INDIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS VOL. 40, NO. 1-2, JAN-DEC 2014

Profiling Children with Dyslexia

SENGOTTUVEL KUPPURAJ SHANBAL JAYASHREE C.

All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, India

ABSTRACT

Dyslexics show variety of reading and writing difficulties and the dyslexic group is highly heterogeneous. The significance of comparing the children with dyslexia on reading and writing aspects of literacy with typically developing children and profiling them based on phonological and non-phonological characteristics is significant. The present study aimed such comparison and results of comparison between children with dyslexia and typically developing children on phonological and non-phonological skills are discussed in detail. Moreover, individual profile of all 16 children with dyslexia is displayed and attempt has been made to group children with dyslexia into surface, phonological, and mixed dyslexia based on profile.

Keywords: Literacy, non-phonological, profile, phonological

1. Introduction

Literacy is defined as the minimal ability to read and write in a designated language combined with the ability to think about the use of reading and writing in everyday life. The components of literacy include reading, writing, and listening (Cunningham 1995). Gayen & Olsen (2003) included phonological awareness, phonological decoding, reading comprehension, spelling, orthographic knowledge, and rapid automatized naming also into reading components. The development of literacy is multidimensional complex process requiring adequate exposure

PROFILING CHILDREN WITH DYSLEXIA

| 57. siege | 67. institution |
|---------------|-----------------|
| 58. recent | 68. pivot |
| 59. plausible | 69. conscience |
| 60. prophecy | 70. heroic |

5. Non word reading test

Test items

| 1 050 1105 | |
|--------------|---------------|
| One syllable | Tw o syllable |
| 1. Gat | 6. higure |
| 2. Rop | 7. kibnick |
| 3. Shug | 8. Pachine |
| 4. Hild | 9. clabnag |
| 5. Narge | 10. tringdom |

6. Alliteration test

| Test items 1 Test items 2 | | | st items 2 |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. | Gap got nod | 1. | train plane prone |
| 2. | Net dig nip | 2. | spade start break |
| 3. | Rope take time | 3. | crumb twist climb |
| 4. | Big pit ball | 4. | pram trap plan |
| 5 | Form fat van | 5 | great glue crane |

7. Rhyming test

| • • | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Test item 1 | Test item 2 | | |
| Main line pain | buckle puddle muddle | | |
| Fog log bag | tight light ride | | |
| Fuss tilt wilt | niece cheese please | | |
| Neck peck beg | nip fib tip | | |
| Nap hip sap | tone home phone | | |
| Pen hen pet | cattle battle handle | | |
| Red big dig | should wood food | | |
| Pip top hop | neat weed seed | | |
| Hid did dub | ship rip stop | | |
| Pack buck rack | tree need free | | |

8. Word repetition

| 1. | Pin | cat | | |
|----|------|------|-------|-------|
| 2. | Cap | sky | tin | |
| 3. | Mat | crow | pick | |
| 4. | Rain | pen | chair | men |
| 5 | Pit | dav | log | shirt |

SENGOTTUVEL KUPPURAJ & SHANBAL JAYASHREE C. 172

6. Cow wool snake hut grape 7. Plank lion heel plot den

9. Non word repetition 1. Ket

- 2. Lum
- 3.
- Muphin
- 4. Ret spige
- 5. Trumfrutnabe
- keld 6. Ronch tarp
- Horpbridnateproog 7.
- Fodewikedrupcren

10. Rapid naming

















































































11. Sound discrimination

| 1. | Rip | tip | 10. | Fish | fish |
|----|------|------|-----|---------|--------|
| 2. | Sick | sack | 11. | Shelled | shield |
| 3. | Side | side | 12. | Halt | hall |

| 4. | Pet | bet | 13. | Try | tie |
|-----|------|------|-----|-------|-------|
| 5. | Big | bog | 14. | Tilt | tilt |
| 6. | Sit | sit | 15. | Ship | sheep |
| 7. | Bed | bad | 16. | Raw | war |
| 8. | Dam | mad | 17. | Throw | throw |
| 9. | Slow | snow | 18. | Rip | reap |
| 10. | End | and | 20. | Nib | nip |

APPENDIX II

Profile on Qualitative analysis of individual data

Subject 1. (Grade I)

Alphabet: Correctly wrote the alphabets b and m only

SC: Performed very poorly

Spelling: Unable to spell any of the words

HQ: Very poor, managed no score *Reading*: Unable to read any of the word

NWreading: unable to read any of the non word

Alliteration: Managed no score Rhyming: Managed no score

Wrep: Managed to repeat only the first series of stimulus which had

only two words (e.g. pin, cat)

NWrep: Managed to repeat the first two non word series only, they were made of one nonword consisted of single syllable. The subject couldn't repeat the third nonword since it had two words.

RN: Took 78 seconds to name all the 35 items in correct order

SDis: Correctly discriminated only three stimuli.

Subject 2 (Grade 1)

Alphabet: Wrote all of the alphabets without error

SC: Copies the first three simple shapes exactly, but only fairly well the complex one.

Spelling:lot, be, fish and tent were spelled correctly out of all forty words.

HQ: Quality was bad.

Reading: Managed to correctly read only the first eight items NWreading: Could read only two of the single syllable nonword. Alliteration: Correctly identified only the alliterated words in second stimuli

Rhyming: Didn't manage any correct responses

Wrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to four words in it.

174 SENGOTTUVEL KUPPURAJ & SHANBAL JAYASHREE C.

NWrep: Could manage to repeat stimulus series which had up to two non words only.

RN: Took 62 seconds to correctly name all of the items. SDis:side, reap, nipwere the ones which were incorrect.

Subject 3 (Grade 1)

Alphabet: unable to write *d*, *p*, and *m*

SC: Completed the simple ones with ease, but managed to copy the final shape only lesser than fair.

Spelling: lot, be and much were written correctly

HQ: Performed fairly

Reading: First three items (tree, little and milk) then 6th (school) and eleven (flower) were correctly read.

NWreading: Managed to read three of the one syllable nonword only.

Alliteration: Poor performance (only 1 and 8 were correct)

Rhyming: Very poor performance

Wrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to four words. (Fair performance)

NWrep: Managed only the first two series, which had only one word each (poor performance)

RN: took 71 seconds to correctly name all the items.

SDis: performed relatively well.

Subject 4 (Grade II)

Alphabet: Excellent performance

SC: simple shapes are drawn correctly, poor copying of complex shape

Spelling: Very poor performance

HO: Bad performance

Reading: Managed only 3(very poor performances)

NWreading: Managed to read only three of the monosyllabic words

Alliteration: Poor performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to four words in it. *NWrep*: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to two non words in it

RN: Took 92 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Performed poorly

Subject 5 (Grade II)

Alphabet: m was written incorrectly

SC: Correctly written simple shapes, complex shape was better

approximating towards stimulus shape *Spelling:* Very poor performance

HQ: Performed fairly

Reading: Seven of the words were read correctly (poor performance)

NWreading: No correct responses *Alliteration:* Poor performance *Rhyming:* Poor performance

Wrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to four words.

NWrep. Could repeat stimulus series which had up to two non words in it

RN: Took 73 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Performed fairly well

Subject 6 (Grade 11)

Alphabet: Had confusion between 9, q and couldn't write u.

SC: Correctly written simple shapes, complex shape was fairly drawn.

Spelling: Very poor performance

HQ: Performed fairly

Reading: Six of the words were read correctly, still a poor performance *NWreading:* Managed to read only three of the monosyllabic words

Alliteration: Poor performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to four words.

NWrep: Could repeat stimulus series which had up to two non words in it

RN: Took 66 seconds to repeat all the items.

SDis: Performed fairly well

Subject 7 (Grade III)

Alphabet: Performed excellently

SC: All the simple shapes were copied correctly, good performance in

copying complex shape *Spelling*: Performed poorly *HQ*: Bad performance

Reading: Number of correct responses is over ten, and most of the

correct responses were correct for the first ten stimulus. *NWreading*: Managed only the single syllable words.

Alliteration: Fair performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Good, managed up to stimulus series which had four words in it NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 48 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performance

176 SENGOTTUVEL KUPPURAJ & SHANBAL JAYASHREE C.

Subject 8 (Grade III)

Alphabet: Performed excellently

SC: All the simple shapes were copied correctly, fair performance in

copying complex shape *Spelling:* Performed poorly *HQ:* Good performance

Reading: Number of correct responses was ten, and most of the correct

responses were correct for the first ten stimulus

NWreading: Managed to read only the single syllable words.

Alliteration: Fair performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Good, managed up to stimulus series which had four words in it *NWrep*: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 38 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Good performance

Subject 9 (Grade III)

Alphabet: Confusion exhibited between 9 and q

SC: All the simple shapes were copied correctly, fair performance in

copying complex shape Spelling: Performed poorly HQ: Good performance

Reading: Number of correct responses was over ten, and most of the

correct responses were correct for the first ten stimulus. *NWreading*: Managed only the single syllable words.

Alliteration: Poor performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Fair, managed up to stimulus series this had four words in it *NWrep*: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 44 seconds to name all the given items

SDis: Good performance

Subject 10 (Grade IV)

Alphabet: Excellent performance SC: Excellent performance Spelling: Good performance

HQ: Very good, closely approximating excellence

Reading: Half of the words were read correctly (i.e. 35, however 90 percent of the correctly read words were in first half of the stimulus)

NWreading: Could even read one bisyllabicnonword

Alliteration: Very good performance

Rhyming: Good performence

Wrep: Could repeat only up to three word stimulus series (very poor

performance)

NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 32 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performence

Subject 11 (Grade 1V)

Alphabet: Excellent performance

SC: Performed very good in complex shape

Spelling: Fair performance *HQ*: Good performance *Reading*: Fair performance

NWreading: Read only monosyllabic words

Alliteration: Poor performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Could repeat only up to three word stimulus series (very poor

performance)

NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had two

nonwords in it

RN: Took 45 seconds to name all the items

SDis: All are correct except 19th item, i.eripand reap (Very good

performance)

Subject 12 (Grade 1V)

Alphabet: Excellent performance

SC: Good Performance in complex shape

Spelling: Poor performance *HQ*: Very good performance *Reading*: Poor performance

NWreading: Read only the monosyllabic words

Alliteration: Poor performance Rhyming: Fair performance

Wrep: Could repeat only up to three word stimulus series (very poor

performance

NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had two

nonwords in it

RN: Took 37 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performance

Subject 13 (Grade 1V)

Alphabet: Excellent performance

SC: Good Performance in complex shape

Spelling: Poor performance *HQ*: Very good performance *Reading*: Poor performance

NWreading: Read only the monosyllabic words

Alliteration: Good performance Rhyming: Poor performance

Wrep: Fair, managed up to stimulus series this had four words in it NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had two

nonwords in it

RN: Took 40 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performance

Subject 14 (Grade V)

Alphabet: u was written incorrectly

SC: Could not copy two of the simple shapes and poor copying of

complex shape

Spelling: Very poor performance

HQ: Poor performance

Reading: Very poor performance NWreading: Only monosyllable words Alliteration: Good performance Rhyming: Very poor performance

Wrep: Fair, managed up to stimulus series this had four words in it NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 27 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performence

Subject 15 (Grade V)

Alphabet: Excellent performance SC: Good copying of complex shape

Spelling: Fair performance *HO*: Good performance

Reading: Less than half is read correctly (poor performance) *NWreading*: Only monosyllable words were read correctly

Alliteration: Very good performance

Rhyming: Fair performance

Wrep: Fair, managed up to stimulus series this had four words in it

NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 26 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performance

Subject 16 (Grade V)

Alphabet: Excellent performance *SC:* Good copying of complex shape

Spelling: Fair performance *HQ*: Very good performance *Reading:* Very poor performance

NWreading: Only the monosyllable words were read correctly

Alliteration: Good performance Rhyming: Good performance

Wrep: Fair, managed up to stimulus series this had four words in it NWrep: Good, managed to repeat stimulus series which had three

nonwords in it

RN: Took 31 seconds to name all the items

SDis: Excellent performance

*Performance rating-very bad <bad < very poor <poor < fair <good < very good <excellent

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors of this paper would like to thank the Director, All India Institute of Speech and Hearing (AIISH), Mysore for permitting to conduct the study. This research paper was part of a masters' dissertation completed by first author and guided by the second author under University of Mysore. The authors of the paper extend their sincere gratitude to all the participants of the study and also to the Director, AIISH, for allowing projecting the work outside the AIISH campus.

SENGOTTUVEL KUPPURAJ

JUNIOR RESEARCH FELLOW,
DEPT. OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE SCIENCES,
ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF SPEECH AND HEARING,
MYSORE 570006, INDIA.
E-MAIL: < KUPPU K7@YAHOO.CO.IN>

PH: +91-9742212172

&

SHANBAL JAYASHREE C

P.HD, LECTURER IN LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY, DEPT. OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY, ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF SPEECH & HEARING, MYSORE 570006, INDIA. E-MAIL: <JSHANBAL@YAHOO.CO.IN>