Diagnostic Test of Reading Disorder in Marathi. M.Ed Dissertation. Mumbai: Centre of Special Education SNDT Women's University.
- [47]. Prema, K.S. (1998). 'Reading Acquisition Profile in Kannada', Doctoral Dissertation. Mysore: University of Mysore.
- [48]. Polloway, E., & Smith, J. (1982). *Teaching Language Skills to Exceptional Learners*. Denver: Love Publishing.
- [49]. Purusottama, G. (1988). Reading Kannada Letters. *Indian Journal of Disability and Rehabilitation*, 59-62.
- [50]. Roongpraiwan, R., Ruangdaraganon, N., Visudhiphan, P., & Santikul, K. (2002). Prevalance and Clinical Characteristics of Dyslexia in Primary School Students. *Journal of Medical Association, Vol.85*, 103-109
- [51]. Rozario, J. (2003). 'Assessment of Learning Disabilities', in Karanth. P and Rozario. J, *Learning Disabilities in India: Willing the Mind to Learn*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [52]. Rama, S. (1984). Diagnosis and Remediation of Dyslexia- An Attempt. Ph.D Thesis Mysore University. In M.B. Buck, Fourth Survey of Research in Education, Vol.2, New Delhi
- [53]. Reddy, G.L. & Ramar, R. (2006). *Learning Disabilities: A Practical Guide to Practitioners*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- [54]. Richey, L.S. & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1991). Teachers Expectations for the Younger Siblings of Learning Disabled Students. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol.16*, 610-615.
- [55]. Shoba, S., Girimaji, S.C., Gururaj, G., Seshadri, D.K., Subhaskrishna, P.B., & Kumar, n. (2005). Epidemiological Study of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Disorders in Urban and Rural Areas of Bangalore, India. *Indian Journal of Medical Research, Vol.122*, 67-79
- [56]. Srikanth, N & Karanth, P. (2003). *Speech Language Pathologist and Remediation of Reading Disabilities* in Karanth. P and Rozario. J, *Learning Disabilities in India: Willing the Mind to Learn*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [57]. Shah. N. (2005). Attention Drficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Pediatric Clinics of India, Vol.40*, No.3, 205-212

- [58]. Sankaranarayanan, A. (2003). *Cognitive Profiles of Children Learning to Read English as a Second Language*, in in Karanth. P and Rozario. J, *Learning Disabilities in India: Willing the Mind to Learn*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [59]. Smith, F. (2004). *What's the Use of the Alphabet*. Victoria B.C: Abel Press.
- [60]. Shah. N., Pawan. A., & Shah, L.P. (1998). *Specific Learning Converse*. Vol.2, No.2, 5-12
- [61]. Shah, N & Bajaj, S. (1994). Study of Students having Uneven Performance in Different Subjects in School. *Archives of Indian Psychiatry*. Vol.1, No.1, 22-24
- [62]. Shavlev, R.S., Auerbach, J., Manor, O., &Gross,T. (2000). Developmental Dyscalculia: Prevalence and Prognosis. *Journal of Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, Vol.2, 58-64
- [63]. Snow, C.E, Burns, M.S, & Griffin, P. (2000). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. US National Research Council Report. Washington, DC: National Academy Press
- [64]. Swarup, S. &Verma, P. (1997). *Test of Special Education*, S.N.D.T Women's University
- [65]. Swarup, S. & Mehta, D.H. (1991). *Behavioural Checklist for Screening Learning Disabled*, Mumbai. S.N.D.T Women's University
- [66]. Spreen, O. (1995). *Developmental Neuropsychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [67]. Shaywitz, S.E., Escobar, M.D., Shaywitz, B.A., Fletcher, J.M., &Makuch, R. (1992). Evidence without Dyslexia may Represent the Lower Tail of a Normal Distribution of Reading and Written Difficulties in Pre-Schoolers. *Disabilities and Impairments*, Vol.19, 15-22
- [68]. Sattler, J.M. (1990). *Assessment of Children*. Sattler, San Diego, C.A
- [69]. Salvia, J., &Ysseldyke, J.E. (1991). *Assessment(5<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- [70]. Strauss, A., &Lehtinen, L. (1947). *Psychopathology and Education of the Brain Injured Child*. New York: Grune and Shratton.
- [71]. Sodhi, S. (1996). *Dyslexia: A Step in the Right Direction*. Delhi: Binny Publishers.
- [72]. Thapa, K, Aalsvoort. V.M.G &Pandey.J. (2008), *Perspectives on Learning Disabilities in India- Current Practices and Prospects*, New Delhi: Sage Publications Pvt Ltd.
- [73]. *Twenty third Annual Report to Congree*, US Department of Education, 2001.
- [74]. Tomblin, J.B, Records, N.L, Buckwalter, P, Zhang, X, Smith, E, O'Brien, M. (1997). Prevalence of Specific Language Impairment in Kindergarten Children. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, Vol.40, 1245-1260
- [75]. Tuttle, C. (1995). *Challenging Voices: Writings By, For and About People with Learning Disabilities*. Los Angeles: Lowell House.
- [76]. Wong, Bernice Y.L. (1996). *The ABC's of Learning Disabilities*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- [77]. Westwood, P. (2008). *What Teachers Need to Know About Learning Difficulties*. Australia: ACER Press.

#### **Websites**

- [78]. <http://etd.uasd.edu/ft/th8654.pdf>
- [79]. [www.indianpediatrics.net/apr2005/apr315-319.htm](http://www.indianpediatrics.net/apr2005/apr315-319.htm)
- [80]. [www.CDC.gov/nchs/pressrom/02news/attendefic.html](http://www.CDC.gov/nchs/pressrom/02news/attendefic.html)
- [81]. [http://www.medicinenet.com/learning\\_disability/page6.htm#is\\_there\\_any\\_treatment\\_for\\_learning\\_disabilities](http://www.medicinenet.com/learning_disability/page6.htm#is_there_any_treatment_for_learning_disabilities)
- [82]. [www.investopedia.com/terms/c/correlationcoefficient.asp](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/correlationcoefficient.asp)
- [83]. [www.investopedia.com/terms/c/coefficient-of-determination.asp](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/coefficient-of-determination.asp)
- [84]. [writing.colostate.edu](http://writing.colostate.edu) > Guides > Reliability & Validity
- [85]. [medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/predictive+validity](http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/predictive+validity)

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Dr. N. Dhanya. "Evolving and Evaluating a Spelling Tool in Malayalam For Identifying Learning Disabilities In Children." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) 22.7 (2017): 47-55.