

CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION OF A DATA COLLECTION TOOL FOR LEARNING DISABILITY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

R. Rajeshkannan* & Dr. V. Ambedkar**

* Ph.D., Research Scholar, Department of Education,
Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar - 608002

** Professor & Co-Ordinator, (Education Wing, DDE),
Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar - 608002

Abstract

Learning Disability in English Language is a neurological disorder. In simple terms, Learning Disability in English Language results from a difference in the way a person's brain is "wired." Children with learning disabilities are as smart as or smarter than their peers. But they may have difficulty in reading, writing, spelling, reasoning, recalling and/or organizing information if left to figure things out by themselves or if taught in conventional ways. It is the right time to measure the Learning Disability in English Language of high school students who are connected with it. As such there is no valid research tool to measure the Learning Disability in English Language of high school students. Hence the research attempted to develop a researcher tool for that purpose.

Key words: Learning Disability, English Language and High School Students

Introduction

Students with Learning Disabilities (LDs) in reading and youngsters who are English language learners (ELLs) both are at risk for low reading achievement, but for different reasons. Children with genuine LDs in reading have intrinsic learning difficulties or differences, often related to problems in phonological processing that impact their word identification skills. ELLs usually can learn to read normally in their native language, but they lack sufficient exposure to both spoken and written English, which can adversely affect their development of English literacy. When both situations coexist for the same youngster when a child with a Learning Disability in English Language happens also to be an English language learner the issues surrounding identification and remediation can be very complex.

Objectives of the Study

- To develop a research tool to measure the Learning Disability in English Language of high school students.

Methodology

Learning Disability in English Language Scale for high school students has been constructed by the investigator. A lot of literature on Learning Disability in English Language, test construction procedures were used for the construction of the tool. The Learning Disability in English Language Scale was constructed after having discussions with teachers of schools and colleges, psychologists and experts in the field of education. The scale has been prepared on five-point rating scale based on Likert's type. The total number of statement is 58 and initially 40 positive and 18 negative statements were prepared in both Tamil and English.

The scoring procedure for positive statement on the tool is as follows: the option Strongly Agree is given 5; Agree is given 4; Undecided is given 3; Disagree is given 2; and Strongly Disagree is given 1. For negative statements it is reversed as strongly disagree is given 5; disagree is given 4; Undecided is given 3; agree is given 2; and Strongly agree is given 1. The minimum score for the tool is '58' and maximum score of the tool is 290.

Item analysis:

The model/draft tool prepared by the investigator was administered on a sample of 100 high school students. They have to select the most appropriate choice in each set of four choices in an item and there is no time limit. Not more than twenty minutes has to be taken by any group to complete the test. Answers are to be shown on the right hand side of the page and by putting a cross (x) on the letter corresponding to the alternative of one's choice. The maximum score would be 58. It is most efficient to do the checking as a single operation after all booklets have been scored.

Item analysis was adopted for the final selection of items. The total scores were calculated separately and they were arranged in the descending order. The top 25 % and the bottom 25% of scores alone were taken into account. The difference in means of the high and low groups for each item was tested for significance by computing the t- ratios. Items with 't' value of 1.96 and above were selected for the final tool. Thus, the final tool contains fifty eight items; the list of items with the 't' value is presented in Table. 1 - Split -half method was also used to find out the consistency of the test. It has been given in table 2.

Table -1
Learning Disability in English Language Scale

| Statement number | t- value | Selected/ Not Selected |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. | 1.243 | Not Selected |
| 2. | 2.163 | Selected |
| 3. | 5.163 | Selected |
| 4. | 5.822 | Selected |
| 5. | 3.823 | Selected |
| 6. | 3.618 | Selected |
| 7. | 3.771 | Selected |
| 8. | 4.070 | Selected |
| 9. | 2.216 | Selected |
| 10. | 5.805 | Selected |
| 11. | 2.795 | Selected |
| 12. | 7.696 | Selected |
| 13. | 3.903 | Selected |
| 14. | 4.706 | Selected |
| 15. | 6.245 | Selected |
| 16. | 2.431 | Selected |
| 17. | 1.998 | Selected |
| 18. | 3.387 | Selected |
| 19. | 4.968 | Selected |
| 20. | 3.364 | Selected |
| 21. | 3.756 | Selected |
| 22. | 3.488 | Selected |
| 23. | 5.487 | Selected |
| 24. | .655 | Not Selected |
| 25. | 4.831 | Selected |
| 26. | 1.274 | Not Selected |
| 27. | 2.431 | Selected |
| 28. | 3.917 | Selected |

| | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------------|
| 29. | 2.431 | Selected |
| 30. | .602 | Not Selected |
| 31. | 6.213 | Selected |
| 32. | 3.085 | Selected |
| 33. | .180 | Not selected |
| 34. | 2.475 | Selected |
| 35. | 3.512 | Selected |
| 36. | 4.229 | Selected |
| 37. | .669 | Not selected |
| 38. | 3.022 | Selected |
| 39. | 4.414 | Selected |
| 40. | 2.661 | Selected |
| 41. | 3.373 | Selected |
| 42. | 4.233 | Selected |
| 43. | 2.245 | Selected |
| 44. | 2.359 | Selected |
| 45. | 5.370 | Selected |
| 46. | 4.526 | Selected |
| 47. | .318 | Not Selected |
| 48. | 4.760 | Selected |
| 49. | 3.284 | Selected |
| 50. | 2.618 | Selected |
| 51. | 8.057 | Selected |
| 52. | .231 | Not Selected |
| 53. | 4.077 | Selected |
| 54. | 2.906 | Selected |
| 55. | 3.073 | Selected |
| 56. | 4.782 | Selected |
| 57. | 3.261 | Selected |
| 58. | 2.032 | Selected |

Reliability

The reliability of test can be defined as the correlation between two or more sets of scores on equivalent tests from the same group of individuals. A test score is called reliable when we have reasons for believing the score to be stable and trust worthy. Stability and trust worthiness depend upon the degree to which the score is an index of “true-ability” free from chance error.

Test-retest (repetition) method was used to arrive at the reliability of the tool. Repetition of a test is the simplest method of determining the agreement between the two set of scores; the test is given and repeated on the same group; and the correlation computed between the first and second set of scores. Given sufficient time between the two tests the administration results show the stability of the test scores. The value of correlation coefficient shows that there is high positive degree of correlation between the two tests and are given in Table 2.

Table: 2

Shows Reliability Co-Efficient of Learning Disability in English Language

| S. No. | Method of Reliability | Values |
|--------|--------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Test-retest (Repetition) | 0.86 |
| 2 | Split – Half | 0.93 |

Validity:

The appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences made from test scores. In research, if findings are to be appropriate, meaningful and useful, they need to be valid.

The first essential quality of valid test is that it should be highly reliable. Besides, the content or face validity, the investigator intended to arrive intrinsic validity. Guilford (1950) defined the intrinsic validity as “the degree to which a test measures what it measures.” The square root of reliability gives the intrinsic validity. Therefore, the intrinsic validity of Learning Disability in English Language is 0.86.

Description of the Final Tool:

The final tool with 44 positive and 6 negative statements was prepared in both English and Tamil. The final tool has been prepared on a five-point rating scale based on Likert’s type. The scoring procedure for the tool with the option Strongly Agree as 5, Agree as 4,

Undecided as 3, Disagree 2 and Strongly Disagree as 1, and 44 for positive statements. For 6 negative statements it is reversed as strongly disagree is given 5, disagree is given 4, Undecided score as 3, agree score as 2, and Strongly agree 1. The minimum score for the tool is '50' and maximum score of the tool is 250.

Conclusion

On the completion of this present study the investigator has been prompted to concluded that the constructed and validate by the Learning Disability in English Language scale included in the present study are not influential enough to alter the disabilities. Therefore the investigator feels that on the completion of the proposed topics of research given here, valid information with regard to disabilities may be obtained. A random sampling technique was adopted to select the sample. The result conducted that there is valid research tool to measure the Learning Disability in English Language of high school students. Hence the research attempted to develop a researcher tool for that present study purpose.

References

- Allen D, Lowe K, Moore K, Brophy S. Predictors, costs and characteristics of out of area placement for people with intellectual disability and challenging behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2007;51:409–16.
- Aman MG, Tasse MJ, Rojahn J, Hammer D. The Nisonger CBRF: a child behavior rating form for children with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 1996;17:41–57.
- Ambedkar V. *Introduction to Educational Research*, First Edition Annaveera Publishers, Orathanadu (2013)
- Ambedkar V. *Teaching of English in Indian Context*, First Edition Annaveera Publishers, Orathanadu (2011)
- Baghdadli A, Pascal C, Grisi S, Aussilloux C. Risk factors for self-injurious behaviours among 222 young children with autistic disorders. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2003;47:622–27.
- Baker P, Allen D. Physical abuse and physical interventions in learning disabilities: an element of risk? *Journal of Adult Protection*. 2001;3:25–31.
- Brauen, M., F. O'Reilly and M. Moore 1994. *Issues and Options in Outcomes-Based Accountability for Students with Disabilities*. College Park, MD: Center for Policy Options in Special Education, University of Maryland.

- Cameron MJ, Luiselli JK, Littleton RF Jr, Ferrelli L. Component analysis and stimulus control assessment of a behavior deceleration treatment package. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 1996;17:203–15.
- Chadwick O, Momcilovic N, Rossiter R, Stumbles E, Taylor E. A randomized trial of brief individual versus group parent training for behaviour problems in children with severe learning disabilities. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*. 2001; 29:151–67.