

A comparison of self perception of children with non-verbal learning disabilities (Nld) and verbal learning disabilities (VLD)

Mohammad Reza Zarbakhsh^{1*}, Homayoon Haroon Rashidi²

¹Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

²Department of Psychology, Dezful Branch, Islamic Azad University, Dezful, Iran

Corresponding author: Mohammad Reza Zarbakhsh, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran E-mail address: rzarbakhsh@yahoo.com

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to compare self perception of children with nonverbal learning disabilities (NLD) and those with verbal learning disabilities (VLD). The sample of study was selected from a group of students referred to the Learning Disability Center in Shiraz. Two different groups of students with NLD and VLD were selected based on their scores on the Pupil Rating Scale: Screening for learning disabilities (Mykelbust, 1971) and the verbal – performance IQ difference on the (WISC-R). Sixty four students 6 to 11 years old were selected, 30 students were diagnosed as having nonverbal learning disabilities and 34 students were diagnosed as having verbal learning disabilities. In order to analyze data two-way ANOVA used. results showed that student nonverbal learning disabilities scored significantly higher on in self perception than student nverbal learning disabilities. However, no significant differences were found on sex of participants. The results of research were discussed, and research limitations and suggestions were presented.

Keywords: Self -Perception, Learning Disabilities, Verbal, Nonverbal.

1.Introduction

Children with learning disabilities are a group of exceptional children with normal appearance and they have normal IQ and sometimes higher. based on Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of Mental Disorder- Revised (DSM-IV-R) (Nikkho and Avadis Yans, 2002). About 2 to 10 percent of children afflicted to this disorder and this disorder in boys are usually threefold girls. Learning disabilities in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders has been suggested such as classification and diagnostic criteria for disabilities in reading, math and written expression. In this defines three major criteria for diagnosis of disabilities of reading, math and written expression are as follows: A) the person's ability or skill in each of the areas of reading, math and written expression that measured by standardized tests and the calendar age, IQ and age-appropriate education is lower than expected levels, significantly. B) learning disabilities affect academic achievement or daily activities that needs the strengths and or skills in reading, math and written expression significantly. C) If there is a sensory defect, learning difficulties should be in addition to those usually seen associated with its defect. Fit Halis is divided learning disabilities into two major categories include verbal learning disabilities and nonverbal learning disabilities, verbal learning disability usually occurs at symbolism and thus affect on formation of concepts. Symbolism is ability to communicate or return the beliefs of audio-visual to significant symbols. Symbolism encompasses all of acts necessary for reading, writing, spelling, counting and talking to successfully. the formation of concepts is considered the most important form of intelligence activities and is related to the ability to classify, to make the abstract, to critical analysis, to generalize and to develop (Halis, translate to Persian Monshi Tosi, 1987).

This fact that left hemisphere of the brain is devoted to verbal information processing and have monitored on production of speech, has been accepted by scholars, but the right hemisphere of the brain is devoted to spatial- visual information processing and also for other types of information processing, has been less acceptable; because for years the left hemisphere were considered as the dominant hemisphere for all or more processing the different types of information. So enough studies was not performed on right hemisphere functions and the important role of this hemisphere in the recognition of everyday problems and emotional functioning (emotional) and social (Thompson, 1996; Heller, 1997; Barce, 1998).

Mykelbust is one of first researcher who has described characteristics of children with disabilities of visual-spatial processing (Mykelbust, 1978; Molenaar-Klumper, 2002; Little, 2002; Gatz, Goldstein and Bires 2002; Russell, 2004). This children later extensively were studied by Rourke and colleagues - that this syndrome called nonverbal learning disabilities (NLD) (Dinklag, 2001; Molenaar-Klumper, 2002; Tanguay 2001, 2003). Syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities (NLD), including a number of potentially disabling symptoms that Rourke (1995) has divided them to three major categories include: Neuropsychological deficits, Academic deficits and Social-emotional/adaptation deficits (quoting from Roman, 1998). Neuropsychological deficits is including problems in visual and tactile perception, psychomotor coordination - motor, visual and tactile attention, nonverbal memory, reasoning, executive functions, and specific problems in aspects of language and speech. Academic deficits are included problems in the following fields: Deficiencies in math calculations, math reasoning, reading comprehension and understanding of some subjects and aspects of written language and handwriting. Social deficits is including problems in social perception and social interaction. Children with this disability seems to be at high risk for becoming infected with various forms (Rourke, Rourke, Young & Leenaars, 1989). Diagnosis of syndrome in nonverbal learning disabilities has consider as an independent diagnosis of verbal learning disabilities in this latter case, attention experts in this field, including (Rourke, 1988-1998; Fudge, 1997;

Maxwel,1998; Frankenberger, 2002 and et al). Some of evolution theories about create of this disability have emphasize the role of right hemisphere (Goldenberg and kasta,1981; Weintraub and Mesulam, 1983; Voeller,1986; Tranel and et al,1987;Ladel and Rasmosen,2005), In contrast some other have emphasize the role of white body system under cortical gray (Cerebral Cortex)(quoting from Tanguay,2001;Vodes and et al,2002). These two views are more complement each other until each other violate, somewhat both view help in predicting correct of this syndrome in different situations (Rourke,1995). One of the features that are easily observed in children with NLD is its verbal IQ significantly higher than their practical IQ in IQ scale (Rourke,ditroch and yung,1973;Johnson,1987; Weintraub and Mesulam,1983). This finding indicate significant difference between verbal abilities (cognitive abilities - language) and nonverbal abilities (cognitive abilities space - visual) in these children. Difference about 10 points or more indicates a significant difference between verbal IQ and practical (Dimitrovsky and et al,1998; McDonough-Ryan and et al,2002).

In this regard Rourke (1989) Furest, Fisk & Rourke,(1990) in the study of children with nonverbal learning disabilities reported using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale that there is difference more than 10 score between verbal IQ and practicality of these children. In this relation, Humphries, Worling,pites (2004) in study with examination a group capabilities of children with nonverbal learning disabilities and children with verbal disabilities received that there is significant difference between verbal IQ and practical IQ in two group with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities in Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children. On other research on this field, Humphries, Krekwich, Snider(1996),with study verbal IQ and practical IQ with nonverbal disabilities in Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children have reported that there is significant difference between verbal IQ and practical IQ To benefit of verbal IQ in Wechsler Intelligence Scale. In this relation Haroon Rashidi (2007) have found with study and compared the performance of 52 subjects boys and girls in 6 to 11 years old with nonverbal learning disabilities (23 person) and with verbal learning disabilities (29 person) in Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children in Shiraz that there is significant differences on sub-tests information , similarities,terms and account between two group with nonverbal learning disabilities and verbal learning disabilities.

In all cases the mean scores groups with nonverbal learning disabilities is higher than mean scores on verbal learning disabilities, except in the field of memory figure and perception.but in sub-test account contrast to other sub-tests means scores group with nonverbal learning disabilities is lower than means scores group with verbal learning disabilities. Also they founded that there is difference in all of practical sub-tests in Wechsler Intelligence Scale-Revised to component adjusted for symptoms in both groups with verbal learning disabilities and non-verbal learning disabilities, So in all subtests scores groups with nonverbal learning disabilities is less than the mean scores groups with verbal learning disabilities (Haroon Rashidi & Shahim, 2007; Haroon Rashidi, 2010). NLD children usually have a good performance in received and express words. The children show disabilities in some aspects of speech and language. Also this children show problems in prosody and amply showing song's emotions. problems in prosody is include uniformity of speech with sound damping. Because these people in social environments excessive talk, peers know them as peoples who excessive talk about a boring issues (Vacca, 2001; Molenaar-Klumper, 2002; Gutz et al, 2002; Russell,2004) weakness in perception, understanding, organizing and disrupting the structure of the story, despite having good grammar, words and other characteristics of these children. Remember story of a story is normal but they forget the main point of story. Also rhythm, music and tone of voice is often difficult (Thompson,1997; Chow & Skuy, 1999).

Problems of visual perception, visual processing and cognitive abilities of the visual-space is the most obvious characteristics of children with NLD (Harnadek & Rourke, 1994).This children show the high insufficiency in the difficult tasks that have need to visual processing and visual-space ability (Bender & Golden1990; Fudge, 1997; Dinklag, 2001). Also these children show some problems in the field of motions and fine motor skills. Difficulties in the total relations with component, especially in the embodiment, have images of the total. Difficulties in drawing or imitating is observed in many of them. Furthermore, especially in the early stages of their handwriting is often weak. Some evidence suggests that children with NLD have learning capable in repeated of motor skills with repeated practice in many times, although they may initially have problems and weaknesses in learning these skills. Handwriting, simple forms of copying, cutting, painting, and drawing shapes are good example from delicate motor skills that improve with age increasingly (Aylward, 2002; Marti, 2004; Forrest, 2005).

Generally, several studies has been done in field of exceptional children and children with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities in particular and further studies is trying to solve children's issues. Generally, cognitive abilities and characteristics of children and adolescents and children with special needs, such as verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities and how students perceive themselves and others to help teachers and parents for action resolve their problems and prevent academic failure that is great calamity of educational system. Determine the strengths and weaknesses points of children with learning disorders of verbal and nonverbal is initial conditions due to individual differences and can guide for future curriculum children. Obviously educational interventions and treatment is requires the evaluation of behavior of these children and recognition of their weaknesses, abilities and needs points. In this regard, evaluation of self-perception in children with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities is an important step in providing educational opportunities for this group of children. The findings of this research will help us that cognitive abilities in children and adolescents with disorders of verbal and nonverbal learning to training programs that its target is different needs of students with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities and the attention focused on this point that students with verbal and non verbal learning disabilities have with different strengths and weaknesses points and in regard to this plan, it will lead to more efficiency.On the other hand , in every society are a group of students with verbal and nonverbal learning disorders and maybe they have imagination and perception of their own apart from normal people. Therefore, knowledge of how these people perceive themselves and others, both for themselves and for people who are somehow associated with them is

important. According to above mentioned issues, investigation and comparison to their perception of how students with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities appear to be necessary, thus this study was conducted In order to this issue.

2. Research Questions

Is there difference between self-perception and its dimentions according to gender (female and male) and type of students with verbal and nonverbal learning disability?

3. Research Method

Present study is Causal – Comparative that it is done as field.

3.1. Statistical Society and Sample

Statistical society of present study was including all of male and female students in primary school with learning difficulties studying in learning disabilities centers of exceptional organization Shiraz in the academic year 2009-2010. Due to the low number of students with learning problems have referred to learning disabilities centers of exceptional organization in city of Shiraz in the academic year 2009-2010, all students were assessed as sample. This number were included 132 students (48 female and 84 males) from three grade third to fifth that was studying 45 students (16 female and 28 male) in third class; 51 students (18 female and 33 male) in fourth class and 37 students (14 female and 23 male) in fifth class. Finally, based on criteria specified that is described in data collection method , 64 subjects as available studied as examples of research.

3.2. Research Tools

In the present study to collect data was used from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), rating scale, students, early diagnosis of children with learning disabilities and perceived competence scale.

3.2.1 The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC):

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Revised (WISC-R) is translated ,adapted and standardized by Shahim (2006) in order to measure intelligence for children 6 to 13 years for used in shiraz. Test – Retest reliability 0/44 to 0/94 (Middle 0/73) and its Split – half reliability 0/42 to 0/98 (Middle 0/69) has been reported. Concurrent validity by using correlation with functional section scores the Wechsler Preschool Scale (WPS) 0/74 (total 0/85). The relationship between IQ with age and economic-social categories, and average as the criterion validity of a significant scale has been reported. The correlation coefficient between IQ of verbal, practical, and total is 0/84,0/76,0/80 respectively.

3.2.2 The pupil Rating Scale:Screening for learning disabilities

This scale has 24 questions, by Michael Bassett in 1971, to identify students with learning disabilities were prepared and revised in 1981. By Michael Bassett in 1981, by this measure examined to compare children with learning disabilities and children without learning disabilities and thus concluded that children with learning disabilities and children without learning disabilities have significantly different in total mean scale each other at the level ($p < 0/001$). In this scale are rating for students by teachers in the five behavioral characteristics following: auditory coperhension(include 4 questions), spoken language(include 5 questions) Orientation(include 4 questions) Motor Coordination(include 3 questions) and Personal-Social behavior (include 8 questions). Scale of this score is based on a scale of five options that options 1 and 2 is lower than average, option 3 average, and options 4 and 5 show higher than average. This scale provides three scores: verbal, non verbal (practical) and the total. Verbal score obtained the sum scores parts of auditory coperhension and spoken language , non verbal obtained the sum scores parts Orientation, Motor Coordination, Personal-Social behavior and total score sum of verbal and nonverbal scores. Thus by using this scale were assessed verbal and nonverbal abilities of students. The pupil Rating Scale: early diagnosis of children with learning disabilities, Michael Bassett, by Ahadi (1994), translated and reliability in a group of learning disabilities by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient has been reported 0/99 and its efficacy in the diagnosis of learning disabilities is confirmed from the normal group. In the present study was used this scale to evaluate teachers for the capabilities of verbal and nonverbal students.

3.2.3 The scale of perceived competence

In this study to measure students' self-perception was used a questionnaire consisting of 48 questions based on self-perception profile of adolescents Harter (1980) and Scale of perceived competence from Harter (1982) that has been prepared by Saif, Bashash and Latifian (2004). This scale evaluate five dimentions of self-perception include the perception of cognitive competence with 8 question, perception of sportive competence with 9 questions, perception of social competence with 10 question, behavioral control with 8 question and general self worth dimension with 13 questions. Respond to items is encoded by five-part likert scores of much agree (score 5) to much disagree (score 1). Reliability of this tool in Saif `study and et al (2004) by method of Cronbach's alpha is reported between 0/71 to 0/85. Also structural validity of this scale has been obtaining through factor analysis with varimax rotation. The results of scale analysis showed that above five factors in total will determine 0/46 the variance of total scores in scale.

3.2.4. Data collection methods

In order to assess intelligence of students the revised Wechsler Scale for Children (Shahim, 2006) were assessed individually all of students in during time six month before date from this study by specialists in centers of learning disabilities were not assessed exceptional Shiraz city and was considered for others the last scores of intelligence evaluation with the revised Wechsler intelligence scale for children that was conducted by specialists in psychometric centers. This information was extracted from the records of students. Selection of final sample in this study was conducted during several step of evaluation and assessment of students, this way that after implementation of the revised Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children, first, those who have a difference of 10 scores and more between verbal IQ and the practical (Rourke,1989; Rourke & Harnadek,fisk an et al,1990; Dimitrovsky an et al,1998;Cornoldi and et al, 1999; Kaufman,2001; Humphries and et al ,2004) is selected as sample and others were eliminated. Range difference between verbal IQ and practical in sample of this study have been changed ranged between 10 and 33 score IQ. All children were located at least in one of verbal IQ, practical and or total in the normal IQ range (based on Kaufman,1975). IQ range of total groups has been changing in a range of 88 to 130. At this stage the total number was 82.

Also, to further ensure compared to sampling, grading scale for students: primary diagnosis of children with learning disabilities, Michael Bassett (1971) to assess verbal and nonverbal abilities of students were provided to teachers in ordinary schools. Before implementing above measures, first necessary explanations about importance of the topic was offered for secure the cooperation of teachers and if teachers during completed the scale in understanding of expressions have the problem, would provide the necessary explanations. Thus by using this scale were assessed verbal and nonverbal abilities students and consider scores of the verbal and practical sub-test Michael Bassett were not equal, students' scores became to standard scores with mean 50 and standard deviation of 10 and then difference between verbal and nonverbal scores were calculated for each student.

After preliminary tests and collect the necessary information, the students with significant differences (10 score or more) in verbal and practical IQ of the Revised Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children and based on studies (Rourke,1989; Rourke & Harnadek,fisk an et al,1990; Dimitrovsky an et al,1998;Cornoldi and et al, 1999; Kaufman,2001; Humphries and et al ,2004) were known with learning disabilities and in the rating scale of students: primary diagnosis of children with learning disabilities, Michael Bassett with advantages in verbal or practical ability were chosen as final sample. 64 students have above characteristics that based on following characteristics is divided two group with nonverbal learning disabilities and verbal learning disabilities in children:

1. First group was included children with nonverbal learning disabilities that were selected based on following two criteria: A) Children that in Wechsler Intelligence revised Scale for children were verbal IQ with obvious advantage (more than 10 scores) compared to practical IQ (nonverbal). B) The pupil Rating Scale: Primary diagnosis of children with learning disabilities, Michael Bassett have more scores in verbal section compared to nonverbal (practical) scores. From 64 sample, 30 student have above characteristics.
2. Second group was included children with verbal learning disabilities that were selected based on following two criteria: A) children that In Wechsler Intelligence revised Scale for children were practical IQ with obvious advantage (more than 10 scores) compared to verbal IQ. B) The pupil Rating Scale: Primary diagnosis of children with learning disabilities, Michael Bassett have more scores in nonverbal (practical) section compared to verbal scores. From 64 sample, 34student have above Characteristics. Thus final sample of this study consisted 64 students with learning disabilities based on gender and age (28 females) and (36 male) from 8 to 11 years old.

Group		Cognitive	Sportive	Social	Behavioral	Self Worth	Self perception
With nonverbal disabilities	male	$\bar{X}$ =20.21 SD=2.89	$\bar{X}$ =20.73 SD=2.78	$\bar{X}$ =23.15 SD=4.96	$\bar{X}$ =24.84 SD=4.92	$\bar{X}$ =22.10 SD=4.31	$\bar{X}$ =114.47 SD=16.18
	Female	$\bar{X}$ =20.18 SD=2.44	$\bar{X}$ =21.18 SD=2.60	$\bar{X}$ =22.54 SD=4.98	$\bar{X}$ =21.45 SD=4.71	$\bar{X}$ =26.36 SD=5.22	$\bar{X}$ =111.72 SD=16.70
With verbal disabilities	Male	$\bar{X}$ =26.95 SD=4.21	$\bar{X}$ =25.81 SD=4.32	$\bar{X}$ =28.54 SD=5.30	$\bar{X}$ =27.81 SD=6.86	$\bar{X}$ =28.04 SD=4.81	$\bar{X}$ =137.18 SD=21.86
	Female	$\bar{X}$ =26.50 SD=4.33	$\bar{X}$ =26.50 SD=5.09	$\bar{X}$ =27.83 SD=5.93	$\bar{X}$ =28.91 SD=8.21	$\bar{X}$ =29.33 SD=4.75	$\bar{X}$ =139.08 SD=24.17

4. Results and Findings

Research question:is there difference between self-perception and its dimentions according to gender (female and male) and type of students (with verbal and nonverbal learningdisabilities). To investigate this question was used two-way analysis of variance. Descriptive and inferential results from this study are presented in Table No. (1to 7). The findings contained in (Table.1) show that the mean scores for males and females is very close to each other in self-perception scale and its dimentions in group

with verbal learning disabilities. In other words, the two groups of males and females have almost the same performance in total score of self-perception scale and its dimensions. The findings show that the mean scores of group with verbal disabilities in self-perception scale and its dimensions is higher than groups with non-verbal disabilities.

Table. 2: Result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in general performance of subjects in self-perception scale					
Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	0.289	1	0.289	0.007	0.936
Type of subjects	920.66	1	920.66	23.02	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	19.557	1	19.557	0.489	0.658
Error	2399.44	60	39.994		
Total	38530.00	64			

Result of Table. 2 shows that in self-perception scale, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

Table 3: Result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in perception of cognitive competence dimension of self-perception scale					
Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	0.858	1	0.858	0.065	0.800
Type of subjects	626.52	1	626.52	47.53	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	0.666	1	0.666	0.051	0.823
Error	790.74	60	13.17		
Total	47433.00	64			

Results of Table.3 shows that in the perception of cognitive competence dimension, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

Table 4: Result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in the perception of sportive competence dimension of self-perception scale					
Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	4.66	1	4.66	0.316	0.576
Type of subjects	397.13	1	397.13	26.90	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	0.206	1	0.206	0.014	0.906
Error	885.59	60	14.76		
Total	37085.00	64			

Results of Table. 4 shows that in The perception of sportive competence dimension, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

Table 5: result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in the perception of social competence dimension of self-perception scale					
Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	14.81	1	14.81	0.534	0.468
Type of subjects	366.56	1	366.56	13.21	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	1.25	1	1.25	0.045	0.832
Error	1664.4	60	27.74		
Total	4527.00	64			

Results of Table. 5 shows that in the perception of social competence dimension, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

Table 6: result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in behavioral control dimension of self-perception scale

Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	0.736	1	0.736	0.019	0.890
Type of subjects	637.057	1	637.057	16.69	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	11.23	1	11.23	0.294	0.589
Error	2290.70	60	38.17		
Total	4369.00	64			

Results of Table 6 shows that in behavioral control dimension, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

Table 7: Result of two-way analysis of variance gender and type of subjects in General Self Worth dimension of self-perception scale

Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig
Gender	0.019	1	0.019	0.007	0.978
Type of subjects	43.35	1	43.35	17.026	0.001
Gender *Type of subjects	2.309	1	2.309	0.907	0.345
Error	152.79	60	2.546		
Total	5124.00	64			

Results of Table 7 shows that in the perception of general self worth dimension, there isn't significant difference between male and female subjects. Furthermore, the above table shows that the performance of subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have significant difference together ($P < 0.001$). The mean comparisons show that students with verbal learning disabilities have achieved higher scores in this field. Also was observed that the interaction between two variables of gender and type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) are not significant.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study has examined the differences between self-perception and its dimensions according to gender (female and male) and type of students (verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities). Results showed that there isn't significant difference between groups of males and females in the scale of social perception and its dimensions, This finding is not far from expectation and is consistent with the findings Jenkins and Asitengton (1996) and Sperling et al (2000). Mentioned researchers found in their research that None of abilities of mind theory are not dedicated to gender and generally there are no significant differences between two genders. In addition should be mentioned that today there isn't many gender differences whereas has been reported in previous decades. In general research shows that gender differences have decreased in recent years and it cause is more in social change, socialization process, change in cultural contexts and create equal opportunities for both genders (Lefrancois,1996). Moreover, the results indicate that variable type of subjects (with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities) is independent from the gender factor in general performance on self-perception scale and all of its dimensions, The mean comparisons show that students with verbal disabilities self-perception scale in and all of its dimensions have achieved higher scores. in other words, There are significant differences in favor of verbal group between subjects with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities in general performance and performance in each of self-perception scale dimensional. This finding is consistent with study that experss; Children with nonverbal learning disabilities show delay in the perception of themselves (Russell and et al,1998; Patterson and Siegel, 1995; 2005; Loundi, 2007). On the other hand results of group impact, likely reflecting this fact that students with nonverbal learning disabilities can not have communication and social interaction with individuals in the environment, hence show significantly lower performance due to their problem.

The findings of this research help us in recognition abilities in children with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities For educational programs that its target is to meet the different needs of students with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities and the attention focused on this point that students with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities have different strengths and weaknesses and attention to this issue in planning educational programs, leading to more efficient . Also by the mass media is tried that

individuals aware with progress and achievements of people with verbal and nonverbal learning disabilities and conditions provide in order to develop relations and interaction of this individuals with normal group.

Overall, the findings of this study show that children with non-verbal learning disabilities is faced more problems in self-perception. Considering the importance self-perception, educational and therapeutic intervention programs need for grow and develop mentioned skills in these children is more apparent. because we grow learners with correct planning, that they have more attention to thoughts, feelings and emotions of their and others, to have Sympathy and empathy with others and to have actively participate in social interactions. First limitations in most questionnaire research including this study, our assessment is based on a report that individuals provide the status of questioned. In fact individual is intermediate between researcher and fact that there is possibility of information diversion. other limitations in this study is including unique sample to centers of specific learning disabilities of exceptional organizations in Shiraz, small samples due to the limited number of centers of specific learning disabilities of exceptional organizations in Shiraz and lack an standard test of academic achievement in the field of reading for children with verbal disabilities. Doing similar research in other groups of exceptional children, including deaf children, gifted, more active, ... and compare them with normal children, investigate of self-perception in different age groups and different educational levels and in order to extension of the results, and access research in other age groups and other educational levels and their comparison together and comparison other characteristics of children with nonverbal learning disabilities Such as memory, social skills, self-concept, etc. for future research are suggested.

References

1. Ahmadi B (1994) Comparing the performance of students with learning disabilities and students without learning disabilities Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. MA Thesis. University of Shiraz.
2. Axelrod L (1982) Social perception in learning disability adolescents. *Journal of Learning Disability*. Vol.15, pp.610-613.
3. Aylward G (2002) Cognitive and neuropsychological outcomes : More then IQ scores . *Mental retardation & Developmental Disabilities Reserch Reviews*. Vol.8, Iss.4, 234-240.
4. Barce P (1998) What are nonverbal learning disabilities . [http:// www.nldontheweb.org/brace.htm](http://www.nldontheweb.org/brace.htm) > .
5. Bender W N & Golden LB (1990) Subtypes of students with learning disabilities as derived from cognitive, academic, behavioral, and self-concept measures. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. Vol.13, 183-194.
6. Bigler E D (1989) On the neuropsychology of suicide. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*., Vol.22, 180-185.
7. Bolaski A & Matt R (1998) Nonverbal learning disabilities: An overview .*Intervention in School and Clinic*. Vol.34, Iss.1, 39-43.
8. Broumbach R A (1996) Nonverbal learning disabilities , Aspergers syndrome, Pervasive developmental disorder Should we care. *Journal of Child Neurology*. Vol.11, 427-429.
9. Broumbach RA. Harper CR & Weinberg WA (1999) The source for Nonverbal learning disorders. *Journal of Child Neurology*. Vol.14, Iss.9.
10. Chow D & Skuy M (1998) Simultaneous and successive cognitive processing in children with nonverbal learning disabilities. *School Psychology International*. Vol.20, Issue.2, pp. 219-231.
11. Clayton M C & Dodd. Jodi L (2005) Nonverbal Neurodevelopmental Dysfunctions . *Pediatric Annals*., Vol.34, Iss.4, pp.321-328.
12. Cleaver RL & Whitman, RD (1998). Right hemisphere, white-matter learning disabilities associated with depression in an adolescent and young adult psychiatric population. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. Vol.186, pp. 561-565.
13. Cornoldi C, Rigoni F, Tressoldi E & Vio C (1999) Perception of Nonverbal Emotion Cues by Children with Nonverbal Learning Disabilities . *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. Vol.32, Issue.1, pp.38-48.
14. Davis J, Parr G & Lan W (1997) Differencces Between Learning Disability Subtypes Classified Using the Revised Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Education Battery . *Journal of Learning Disabilities*., Vol.30, Iss.3, pp.346-352.
15. DeLuca JW, Rourke BP & DelDotto JE (1991) Subtyes of arithmetic disabled children: Cognitive and personality dimension In. B.R. Rourke(ED). *Neuropsychology Validatiom of Learning Disabilities Subtyes*. New York. pp.180-219 .
16. Denckla M B (1993) The child with developmental disabilities grown up: adult residual of childhood disorders. *Neurologic Clinics: Behavioral Neurology*. Vol.11, pp.105-125.
17. Dimitrovsky L. Spector H, Levy-Shif R & Vakil E (1998) Interperatation of facial expressions of affect in children with learning disabilities with verbal or nonverbal deficits . *Journal of Learning Disabilities*., Vol.31, Issue.3, pp.286-292.

18. Dinklag D (2001) Asperger's disorder and nonverbal learning disabilities : How are these disorders related to each other?.<http://www.nldontheweb.org/dinklage-1.htm>.[2005/11/01].
19. Drummond CR, Ahamad SA & Rourke BP (2005) Rules for classification of younger children with nonverbal learning disabilities and basic phonological processing disabilities . *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. Vol. 20, Issue.2, pp.171-182.
20. Ewing-Cobbs L, Fletcher JM, & Levin HS (1995) Traumatic brain injury. In B. P. Rourke (Ed.), *Syndrome of Nonverbal Learning Disabilities: Neurodevelopmental Manifestations*. New York: Guilford Press. pp. 433-459.
21. Fisher NJ & DeLuca JW (1997) Verbal learning strategies of adolescents and adults with the syndrome nonverbal learning disabilities . *Child Neuropsychology*.,Vol.3, pp.192-198.
22. Forrest B (2005) The Utility of math difficulties,internalized psychopathology , and visual-spatial deficits to identify children with the nonverbal learning disability syndrome:evidence for a visual-spatial Disability. *Child Neuropsychology*. Vol.10,Issue. 2, pp.129-146.
23. Foss J (1999) Student with nonverbal learning disabilities . [http:// www.nldontheweb.org/foss.htm](http://www.nldontheweb.org/foss.htm) . [2009/11/01]
24. Frankenger C (2002) Non-verbal Learning Disabilities:An Emerging profile . <http://www.nldontheweb.org/frankenberger.htm>. [2009/11/01].

F .i
udg E (1997) What is nonverbal learning disorder
syndrome?.[Online].

Furest DR, Fisk JL & Rourk BP (1990) Psychosocial functioning of learning-disabled children : Relation between WISC .25 verbal IQ- performance IQ discrepancies and personality subtypes .*Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. Vol.58, pp.657-660.

26. Halis Fit (1987) Physical education and rehabilitation for the development, adaptation and recovery disabled, translated by Mohammad Taghi Monshi Tousi, Department of Islamic Research, Mashhad: Astan Qods Razavi, Cultural Affairs.
27. Hallahan Daniel P ·Kauffman James M (1996) Exceptional children: Introduction to special education, translated by Mohammad Taghi Monshi Tousi, Department of Islamic Research, Mashhad: astan ghods razavi, publishing beh company.
28. Haring & McCormick L (1986) *Exceptional Children and Youth*,4 th.ed,New York:Charles,E.Merril Publishing Company.
29. Harnadek M CS & Rourke BP (1994) Principal identifying features of the syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities in children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.Vol.27.
30. Haroon Rashidi H (2010) Non-verbal learning disabilities. Iranian Journal of Education and training of Exceptional Children, 91.
31. Haroon Rashidi H, Shahim S (2007) Comparing the performance of children with verbal learning disabilities and children with non-verbal disabilities in sub-tests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test, and math scale of Iranian Key Math .*Journal of Science and Research in Psychology*, Islamic Azad University ,Khorasgan Branch, No. 36, Summer 1386.
32. Heller W (1997) Understanding nonverbal learning disability [online]. <http://www.nldontheweb.org/heller.htm> .[2009/11/01]
33. Humphries T, Cardy JO ,Worling DE & Peets K (2004) Narrative comprehension and retelling abilities of children with nonverbal learning disabilities ". *Brain and cognition*.,Vol.56, pp.77-88.
34. Humphries T, Krekwich K & Snider L (1996) Evidence of nonverbal learning disabled boys with sensory integrative dysfunction *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. 82, pp. 979-989.
35. Johnson DJ & Myklebust HR (1971) Learning Disabilities : *Educational principles and practices*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Johnson DJ (1987) Nonverbal learning disabilities. *Pediatric Annals*. Vol.16, pp.133-141. .36

37. Katz I, Goldstein G & Beers SR (2002) Learning Disabilities in Older Adolescents and Adults;Clinical Utility of the Neuropsychological perspective.Kluwer Academic Publishers :New York.
38. Kaufman AS & Lichtenberger EO (2001) *Essentials of WISC-III and WPPSI-R Assessment* . New York: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.

39. Liddel G & Rasmussen C (2005) Memory profile of children with nonverbal learning disorder . *Learning Disabilities Reserch & Practice*.Vol.20,Issue. 3, pp137-141.
40. Little L (1993) Nonverbal learning disorder and socioemotional functioning : A review of recent literture." *Journal Learning Disabilities*. Vol.26, no.10, pp.653-665.
41. Little L (1998) Severe childhood sexual abuse and nonverbal learning disability". *American Journal of Psychotherapy*.Vol.52 Iss.3, pp.367-382.
42. Little L (2002) The Misunderstood Child: The child with a nonverbal learning disorder.[Online] <http://www.nldonthweb.org/Little.htm>. [2009/11/01].
43. Ludwig VH (2004) What is a nonverbal learning disability?"*The Exceptional Parent*.Vol.34.Iss.8,49-52.
44. McDonough-Ryan P, DelBello M, Shear PK, Ris DM, Soutullo C & Strakowski SM (2002) Academic and cognition abilities in children of parents with bipolar disorder: A test of the nonverbal learning disabilities model. *Journal of Clinical & Experimental Neuropsychology*,Vol.24, Issue. 3, 280-286.
45. Molenaar-Klumper M (2002) Non-Verbal Learning Disorder: *Characteristics, Diagnosis and Treatment* within an Education Setting. London,GBR:Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
46. Morris S (2002) Promoting social skills among students with nonverbal learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*.Vol.34, Iss.3.
47. Moss Thompson O (1985) The nonverbal dilemma. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.Vol.18, 400–402.
48. Mykelbust HR (1975) Nonverbal learning disorder :Assessment and intervention .*Progress Learning Disabilites*,Vol.3, 85-121.
49. Nichelli P & Venneri A (1995) Right hemisphere developmental learning disability:A case study.*Neurocase*.Vol.1.
50. Nikkho M, Avadis Yans (2002) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental disabilities DSM-IV-TR (Text Revision), American Psychiatric Association. 2000,Tehran, sokhan publications, second edition.
51. Petti VL,Voelke SL, Shore D & Hayman-Abello S (2003) Perception of nonverbal emotion cues by children with nonverbal learning disabilities. *Journal of Developmental &Physical* ,Vol.15,Issue.1, 23-36.
52. Roman M (1998) The syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities: Clinical description and applied aspects. [online]. <http://www.nldonthweb.org/roman.htm>. [2009/11/01].
53. Rourke BP, Young GC & Leenaars AA (1989)A childhood learning disability that predisposes those afflicted to adolescent and adult depression and suicide risk. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.Vol.22, 169-175.
54. Rourke BP & Finlayson MAJ (1978) Neuropsychological significance of variations in patterns of academic performance: Verbal and visual–spatial abilities. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*.vol.6, 121–133.
55. Rourke BP & Strang JD (1978) Neuropsychological significance of variations in patterns of academic performance: Motor, psychomotor, and tactile-perceptual abilities. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*.Vol.3,62–66.
56. Rourke BP & Strang JD (1983) Subtypes of reading and arithmetic disabilities: A neuropsychological analysis.*In M. Rutter (Ed.), Developmental neuropsychiatry*. New York,N.Y: Guilford press.
57. Rourke BP & Telegdy GA (1971) Lateralizing significance of WWISC verbal-performance discrepancies for older children with learning disabilities. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*,Vol.33, 875-883.
58. Rourke BP & Tsatsanis KD (1996) Syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities: Psycholinguistic assets and deficits . *Topics in Language Disorders*.Vol.16,pp. 30-44.
59. Rourke BP, Dietrich DM & Young GC (1973) Significance of WISC verbal-performance discrepancies for younger children with learning disabilities. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*.vol.36, 275-282.
60. Rourke BP, Young GC, Strang JD & Russell CK (1986) Adult outcomes of central processing deficiencies in childhood. *In I. Grant & K. M.Adams(Eds.), Neuropsychological assessment in neuropsychiatric disorders: Clinical methods and empirical findings* (pp. 244-267). New York: Oxford University Press.
61. Rourke BP & Conway JA (1997) Disabilities of arithmetic and mathematical reasoning: Perspectives from neurology and neuropsychology . *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. vol. 30, No.1, 214-220.
62. Rourke BP (1987) Syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities: The final common pathway of white-matter disease/dysfunction? *Clinical Neuropsychologist*. vol.1, 209–234.

63. Rourke BP (1989) Nonverbal Learning Disabilities, Socioeconomic Disturbance, and Suicide. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. vol. 22, Iss.3.
64. Rourke BP, Young GC & Flewelling RW (1971) The relationships between WISC verbal-performance descriptions and selected verbal, auditory perceptual and problem solving abilities in children with learning disabilities. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. Vol, 27, 475-479.
65. Rourke BP (1988) Socio-emotional disturbances of learning-disabled children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. Vol.56, 801-810.
66. Rourke BP (1993) Arithmetic disabilities, specific and otherwise: A Neuropsychological perspective. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. vol. 26, 214-220.
67. Rourke BP (1995) Syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities. *Neuropsychological manifestations*. New York: Guilford press.
68. Russell C (2004) Understanding nonverbal learning disorders in children with spina bifida. *Teaching Exceptional Children*. Vol.36, Issue. 4, 8-16.
69. Ryan TV, Goering AM, Cowen L, Crews DW & Barth JT (1998) A Case of triple X syndrome manifesting with the syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities. *Child Neuro Psychology*, Vol.4, Iss.3.
70. Semrud-Clikeman M & Hynd GD (1990) Right hemispheric dysfunction in nonverbal learning disabilities: social, academic, and adaptive functioning in adults and children. *Psychological Bulletin*. Vol.107, Iss.2, 196-105.
71. Shahim Sima (1998) Wechsler Intelligence Revised Scale for Children, the agenda and norms, Shiraz University Publications, second edition.
72. Strang JD & Rourke BP (1983) Concept-formation / non-verbal reasoning abilities of children who exhibit specific academic problems with arithmetic. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*. Vol.12, 33-39.
73. Swillen A, Vandeputte L, Cracco B, Maes B, Ghesquiere P, Devriendt K & Fryns J (1999) Neuropsychological, learning and psychological profile of primary school age children with Velo-cardio-facial syndrome (22q11 deletion): Evidence for a nonverbal learning disabilities? *Child Neuropsychological*. Vol.5, Iss.4, pp.230-242.
74. Tanguay P (1998) Nonverbal learning disorders: What to look for. [Online].
75. Tanguay P (2001) Nonverbal Learning Disabilities at Home, (a parent's guide). London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
76. Tanguay P (2003) Nonverbal learning disabilities at school educating students with NLD, Asperger syndrome, and related conditions. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol.73, Part.3, pp.445.
77. Telzrow FC & Bonar MA (2002) Responding to students with nonverbal learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*. Vol.34, Iss.6.
78. Thompson S (1996) Nonverbal learning disorders. [Online]. <http://www.nldontheweb.org/thompson.htm>. [2009/11/01].
79. Vacca M (2001) Confronting the puzzle of nonverbal learning disabilities. *Educational Leadership*. Vol.59, Issue.3.26.
80. Voeller KKS (1986) Right hemisphere deficit syndrome in children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. Vol.143, 1004-1009.
81. Volden J (2004) Nonverbal learning disability: A Tutorial for speech-language pathologists. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. Vol.13, Issue. 2, 128-141.
82. Weintraub S & Mesulam MM (1983) Developmental learning disabilities of the right hemisphere: Emotional, interpersonal, and cognitive components. *Archives of Neurology*. vol.40, 463-468.
83. White RF, & Kregel M (1995) Multiple sclerosis. In B. P. Rourke (Ed.), Syndrome of nonverbal learning disabilities: *Neurodevelopmental manifestations* (pp. 407-432). New York: Guilford Press.
84. Worling DE, Humphries T, Tannock R (1999) Spatial and emotional aspects of language inferencing in nonverbal learning disabilities. *Brain and Language*. Vol.70, 220-239.
85. Marti L (2004) Nonverbal learning disability in the childhood. *Journal of Child Neurology*. Vol.19, Iss.10, 830-836.