DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 466 EC 142 125

AUTHOR Epps, Susan; And Others

TITLE Differentiating LD and Non-LD Students: "I Know One

When I See One."

INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Inst. for Research on

Learning Disabilities.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative

Services (ED), Washington, DC.

REPORT NO IRLD-RR-52
PUB DATE Mar 81
CONTRACT 300-80-0622

NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Clinical Diagnosis; Elementary Education; Handicap

Identification; *Learning Disabilities; Low

Achievement; School Psychologists; Special Education

Teachers

ABSTRACT

The study involving 65 school psychologists, 38 special education teachers, and 21 "naive" university students (those not in education or psychology related programs) examined the extent to which school personnel were able to differentiate learning disabled (LD) students from low achievers by examining students' patterns of scores on psychometric measures. Each S was provided with forms containing information on 41 test or subtest scores of 9 school identified LD and 9 nonLD fourth grade students and was instructed to indicate which he/she believed were LD and which were nonLD. Accuracy and interjudge agreement confirmed the difficulty of differentially diagnosing students with learning disabilities and suggested that having information from a battery of tests does not increase the decision maker's ability to discriminate between LD and nonLD students. It was recommended that current assessment practices be simplified. (Author/SB)



University of Minnesota

Research Report No. 52

US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION (ENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization in growthing it.

Minor hange have been made to improve reprison to improve

Poir to of view or opin onsistated in this document, to not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DIFFERENTIATING LD AND NON-LD STUDENTS:

"I KNOW ONE WHEN I SEE ONE"

Susan Epps, James E. Ysseldyke, and Matthew McGue



Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "



Director: James E. Ysseldyke

Associate Director: Phyllis K. Mirkin

The Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities is supported by a contract (300-80-0622) with the Office of Special Education, Department of Education, through Title VI-G of Public Law 91-230. Institute investigators are conducting research on the assessment/decision-making/intervention process as it relates to learning disabled students.

During 1980-1983, Institute research focuses on four major areas:

- Referral
- Identification/Classification
- Intervention Planning and Progress Evaluation
- Outcome Evaluation

Additional information on the Institute's research objectives and activities may be obtained by writing to the Editor at the Institute (see Publications list for address).

The research reported herein was conducted under government sponsorship. Contractors are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position of the Office of Special Education.



Research Report No. 52

DIFFERENTIATING LD AND NON-LD STUDENTS: "I KNOW ONE WHEN I SEE ONE"

Susan Epps, James E. Ysseldyke, and Matthew McGue
Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
University of Minnesota

March, 1981

Abstract

This study examined the extent to which school personnel were able to differentiate learning disabled students from low achievers by examining students' patterns of scores on psychometric measures. Subjects were 65 school psychologists, 38 special education teachers, and a "naive" group of 21 university students in programs unrelated to education or psychology. Each judge was provided with forms containing information on 41 test or subtest scores of 9 schoolidentified LD students and 9 non-LD students and instructed to indicate which he/she believed were learning disabled and which were non-learning disabled. Accuracy and inter-judge agreement confirmed the difficulty of differentially diagnosing students with learning disabilities and suggested that having information from a battery of tests does not increase the decision maker's ability to discriminate between LD and non-LD students. Considering the extreme difficulty in integrating empirical and non-empirical information, it is recommended that current assessment practices be simplified.



Differentiating LD and Non-LD Students "I Know One When I See One"

Learning disabilities researchers typically have attempted to identify the salient characteristics that distinguish LD students from other students, especially those identified as "educable mentally retarded," "emotionally disturbed," or "normal" (Ackerman, Peters, & Dykman, 1971; Bussell, Huls, & Long, 1975; Gajar, 1979; Wagonseller, 1973; Webster & Schenck, 1978). A major difficulty with such studies is that they compare learning disabled students to populations with obviously different characteristics. In comparison to the mentally retarded, intellectual differences are expected and observed; compared to students classified as emotionally disturbed, differences in the number of behavior problems are expected and observed; in comparison to "normal" students, differences in the level of academic achievement are expected and observed. Such investigations provide little new or useful information.

Difficulties typically arise when diagnostic personnel attempt to differentiate LD students from those who are simply slow learners.

These students are ones who fail to acquire academic skills and fail to meet the objectives that the school sets for them. A critical diagnostic problem is seen in efforts to decide, from among the population of students who are not "making it" in school, who should be declared LD and provided with special educational interventions. Research is nearly nonexistent on this critical diagnostic problem.

Ysseldyke, Algozzine, Shinn, and McGue (in press) found a relatively



large number of fourth-grade students who were low achieving but not labeled as LD, despite the fact that school personnel believed that few such students existed in their schools. The students scored in the lowest quartile on a group achievement test, but had not been identified as LD by their school districts.

Given that the two groups of students (low achievers and LD) do exist, it becomes important to investigate the basis for distinguishing them. Ysseldyke et al. (in press) examined the extent to which measures of cognitive ability, academic achievement, perceptual-motor skills, self-concept, and behavior problems discriminated between low achievers and school-identified LD children. Their results indicated considerable similarities between the two groups; an average of 96% of their scores were within a common range and the performance of the LD and low-achieving students on many of the subtests was identical. Based on individual psychometric measures, Ysseldyke et al. raised serious concerns regarding the differential classification of low-achieving students as either learning disabled or non-learning disabled.

Some school personnel have argued, however, that decisions actually are made on the basis of the <u>pattern</u> of scores that students obtain on several different psychometric instruments. It thus becomes important to ascertain the extent to which school recision makers can distinguish between the two groups when given patterns of scores on multiple measures.

The use of a number of scores to identify learning disabled students is, in fact, mandated by the U.S. Office of Education. The August 2^3 ,



1977 Federal Register specifically states that "no single procedure is used as the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program for a child" (p. 42497). To determine the existence of a specific learning disability, "a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability" (Federal Register, 1976, p. 65083) must be demonstrated. Both of these federal guidelines necessitate the use of more than one test in an evaluation of a student, a procedure which, in turn, requires an examination of a student's pattern of scores.

Although an ability-achievement discrepancy is a typical requirement for classification as learning disabled, by no means is there consensus that it is a useful concept. Salvia and Ysseldyke (1981) caution that before a student's difference scores can be interpreted, it must be established that the differences are reliable; differences in stardardization samples for the two tests also should be considered. In practice, these cautions frequently are ignored. In addition, a number of studies (Algozzine, Forgnone, Mercer, & Trifiletti, 1979; Algozzine, Ysseldyke, & Shinh, 1980; Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1979) argue that learning disabilities is largely a category of underachievement, thus suggesting that the degree of students' achievement deficits also should be considered whe determining eligibility for LD placement.

To investigate the extent to which judges could differentiate between non LD students and those who are learning disabled, Epps, McGue, and Ysseldyke (1981) presented 18 judges with an array of test information similar to that typically presented in placement team meetings and asked them to determine which of 99 students were LD and which were not. The judges were individuals who had previous experience in psychoeducational assessment



and/or placement team decision making, plus experience in research on learning disabilities. Epps et al. (1981) found that the judges were extremely inaccurate and rarely in agreement with each other. The judges also emphasized different factors in making their decisions. As Epps et al. noted, however, the judges were not working within the educational system and were not making day-to-day decisions about the classification of students. To overcome this limitation, the present study was designed so that actual decision makers in the field could attempt to use patterns in the data to differentiate LD and non-LD students. In addition, a comparison group of individuals unfamiliar with psychoeducational decision making was included to provide base-line accuracy information.

Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 65 school psychologists, 38 special education teachers (SLD or SLBP), and 21 university students in programs unrelated to education or psychology (the "naive" group). The school psychologists were randomly selected from the 1979 NASP Directory.

Since there is no comparable national directory for special education teachers, their participation was solicited in two ways. First, the names of 175 elementary schools were randomly selected from a directory of U.S. schools. The packet of materials was sent to the "LD Teacher" at each of these schools. Second, the name of one director of special education was randomly selected from each state and from the District of Columbia. Each director was sent two packets of materials and requested to give them to "any two SLD/SLBP teachers from [his/her]



district who would be willing to provide input for our LD/Non-LD classification study." Both the names of the elementary schools and the special education directors were obtained from the <u>School Universe</u>

<u>Daca Book, School Year 1976-1977.</u>

Altogether, a total of 306 forms was sent out to school psychologists; 277 were sent out to elementary schools or to special education directors for the special education teachers. For participating in the study, each subject had the opportunity to earn a cash prize of \$25, \$15, or \$10. The relatively low response rates for school psychologists and teachers (21.2% and 13.7%, respectively) seemed to be due in part to the difficulty in reaching the individuals (incorrect addresses, etc.) and to the time-consuming nature of the task.

The participation of the naive group was solicited from two undergraduate courses, one in mechanical engineering and one in business management. The main criterion for their inclusion in the study was that they were inexperienced in psychoeducational assessment; that is, they had not taken education courses nor any psychology classes beyond introductory psychology. For participation in the study, each subject earned \$5.

<u>Materials</u>

Forms containing the chronological age and sex of 18 fourth-graders and information on their actual test scores in five domains were prepared. These domains and the tests used were: (a) aptitude (WISC-R, Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability, (b) academic achievement (Woodcock-Johnson Tests of AChievement, PIAT, Stanford Achievement Test - math calculation and math concepts), (c) perceptual-motor



(Bender, VMI), (d) self-concept (Piers-Harris), and (e) behavior problems (Peterson-Quay). Across these five domains, test scores were provided on 41 variables.

Based upon the school_classification and low-achievement criteria, the 18 cases were selected from a larger study that compared the test performance of 50 school-identified LD students to that of 49 low-achieving students who had not been identified as learning disabled. Nine of the 18 cases were school-identified LD students and nine were low achievers from metropolitan Minneapolis and St. Paul schools. Only eight of the low achievers were included in the analysis. The LD/non-LD classification was not indicated on the judges' test score forms. The exact criteria for identification of students as LD by the schools were unknown. The low-achieving group had not been identified as LD by their school districts, but scored at or below the 25th percentile on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills which had been administered by the schools during the fall of the school year.

As a criterion for considering a student LD, the degree of students' achievement deficits was taken into account and contributed to the case selection procedure. The achievement deficits were operationalized in two ways using subjects' observed test scores in written expression, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, mathematics calculation, and mathematics reasoning. In one condition (1.0 SD), the student was considered LD by definition if the score earned on at least one of the criterion measures was between 1.0 and 1.5 standard deviations below the mean (standard scores of 78 to 85). In the



other condition (1.5 SD), the student was considered LD if the score earned was at least 1.5 standard deviations below the mean (standard scores of 77 or below). Tables were developed listing school-identified LD students and low achievers who met the criterion of LD or non-LD according to the low achievement definition. Cases were then randomly selected from the categories, resulting in the numbers presented in Table 1.

·Insert Table 1 about here

Along with the schools' classification and the two operationalizations of the low achievement definition, the federal definition of learning disabilities, taken from the December 29, 1977 Federal Register, was used to classify students as LD or non-LD. That definition lists . seven areas in which a child may be determined to have a specific learning disability: oral expression, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, mathematics calculation, mathematics reasoning, listening comprehension, and written expression. However, the federal definition does not specify the amount of discrepancy between ability and achievement that is required. In the present study, the federal definition was operationalized in two ways using subjects' observed aptitude-achievement test scores in the areas of intelligence and achievement. The following measures were used to ascertain discrepancy in the seven areas: (a) written expression (WISC-R Full - W-J Written Language Achievement), (b) basic reading skill (WISC-R Full - W-J Reading Achievement), (c) reading comprehension (WISC-R Full- PIAT Reading Comprehension), (d) mathematics calculation (MISC-R Full - Stanford Mathematics Calculation), and (e) mathematics reasoning (WISC-R

Concepts). In one condition (1.0 SD), the student was considered LD by definition if there was between a 1.0 and 1.5 standard deviation difference on at least one of the five aptitude-achievement discrepancy scores (difference scores of 15 to 22). In the other condition (1.5 SD), the student was considered LD if there was at least a 1.5 standard deviation difference on at least one of the five aptitude-achievement discrepancy scores (difference scores of 23 or more). Table 2 indicates the number of cases of school-identified LD students and low achievers who were classified as LD and non-LD based on the school's definition and the federal definition.

Insert Table 2 about here

Along with the "test scores" form, the packet of materials given to judges included a "tests administered" form that specified which tests were used in each of the five areas. A third sheet provided normative data on those measures that did not have a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15. These included the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test, the Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration, and the Peterson-Quay Behavior Problem Checklist. Also provided were a full group mean and standard deviation for the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, based upon the larger sample of 99 students. the Appendix for copies of all materia.s provided to judges.)

Procedure

Each judge received the packet of materials and a response form and then was instructed to examine the test scores for the 17 students and to indicate which he/she believed were learning disabled and which



were non-learning disabled. After a decision had been made regarding each child's classification, the judge indicated his/her degree of certainty on a four-point scale from very uncertain to very certain. Then each judge rated the extent to which different factors affected his/her decisions.

Results

Judges' Accuracy

Judges' accuracy in identifying the non-LD and school-identified learning disabled students is reported in Table 3. A comparison was made between judges' ratings and school classification, between judges' ratings and the classifications from each of the two levels of achievement deficit, and between judges' ratings and the classifications from each of the two federal definitions. The accuracy percentages were computed separately for LD and non-LD students within each of the five conditions and \underline{F} values were calculated. All three groups of j 'ges were in agreement with the schools' classifications only about half of the time and there was no significant difference between the teachers, the school psychologists, and the naive group in their overall agreement with the schools [F(2,121) = .44, p = .64].

When the 1.0 SD achievement deficit was considered, whereby a student was classified as LD if the score earned on at least one of the criterion measures was between 78 and 85, again there was no significant difference between the three groups in their overall accuracy [F(2,121) = .85, p = .43]. However, when the 1.5 achievement deficit was considered, whereby a student was classified as LD if the score earned on at least one of the criterion measures was 77 or below, there was a significant difference [F(2,121) = 18.29,



p < .000]. The naive group was more accurate in identifying those students who had scores of 77 or below (73.1%) than were either the teachers (54.7%) or the school psychologists (56.5%).

. Insert Table 3 about here

Although the naive group was more accurate in identifying those students who were classified as LD based upon the 1.5 SD low achievement definition, they were less accurate (26.3%) in identifying those students who had a moderate aptitude-achievement discrepancy (1.0 SD federal definition) then were either the teachers (43.7%) or the school psychologists (42.4%). The naive group was also less accurate (35.0%) in identifying those students who had a severe aptitude-achievement discrepancy (1.5 SD federal definition) than were either the teachers (53.6%) or the school psychologists (53.6%). However, the teachers and school psychologists were in agreement with the two operationalizations of the federal definition for only about half of the students.

Judges' Leniency

The second factor that was examined was leniency, which reflects the percentage of children classified as LD. By definition, a lenient judge classifies more students as LD than as non-LD. A non-lenient judge classifies fewer students as LD than as non-LD. As can be seen in Table 4, the overall leniency of the three groups did not differ significantly [F(2,121) = 1.2, p = .32]. In other words, teachers (39.1%), school psychologists (35.6%), and the naive group (32.5%) identified an approximately equal proportion of the students as LD. Overall, the three groups were less lenient in their classifications than



were the schools and identified fewer students as LD than the 50% which the schools had so identified.

Insert Table 4 about here

As can be seen in Table 4, students 1, 12, and 17 met the criteria for LD based upon the school definition and the two low achievement definitions. Yet, for student 1, only 26.3% of the teachers and 18.5% of the school psychologists identified him as LD. In contrast, 85.7% of the naive group did so. Despite the fact that 73.7% of the teachers and 81.5% of the school psychologists incorrectly classified the student, regardless of which definition was used as a criterion, as a group each was certain of its decision (average degree of uncertainty: 2.97 for teachers and 3.05 for school psychologists on a scale where 2 = uncertain and 3 = certain). For student 12, greater percentages of teachers (44.7%) and of chool psychologists (58.5%) dentified him as LD than for student 1. Still a significantly greater percentage of the naive group identified him as LD (90.5%).

Students 5, 6, 10, 14, and 17 met the criteria for LD based upon the school definition and the two federal definitions. For three of these four students (6, 10, and 14), significantly greater percentages of teachers and school psychologists identified them as LD than did the naive group. For student 5, however, there was no significant difference in the percentages of judges classifying him as LD,

There was only one student (student 17) who met the criteria for LD based upon all five conditions, namely, the school definition, the



two low achievement definitions, and the two federal definitions.

For student 17, a greater percentage of the naive group (81.0%) identified him as LD than did the teachers (63.2%) or school psychologists (64.6%), although this difference was not significant. Despite the fact that this student was classified as LD based upon all five definitions, a considerable percentage of teachers (36.8%) and school psychologists (35.4%) classified him as non-LD. In general, for all three students (1, 12, and 17) who met the criteria for definition as LD under the school and low achievement definitions, a greater percentage of the naive group identified the students as LD—than did the teachers or school psychologists. The reverse was true when the school and federal definitions were considered. For three of these four students (6, 10, and 14), greater percentages of the teachers and school psychologists identified the students as LD than did the naive group.

Table 4 also provides information on two students (8 and 13) who did not meet the criteria for the school definition or for the two low achievement definitions of LD. That is, the schools did not classify them as LD nor were any of their scores on standardized tests 85 or below. Yet, a fourth of the teachers (26.3%) and 13.8% of the school psychologists, along with 38.1% of the naive group, classified student 8 as LD. Similarly, a substantial number of teachers (18.4%) and school psychologists (12.3%), along with 14.3% of the naive group, also classified student 13 as LD. Another student (student 11) did not meet the criteria for the school definition or for the two federal definitions of LD. That is, the schools did not classify him as LD nor were any of

his ability-achievement discrépancy scores as great as 15 points.

Yet 34.2% of the teachers and 23.4% of the school psychologists, along with 66.7% of the naive group, classified student 11 as LD.

Intergroup Agreement

The third factor that was investigated was intergroup agreement, the extent to which judges of one group agreed with judges of another group in their ratings of the students. For each of the three experimental groups, teachers, school psychologists, and naive, the proportion of group members who classified each of the 17 cases as LD was determined. The 17 proportions represent the extent to which teachers for example, in general, identified each of the students as being learning disabled. In deriving the index, the point biserial correlation between each judge's ratings and the three group composites was then calculated as a measure of the extent to which each judge agreed with teachers, school psychologists, and naive.

Considering that the naive group had no training in psychoeducational decision making, we would expect them to be in low agreement with school personnel. As can be seen in Table 5, the naive group was in low agreement with both the teachers' composite group decisions (.04) and the school psychologists' composite group decisions (.08). For professionals trained in this decision-making process, we would expect to find high agreement. Teachers were found to agree as much with the school psychologists' composite (.50) as with their wm (.49). Similarly, school psychologists agreed as much with the teachers' composite (.47) as with their own (.53). Thus, high agreement was observed between the two professional groups.



Insert Table 5 about here

Factors Influencing Decisions

The fourth factor that was examined was the degree to which certain factors influenced judges' decisions. Each judge rated the effect that the factors had on her/his decisions. As can be seen in Table 6, there was a high degree of similarity in the ratings across the three groups. There were no significant differences between the three groups on the rated importance of intellectual measures, measures of academic achievement, perceptual-motor tests, adaptive behavior, personality test data, and behavioral recordings. Both teachers and school psychologists rated intellectual factors, academic achievement, and discrepancies between expected and actual achievement very highly (range of ratings: 4.2 to 4.4). In contrast, the child's sex and personality were rated as low in importance.

Insert Table 6 about here

In their ratings of the importance of various factors on their decisions, judges were likely to have been guided by their knowledge of the definitions for learning disabilities. Thus, their ratings might reflect more of what they believe were important factors than of what factors actually were important in their decision-making process. To examine the variables that the three groups of judges actually used to classify the students, mean difference scores were examined. For each group, the means of each of the 41 original test scores were calculated for students whom the judges in the group classified as LD and for students



whom they classified as non-LD. In addition, the means for five discrepancy scores (WISC-R Verbal - WISC-R Performance, W-J Reading Aptitude - W-J Reading Achievement, W-J Mathematics Aptitude - W-J Mathematics Achievement, W-J Written Language Aptitude - W-J Written Language Achievement, and WISC-R Full - PIAT Total) were calculated. The 46 absolute mean differences were determined and then rank ordered from largest to smallest. For example, for a group of judges, the variable ranked first would be that variable for which the students judged learning disabled were most different from the students judged non-learning disabled. Thus, that variable apparently played a major role in the differentiation of LD from non-LD for that group of judges, although not necessarily for each judge within that group. For each group of judges, the 11 highest-ranked variables are presented in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

As can be seen in Table 7, there is a considerable overlap in the variables for teachers and school psychologists. Of the 11 variables listed, 9 are common to both. In addition, there is overlap in the variables for the naive group as compared with the teachers and school psychologists. Of the 11 variables listed for this group, 4 of them are common to those of both the leachers and school psychologists and another 2 are common to those of the school psychologists. At the group level of analysis, average mean difference scores suggest that both teachers and school psychologists primarily examined achievement measures with less emphasis given to cognitive measures, aptitude-achievement discrepancy, and school-related aptitude measures. In



contrast, the naive group apparently gave greater consideration to individual subtests. Although the teachers gave a high rating to the degree to which intellectual measures influenced their decisions (rating of 4.3), the mean difference in IQ between the group of students they identified as non-LD versus those identified as LD was only 1/2 a point. Similarly, the school sychologists gave a high rating to intellectual measures (4.2), yet the mean difference in IQ between the two groups was only one point. However, for the naive group, who rated intellectual measures at 3.9, the mean difference in IQ between the two groups was 13.1 points with the non-LD group scoring higher.

Discussion

There is little doubt that the identification of students with learning disabilities is fraught with difficulties. Not only are there no meaningful psychometric differences between students identified by schools as learning disabled and those who are performing poorly in school and not identified as LD (Eno & Woehlke, 1980; Ysseldyke et al., in press), but judges experienced in psychoeducational assessment, although not working within the educational system, also were unable to identify accurately the LD students when presented with their patterns of scores on numerous devices (Epps et al., 1981). The results of the present study confirm the difficulty of differentially diagnosing students with learning disabilities, even when actual school decision makers are the judges, and suggest that having access to information from a battery of tests does not increase the decision maker's ability to discriminate between LD and non-LD students. Despite the fact that there was high intergroup agreement between teachers and school



psychologists and low intergroup agreement between the naive group and school personnel, all three groups still identified approximately the same number of students as LD. And despite the fact that the naive group was the only group having no specific training in psychoeducational decision making, they were significantly more accurate in identifying those students classified as LD using the 1.5 standard deviation low achievement definition. For the student who met the criteria for definition as LD under all five definitions, a greater percentage of the naive group identified him as LD than did either the teachers or school psychologists. In addition, although two of the students were classified as non-LD in four of the five conditions, a substantial number of both teachers and school psychologists classified them as LD.

The difficulty in discriminating the LD from the non-LD students is likely to have been influenced by a number of factors. First, test results were presented in standard scores with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15. Such a format may have been confusing for those teachers who are more accustomed to grade and age equivalents and for those school psychologists who are more accustomed to WISC-R scaled scores with a mean of 10 and standard deviation of 3. Second, some of the judges may have been unfamiliar with the tests and their school systems may have employed a different battery of tests. Third, a lack of consistent agreement among school personnel reflects, in part, the varying state guidelines for LD identification. Fourth, other types of information, beyond psychometric data, may contribute to LD identification and classification decisions. Indeed, it is desirable to have direct observational data on the student's behavior and actual classroom work and information from criterion-referenced tests. The format of this



study necessitated a test-centered approach to diagnosis which precluded consideration of qualitative information. Fifth, classification decisions are, in fact, not made by one person. Indeed, the August 23, 1977 Federal Register states that each public agency shall "insure that the placement decision is made by a group of persons" (p. 42497). And sixth, there are certain external constraints that frequently are considered in classification decisions (e.g., the availability of an LD program in the student's school).

Federal guidelines mandate the use of more than one test in an evaluation of a student and thus require an examination of a student's pattern of scores. Consequently, school decision makers must evaluate a multitude of empirical information as well as non-empirical criteria. They must decide what data are relevant and valid and then weigh the importance of various pieces of data and combine or organize them in some manner. This approach to evaluation using multiple sources of information is nonproblematic if we assume that individuals are capable of conducting such complex tasks. However, a number of studies have consistently demonstrated that we are far less capable of making complex judgments than we typically believe. For example, Oskamp (1965) demonstrated the low accuracy of judgments of trained psychologists when presented with a complex judgment task. As the psychologists gained further information about the case, they became increasingly confident in their decisions, although their average final accuracy never exceeded 28%. Indeed, increasing feelings of confidence as more information is gathered is not a sure sign of increasing accuracy in the decision.

Why we experience difficulty in making complex judgments, such



as identifying LD students, is uncertain. First, it may be in part due to the insufficient and inaccurate feedback that we often receive about our judgments. In other words, there is wide disagreement about what constitutes the category of learning disabilities and no specific external criterion with which we can check our decisions. Second, individuals frequently do not adhere to certain basic normative rules when forming judgments. For example, they may fail to consider the technical adequacy of various psychoeducational devices or the appropriateness of using various tests with certain populations. And third, poor judgments may be caused by "cognitive overload." In many cases, information becomes too complex for us to process optimally. In attempting to use simplifying judgment strategies, we are likely to ignore much information and often will integrate other information inaccurately. The human tendency to simplify complex tasks appears to be most commonly expressed by using new information to confirm an existing hypothesis rather than disregarding the new information (Jason, 1978). Thus, in the present study, the decision makers were likely to have evaluated the extensive array of data in terms of its contribution to their initial hypothesis of a student's classification.

When psychoeducational decisions are impaired by bias in assessment or failure to consider certain normative principles, training specifically aimed at remediating these problems may improve decision making. However, when decisions are impaired by cognitive overload, corrective training may provide little or no improvement.

Considerable time and expense are expended by school personnel to determine the classification of students referred for evaluation. This



process of evaluation typically involves the use of numerous psychoeducational devices which frequently requires the services of several
diagnostic personnel. Considering the extreme difficulty in integrating the multitude of empirical and non-empirical information,
and given the fact that there are no meaningful psychometric differences
between school identified LD students and low achievers .no are not
identified as LD, a change is necessary in current assessment practices.
Such a modification would desirably simplify the evaluation process so
that fewer tests are used. In addition, the placement of a student in
an educational setting might be determined more profitably by examining
his/her present repertoire of behaviors rather than by collecting a
multitude of test scores and then placing the student according to the
diagnostic label (Deno & Mirkin, 1977; Hallahan & Kauffman, 1977;
Neisworth & Greer, 1975).

Given current definitions of the category of "learning disabilities" and the extreme heterogeneity of the population of students considered learning disabled, there is little basis for the hope that school personnel are going to be able to diagnose LD students reliably. Indeed, the educational utility of the ca:egory of "learning disabilities" is suspect.



References

- Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C., & Trifiletti, J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives. <u>Learning Disability Quarterly</u>, 1979, 2, 25-31.
- Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Shinn, M. <u>Identifying children</u> with learning disabilities: When is a discrepancy severe?

 (Research Report No. 47). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1980.
- Bussell, C., Huls, B., & Long, L. Positive reinforcers for modification of auditory processing skills in LD and EMR children. <u>Journal of Learning Disabilities</u>, 1975, 8, 373-376.
- Deno, S. D., & Mirkin, P. K. <u>Data-based program modification: A manual</u>. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- Eno, L., & Woehlke, P. Diagnostic differences between educationally handicapped and learning disabled students. <u>Psychology in the Schools</u>, 1980, <u>17</u>, 469-473.
- Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Inter-judge agreement in classifying students as learning disabled</u> (Research Report No. 51). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1981.
- Federal Register. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 41(230), Monday, November 29, 1976, Part III.
- Federal Register. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 42(163), Tuesday, August 23, 1977, Part II.
- Federal Register. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 42(250), Thursday, December 29, 1977.
- Gajar, A. Educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed: Similarities and differences. Exceptional Children, 1979, 45, 470-472.
- Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. Labels, categories, behaviors: ED, LD, and EMR reconsidered. The Journal of Special Education, 1977, 11, 139-149.
- Jason, H. Foreward. In A. Elstein, L. Schulman, & S. Sprafka (Eds.), Medical problem solving. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Neisworth, J. T., & Greer, J. G. Functional similarities of learning disability and mild retardation. Exceptional Children, 1975, 42, 17-21.



- Oskamp, S. Overconfidence in case-study judgments. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Consulting Psychology</u>, 1965, <u>29</u>, 261-265.
- Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Assessment in special and remedial</u> education (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1981.
- School Universe Data Book, School Year 1976-1977. Denver: Curriculum Information Center, 1977.
- Wagonseller, B. R. Learning disabilities and emotional disturbances: Factors relating to differential diagnosis. <u>Exceptional Children</u>, 1973, 40, 205-206.
- Webster, R. R., & Schenck, S. J. Diagnostic test pattern differences among LD, ED, EMH, and multihandicapped students. <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, 1978, 72, 75-80.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled students. <u>Learning Disability Quarterly</u>, 1979, 2, 3-13.
- V.seldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M. R., & McGue, M. Similarities and differences between low achievers and students labeled learning disabled. The Journal of Special Education, in press.

Footnote

¹One of the low achievers was deleted from the study due to typographical errors that were detected in several subtest scores after materials had been mailed to teachers and school psychologists.



Table 1

Number of Students Within Categories of School and

Low Achievement Definitions of Learning Disabilities

Low Achieve	ement Definition a	School	Definition
		LD	Non-LD
Non-LD	(86 or above)	3	2
1.0 SD LD	(78 to 85)	3	3
1.5 SD LD	(77 or below)	3	3

Numbers in parentheses indicate the achievement deficit scores (in standard score units: \bar{X} = 100, SD = 15) required for each operationalization of the low achievement definition.



Table 2

Number of Students Within Categories of School

and Federal Definitions of Learning Disabilities

Federal Def	initiona	School School	Definition
		LD	Non-LD
Non-LD	(1-14)	1	1
1.0 SD LD	(15-22)	3	2
1.5 SD LD	(23 or more)	5	5

^aNumbers in parentheses indicate the ability-achievement discrepancy scores required for each operationalization of the federal definition.



Table 3

Judges' Accuracy in Identifying LD and Non-LD Students

According to Five Definitions

	Teachers	Sch. Psyc.	Naive	F(2,121)	p
School Definition					
% Correct LD	42.8	41.4	38.ì	. 39	.68
% Correct Non-LD	65.1	70.1	73.8	1.76	.18
% Overall Accuracy	53.3	55.2	54.9	. 44	.64
1.0 SD Achievement Defic	<u>:it</u>				
% Correct LD	45.6	43.2	38.5	1.08	. 34
% Correct Non-LD	76.7	82.5	81, 9	.93	. 40
% Overall Accuracy	54.7	54.8	51.3	. 85	.43
5 SD Achievement Defic	it				
% Correct LD	41.2	38.9	57.9	5.79	.004
% Correct Non-LD	62.1	66.1	81.4	7.68	.0007
% Overall Accuracy	54.7	56.5	73.1	18.29	.0000
1.0 SD Federal Definition	on_				
% Correct LD	40.3	37.6	26.7	4.39	.014
% Correct Non-LD	69.7	79.2	23.8	19.80	.000
% Overall Accuracy	43.7	42.4	26.3	10.43	.0001
1.5 SD Federal Definition	o <u>n</u>				
% Correct LD	43.8	40.8	22.4	8.57	.0003
% Correct Non-LD	67.7	71.8	53.1	8.24	.0004
% Overall Accuracy	53.6	53.6	35.0	24.85	.0000

Table 4

Percentages of Judges Classifying Student as LD (Leniency)

	Student Cla	ssification a					
	Low Ach	Federal	Teachers	Sch. Psyc.	Naive	$\chi^2(df=2)$	P
1	L-L-L	L-N-N	26.3	18.5	85.7	33.7	.0000
2	N-L-L	N-L-L	15.8	15.4	9.5	.5	.77
3	L-L-N	L-L-N	71.1	61.5	14.3	19.2	.0001
4	N-L-N	N-L-L	89.5	90.8	23.8	40.5	.0000
5	L-N-N	L-L-L	26.3	21.5	14.3	1.2	.56
6	L-L-N	LL-L	63.2	67.7	23.8	13.0	.002
7	N-L-L	N-L-L	63.2	52.3	14.3	13.5	.001
8	N-N-N	N-L-N	26.3	13.8	38.1	6.1	.05
9	N-L-N	N-L-L	21.1	7.7	23.8	5.2	.07
LO.	L-N-N	L-L-L	40.5	30.8	4.8	8.4	.01
.1	N-L-L	N-N-N	34.2	23.4	66.7	13.1	.001
.2	L-L-L	L-L-N	44.7	سى ر58	90.5	11.8	.003
.3	N-N-N	N-L-N	18.4	12.3	14.3	.7	.70
4	L-L-N	L-L-L	44.7	40.0	9.5	8.1	.02
. 5	N-L-N	N-L-L	10.5	17.2	19.0	1.1	.59
.6	L-N-N	L-L-N	5.3	9.2	19.0	3.0	.23
.7	L-L-L	L-L-L	63.2	64.6	81.0	2.3	.32
)ve i	all Lenienc	- _b	39.1	35.6	32.5		

The two columns indicate the classifications of each student (L=LD, N=Non-LD) according to three criteria. The "Low Ach" column lists the classifications of the student according to the school, the 1.0 SD low achievement definition, and the 1.5 SD low achievement definition. The "Federal" column lists the classifications of the student according to the school, the 1.0 SD federal definition, and the 1.5 SD federal definition.



 $b_{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$ (2,121) = 1.2, $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ = .32.

Table 5

Average Correlations of Agreement with Group Composite

	Co	mposite Grou	p Decis	ions	
	Teachers	Sch. Psyc.	Naive	F(2,121)	р
Teachers	.49	.50	.05	36.98	.0000
School Psychologists	.47	.53	.10	31.35	.0000
Nai v e	.04	.08	.62	31.76	.0000



Table 6

Judges' Ratings of the Degree to Which Factors

Influenced Their Decisions

	Mean	s and Ranges	of Ratin	gs ^a
Factor	Teachers			0veral1
Intellectual	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.2
	(3-5)	(1-5)	(3-5)	(1-5)
Academic Achievement	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.2
	(3-5)	(1-5)	(3-5)	(1-5)
Child's Sex ^b	1.9	1.9	1.2	1.8
	(1-5)	(1-4)	(1-2)	(1-5)
Perceptual-Motor	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.5
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)
Adaptive Behavior	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.1
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)
Expected-Actual Achievement Discrepancy	4.4	4.4	3.4	4.2
	(3-5)	(1-5)	(2-5)	(1-5)
Personality Data	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.9
	(1-4)	(1-4)	(2-5)	(1-5)
Behavioral Recordings	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.0
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)
Subtest Score Discrepancy b	4.1	3.6	3.0	3.6
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)

Ranges are the numbers in parentheses. Variables were rated on a scale where 1 = none, 2 = insignificant, 3 = moderate, 4 = significant, 5 = very significant.



bThese factors were rated differentially across groups of judges: Child's Sex [F(2,117) = 5.53, p < .01]; Expected - Actual Achievement Discrepancy [F(2,118) = 10.64, p < .0001]; Subtest Score Discrepancy [F(2,115) = 7.68, p < .001].

Table 7

Average Mean Differences Between Non-LD and LD Students for Each Group of Judges^a

Teachers	Avg. Mean Difference	School Psychologists	Avg. Mean Difference	Naive	Avg. Mean Difference
PIAT Mathematics	10.0	PIAT Mathematics	12.1	W-J Reading Aptitude	13.5
W-J Memory	6.6	W-J Mathematics Achievement	8.5	W-J Verbal Ability	13.2
W-J Mathematics Achievement	6.5	W-J Verbal Ability	7.8	WISC-R Full	13.1
PIAT Total	6.0	W-J Memory	7.7	WISC-R Performance	12.9
WISC-R Full - PIAT Total	5.5	PIAT Total	7.5	WISC-R Vocabulary	12.9
WISC-R Verbal - WISC-R Performanc	e 5.4	W-J Knowledge Aptitude	7.4	W-J Knowledge Aptitude	12.0
W-J Verbal Ability	5.2	W-J Written Language Aptitude	7.4	PIAT Total	12.0
PIAT Information	5.2	PIAT Passage Comprehension	7.3	WISC-R Information	11.8
W-J Writ. Lang. Aptitude - W-J Writ. Lang. Achievement	5.1	W-J Writ. Lang. Aptitude - W-J Writ. Lang. Achievement	7.1	WISC-R Picture Completion	11.6
PIAT Passage Comprehension	5.1	PIAT Information	7.1	PIAT Information	11.5
W-J Written Language Aptitude	5.1	W-J Reading Aptitude	7.0	PIAT Passage Comprehension	11.2

^aThe table presents the first 11 variables for the three groups of judges, starting with the one of greatest average mean difference.



APPENDIX



TEST SCORES

			li .					,	/1 3 C -	R								Vood	cock-J	lobne	34 Co l	nitiv	•				ck-Joh tvenes				P1/	LT.		,	Stani Achter	ord Name		optual Cor	Self Coacept		ekavle Petera			,
Sobject #	Į.	78.	Tell Scale		Performance	Information	Stailerities	Arithmetie	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Pic Completion	Pic Aireage	Block Design	Obj Assembly	Coding	Front Cog	Landing Apr	Mach Apt	Enovledge Apt	Heite Lang Apt	Verbel Abil	Parcey Speed	Nemoty	Leascoing	Kath	Reading	Vrit Language	Resic Skills	Kath	Reading Locol	Pass Comprehes	Spelling	laformation	Total Test	Nath Cale	Math Concepts	Jepage	204	Plare- Rerris	losé-loss	Soc Delis	Cond Prob	Pare Prob	
1	н	10-9		2 4	5 8	2 9:	3 90	- 50	75	90	90	90	95	+0	80	36	56	106	86	92	79	75	19	94	25	72	75	74	100	77	88	74	87	\$2	81	"	2	14	40	3	0	,	2	-
2	,	9-9	167	7 10	2 11:	t 100	> 93	90	115	110	110	125	95	113	100	73	100	54	100	100	98	107	93	87	92	92	92	87	**	94	*	93	101	97	u	"	2	14	52	•	0	o	,	
3	×	10-1	101	, ,	\$ 120) 0 :	100	93	110	103	110	135	115	115	95	92	34	58	44	85	95	95	82	*3	"	87	94	82	91	94	101	92	102	97	93	97	3	16	57	1	1	•	2	
4	,	9-9	111	, ,	5 12	100	120	75	93	90	125	125	125	120	#5	,,	98	94	78	78	78	87	80	78	83	163	112	*3	72	104	**	97	93	91	**	41	4	14	43	4	0	0	7	
3	Ħ	10-1	104	10)	109	100	90	116	110	105	110	105	1.0	113	95	94	90	87	87	112	- 54	42	102	75	49	82	87	114	99	101	Ħ	"	97	91	93	4	10	67	,	0	4	5	
4	,	2-4	119	11	1 11	100	120	90	125	140	115	120	100	115	103	*3	90	103	8 1	86	87	108	8 1	116	74	82	85	44	100	11	95	90	*	92	44	"	6	20	30		0	4	,	
7	×	10-2	109	, ,	8 1 2	1 10:	s 10	93	100	103	110	120	100	140	105	100	106	98	95	94	111	76	108	114	102	*3	92	95	112	90	94	90	116	"	%	91	3	15	67	0	0	0	1	
£	×	10-1	103	10	6 10:	110	85	95	120	115	110	110	90	103	105	98	88	100	104	92	116	%	16	8 2	**	85	83	44	113	47	93	81	114	94	105	77	3	16	65	0	٥	٥	2	
•	H	10-1	106	10	\$ 104	105	120	100	100	110	105	110	120	100	5 0	109	116	> €	119	119	115	87	125	103	119	101	и	**	, 119	95	103	44	110	105	14	109	0	17	21	10	0	5	,	



38.

	, ,	,	!1					#1	isc -	R					1	ı	1	łoodc s	ĸk-Ja	da sos	Cogs	ltlve	1		1		ck-Jo evene		,		? L	AŦ			Stan Achie	ford vocent		epterl Her	Soli Concep			Sac Ln pa-Qua		
Subject #	Sex	2	Pull Scale	Verhel	relterames	Laformatios	Similerities	Artthmet Se	Yocabulary	Comprehension	Pic Completion	Pic Arrange	Slock Design	On Assembly	Coding	Broad Cog	Le ading Apt	Yath Apt	Inculedge Apt	Vrite Lang Apt	Verbal Abil	Perces Speed	Housesy	Receoulng	Kath	Lasding	Writ Leaguage	Banic Skills	MD	Leading Lacoz	Pass Comprobes	Spelling	Informacion	Total Test	Nath Cale	fath Concepts	beader	De.	Merro- terris	Sed-Zeo	loc Dalits	dorf bas	der Pres	
10	×	9-7	115	119	106	100	135	105	110	130	100	105	115	115	99	106	111	110	106	103	122	111	91	91	16)	102	103	105	115	105	314	115	115	111)	81	**	0	18	48	15	2	1	1	<u> </u>
11	н	10-1	110	105	115	105	115	100	100	160	110	105	125	110	103	10)	114	102	10)	95	106	27	*)	106	105	17	82	86	94	95	\$7	79.	110	95	104	97	0	16	63	2	0	1	4	
12	Я	10-0	**	81	9)	75	80	10	90	90	×	120	80	90	190	\$0	69	78	74	87	87	108	24	67	79	82	79	8 2	*	92	101	87	Ħ	92	79	12	2	13	39	1	0	6	•	
1)	н	10-9	•1 -	80	#5	75	90	75	80	100	95	90	85	100	75	69	65	65	65	65	"	63	78	91	65	65	65	45	43	12	65	69	9)	"	79	73		•	73	6	0	18	4	
14	×	9-1 0	105	105	105	100	105	90	115	110	105	100	110	100	185	100	102	105	19)	104	117	92	114	8 2	97	**	83	"	128	96	110	90	121	164	91	104	3	14	54	2	0		0	
15	и	10-8	107	106	103	110	105	100	103	115	90	100	95	115	120	96	94	100	85	82	90	102	71	135	79	"	92	3 2	89	105	%	93	113	16	54	109	3	19	71	•	•	2	0	
16	×	10-4	112	107	111	105	100	100	115	110	100	103	110	125	115	91	91	85	67	91	**	*)	91	95	100	119	97	10)	115	117	10)	110	103	112	6)	93	2	15	51	0	0	s	0	
17	×	%-11	116	115	112	115	125	105	135	115	120	115	120	1',0	9 0	116	114	110	110	104	112	89	114	135	19)	102	204	**	107	106	111	92	11)	107	94	95	1	20	72	14	2	18	25	
16	×	9-10	89	91	91	75	90	80	100	115	15	90	100	100	.02	8 1	12	77	45	74	74	102	102	96	49	"	n	72	72	75	65	69	65	6.5	1.	75	4	16	3.8	•	4	" 4	10 1	

Tests Administered

All measures have a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15 unless otherwise indicated.

APTITUDE MEASURES

WISC-R

Full Scale
Verbal Scale
Performance Scale
Information
Similarities

Arithmetic Vocabulary

Comprehension
Picture Completion
Picture Arrangement

Block Design Object Assembly

Coding

Woodcock-Johnson Cognitive

Broad Cognitive Reading Aptitude Math Aptitude Knowledge Aptitude

Written Language & Aptitude

Verbal Ability Perceptual Speed

Memory Reasoning

ACHIEVEMENT MEASURES

Woodcock-Johnson Achievement

Math Reading Written Language Basic Skills

Peabody Individual Achievement (PIAT)

Math
Reading Recognition
Passage Comprehension

Spelling Information Total Test

Stanford Achievement

Math Calculation

Math Concepts

PERCEPTUAL MOTOR (Use norms provided)

Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test

Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (VMI)

SELF-CONCEPT (Use norms provided)

Piers-Harris

BEHAVIOR RATINGS (Use norms provided)

Peterson-Quay

Inadequacy-Immaturity
Socialized Delinquency

Conduct Problem
Personality Problem



A. BENDER: Normative Data

Age Group	Я	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Plus/Minus S.D.
		13.6	3.61	10.0 to 17.2
5-0 to 5-5	81			
5-6 to 5-11	128	9.8	3.72	6.1 to 13.5
6-0 to 6-5	155	8.4	4.12	4.3 to 12.5
6-6 to 6-11	180	6.4	3.76	2.6 to 10.2
7-0 to 7-5	156	4.8	3.61	1.2 to 8.4
7-6 to 7-11	110	4.7	3.34	1.4 to 8.0
8-0 to 8-5	62	3.7	3.60	.1 to 7.3
8-6 to 8-11	60	2.5	3.03	.0 to 5.5
9-0 to 9-5	65	1.7	1.76	.0 to 3.5
9-6 to 9-11	49	1.6	1.69	.0 to 3.3
10-0 to 10-5	27	1.6	1.67	.0 to 3.3
10-6 to 10-11	31	1.5	2.10	.0 to 3.6

B. DEVELOPMENTAL TEST OF VISUAL MOTOR INTEGRATION (VMI): Normative Data

	Age Eq	uivalents		Age Eq	uivalents
Score	Male	Female	Score	Male	Female_
1	2-10	2-10	13	6-10	6-7
2	3-0	· 3~0	14	7-4	7-2
3 .	3-2	3-2	15	7-10	7-11
4	4-1	3-10	16	8-7	8-8
Ś	4-4	4-1	17	9-4	9–6
6	4-6	4-4	1 18	10~2	10-3
7	4-9	4-8	[†] 19	10-11	11-1
8	5-0	4-11	20	11-9	12-0
9	5-3	5-3	21	12-8	13-0
10	5-7	5-6	22	13-9	13-11
11	6-0	5-10	23	14-10	14-10
12	6-5	6-2	24	15-11	15-9

C. PIERS-HARRIS SELF-CONCEPT

There are a total of 80 items. The higher the score, the higher the self-concept. Institute Sample for LD and Non-LD (N = 99) \overline{X} = 52.14, SD = 14.43

D. PETERSON-QUAY BEHAVIOR PROBLEM CHECKLIST: Means and Standard Deviations of Various Samples

VELIOUS CHMPICS		Cond	uct	Perso	nality	Immat	urity		lized quency
	N	$\bar{\mathbf{x}}$	SD	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	SD	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	SD	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	SD
Public School (rated by teachers):									
K males	336 342	4.52 3.73	4.93 4.44	3.66 3.68	3.56 3.19	1.63 1.67	1.87 1.81	0.34 0.27	0.97 0.74
K females	206 281	2.33	3.76 3.09	3.96 3.37	3.60 3.00	1.16	1.65	0.17	0.62
1st males	309 279	4.05 4.24	4.36 4.96	2.80 3.47	3.11 3.5.	1.50 1.62	1.69	0.23 0.43	0.66 1.15
1st females	257 276	1.72 2.18	2.96 3.34	2.62 3.20	2.84 2.91	0.84 1.21	0.13 1.71	0.11 0.20	0.38 0.62
2nd wales	294 273 297	4.20 4.12 1.95	4.64 4.76 3.30	3.01 2.89 2.71 3.30	3.09 3.19 3.16 3.26	1.76 1.61 1.09 1.02	1.88 1.79 1.62 1.54	0.34 0.48 0.19 0.21	0.88 1.07 0.58 0.71
6th male 6th female	276 62 41	2.00 2.93 1.44	3.33 3.66 2.45	2.77 2.76	3.13 3.30	1.35 1.02	1.99		

ID	Ø			

Response Form

After examining the test scores for each child, indicate your decision of LD or non-LD. Then indicate how certain you are of your decision. Please use the back of this page to record any comments you have concerning the sorting task you have completed.

Subject Number	LD	Non-LD	Ve ry <u>Certain</u>	Certain	Uncertain	Very Uncertain
1						
2						
3			Supply of STOR			
4			***************************************			
5			-			
6 !						
7 .						
8						
9						
10	******					
11						
12						
13						-
14	~					-
15						
16			*****			
17		-	*****			-
18		*	-			

Please rate the extent to which each of the factors listed below affected your decisions. Use the following numbers to indicate the <u>effect</u> of each factor.

1 = None 2 = Insignificant 3 = Moderate 4 = Significant 5 = Very Significant

Scores on intellectual measures
Scores on measures of academic achievement
The child's sex
Scores on perceptual-motor tests
Adaptive behavior
Discrepancies between expected and actual achievement
Personality test data
Rehavioral recordings
Subtest score discrepancies
Other (please describe)



PUBLICATIONS

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities University of Minnesota

The Institute is not funded for the distribution of its publications. Publications may be obtained for \$3.00 per document, a fee designed to cover printing and postage costs. Only checks and money orders payable to the University of Minnesota can be accepted. All orders must be prepaid.

Requests should be directed to: Editor, IRLD, 350 Elliott Hall; 75 East River Road, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

- Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessing the learning disabled youngster: The state of the art (Research Report No. 1). November, 1977.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Regan, R. R. <u>Nondiscriminatory assessment and decision making</u> (Monograph No. 7). February, 1979.
- Foster, G., Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. Susceptibility to stereotypic bias (Research Report No. 3). March, 1979.
- Algozzine, B. An analysis of the disturbingness and acceptability of behaviors as a function of diagnostic label (Research Report No. 4). March, 1979.
- Algozzine, B., & McGraw, K. <u>Diagnostic testing in mathematics: An extension of the PIAT?</u> (Research Report No. 5). March, 1979.
- Deno, S. L. A direct observation approach to measuring classroom behavior: Procedures and application (Research Report No. 6). April, 1979.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Mirkin, P. K. <u>Proceedings of the Minnesota round-table conference on assessment of learning disabled children</u>
 (Monograph No. 8). April, 1979.
- Somwaru, J. P. A new approach to the assessment of learning disabilities (Monograph No. 9). April, 1979.
- Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C. D., & Trifiletti, J. J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives (Research Report No. 7). June, 1979.
- Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A validation report (Research Report No. 8). June, 1979.



Note: Monographs No. 1 - 6 and Research Report No. 2 are not available for distribution. These documents were part of the Institute's 1979-1980 continuation proposal, and/or are out of print.

- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & Potter, M. <u>Technical</u> adequacy of tests used by professionals in simulated decision making (Research Report No. 9). July, 1979.
- Jenkins, J. R., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Measuring pupil progress toward the least restrictive environment (Monograph No. 10).

 August, 1979.
- Mirkin, P. K., & Deno, S. L. <u>Formative evaluation in the classroom: An approach to improving instruction</u> (Research Report No. 10). August, 1979.
- Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Current assessment and decision-making</u> practices in model programs for the learning disabled (Research Report No. 11). August, 1979.
- Deno, S. L., Chiang. B., Tindal, G., & Blackburn, M. Experimental analysis of program components: An approach to research in CSDC's (Research Report No. 12). August, 1979.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M., & McGue, M. <u>Similarities and differences between underachievers and students labeled learning disabled: Identical twins with different mothers</u> (Research Report No. 13). September, 1979.
- Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, R. <u>Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled students</u> (Monograph No. 11). October, 1979.
- Poland, S. F., Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Mirkin, P. K. <u>Current</u> assessment and decision-making practices in school settings as reported by directors of special education (Research Report No. 14). November, 1979.
- McGue, M., Shinn, M., & Ysseldyke, J. <u>Validity of the Woodcock-Johnson</u> psycho-educational battery with learning disab' 1 students (Research Report No. 15). November, 1979.
- Deno, S., Mirkin, P., & Shinn, M. <u>Behavioral perspectives on the assessment of learning disabled children</u> (Monograph No. 12). November, 1979.
- Sutherland, J. H., Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Young, S. What can I say after I say LD? (Research Report No. 16). December, 1979.
- Deno, S. I.., & Mirkin, P. K. Data-based IEP development: An approach to substantive compliance (Monograph No. 13). December, 1979.
- Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & McGue, M. The influence of test scores and naturally-occurring pupil characteristics on psychoeducational decision making with children (Research Report No. 17).

 December, 1979.
- Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Decision makers' prediction of students' academic difficulties as a function of referral information</u> (Research Report No. 18). December, 1979.



- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. <u>Diagnostic classification decisions</u>
 <u>as a function of referral information</u> (Research Report No. 19).

 January, 1980.
- Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Chiang, B., & Lowry, L. <u>Relationships</u>
 among simple measures of reading and performance on standardized
 achievement tests (Research Report No. 20). January, 1980.
- Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Lowry, L., & Kuehnle, K. <u>Relationships</u> among simple measures of spelling and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 21). January, 1980.
- Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Marston, D. <u>Relationships among simple</u> measures of written expression and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 22). January, 1980.
- Mirkin, P. K., Deno, S. L., Tindal, G., & Kuehnle, K. <u>Formative evaluation</u>: Continued development of data utilization systems (Research Report No. 23). January, 1980.
- Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Robinson, S., & Evans, P. <u>Relationships</u> among classroom observations of social adjustment and sociometric rating scales (Research Report No. 24). January, 1980.
- Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Factors influential on the psycho-educational decisions reached by teams of educators</u> (Research Report No. 25). February, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. <u>Diagnostic decision making in individuals susceptible to biasing information presented in the referral case folder</u> (Research Report No. 26). March, 1980.
- Thurlow, M. L., & Greener, J. W. <u>Preliminary evidence on information considered useful in instructional planning</u> (Research Report No. 27). March, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Regan, R. R., & Schwartz, S. Z. The use of rechnically adequate tests in psychoeducational decision making (Research Report No. 28). April, 1980.
- Richey, L., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. <u>Teachers' expectations for the siblings of learning disabled and non-learning disabled students:</u>
 A pilot study (Research Report No. 29). May, 1980.
- Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Instructional planning: Information collected by school psychologists vs. information considered useful by teachers</u> (Research Report No. 30). June, 1980.
- Algozzine, B., Webber, J., Campbell, M., Moore, S., & Gilliam, J.

 Classroom decision making as a function of diagnostic labels and perceived competence (Research Report No. 31). June, 1980.



- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., Richey, L., & Thurlow, M. L. <u>Psychoeducational assessment and decision making:</u>
 A computer-simulated investigation (Research Report No. 32).
 July, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., & Richey, L.

 <u>Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Individual case</u>

 studies (Research Report No. 33). July, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., Potter, M., & Richey, L.

 <u>Technical supplement for computer-simulated investigations of the psychoeducational assessment and decision-making process</u> (Research Report No. 34). July, 1980.
- Algozzine, B., Stevens, L., Costello, C., Beattie, J., & Schmid, R.

 <u>Classroom perspectives of LD and other special education teachers</u>
 (Research Report No. 35). July, 1980.
- Algozzine, B., Siders, J., Siders, J., & Beattie, J. <u>Using assessment information to plan reading instructional programs: Error analysis and word attack skills (Monograph No. 14).</u> July, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J., Shinn, M., & Epps, S. A comparison of the WISC-R and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of C raitive Ability (Research Report No. 36). July, 1980.
- Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. An analysis of difference score reliabilities on three measures with a sample of low achieving youngsters (Research Report No. 37). August, 1980.
- Shinn, M., Algozzine, B., Marston, D., & Ysseldyke, J. A theoretical analysis of the performance of learning disabled students on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 38).

 August, 1980.
- Richey, L. S., Ysseldyke, J., Porter, M., Regan, R. R., & Greener, J.

 <u>Teachers' attitudes and expectations for siblings of learning disabled children</u> (Research Report No. 39). August, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). A naturalistic investigation of special education team meetings (Research Report No. 40). August, 1980.
- Meyers, B., Meyers, J., & Deno, S. <u>Formative evaluation and teacher decision making: A follow-up investigation</u> (Research Report No. 41). September, 1980.
- Fuchs, D., Garwick, D. R., Featherstone, N., & Fuchs, L. S. On the determinants and prediction of handicapped children's differential test performance with familiar and unfamiliar examiners (Research Report No. 42). September, 1980.

- Algozzine, B., & Stoller, L. <u>Effects of labels and competence on teachers' attributions for a student</u> (Research Report No. 43). September, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). The special education assessment and decision-making process: Seven case studies (Research Report No. 44). September, 1980.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Fotter, M., & Regan, A. A descriptive study of students enrolled in a program for the severely learning disabled (Research Report No. 45). September, 1980.
- Marston, D. Analysis of subtest scatter on the tests of cognitive ability from the Woodcock-Johnson Psycno-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 46). October, 1980.
- Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Shinn, M. <u>Identifying children with</u> <u>learning disabilities: When is a discrepancy severe?</u> (Research Report No. 47). November, 1980.
- Fuchs, L., Tindal, J., & Deno, S. <u>Effects of varying item domain</u> sample duration on technical characteristics of daily measure. in reading (Research Report No. 48). January, 1981.
- Marston, D., Lowry, L., Deno, S., & Mirkin, P. <u>An analysis of learning</u> trends in simple measures of reading, spelling, and written ε pression: Δ longitudinal study (Research Report No. 49). January, 1981.
- Marston, D. The reliability of formative measures of written expression (Research Report No. 50). January, 1981.
- Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E. <u>Inter-judge agreement in classifying students as learning disabled</u> (Research Report No. 51). Februsry, 1981.
- Epps, S., Ysseldyke, J. E., & McGue, M. <u>Differentiating LD and non-LD students: "I know one when I see one"</u> (Research Report No. 52). March, 1981.
- Evans, P. R., & Peham, M. A. S. Testing and measurement in occupational therapy: A review of current practice with special emphasis on the Southern California Sensory Integration Tests (Monograph No. 15).

 April, 1981.