



A STUDY ON DYSLEXIA AMONG TEACHER TRAINEES

GIRIJADEVI V. SUNKAD,

Research Scholar,
Department of Education,
Rani Channamma University,
Belagavi-591156
(KR) INDIA

Prof. PURNIMA PATTANSHETTI,

Professor (Retd) & Research Guide,
Department of Education,
Rani Channamma University,
Belagavi-591156
(KR) INDIA

ABSTRACT

In the present paper an attempt has been made to compare dyslexic and non-dyslexic teacher trainees with regard to five areas namely, (i) emotional intelligence, (ii) movements and perceptions, (iii) structure and sequence, (iv) short term memory, and (v) language and communication. The teacher trainees studying in the academic year 2018-19 were chosen as the samples of the study and were drawn by purposive sampling technique. The data was collected using a questionnaire constructed and validated by the researcher. The data was analyzed using percentiles.

Key words: *Dyslexic, non-dyslexic, teacher trainees, emotional intelligence, movements and perceptions etc.*

INTRODUCTION

Dyslexia is a learning problem that teachers, parents, and scientists are concerned about. It is one of a number of different learning disorders that affect different aspects of academic achievement. Dyslexia is one of the well-studied types of learning disorders, impacting more than 80% of those who are labeled as learning challenged. It is linked to difficulties with reading, writing, and sequential symbolic knowledge. Approximately 4-10% of the population suffers from this specific reading problem.

HRIDAYNATH SONUNE

1P a g e

Dyslexia is a neurologically based, frequently hereditary condition that affects language acquisition. It manifests as impairments in receptive and expressive language, including phonological processing, reading, writing, spelling, handwriting, and sometimes mathematics, in varying degrees of severity. Dyslexia is not caused by a lack of motivation, sensory impairment, or insufficient educational or environmental chances, but it can occur in conjunction with them. Despite the fact that dyslexia is a lifelong condition, individuals with it often react well to timely and adequate treatments.

Objectives

- To compare the strengths and weaknesses of dyslexic and non-dyslexic teacher trainees.
- To study the realistic approach towards grooming the dyslexic teacher trainees.

Need and Importance of the Study

Dyslexia as a learning disability affects not only children of tender ages but also developed among the adults also if not identified and treated at an early age and stage. The term 'dyslexia' is not confined only to childhood; a small adult population also suffers with adult dyslexia. Sometimes the teachers in teaching profession who identifies the dyslexia in students may also be affected by dyslexia. Dyslexic students most of the time gets neglected with their strengths and this would be an attempt to focus on eradicating such discrimination. Many researches till now focused on studying dyslexia among school children, but a very less and few studies were conducted regarding adult dyslexia and that too dyslexia among teacher trainees. Accordingly, the present study has been undertaken by the researcher.

Literature Review

Giovanioli et.al (2016) in their study found that, children with dyslexia have deficits in several spatial abilities. This is in contrast to the point of view that the individuals with dyslexia have superior spatial processing ability (Duranovic et al., 2015; Wang & Yang, 2011; Bacon et al., 2010). The study by Jonathan Glazzard (2017) explored the perceptions of trainee teachers with dyslexia, and their mentors, of their placement experiences during their initial teacher training course. The research was conducted within one initial teacher education partnership in the north of England. Data were collected through two focus groups; one of trainees and one of mentors. Trainees described the difficulties they experienced with teaching literacy (particularly phonics), difficulties with memory and difficulties with the administrative demands of placement. Mentors emphasized trainee's weaknesses and

HRIDAYNATH SONUNE

2P a g e

although some mentors wanted to recognize and support the strengths of the trainees, they felt responsible as gate-keepers to the profession. It was proven that dyslexic students' intelligence is normal (Rajapakse et al., 2018), but they think differently. Klonari & Passadelli, (2019b) stated that although all students face difficulties in spatial thinking, the issue for dyslexic students is more acute. Dyslexia is a learning disability that affects various areas of academic performance (Passadelli et al. 2020).

Methodology

The study was conducted by employing descriptive survey research method.

Sample

Teacher trainees studying in the academic year 2018-19 were chosen as the samples of the present study by purposive and/or convenient sampling technique.

Tools used

- Self assessment questionnaire for identifying teacher trainees with dyslexia.
- Questionnaire on dyslexia for teacher educators.

Statistical Techniques Employed

The collected data were analyzed using percentiles.

Research Outcomes

1. About 13.6% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 86.4% 'Strongly Agreed' that, teacher trainees had 'difficulty while speaking or explaining ideas'.
2. About 14.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 85.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees are 'easily distracted by sights or sounds'.
3. About 1% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 18% 'Agreed' and remaining 81% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'not confident about his/her own decisions'.
4. About 5% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 10.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 84.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'had the problem of changing mood'.
5. About 2% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 9.8% 'Agreed' and remaining 88.2% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'find difficulty in adjusting to the changes'.

6. About 7% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 12.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 81.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'not clear about the things to be done'.
7. About 1.5% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 0.5% 'Disagreed', 2% 'Neutral', 8.5% 'Agreed' and 87.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'had inferiority complex'.
8. About 1% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 9% 'Agreed' and remaining 91% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'not aware about their strengths and weaknesses'.
9. About 1.4% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 0.6% 'Disagreed', 3% were 'Neutral', 8.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 86.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'not comfortable to work in different situations'.
10. About 4.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' whereas 95.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'good in other areas such as art, drama, music or sports'.
11. About 10% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 90% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'confuse letters with similar appearance'.
12. About 8.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 91.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'misread words in text (were and where, cat and cot)'.
13. About 6.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 93.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'reverse letters when reading (on as no)'.
14. About 0.5% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 11% 'Agreed' and remaining 88.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were found 'slow while copying from a book or black board to paper'.
15. About 0.5% of teacher educators 'Disagreed', 2.5% 'Neutral', 4.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 92.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'skip or add the words while reading'.
16. About 0.5% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 0.5% 'Disagreed', 2.5% 'Neutral', 3.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 93% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'unable to understand the main idea of a passage'.
17. About 2% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 6% 'Agreed' and remaining 92% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'guess words from initial letters'.
18. About 1% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 1% 'Disagreed', 3% 'Neutral', 5% 'Agreed' and remaining 90% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'stumbles while reading'.
19. About 1% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 1% 'Disagreed', 5% 'Neutral', 4.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 88.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'take time to respond to the questions'.
20. About 1% of teacher educators 'Disagreed', 1% 'Neutral', 6.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 91.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'find difficulty in understanding verbal instructions'.

21. About 2% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 4% 'Disagreed', 2.5% 'Neutral', 4% 'Agreed' and remaining 89.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'find it difficult to organize thoughts into papers'.
22. About 1% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 4.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 94.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'leave out words in writing'.
23. About 4.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 95.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'spell the same word in several different ways'.
24. About 0.5% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 5.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 95.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'make many rewrites'.
25. About 5.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 94.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'find difficulty in reasoning skills'.
26. About 4.5% of teacher educators 'Agreed' and remaining 95.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'make punctuation errors'.
27. About 1% of teacher educators were 'Neutral', 6.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 92.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'require frequent reminders'.
28. About 1% of teacher educators 'Disagreed', 0.5% 'Neutral', 7.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 91% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'confuse when several instructions are given at once'.
29. About 2% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagree', 1% 'Disagree', 4% 'Neutral', 4.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 88.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees 'forget the content of instruction'.
30. About 2% of teacher educators 'Strongly Disagreed', 1% 'Disagreed', 3% 'Neutral', 4.5% 'Agreed' and remaining 89.5% 'Strongly Agreed' that, the teacher trainees were 'unable to recall sequence of events'.

CONCLUSION

Dyslexic teacher trainees though lacking in the five areas mentioned hereinabove, yet have extraordinary strengths such as creativity, good imagination, co-curricular skills, sports, singing, drawing and so on and are quite supportive and encourage them to become effective teachers at par with non-dyslexic teacher trainees.

REFERENCE:

1. Alison Bacon & Simon J. Handley (2010), *Dyslexia, Reasoning and the Importance of Visual-Spatial Processes*, Nova: New York
2. Andrew W. Halpin (1966), *Theory and Research in Administration*, New York: Macmillan Company, Pp 131.

HRIDAYNATH SONUNE

5P a g e



3. Anthoula Styliani Passadelli, Aikaterini Klonari, Vyron Ignatios Michalakakis and Michail Vaitis (2020), Geography Teachers' Knowledge of and Perceptions on Dyslexia, Education Sciences, DOI: 10.3390/educscie10100278
4. Basavayya., D. and Venkataiah., N. (2016), Essence of Educational Research Methodology, Volume 2. *Hyderabad, Neelkamal Publications Pvt. Ltd.*
5. Best., J.W. (1996), Research in Education. *New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.*
6. Creswell., J.W. (2014), Research- Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach (4th Edition), *London: SAGE.*
7. Garrette., H.E. (2005), Statistics in Psychology and Education. *New Delhi: Paragon International Publishers.*
8. Giulia Giovagnoli, Stefano Vicari, Serena Tomassetti and Deny Menghini (2016), The Role of Visual-Spatial Abilities in Dyslexia: Age Differences in Children's Reading?, *Frontiers in Psychology*, DOI: 10.3389/fpsy.g.2016.01997
9. Glazzard, J (2017), Assessing Reading Development through Systematic Synthetic Phonics English in Education, 51 (1), Pp 44-57, ISSN: 1754-8845, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/eie.12125>
10. Klonari, A.; Styliani Passadelli, A. (2019). Differences between dyslexic and non-dyslexic students in the performance of spatial and geographical thinking. *Review of International Geographical Education Online (RIGEO)*, 9(2), 284- 303. Retrieved from <http://www.rigeo.org/vol9no2/Number2Summer/RIGEO-V9-N2-2.pdf>, DOI: 10.33403/rigeo.510360
11. Koul Lokesh., (2000), Methodology of Educational Research (3rd Edition). *New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.*
12. Li-Chih Wang and Hsien-Ming Yang (2011), The Comparison of the Visuo-Spatial Abilities of dyslexic and normal students in Taiwan and Hong Kong, *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32 (3): 1052-7, DOI: 10.1016/j.ridd.2011.01.028.Epub 2011 Feb 21
13. Mirela Duranovic, Mediha Dedeic and Miroslav Gavric (2015), Dyslexia and Visual-Spatial Talents, *Current Psychology*, 34 (2), DOI: 10.1007/s12144-014-9252-3



14. Sampath Rajapakse, Dasuni Polwattage, Umesha Guruge and Isuru Jayathilaka (2018), ALEXZA: A Mobile Application for Dyslexics Utilizing Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Concepts, Proceedings on 3rd International Conference on Information Technology Research (ICITR), DOI: 10.1109/ICITR.2018.8736130
15. Tuckman., Bruce., W. (1978), Conducting Educational Research. *New York: Harcourt Brace Hovanovich Inc.*