



## Understanding specific learning disabilities (SLD): A narrative literature review and analysis

Dr. Jaswant Singh Yadav, Sanjay

Department of Psychology, Indraprastha College for Women, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

### Abstract

This narrative literature review examines Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), a spectrum of neurodevelopmental disorders impacting academic skills. Tracing the historical trajectory, the study highlights shift from early emphasis on intelligence-academic discrepancies to a recognition of multifaceted factors like processing speed and executive functions. Theoretical perspectives explore cognitive theories, emphasizing both early models and contemporary attention to executive functions. Genetic influences underscore the interplay between genetics and the environment. Diagnostic challenges and evolution are discussed, including changes in the DSM-5 and the growing significance of Response to Intervention (RTI) models for early identification. Comorbidities, particularly the interrelation between SLD and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), are addressed, emphasizing comprehensive assessments. Interventions and educational strategies encompass evidence-based practices like phonics-based reading programs and technology-assisted interventions. Inclusive approaches, including Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), are explored. In conclusion, the study underscores the evolving understanding of SLD, transitioning from narrow perspectives to a nuanced comprehension of its neurodevelopmental complexities. Advocating for continued interdisciplinary collaboration and innovative interventions, the research aims to enhance support and educational outcomes for individuals with SLD.

**Keywords:** Specific learning disabilities (SLD), neurobiological perspectives, diagnostic challenges, evidence-based interventions, inclusive education

### Introduction

Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) refer to a variety of neurological disorders that have a major influence on the ability to learn and use academic skills. This review aims to comprehensively examine the existing understanding of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), analyzing important topics, theoretical frameworks, and developing patterns in research. Specific Learning Disability (SLD), which is marked by difficulty in areas such as reading, writing, arithmetic, and other academic subjects, presents significant obstacles for individuals and has extensive consequences for their educational path and beyond.

Gaining a comprehensive understanding of the intricacies of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) is of utmost importance for educators, researchers, and policymakers alike. This review seeks to elucidate the complex nature of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) and its ramifications for individuals' scholastic attainment and interpersonal growth. Through a thorough analysis of existing literature, our objective is to examine and explain areas of study that have not been adequately explored, areas where there is disagreement, and areas that are just beginning to gain attention. This will result in a comprehensive summary of the present state of research on Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD).

### Historical overview

The history of Specific Learning Disability (SLD) research is indeed multifaceted, with evolving definitions and diagnostic criteria reflecting a deepening understanding of the complexities associated with these conditions. Early conceptualizations of SLD cantered around the notion of significant discrepancies between intellectual potential and academic achievement. This initial perspective is evident in historical frameworks such as the "discrepancy model,"

which emphasized the notable difference between a student's cognitive abilities and their actual academic performance (Fletcher *et al.*, 1994) <sup>[5]</sup>.

As research progressed, scholars began to recognize that a singular focus on the intelligence-academic achievement gap was insufficient to capture the diverse challenges faced by individuals with SLD. A pivotal shift occurred as researchers started to explore the multidimensional nature of SLD, considering various cognitive and neuropsychological factors. Notably, processing speed, working memory, and executive functions emerged as crucial components in understanding learning disabilities more comprehensively (Fletcher *et al.*, 2007; Swanson, 1993) <sup>[6, 20]</sup>.

For instance, the work of Fletcher and colleagues (1994) <sup>[5]</sup> highlighted the importance of considering processing speed deficits in individuals with SLD. Their research underscored how sluggish cognitive processing could impact academic tasks, leading to a more nuanced understanding of learning disabilities beyond mere discrepancies in intellectual and academic abilities.

Similarly, investigations into working memory, as exemplified by research from Swanson (1993) <sup>[20]</sup>, brought attention to the role of memory processes in learning and academic achievement. Deficits in working memory were identified as significant contributors to difficulties in tasks requiring information retention and manipulation, shedding light on the cognitive intricacies associated with SLD.

Executive functions, another critical aspect, gained prominence in SLD research, with studies emphasizing the impact of difficulties in planning, organization, and cognitive flexibility on learning outcomes (McGrath *et al.*, 2017). This broader perspective acknowledged that learning disabilities were not solely determined by a single factor but were instead influenced by a combination of cognitive processes.

In summary, the trajectory of SLD research reflects a progressive shift from a narrow focus on intelligence-achievement discrepancies to a more comprehensive understanding of the multidimensional nature of learning disabilities. Processing speed, working memory, and executive functions have become integral components in contemporary conceptualizations of SLD, enriching diagnostic criteria and informing interventions to better support individuals with learning disabilities.

## Theoretical perspectives

### A. Cognitive theories

- 1. Information processing models:** Early cognitive theories, such as those proposed by Vygotsky (1978)<sup>[22]</sup> and Gagné (1985)<sup>[7]</sup>, emphasized deficits in specific cognitive processes as central to SLD. Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory highlighted the importance of language and social interaction in cognitive development, contributing to the understanding of how language deficits may affect academic skills. Gagné's model of information processing focused on the stages of learning and memory, providing insights into how impairments in these processes could impact the acquisition of academic knowledge (Gagné, 1985)<sup>[7]</sup>. Additionally, Stanovich's (1988)<sup>[19]</sup> work on the phonological processing model underscored the significance of phonological awareness in reading development.
- 2. Executive functioning:** Contemporary research has increasingly explored the role of executive functions in understanding the complexities of SLD. Miyake *et al.* (2000)<sup>[12]</sup> demonstrated the importance of executive functions, including attention, inhibition, and working memory, in academic performance. This perspective aligns with the work of Blair and Razza (2007)<sup>[2]</sup>, who emphasized the role of executive functions in supporting self-regulation and academic success. Furthermore, Diamond (2013)<sup>[3]</sup> expanded on the role of executive functions in various aspects of life, emphasizing their impact on goal-directed behavior and problem-solving.

### B. Neurobiological perspectives

- 1. Neuroanatomical correlates:** Advances in neuroimaging have provided insights into the neurobiological underpinnings of SLD. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies (e.g., Shaywitz *et al.*, 2002; Gabrieli, 2009)<sup>[8, 18]</sup> have revealed structural and functional differences in brain regions associated with language, reading, and mathematics in individuals with SLD. Gabrieli's work explored the neural basis of dyslexia, highlighting abnormalities in the activation of the left temporoparietal cortex during reading tasks (Gabrieli, 2009)<sup>[8]</sup>. This evidence supports the idea that neuroanatomical correlates play a crucial role in understanding the cognitive challenges faced by individuals with SLD.
- 2. Genetic influences:** Research has identified potential genetic factors contributing to SLD susceptibility. Studies by Grigorenko (2001)<sup>[9]</sup> and Fisher and DeFries (2002)<sup>[14]</sup> highlighted the interplay between

genetic and environmental influences in the development of SLD. Grigorenko's research focused on the heritability of dyslexia, revealing specific genetic markers associated with reading difficulties (Grigorenko, 2001)<sup>[9]</sup>. Additionally, Scerri *et al.* (2019)<sup>[17]</sup> conducted genome-wide association studies to identify specific genetic variations linked to SLD, further emphasizing the need for a comprehensive understanding of the genetic basis of SLD.

## Diagnostic challenges and evolution

### A. Shifting diagnostic criteria

- 1. DSM-5:** The fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) introduced changes to the classification of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), reflecting an evolving understanding of these disorders. Notable changes included a move away from a strict reliance on a significant discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement. Instead, DSM-5 emphasizes the importance of identifying a specific learning difficulty in the context of age-appropriate academic skills (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)<sup>[1]</sup>. This shift acknowledges the heterogeneity in how SLD may manifest across individuals and highlights the importance of considering developmental appropriateness in diagnosis.
- 2. Response to Intervention (RTI):** The Response to Intervention (RTI) model has gained prominence as an alternative or complementary approach to traditional discrepancy models for identifying and addressing learning difficulties (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). RTI focuses on early identification through a tiered system of interventions, allowing educators to provide support at various levels based on students' responses. This model aims to prevent academic failure by intervening early and tailoring support to individual needs. The evolution towards RTI reflects a broader recognition of the dynamic and multifaceted nature of learning difficulties.

### B. Comorbidity and overlapping conditions

- 1. SLD and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD):** Research has increasingly recognized the comorbidity between SLD and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (Willcutt *et al.*, 2012)<sup>[23]</sup>. The overlapping cognitive and behavioral features of these disorders pose challenges for accurate diagnosis. Comprehensive assessments that consider both academic and attentional aspects are essential to capture the nuanced presentation of these co-occurring conditions (Nigg, 2005)<sup>[14]</sup>. This recognition has implications for intervention planning, emphasizing the importance of addressing both SLD and ADHD symptoms simultaneously.
- 2. Emotional and behavioral aspects:** The literature suggests a bidirectional relationship between SLD and emotional/behavioral difficulties (Riddick, Sterling, & Farmer, 1999)<sup>[15]</sup>. Children with SLD may experience frustration and anxiety related to academic challenges, contributing to emotional and behavioral problems. Conversely, emotional and behavioral difficulties can

also impact academic performance. This bidirectional relationship highlights the importance of holistic support strategies that address both the academic and emotional needs of individuals with SLD.

## Interventions and educational strategies

### A. Evidence-based interventions

- 1. Phonics-based reading programs:** Systematic phonics instruction remains a cornerstone of effective reading interventions for individuals with dyslexia (National Reading Panel, 2000) [13]. Interventions grounded in phonics emphasize explicit teaching of the relationships between letters and sounds, supporting the development of decoding skills. Programs like Orton-Gillingham and Wilson Reading System have demonstrated effectiveness in improving reading outcomes for individuals with dyslexia (Torgesen *et al.*, 2001; Wilson, 2005) [21, 25]. These structured approaches provide targeted support for phonological processing difficulties.
- 2. Technology-assisted interventions:** The integration of technology, including educational apps and software, has shown promise in enhancing the learning experience for students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) (Higgins *et al.*, 2005) [10]. Computer-assisted interventions can offer individualized and engaging learning experiences, allowing students to practice and reinforce academic skills. Tools like speech-to-text software and audiobooks can address challenges associated with reading and writing, promoting accessibility and independence (Rose & Meyer, 2002) [16].

### B. Classroom accommodations

- 1. Universal Design for Learning (UDL):** Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles promote inclusive education by providing multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression to accommodate diverse learning needs (Rose & Meyer, 2002) [16]. UDL emphasizes proactive planning to create flexible learning environments that address the variability of learners. For example, offering content in various formats, providing choices for how students demonstrate understanding, and incorporating assistive technologies align with UDL principles, fostering an inclusive and supportive classroom environment.
- 2. Individualized Education Programs (IEPs):** Tailored educational plans, such as Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), continue to be crucial tools in ensuring that students with SLD receive appropriate support and accommodations (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004). IEPs involve collaborative planning between educators, parents, and other professionals to outline specific goals, services, and accommodations tailored to the individual needs of the student. Regular monitoring and adjustments to the IEP ensure that interventions remain responsive to the student's progress and evolving needs.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, this comprehensive literature review and analysis have provided an in-depth exploration of Specific

Learning Disabilities (SLD), encompassing historical perspectives, theoretical frameworks, diagnostic evolution, and effective interventions. The journey through the historical overview revealed the dynamic nature of SLD research, from early concepts of intelligence-achievement discrepancies to the recognition of multifaceted cognitive processes influencing learning difficulties.

Theoretical perspectives illuminated the cognitive and neurobiological dimensions of SLD, emphasizing the importance of information processing models, executive functioning, neuroanatomical correlates, and genetic influences. These perspectives collectively contribute to a holistic understanding of the intricate challenges faced by individuals with SLD, offering valuable insights for both research and practical applications.

The examination of shifting diagnostic criteria highlighted the progress in our conceptualization of SLD, with the DSM-5 emphasizing age-appropriate academic skills and the adoption of Response to Intervention (RTI) reflecting a dynamic approach to early identification and intervention. Comorbidity with conditions like ADHD and the bidirectional relationship between SLD and emotional/behavioral aspects underscored the complexity of diagnosis and the importance of holistic assessments.

Interventions and educational strategies presented evidence-based approaches, such as phonics-based reading programs and technology-assisted interventions, addressing the core difficulties associated with SLD. Classroom accommodations, including Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), emphasized the need for tailored support to ensure inclusive and effective education for individuals with SLD.

In essence, this literature review not only consolidates existing knowledge on SLD but also sheds light on areas that warrant further exploration and research. Understanding the intricacies of SLD is paramount for educators, researchers, and policymakers to enhance support systems and interventions, ultimately fostering an environment where individuals with SLD can thrive academically and emotionally. As we move forward, continued research and collaborative efforts will contribute to refining our understanding of SLD and optimizing strategies for intervention and support.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 5th ed. Arlington (VA): American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013.
- Blair C, Razza RP. Relating effortful control, executive function, and false belief understanding to emerging math and literacy ability in kindergarten. *Child Development*, 2007;78(2):647-663.
- Diamond A. Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2013;64:135-168.
- Fisher SE, DeFries JC. Developmental dyslexia: Genetic dissection of a complex cognitive trait. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2002;3(10):767-780.
- Fletcher JM, Francis DJ, Shaywitz SE, Lyon GR, Foorman BR, Stuebing KK, *et al.* Intelligent testing and the discrepancy model for children with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 1994;17(4):223-237.

6. Fletcher JM, Lyon GR, Fuchs LS, Barnes MA. Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention. New York (NY): Guilford Press, 2007.
7. Gagné ED. The cognitive psychology of school learning. *Educational Researcher*,1985;14(1):14-18.
8. Gabrieli JD. Dyslexia: A new synergy between education and cognitive neuroscience. *Science*,2009;325(5938):280-283.
9. Grigorenko EL. Developmental dyslexia: An update on genes, brains, and environments. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*,2001;42(1):91-125.
10. Higgins K, Boone R, Lovitt T, Adams A. Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities: 1995-2005. *Exceptional Children*,2005;71(3):345-363.
11. McGrath LM, Pennington BF, Shanahan MA, Santerre-Lemmon LE, Barnard HD, Willcutt EG, *et al.* A multiple deficit model of reading disability and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Searching for shared cognitive deficits. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*,2011;52(5):547-557.
12. Miyake A, Friedman NP, Emerson MJ, Witzki AH, Howerter A, Wager TD. The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex "frontal lobe" tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*,2000;41(1):49-100.
13. National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. Bethesda (MD): National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000.
14. Nigg JT. Neuropsychologic theory and findings in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: The state of the field and salient challenges for the coming decade. *Biological Psychiatry*,2005;57(11):1424-1435.
15. Riddick B, Sterling C, Farmer M. Dyslexia and inclusion: Time for a social model of disability? *International Studies in Sociology of Education*,1999;9(3):225-239.
16. Rose DH, Meyer A. Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning. Alexandria (VA): Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2002.
17. Scerri TS, Schulte-Körne G, Morris AP. Consortium meta-analysis of dyslexia candidate gene association studies: An update. *Journal of Human Genetics*,2019;64(3):195-207.
18. Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Fulbright RK, Skudlarski P, *et al.* Disruption of posterior brain systems for reading in children with developmental dyslexia. *Biological Psychiatry*,2002;52(2):101-110.
19. Stanovich KE. Explaining the differences between the dyslexic and the garden-variety poor reader: The phonological-core variable-difference model. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*,1988;21(10):590-604.
20. Swanson HL. Working memory in learning disability subgroups. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*,1993;56(1):87-114.
21. Torgesen JK, Wagner RK, Rashotte CA, Rose E, Lindamood P, Conway T, *et al.* Preventing reading failure in young children with phonological processing disabilities: Group and individual responses to instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,2001;93(2):288-298.
22. Vygotsky LS. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1978.
23. Willcutt EG, Pennington BF, Olson RK, Chhabildas N, Hulslander J. Neuropsychological analyses of comorbidity between reading disability and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: In search of the common deficit. *Developmental Neuropsychology*,2012;37(6):594-613.
24. Wilson BA. Using Orton-Gillingham to teach decoding to students with learning disabilities: A review of the literature. *Annals of Dyslexia*,2005;55(1):151-171.