

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Learning Disabilities (LD) represent a heterogeneous group of disorders affecting various cognitive abilities, including listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, and math. It's a neurological condition impacting information processing, often termed a hidden disability due to its unseen nature. Studies suggest that in India, every classroom has about five children with learning disabilities. Despite this, LD often goes unrecognised due to a lack of awareness of identification. Teachers play a pivotal role in early identification, yet studies reveal gaps in the knowledge and training of teachers. While standardised screening tools exist, they are often not suitable or used by primary school teachers. The development of an assessment tool tailored for primary school teachers in regular classroom settings is imperative for early intervention and support. Such initiatives can prevent academic struggles, school dropouts, and societal exclusion among children with LD, emphasising the critical need for teacher empowerment and awareness campaigns. With this backdrop, the current research study was carried out with the primary objective of developing an assessment scale for PRTs to identify children with LD, also with secondary objectives to assess the KAP of the PRTs on LD, to study the socio-demographic determinants on KAP of the primary school teachers on learning disability, to conduct a Sensitisation Programme for PRTs on LD, and to examine the effects of sensitisation programme on Knowledge Attitude, Practice (KAP) on learning disability. Subsequently, the hypothesis was formulated after an extensive literature review. The assumptions were that the developed assessment scale would have sufficient validity and reliability scores in the range of good model fit as per factor analysis (Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis). The KAP of teachers with learning disability will not interact significantly. Socio-demographic markers will not have any influence on the KAP. The sensitisation programme will not have a significant effect on the KAP of teachers.

To achieve the research objectives and observe the assumptions, a cross-sectional research design was employed, utilising purposive sampling to select primary school teachers from schools within the Coimbatore jurisdiction of Tamil Nadu, India. The study focused on educators from mainstream classrooms, encompassing both government and private schools instructing students from grades 1 to 5. A list of primary schools in the Coimbatore district

was obtained from the District Education Office to facilitate the selection process. Inclusive criteria comprised both male and female teachers from government and private schools, while exclusion criteria included teachers from special schools, tuition providers and those with disabilities. The sample was drawn from five zones across Coimbatore, namely the north, south, east, west, and central zones as well as rural areas of Coimbatore jurisdiction. Initially, 650 primary school teachers were approached, of which 562 consented to participate. Ultimately, data from 514 teachers were considered for analysis, based on the clarity and completeness of the collected scales. The Institute Human Ethics clearance was obtained.

The development of study tools progressed through a comprehensive review of existing literature was conducted, alongside theoretical orientation sessions followed by the actual construction of the tools, which included several key steps. An assessment scale tailored for PRTs to identify LD was formulated. For the development of the assessment scale, an extensive literature review was conducted, delving into textbooks, journals, and various search engines. This review meticulously sifted through text materials and research about learning disabilities, covering aspects such as definitions, characteristics, symptoms, causes, and types. Relevant full-text sources were carefully selected and scrutinised to extract pertinent statements. These statements were then systematically organised and categorised into domains to align with the subsets of the assessment scale. Additionally, a Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices (KAP) scale focusing on teachers' understanding and approach towards learning disabilities was constructed.

The assessment scale initially had a total of 104 items generated from this wealth of relevant material, ensuring comprehensive coverage of statements related to all types of LDs. These items were integrated into a 5-point Likert scale designed to aid in the identification of SLD. The statements in the scale were based on the frequency of indications and signs exhibited by children, with a higher frequency indicating a more severe learning disability. The scoring system was intentionally designed to be straightforward for teachers to calculate, devoid of negative questions, to facilitate ease of use in practical classroom settings. The primary objective of this scale was to streamline the identification process of LD for PRTs.

Following the item generation phase, the developed scale underwent rigorous validation procedures, including face validity and content validity assessments by a panel of nine experts. This panel comprised three developmental paediatricians, one neurologist, one

professor from the Department of Special Education, two professors from the Department of Human Development, one clinical psychologist, and one special educator. Incorporating the suggestions and opinions of these experts, the assessment scale was refined, resulting in a total of 96 items. The Teacher's Knowledge Scale on LD, the Attitude Scale for primary school teachers towards Learning Disability, and the Checklist on Teaching Practices of primary school teachers, also underwent rigorous assessments for both face and content validity. Suggestions and opinions from experts were integrated into the KAP Scale. Specifically, the Knowledge Scale comprised 57 items, the Attitude Scale consisted of 35 items and the Practices checklist contained 24 items. Subsequently, the tool was deployed in a pilot study involving 133 samples. The data collected from the pilot study underwent thorough analysis, including the application of Cronbach's Alpha test for tool validation. The results of Cronbach's alpha analysis provided conclusive evidence of the reliability and robustness of the developed scale, affirming its utility and efficacy in identifying LD among primary school children.

CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

Data collection was crucial for obtaining information from participants. Active participation was seen from 564 teachers. Responses from 514 teachers were suitable for analysis. During data collection, the assessment scale for identifying learning disabilities was administered with clear instructions. Similarly, the KAP scale and socio-demographic questionnaire were administered with detailed instructions for congruent responses from teachers. The data was scored and consolidated according to developed scoring norms to evaluate KAP levels. Higher scores corresponded to higher levels of knowledge, favourable attitudes, and good/satisfactory teaching practices. KAP levels were categorised based on the average sum of scores. This data of 514 teachers underwent validity and reliability testing procedures to standardise the scale.

SENSITISATION PROGRAMME

The Sensitisation Programme was carefully structured to enhance teachers' knowledge about learning disabilities, ensuring they are informative, engaging, and highlighting the vital importance of sensitisation in this study. By focusing on expanding their understanding of how learning disabilities manifest in the classroom, the programme aimed to equip teachers with the necessary skills and awareness to identify and support children effectively. Sensitisation was crucial to ensure that teachers grasped the significance of their role and

recognised how their teaching practices could directly influence the educational experiences and outcomes of children with LD.

The sensitisation programme was instrumental in familiarising teachers with crucial aspects such as identification techniques, assessment scales, and inclusive teaching strategies. Through structured sessions, participants were immersed in a carefully planned curriculum, designed to optimise learning outcomes.

The content development process adhered to instructional design principles, outlining learning disabilities, highlighting common signs, and emphasising inclusive teaching strategies. Materials were tailored to meet teachers' needs, utilising clear language, visuals, and interactive elements. The overarching goal was to equip educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to effectively identify and support students with learning disabilities in the classroom.

The Sensitisation Programme was grounded in Gagne's instructional design based on Gagne's Conditions of Learning Theory, providing a robust theoretical framework for its design. Following this model, content was structured into 12 one-hour sessions conducted over six weeks, with two sessions held weekly. A total of 53 teachers willingly participated in the programme, with data collected at three intervals: before, 7 days after, and 30 days follow-up test of the sensitisation programme was done to find the effectiveness.

DATA ANALYSIS

The standardisation procedures encompassed various validity and reliability tests, including content validity, principal component analysis, exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis (structural equation modelling), and reliability tests such as Cronbach's alpha, test-retest, inter-rater reliability, and sensitivity and specificity tests. Data collected on teachers' Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices (KAP), along with socio-demographic markers, underwent descriptive analysis to compute frequencies and percentages. Statistical analysis was conducted to fulfil research objectives, such as the Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis test, and post-hoc tests to assess associations and influences between variables. The Friedman Test was utilised to examine data before, after, and during the follow-up of the sensitisation programme, evaluating sample responses over time. Pairwise comparisons before and after the sensitisation programme and during follow-up were analysed using the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test to assess the program's impact.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the present study are highlighted below.

A. Standardisation of the assessment scale

The tool standardisation process included validity and reliability tests. At first, the developed assessment tool was subjected to face validity and content validity in which 104 items were reduced to 96 items with rewording and removal of the statements that were found to be not relevant by the subject experts. The tool consisted of 7 domains of LD. Further, factor analysis was done. In factor analysis, both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted to get a good fit of the scale. The obtained results are as follows.

- KMO Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .959 indicated adequate sampling.
- Bartlett's Test of Sphericity sig at 1% level
- Exploratory Factor Analysis using PCA – Factors loadings and communalities are as follows, factor loading of more than .4 was taken which resulted in 48 items out of 96 items and was grouped into 7 components which were considered to be the final scale.
- The Rotated Component Matrix displayed the loadings for each item on each rotated component, again clearly showing which items make up each component – according to which components were interpreted and named as follows:
 - Component 1 - Perceptual ability,
 - Component 2 - Executing Reading and writing
 - Component 3 - Thought process in Reading and writing
 - Component 4 – Cognitive functioning
 - Component 5 - Mathematical ability
 - Component 6 – Classroom behaviour
 - Component 7- Motor skills

Further, the total variance was explained with Eigenvalues over 1 for all the 7 components, the cumulative percentage of 65.58% was obtained which indicated an acceptable range of the tool in the standardisation process. The factor correlation of the Component Transformation Matrix displayed the correlations of value less than 0.8. which indicated the correlation between the components was not highly significant again indicating a good validation value.

Coming to the confirmatory factor analysis which was done using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) indicated a good model fit scale with the factor loading above .7 for almost all the items and the values of CFI= 0.90, GFI=.806, PCFI= 0.813, RMSEA= .062, all being in the acceptable range.

With tests of reliability, Cronbach's Alpha test showed the overall reliability of the scale to be in excellent range with a value of 0.972. The component-wise reliability of the standardised scale is as follows where all values indicated acceptable, good and excellent reliability level.

• Perceptual ability	0.935
• Executing Reading and writing	0.928
• Thought process in Reading and writing	0.908
• Cognitive functioning	0.878
• Mathematical ability	0.908
• Classroom behaviour	0.797
• Motor skills	0.803

Test-retest reliability showed that the Pearson correlation was 0.703 with .000 significance indicating a good reliability level. Inter-rater reliability (IRR) was found to be 73.3%, signifying a strong agreement level. Sensitivity and Specificity were also in the excellent reliability level with the scores being 91.3%, for sensitivity and 96.83% for specificity. The Kappa coefficient of agreement was obtained at 0.862, representing almost perfect agreement and it was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

B. Development of norms of the standardised assessment scale and administration

The norms development process involves calculating Z-scores and percentile ranks to assess learning disabilities. Z-scores, representing how values compare to the mean in standard deviations, enable comparisons across distributions. These scores categorise learning disabilities into five quartile ranks: normal, mild, moderate, severe, and profound, providing class intervals for assessment. By comparing total scores with Z-scores and raw scores, the tool effectively identifies learning disability levels, making it practical and user-friendly for educators.

The process of developing norms includes calculating Z-scores and percentile ranks to assess learning disabilities. Z-scores, which indicate how values compare to the mean in standard deviations, facilitate comparisons across distributions. For example, a raw score of 70 corresponds to a Z-score of -1.55. These scores categorise learning disabilities into five quartile ranks: normal, mild, moderate, severe, and profound, establishing class intervals for assessment. By comparing total scores with Z-scores and raw scores, the tool effectively identifies learning disability levels, making it practical and user-friendly for educators.

C. Knowledge Attitude Practice of primary school teachers on learning disabilities

The following results highlight the KAP of PRTs on LD.

i. Socio-demographic markers of the teachers

- The majority of teachers fell within the 31-50 age range, with equal representation at 30% in both the 31-40 and 41-50 groups. Younger teachers, aged 21-30, made up 26.6%, while those in the 51-60 age group accounted for 13.4%, contributing to a balanced distribution across age groups.
- Gender distribution among teachers provides insights into potential gender-specific challenges and preferences. Predominantly female teachers constituted 90.5% of the sample, while males represented 9.5%.
- Marital status analysis revealed that the majority of teachers (81.5%) were married, with a smaller percentage single (16.4%) and a very small portion widowed (2.1%).
- The analysis of the number of children revealed that the majority of teachers (41.8%) had two children, followed by those with one child (33.7%). A smaller percentage of teachers had no children (21.2%), while a very small portion had three or more children (3.3%).
- Family type also plays a role, with 63.8% of teachers coming from nuclear families and 36.2% from joint families.
- Area of living analysis showed that 44.7% of teachers resided in urban areas, 29% in rural areas, and 26.3% in semi-urban areas.
- Educational qualifications are significant, with 62.3% holding a degree with a B.Ed, 22% possessing a degree without a B.Ed, and 15.7% had a diploma or teacher training.
- Experience levels varied, with 33.2% having over 15 years of experience, 30.2% less than 5 years, 20.8% with 6-10 years, and 15.8% with 11-15 years.

- In type of school, with 73.5% of teachers in private schools and the rest in government schools. Curriculum frameworks differed, with 82.5% teaching under state boards, 11.3% under CBSE, and 6.2% under ICSE.
- Regarding working with counsellors 78.2% of teachers had no collaboration, while 21.8% worked with counsellors.
- In child development and psychology in their curriculum, 285 teachers (55.4%) indicated that had child development and psychology in their curriculum. Conversely, 229 teachers (44.6%) did not have child development and psychology in their curriculum.

ii. Level of Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) among primary school teachers on learning disability

- In knowledge, the majority 76.8% maintained a moderate level followed by 13.4% with a high level and 9.8% with a low level of knowledge about learning disabilities.
- Examining attitudes, 6.0% hold an unfavourable perspective, 60.3% maintain a neutral stance, and 33.7% express a favourable attitude.
- Concerning classroom teaching practices, 3.3% demonstrate poor or unsatisfactory methods, 57.6% exhibit average practices, and 39.1% showcase good or satisfactory approaches concerning learning disabilities.

iii. Interaction of KAP and Socio-demographic markers of teachers on LD

a. Interaction of KAP of PRTs on LD

The correlation coefficients indicated a positive correlation between the KAP of PRTs regarding LD. The interaction of attitudes and practices regarding LD among teachers was stronger than that of knowledge and practices.

b. Socio-demographic markers on teachers' knowledge of learning disability

Significant influence of socio-demographic markers on knowledge was found with age, marital status, no of children, years of experience, board of the school, type of school, family type, and child development /psychology in the curriculum.

- **Age:** Older teachers reported had higher knowledge levels. Teachers of 51-60 have higher knowledge levels than those aged 41-50 and 31-40 and teachers aged 31-40 years have higher knowledge levels than those aged 21-30 years.

- **Marital Status:** Married teachers have better knowledge towards LD compared to those who are widowed and single.
- **Number of children:** Teachers with 3 or more children demonstrated significantly higher knowledge levels.
- **Years of experience:** 6 – 10 years of experience teachers had a higher knowledge level when compared to less than 5 years of teaching experience.
- **Board of School:** Teachers working in ICSE schools demonstrated significantly higher knowledge levels.
- **Type of school:** Private school teachers exhibited a higher mean rank.
- **Family type:** Teachers from joint families possessed a higher knowledge.
- **Child development / Psychology in the curriculum:** Teachers who had a curriculum with child development/psychology had a higher knowledge score.

c. Socio-demographic markers and attitude of PRTs on LD

A significant difference was found in attitude with age, marital status, no of children, educational qualification, years of experience, board of the school, type of school, and child development /psychology in curriculum.

- **Age:** Teachers aged 51-60 demonstrated favourable attitudes compared to those aged 31-40 and a significant difference was found between the 31-40 and 21-30 age groups indicating the older age group had a favourable attitude.
- **Marital Status:** Single teachers demonstrated unfavourable attitudes than married or widowed teachers.
- **Number of children:** Teachers with three or more children had significantly favourable attitudes than those with no children, results indicated that teachers with children had favourable attitudes towards learning disability.
- **Years of experience:** Teachers with over 15 years followed by 11 to 15 years of experience showed favourable attitudes.
- **Educational Qualification:** Diploma/teacher training qualified teachers showed favourable attitudes compared to those with graduated with and without B.Ed.

- **Board of School:** Teachers working in ICSE schools demonstrated a favourable attitude
- **Type of school:** Private school teachers exhibited a favourable attitude
- **Child development / Psychology in curriculum:** Teachers with child development / psychology in their curriculum had a favourable attitude.

d. Socio-demographic markers and practice of primary school teachers on Learning Disability

A significant difference was found in teachers' teaching practice with age, marital status, no of children, years of experience, board of the school, type of school, and child development /psychology in the curriculum.

- **Age:** 51-60 years demonstrated good/satisfactory classroom teaching practices than those aged 31-40 years and 31-40 years showed good/satisfactory teaching practices than 21-30 years signifying that older teachers exhibited good/satisfactory classroom teaching practices.
- **Marital Status:** Married and widowed teachers exhibited good/satisfactory teaching practices.
- **Number of children:** Teachers with 3 or more children demonstrated significantly good/satisfactory teaching practices.
- **Years of experience:** Teachers with more than 15 years of experience exhibit good/satisfactory classroom teaching practices.
- **Board of School:** ICSE school teachers exhibited significantly good/satisfactory teaching practices compared to state board teachers and CBSE board teachers.
- **Type of school:** Private school teachers exhibited good/satisfactory classroom teaching practices
- **Child development/Psychology in curriculum:** Teachers with this inclusion demonstrated good/satisfactory teaching practices related to learning disabilities.

D. Effect of Sensitisation Programme on KAP of Teachers

The results of the sensitisation programme are as follows

- **Knowledge:** The mean score of knowledge of the PRTs on LD was increased from a moderate level before sensitisation (34.47) to a higher level after sensitisation and

follow-up respectively (39.62 and 40.87) and the difference was significant at 1% level.

- **Attitude:** The mean score before sensitisation was slightly higher than the after and follow-up. The mean scores (before sensitisation – 84.82, after sensitisation – 83.15, follow up – 82.98) did not differ significantly and fell on neutral attitude.
- **Practice:** A statistically significant difference at 1% level was found across before sensitisation and follow-up pair. The mean score of the practice of the PRTs increased from the average level before sensitisation (18.96) to a good/satisfactory level in the after-sensitisation and follow-up respectively (19.42 and 19.87).

These findings demonstrate that the sensitisation program had a positive impact on improving the knowledge and teaching practices of teachers, while their attitudes remained stable. This indicated that the program was effective in enhancing the overall knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) of teachers.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implications of the study are classified under, a) implications on the central and state government, b) implications on educational institutions, c) implications on teachers, d) implications on parents and e) implications on future research.

a) Implications on the central and state government

The central and state governments bear the social responsibility of promoting the holistic development of children. The investigation underscores the urgent need to include dedicated chapters addressing hidden disabilities, such as learning disabilities, in the National Policy. Additionally, there is a pressing need to address the disparities in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) among teachers across different educational boards, including ICSE, State Board, and CBSE. A uniform policy and standardised training for all teachers, regardless of the board, would ensure equitable access to quality education for children with learning disabilities. Periodic awareness programmes and consistent teacher training across all boards are essential to enhance their effectiveness, ultimately benefiting the children who need these interventions the most. Besides, the curriculum for teacher training programmes, including B.Ed courses, may integrate specialised modules on learning disabilities to equip teachers with the necessary knowledge and effective teaching practices. To further support students, the government should emphasise the appointment of qualified school counsellors

in every school, ensuring that both students and teachers receive the guidance and assistance needed for successful intervention.

b) Implications on educational institutions

- ***Prioritising LD Identification:*** Educational institutions must prioritise accurately identifying learning disabilities (LD), as data suggests that up to 100 LD children may be present in an average-sized school, with approximately five per classroom.
- ***Using Standardised LD Assessment Tool:*** Schools should implement a standardised tool for LD identification as a routine classroom activity, ensuring consistent and early detection of LD across all educational boards, including the State Board, CBSE, and ICSE.
- ***Teacher Training and Curriculum Integration:*** Regardless of the curriculum they follow (including Child Development or Psychology), teachers should be trained to adapt their teaching methods to meet the specific needs of children with LD, ensuring a more inclusive learning environment.
- ***Sensitisation Programme and KAP Enhancement:*** Schools should ensure that teachers undergo a sensitisation programme to enhance their Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) regarding LD. These programmes should focus on developing empathy and practical strategies for supporting LD students in the classroom.
- ***Comprehensive Support with Counsellors:*** Schools should involve counsellors to provide comprehensive support, offering tailored activities and guidance to both teachers and LD students. This collaboration is essential for addressing the unique challenges faced by LD students and ensuring their success.

c) Implications for teachers

- ***The teacher-student relationship***

The teacher-student relationship is widely regarded as a significant bond, with teachers playing a crucial role in monitoring and evaluating each child's learning and behaviour patterns. They should be actively involved in both curricular and extracurricular activities to identify any issues requiring additional support. Despite the importance of this role, teachers must enhance their knowledge about learning disabilities (LD) and strengthen their connection to the profession. A teacher's behaviour and attitude can shape a child's personality, leaving lasting impressions through their words and actions. Encouragement

builds confidence, while negative comments can harm a child's emotional well-being. Teachers act as sensors for potential problems and challenges in the classroom, helping to better support and integrate children with learning disabilities. Regardless of age, experience, or educational level, teachers must influence the environment positively. Teachers should implement practices that ensure all students, including those with LD, receive equal opportunities, fostering a diverse and supportive classroom environment to promote inclusive education. This approach is essential for helping students become well-adjusted and productive members of society.

d) Implications for parents

- ***Personal contribution of parents:*** Parents play a crucial role in supporting their children's educational journey, especially when it comes to children with LD. The parent-child relationship has become increasingly significant, and parents must actively monitor and evaluate their children's learning patterns while engaging in their academic activities. Collaborating with teachers is essential to help children overcome problems and challenges, particularly those related to LD. Acceptance of children with LD within the family and creating a supportive home environment tailored to their needs is vital for their development.
- ***Parent-teacher relationship:*** A strong parent-teacher relationship is key to ensuring continuity of support. Parents should reinforce and follow the educational strategies implemented by teachers at school, creating a cohesive and effective learning experience at home. Regular participation in PTA meetings enhances collaboration between parents and teachers, fostering better communication and shared goals for the child's progress. Additionally, further investigation into socio-demographic factors and the influence of significant others, like teachers and parents, on child development is necessary to refine educational strategies and improve support systems for children with special needs. Inclusion in education is a critical aspect that parents must support. Collaborating with teachers to promote inclusive practices ensures that children with LD receive equal opportunities and the necessary accommodations. By working together, parents and teachers can create an environment where all children, regardless of their abilities, can thrive and succeed.

e) Implications for future research

Future research stemming from this study addresses several key areas like advanced tool development, customisation for diversity, collaborative research, teacher training solutions, impact and longitudinal studies, technological integration and policy advocacy. It is crucial to examine how existing policies and curriculum designs affect the support for children with learning disabilities (LD), assessing their alignment with effective LD identification and support strategies. Exploring the integration of technology, such as mobile applications and digital tools, will be important, particularly with advancements like artificial intelligence (AI) that could improve LD identification and support. Enhancing teacher training programmes to better address KAP related to LD, including evaluating the impact of various training approaches on classroom practices. Additionally, future research should consider the standardisation of the assessment tool in regional languages to ensure accessibility and effectiveness across diverse linguistic contexts. Investigating the effectiveness of different intervention strategies and support systems for LD students will also be valuable in identifying best practices for managing and supporting these learners. Lastly, longitudinal studies are to be conducted to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of tools and interventions, guiding ongoing improvements.

CONCLUSION

This research study set out to address the research questions surrounding the identification of learning disabilities (LD) by primary school teachers. First, the need for an assessment scale to identify LD in classrooms was established, confirming that teachers require a reliable tool to effectively identify and support students with LD. The developed **HANDY TOOL FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TO IDENTIFY LEARNING DISABILITIES (HT-LD)** (Annexure III a) emerged as a key outcome, demonstrating its effectiveness in real classroom settings. This tool not only aids in early identification but also facilitates early intervention, which is crucial for the educational progress of students with LD.

The study also delved into the levels of KAP among PRTs concerning LD. It revealed significant insights into how these three aspects interact, and how socio-demographic factors influence teachers' KAP levels. Additionally, the research showed that sensitisation programmes significantly enhance teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices, reinforcing the importance of continuous professional development.

In conclusion, this study has made significant strides in advancing LD identification by primary school teachers, grounded in educational theory and practical application. The development of the HT-LD tool, now copyrighted (Annexure III b), provides educators with a practical and user-friendly resource that enhances inclusive education. The research underscores the importance of standardised tools and teacher training while calling for ongoing research and development, including technological advancements and regional language standardisation, to further improve LD identification and ensure tailored interventions for all students.