Journal of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing , 1990, Vol XXI

Linguistic Profile Test (LPT) - Normative data for children in Grades I to V

M.G. Suchitra & Pratibha Karanth
Dept. of Speech Pathology,
All India Institute of Speech and Hearing., Mysore

Abstract

The study focussed on the collection of normative data for school going children from Grade I to Grade V for the Linguistic Profile Test (LPT). 150 children ranging in age from 6+ years to 10+ years were the subjects in the current study. There were 30 subjects in each age group. Mean and standard deviation of LPT scores (total scores) were calculated. Mean and standard deviations of each of the three sections (Phonology, Syntax and Semantics) of LPT was also obtained. The normative data would be useful in identifying children with language disorders at particular linguistic, levels and also as a baseline for speech-language therapy.

The qualitative analysis of the data were in line with the descriptive studies on the aspects of language i.e, Phonology, Syntax and Semantics. Mean score for the Phonology section was higher when compared to the other two sections, confirming the earlier findings that Phonological development was almost complete by the time the child reaches 6 years and beyond this the same level was maintained. As chance factor was high in the younger age groups in grammalicality judgement tasks (in the syntax section), the Grammatical Sensitivity Index (A') was calculated The Sensitivity Index indicated an increase in grammatical sensitivity with an increase in age, confirming the findings of the earlier study that adult like sensitivity was acquired by adolescence. The findings in the semantic section were also similar to those in the syntax section. Statistical analysis (Newman I Keul' s Range Test i indicated significant difference among most of the age groups (excepts 6+ & 7+) for total scores as well as for each of the three sections of LPT, confirming the findings of the earlier studies that a developmental trend was evident among age groups with-a rise at about 8 years and tending to slow down at about 10 years of age.

The findings of the current study are in line with those of other investigators who equate metalinguistic awareness with other skills which emerge later in childhood at which stage the child gives evidence of the ability to formulate and make judgements about language.

Introduction

The presentation of language tests has assumed that a judgement of "language disorder" must be based on an understand ing in both form and function, of what is to be expected with chronological age. The description available from an appropriate combination of test results the child's abilities and disabilities within his language system (Harold and Thomas 1981).

During the last decade or two, a plethora of language tests have been published in the west. Consequently, the speech

- language clinician in the west has a wide choice of language tests for different purposes in different theoretical frameworks. The Indian scene on the other hand is characterised by an extreme paucity of language tests. In the recent past some attempts have been made to fill the lacunae (SST - Syntax Screening Test in Tamil - Sudha. 1981, Task & Stask - Test for Acquisition of Syntax inKannada-Vijayalakshmi. A.R. 1981,3D - Language Acquisition Test -Geetha 1986,Kamalini 1986, Usha 1986). The development of Linguistic Profile Test was one such.

The Linguistic Profile Test, henceforth referred as (LPT) was designed with the objective of evaluating and analyzing adequate linguistic samples at the Phonological, Syntax and Semantic levels. The test was originally designed a decade ago (Karanth, 1980 a) in Kannada. The frame work of the test is such that, it can be easily constructed in any language. Over the last ten years, the test has been used extensively with clinical populations (both adults and children) and has been found clinically useful, both for evaluation and as a basis for rehabilitation and linguistic retraining of the communicatively disabled (Karanth, 1980 (a) & (b), 1981,1984,1988,1990 and 1991). During this period the test has undergone some revisions. A parallel version of the test was developed in Hindi (Karanth, Pandit, and Gandhi 1986). Data on a large number of normal adults and stroke patients including aphasics and nonaphasics (Karanth, Ahuja, Nagaraj, Pandit, and Shivashankar, 1991) has been collected and analyzed. A picturised version of the test for young children of 3-7 years of age has been constructed and field tested (UNICEF funded joint project - RRTC, Madras and NIHH, Bombay) in seven Indian languages including Kannada and Hindi, Tamil, Oriya, Gujarathi, Marathi and Bengali.

The Linguistic Profile Test has three major sections dealing with Phonology, Syntax and Semantics respectively, with discourse forming the tail end of the third section. The choice of methods with in these sections covers a wide range of tasks such as pointing, repetition, naming, indication of grammatical and semantic acceptability, listing of lexical categories, sentence completion, matching synonyms and antonyms etc (Karanth 1980 (a) & (b).

The current study aimed at confirming the developmental trend based on the collection of large scale normative data on LPT for school going children between 6-10 years of age (i.e. from grade I to grade V). Normative scores of LPT would be useful in identifying school age children with language disorders and also in finding out the area of deficit - i.e., linguistic skills and structures at different linguistic levels which is essential to carry out a systematic language remediation programme.

Methodology

Subjects:

30 children each from grade I to V

ranging in age from 6+ years to 10+ years were the subjects in the current study. These children were

(1) Healthy normal children with no physical or sensory disabilities.

(2) Native speakers of Kannada.

(3) Were studying in Kannada medium.

The subject details are in Table 1.

Table 1 : Age groups and the number of subjects in each group.

Age Group	No. of subjects		
	Males	Females	Total
6+ years	15	15	30
7+ years	12	18	30
8+ years	13	17	30
9+ years	13	17	30
10+ years	20	10	30

Procedure:

The Linguistic Profile Test was administered during the second term of the academic year. Unlike the earlier studies (Karanth 1984, Kudva 1991) where each subject was tested individually on all ilcms of all subsections, forthe subjects of the age groups 8+ years and 10+ years, the section I-Phonology and parts of section III-Scmantics (i.e. the subsections semantic discrimination, expression; lexical category, polar questions, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations) were administered individually. However, section II-Syntax and certain parts of Section Ill-Semantics (sub-sections - synonymy, antonymy, homonymy, semantic anomaly, semantic contiguity and semantic similarity) were administered to groups of 15 children as these age groups were familiar with writing tasks and the tasks involved in the test (LPT) were similar to those exercises given in their classroom set up. For children of the age groups 6+ years and 7+ years all the three sections were administered individually. Apart from the LPT test format which was routinely used, separate response sheets were prepared for the sections which were administered in group. While administering Section III - Semantics - the subsections were administered consecutively. The subjects were instructed to carefully listen to each sentence spoken by the tester and indicate whether the sentence was grammatcally acceptable [•] or not [X] (on a prepared response sheet). Examples of correct and incorrect forms were given and an attempt was made to ascertain that the subjects understood the instructions. The test items were presented auditorily one after the other with adequate time between items for recording responses. The children were tested in quiet classroom siluation. All the responses were recorded on response sheets.

Analysis : The data recorded were tabulated and the Mean and SD of LPT scores for each age group were computed. Further, Newman/Keul's Range Test was used to find out the significance of difference between means.

Results:

The Mean and Standard Deviation of LPT scores (total scores) are given in Table 2. The results indicated that the Mean score ranged from 201.17 to 251.64. The

total score increased from 6+ years to 10+ years.

Age Group	Mean Scores (Total Scores)	S.D.
6+ years	201.17	10.53
7+ years	202.01	14.26
8+ years	235.14	17.44
9+ years	242.00	14.24
10+ years	251.64	11.63

The mean total scores and standard deviation of the three sections of LPT, namely Phonology, Syntax and Semantics are given in Table 3. Newman/ Keul's Range Test was used to find out the Significance of difference between Means, the results of which are given in Table 4.

Table 3 : Mean and Standard Deviations for Different Age Groups

Age Group	Phonology Mean	Phonology S.D.	Syntax Mean	Syntax S.D.	Semantics Mean	Semantics S.D.	Tot 1 Scores Mean	Tot 1 Scores S.D.
I (6+ years)	87.48	2.55	57.87	7.43	56.32	7.70	201.17	10.53
11 (7+ years)	88.82	2.88	55.95	8.1 1	56.93	8.72	202.01	14.26
III (8+ years)	92.55	3.03	69.07	8.62	72.00	8.96	235.14	17.44
IV (9+ years)	93.79	3.20	70.87	7.72	78.03	8.32	242.00	14.24
V (10+years)	96.25	2.30	73.43	8.34	81.93	5.88	251.64	11.63

Table 4 : Significance of the difference between Means (Newman/Keul 's Range Test). * - indicates significant difference at 0.05 level.

Age Groups.	Total Scores	Phonology	Syntax	Semantics
6+ Vs 7+	-	-	-	-
6+ Vs 8+	*	*	*	*
6+ Vs 9+	*	*	*	*
6+ Vs10+	*	*	*	*
7+ Vs 8+	*	*	*	*
7+ Vs 9+	•	*	*	*
7+ Vs10+	*	*	*	*
8+ Vs 9+	*	*	*	*
8+Vs10+	*	*	*	*
9+ Vs10+	*	*	*	*

It was observed that the Mean score obtained for Phonology was significantly higher than that for syntax and semantics. In all the three tasks there was a sudden change in the performance between the ages of 7-8 years and the scores in all the tasks increased as a function of age. From the age of 7+ to 10+ years the children obtained highest scores in Phonology followed by Semantics and Syntax. However children in the age group of 6+ years, obtained highest scores in Phonology followed by Syntax and Semantics.

From the mean scores obtained by the children in these five age groups, it was evident thatbeginning with ascoreof around 50 at the age of 6 there was a gradual but consistent increase in scores with a sharp rise around the age of 7-8 years for the semantic and syntactic sections of LPT. The results showed a higher level of phonological development through the age range studied.

In the earlier study (Karanth, 1984), Children below 6 years were unable to carry out the task on section II -Syntax - which calls for judgement of syntactic acceptability of a given item. These children tended to accept or reject all given items without discrimination. At around 5.10 years of age, children were found to attempt the task and perform at a chance level of 50, gradually achieving about 80-90% proficiency by about 12.6 years of age, with a sharp rise in grammaticality judgement ability between 6-9 years of age. The mean total scores in Section II - i.e., Syntax ranges from (57.87 ± 7.43) lo (73.43 ± 8.43) from Grade I to Grade V. Improvement in mean total scores is evident from 8+ years onwards though not as significant as in Phonology.

In view of the fact that a chance factor is high in the younger age groups in grammaticality judgement tasks, the Grammaticalily Sensitivity Index (A^1) as given by Linebarger, Schwartz and Saffran (1983) was computed for each child in the present study. The Grammalicalily Sensitivity Index (A^1) is a nonparamctric index of sensitivity based upon the estimated area under the receiver operating-characteristic (ROC) curve which is theoretically equal to the proportion of correct responses attainable in a two alternate forced choice procedure and as such provides a pure measure of sensitivity.

The mean scores of Index of sensitivity A'obtained by the different age groups on the different syntactic structures in the current study is given in Table 5.

The average value A across the five age groups can be seen to increase from 0.61 lo 0.80 indicating an increase in grammatical sensitivity with an increase in age. However, the maximum sensitivity (A^1 = 1.0) was not attained even by the age of 11 years.

The findings clearly showed a differential rate of acquisition of grammatical sensitivity across these categories. The sensitivity lo plural markers was already high throughout. On the other hand, sensi-

Table 5 : Mean Scores of Index of Sensitivity (A') for different age groups.

Sl.No.	Item	6+ years	7+ years	8+ years	9+ years	10+years
A.	Moiphophoncmic structure	0.54	0.56	0.79	0.87	0.87
B.	Plural forms	0.85	0.80	0.87	0.89	0.89
C.	Tenses	0.52	0.50	0.65	0.64	0.58
D.	PNG Markers	0.69	0.66	0.80	0.87	0.89
E.	Case Markers	0.54	0.61	0.73	0.80	0.86
F.	Transitive Intronsive & Causa lives	0.65	0.63	0.84	0.82	o.81
G.	Sentence Types	0.73	0.64	0.82	0.79	0.87
H.	Predicates	0.47	0.49	0.88	0.87	0.87
I.	Conjunctions comparatives & quotation	0.60	0.62	0.69	0.72	0.72
J.	Conditional Clauses	0.61	0.64	0.70	0.72	0.72
K.	Participial construction	0.47	0.55	0.66	0.69	0.69
	x	0.61	0.61	0.77	0.79	0.69

tivity to participial constructions was lowest at age 6-7 years and increased very gradually reaching only 0.7 at the highest age level being tested here i.e., 10+ years. In contrast sensitivity to predicates was low in the age group of 6+ years and 7+ years, increased dramatically within the next year (8+ years) and the same was maintained across the older age groups. The other subcategories fall in between these extremes indicating differential sensitivity to different syntactic structures at various ages. But there was an overall increase in sensitivity to all the structures tested across the age ranges studied here. The various subcategories were also ranked in order of decreasing scores (based on the sensitivity index) within the category with the highest score being ranked 1 and the lowest 11.

As seen from the table it was evident that plurals were the most sensitive in all the five age groups studied here. The items i.e., morphophonemic structures, PNG markers, and predicates were relatively more sensitive compared to the rest of the items, showing a developmental trend across the age group studied here. The items i.e., case markers, transitive, intransitive and causatives, sentence types, conjunctives, comparatives and quotalives and conditional clauses exhibited alow sensitivity throughout. The items i.e. participial constructions and tenses exh i bi ted lowest sensi tivity across all the age groups studied here.

Table. 6. Ranking of subcategories (items of Syntax section) based on Sensitivity index.

Rank	6+yrs Items	Rank	7+yrs Items	Rank	8+yrs Items	Rank	9+yrs Items	Rank	10+yrs Items
1	B	1	B	1	11	1	B	1.5	B & D
2	B	2	D	2	B				
3	D	3.5	G & J	3	F	3	A.D. & H		
4	F			4	G			4	A.G. & H
5	J	5	F		D	5	F		
6	I	6	I	6	A	6	E	6	E
7.5	E & A	7	E	7	E	7	G	7	F
9	C	8	A	J	8.5	I&J	8.5	I & J	
10.5	K & H	9	K	9	l				
		10	C	10	K	10	K	10	K
		11	H	11	C	11	C		

The mean scores and standard deviation for the different items of the Semantic section are given in Table 7.

Table 7 : Mean and S.D. for different items of the Semantic Section of LIT

Items No.	6+ X	S.D.	7+ X	S.D.	8+ X	S.I).	9+ X	S.D.	10+ X	S.D
A.										
1	4.2	1.4	4.2	1.2	4.8	0.9	4.7	0.9	5	0
2	5.0	0.0	5.0	0		0		0	5	0
3	3.7	1.3	4.3	1.3	4.5	1.1	4.6	0.9	4.6	1.0
B										
1	19.4	2.2	19.9	0.3	19.8	0.5	19.6	1.7	19 9	0.2
2	6.2	3.1	6.8	2.6	9.5	2.3	9.1	3.1	10 0	2.2
3	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.9	2.2	1.6	3.6	1.7	3.6	1.7
4	0.2	0.8	0.6	1.3	2.6	1.6	3.2	1.8	4.0	1.2
5	0.03	0.2	0.03	0.2	0.9	1.3	0.9	0.9	1.5	1.2
6	7.4	2.0	7.6	2.2	90	0.9	8.9	0.8	9.2	0.9
7	2.3	1.7	2.0	1.7	3 5	l.6	4.2	1.2	4.4	1.1
8	2.3	1.0	2.5	1.4	3.9	O.8	4.0 '	0.9	4.3	0.7
9	1.9	1.2	13	0.8	2.9	0.9	3.5	1.1	3.7	1.1
10	0.9	1.3	1.0	1.4	28	1.6	3.1	1.4	3.8	1.2
11	0.4	1.1	0.5	1.0	2.0	1.6	2.9	1.6	3.';	1.7

Under the semantic section, better performance was observed for items in section III-A - Semantic Discrimination as against Section III-B. The mean total scores for most of the items in Section III-A (Semantic Discrimination) was higher (with scores reaching maximum level even for the lowest age group (when compared to scores

in Section III-B Semantic Expression) where differential performance was observed for the items across all age groups studied here. Better performance for item No. 2 (Furniture) as against the item No. 1 (Colour) and item No. 3 (Body parts) was found. Maximum scores have been obtained by children of 6+ years age group of item No. 2, whereas the findings for the other items (item No. 1 & 3) indicate a gradual improvement in performance from 8+ years age group, with performance reaching maximum level only at the highest age group studied (i.e. 10 yrs).

The mean scores on item No. 1 - Naming under section III-B - Semantic Expression, indicated an overall better performance compared to other items in this section, withmaximum scores attained even at 6+ years level (the youngest age group in the current study). The performance was relatively same across age groups and remained high throughout. It may be seen that while the performance on semantic discrimination was already high (Maximum scores were attained even at the lowest age group studied i.e., 6+ years) the performance on item No. 5, i.e., Homonyms (providing alternate meanings for words) was poor and remains low throughout - across the age groups studied. Though there was an improvement at 8+ years, the overall performance was lower at all stages. The other items fall in between these extremes indicating differential performance to different semantic structures at various ages. An overall increase or better performance for all items was obvious across the age range studied i.e., with increase in age, the performance was better with a spurt in growth of these abilities at around 8+ years. Better performance was observed for items Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, & 2 (i.e. Polar questions, semantic, Syntagmatic relations and Lexical category respectively) and a comparatively poorer performance was observed for item Nos. 3, 4, 11 & 10 (Synonymy, Antonymy, Semantic similarity and semantic contiguity respectively).

Thus the findings in the semantic section of this study were similar to those in the syntax section i.e., Maximum scores were not obtained even by the oldest age group studied (i.e., 10+ years).

Discussion

The findings in the Phonologic section were in agreement with the findings of the earlier study (Karanth, 1984), and confinned the earlier observation that phono0-logical development was almost complete by the time the child reaches 6 years and beyond this the same level was maintained.

The findings in the Syntax section i.e. an improvement in the mean total scores from 8+ years, were in agreement with those reported by Bohannon (1976), Karmiloff-Smith (1979), Hakes (1980) and Vankleek (1982), Tunmer&Bowey (1982).

The overall findings of the Syntax section of the current study confirmed the findings of the previous study (Karanth, 1984) and were in agreement with the con-

elusion of the earlier study that adult like sensitivity to grammaticalily judgemeni is acquired by adolescence. The findings that beginning around 6-7 years, children arc gradually able to make judgements more like adults by evaluating the properties of the sentences was also in agreement with the earlier observations of Bohannon(1976), School and Ryan (1980) and Hakes (1980). The findings of this study are also in consonance with Karmiloff-Smith's (1979) ascertain that by age of 8 years the child has attained a more abstract level of linguistic competence with which he can cope with out functional, semantic and pragmatic procedures of normal language usage. In a more recent study on grammaticality judgement tasks, carried out in India, Vasantha, Shastry and Maruth (1989) report similar findings that an increase in grammatical judgement ability is seen from 4.5 to 8.5 years with a dramatic improvement around 6.5 + 7 years. Vasantha et al conclude that by about the age of 8 to 8.5 years an asymptote is reached by which time the performance is almost adult like. However the results of the present study indicate that this might be true only of the particular structures included in their study. With the inclusion of more complex structures the increase in grammatical judgement ability can be shown to increase until 12-14 years of age (Karanth, 1984) and is also evident from the findings of the current study where maximum sensitivity (A = 1.0) is not attained even al 11 years of age.

The findings in the Semantic section, i.e.for items in Section III-A are in agreement with the study by Hulttenlocher, Smiley and Ratner, (1974) wherein, it is reported that the object concepts seem to be among first "natural language concepts" to be acquired. Children comprehend and produce words which group perceptually similar objects, both animate and inanimate by approximately 14 months (Goldin-Meadow ct al 1976, Huttcnlocher, 1974). The information involved in the categorization is perceptual and may be representable in the form of prototypes or images of the average unit. This early emergence might be also due to theirhaving been named more frequently than any other category (Hultcnlocher, Smiley and Ratner, 1983). Istomina (1963) and Johnson (1977) from their study report that even though among the earliest adjectives in childrens vocabulary arc colour words, yet young children are notoriously bad at using colour words appropriately. Any complete account regarding acquisition of colour words will have to progress in studies that relate this aspect to child's conceptual and linguistic development.

The findings for items in Section 11I-B agree with those of Bower (1974) wherein earlier recognition of familiar persons and objects in many different orientations and contexts at around 6-7 months has been reported staling that cognitive abilities that arc prc-requisite for learning proper names are present well before speech.

The results of studies on similar items (items similar to item nos. 2,3,4,6,7,8,10 & 11 of LPT) indicate that the findings are on similar lines with that of the present study. Howe & Hillman (1973) found in their study that even four year olds showed some ability to discriminate between sentences that violate selectional restrictions and ones that do not. Research on children's abilities to judge that sentences are ambiguous also suggest that this ability increases considerably during middle childhood and even beyond (Kessel, 1970) Schultz & Pilon 1973). The performance of the 6 year old was sufficiently poor for all kinds of ambiguities tested. Acceptability tasks involving semantic restrictions have also been studied by Howe and Hillman (1973) and James and Miller (1973). Their study indicated that both 5 and 7 year old were capable of distinguishing between meaningful and anomalous sentences involving + animate or + human selection. The results of the current study arc in agreement with the studies of Howe & Hillman (1973) and James and Miller (1973). Even the youngest age group in the current study (6 + years) have correctly judged the sentence No.3 of item 7. Whereas poor performance in terms of judging and explaining the ambiguity is found for sentences No. 1, 2 & 5. Sentence No. 4 has been accepted as anomalous even by the youngest group. These findings are in line with the findings of Huttenlocker, Smiley & Ratner (1983) who report that the earliest adjectives to appear in spontaneous speech in data are not words for inherent properties of objects like colour or shape rather they are temporary states such as hot, wet etc. In contrast to either object or inherent properties or temporary states, relational properties (eg: big, small) involve a relational notion namely the comparison of a target object to some standard. Barllelt (1976) reports that children comprehend the comparative sense of big and small by 2.5 years. Nelson & Benedict (1974) report that second class relative appears only after the age of 6 years. Words that specify relationships between people, objects and events occur quite early in child's language, but the meanings of most relational words are not acquired in all their complexity until the child is 4 or 5 years or older (de Villiers & de Villiers, 1982). Several studies have devised language games to test children's knowledge of spatial adjectives. Clark (1972) reports of a consistent order of difficulty of spatial adjectives in the opposite game. So also in the study by Carey and Considine, (1973). The youngest children in Clark's study with a mean age of 4.4 could produce semantically appropriate responses to big and small. Whereas only 82% and 80 % gave appropriate responses to long/short and tall/short respectively. For other spatial adjectives, the the percentage of appropriate responses was 45% for high/low, 12% for thick/thin, 7% for wide/narrow, 2% for deep/shallow. Carey & Considine (1973) have noted that the rela-

tive frequency with which each pair appears in the language of adults (Kucere & Francis 1967) and in the speech of 5 year olds (Wepman & Hess 1969) also partially predicts the order of difficulty of these adjectives for children. Similar findings are observed in the current study.

Sack and Beilin (1971) report that the ability to judge synonymy emerges later than the ability to understand the sentences being judged. The results of this study suggest that there is a substantial development during middle childhood of children's ability to judge synonymy and that this development occurs later than the development of the ability to understand the sentences judged. Further, they also suggest that younger children (first graders and younger) may perform systematically worse than chance on synonymous sentence pairs.

More recently, attention has been focusscd on linguistic developments occurring after age of 4-5 years, around the time when children begin to learn to read. Research (Tunmer & Bowey, (1984) on the nature of linguistic development during middle childhood (the period from 4-8 years) reveals that not only is there a continuation ofearlierdevelopmental processes, but there emerges a new kind of linguistic functioning, which has been referred to as Metalinguistic development. Hakes (1980) reports that the review of existing literature suggests that during middle childhood a wide variety of linguistic abilities - those characterized as Metalinguistic show striking development where the studies sought to examine the developments occurring between the ages of 4-8 years in diverse metalinguistic abilities.

According to Flavell (1978, 1981) the development of all mcla-abilities, including metalinguistic awareness is thought to occur gradually over a period of years during childhood.

The findings that, from the age of 7 years to 10 years the children obtained lowest scores in syntax followed by semantics and phonology whereas the children of 6+ years, obtained lowest scores in semantics followed by syntax and phonology cannot be attributed to the difference in administration (i.e. parts of the test being administered to the children of 6+ and 7+ years individually and to the children of 8+, 9+ and 10+ years in group) as the similar results have been found in the earlier studies Karanth (1984) and Kudva (1991) wherein, the test was administered individually.

The overall findings in the current study which is in concurrence with the results of the earlier studies Karanth (1984), Rangasayce et al (1988) and Kudva (1991) indicate the following :

As the difference in the younger age groups i.e. 6+ and 7+ years is not statistically significant the picturised version of the test (RRTC Test Battery) has been found to be useful for the younger age groups i.e. below 7 years.

- LPT can be used for evaluating children above 7 years of age,lhe scores in the age groups of 7+,8+,9+, and 10+ years being statistically significant for the total scores as well as for the three

sections of the LPT. In the Phonology section, ***where*** *most of the phonological development is complete by 6 years, the test (LPT) can be used to check phonological competence in children.*

The Linguistic Profile Test can also be used as a basis for therapeutic programme i.e. the performance of an individual with reference to items within each section can be looked into by the therapist for eg: in Syntax section - the performance on different structures can be observed and noted down and appropriate steps for remediation can be planned. In Semantics section, an idea about the acquisition of concepts which are included in these items is of great help in planning speech - language therapy especially in young children with speech-language-hearing disorders who are yet to learn the basic aspects of speech-language.

Conclusion

The Linguistic Profile Test is useful for identification of language disorders and also in finding out the area of deficit. Individual linguistic profiles give a clear picture of the performance at various levels. The profiles can also be used for rc-cvaluation for assessing progress from time to time and as a basis for therapeutic programmes.

Acknowledgement

We are extremely grateful to the authorities, Head Mistress & Staff of J.S.S. Primary School, Saraswathipuram, for the permission to collect the data at their school and the children who enthusia--tically participated in the data collection process.

References

Bartlett. E.J. (1976). Cited in chapter 5. de Villiers. J.G. and De Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition* (pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Bartlett, E.J. (1977). Cited in Huttenlocher, L, Smiley, P and Ratner, H. What do word meanings reveal about conceptual development ? - Theory and research on action words. Part 5 : In Seiler, Th.B. and Wannen Macher, W (Eds). *Concept Development and the Development of Word meaning* (pp 210-234), New York : Springcr-Verlag. 1983.

Bierwisch (1970). Cited in chapter 5. de Villiers, J.G. and devilliers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150) Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Bohannon, J.N. (1976). Normal and Srambled grammar in discrimination, imitation and comprehension. *Child Development,* 47, (Pp 669-681).

Bower,T.G. (1974). Cited in Chapter 5.de Villiers, J.G. , and dc Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150) Cambridge : Hervard University Press. 1982).

Brow, R. (1973). *A First language.* The Early stages. London : George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Carey, S., and Considine, T. (1973). Cited in Chapter 5. de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1982.

Clark, E.K. (1972). Cited in chapter 5.de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Clark, E.V. (1973). Cited in chapter 5. de Villiers, J.G. and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition,* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Hervard University Press. 1982.

Clark, H.H. (1970). cited in Chapter 5. de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

de Villiers, J.G. and dc Villiers, P.A. (1982). *Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.'

Flavell, J.H.(1978). Cited in Part III-3.1). Tunmer, W.E., Pratt, C, and Herriman, M.L. (Eds). *Metalinguistic Awareness in children.* Theory, Research and Implications (Pp 128-143). New York : Springer Verlag. 1984.

Flavell, J.H.(1981). CitedinPartHI-(3.1). Tunmer, W.E., Pratt, C, and Herriman, M.L. (Eds). *Metalinguistic Awareness in children.* Theory, Research and Implications (Pp 128-143). New York : Springer Verlag. 1984.

Geetha, H. (1986). *ID-Language Acquisition Test* (3D-LAT). Dissertation. Mysore : University of Mysore.

Goldin-Mcadow (1976). Cited in Part 5. Sciler, Th.B., and Wanhen Macher, W. (Eds). *Concept Development and the Development of Word Meaning,* (210-234^ New York : Springer Verlag. 1983A Hakes, D.T. (1980). The Development of Metalinguistic Abilities in children. Berlin : Swpringer Verlag.

Harold, A.P., and Thomas, P.M. (1981). *Appraisal and Diagnosis of Speech and Language Disorders.* (Pp 102-157). London : Prentice Hall.

Hcider, E.R. (1971). Cited in chapter 5. dc Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Heider, E.R. (1972). Cited in chapter 5. de Villiers, j.G. and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University. 1982.

Howe, H.E., and Hillman, D. (1973). Cited in chapter 2. Hakes, D.T. *The Nature of Metalinguistic Abilities.* (Pp 21-40). Berlin : Springer Verlag. 1980.

Hultcnlocher,J.(1974). cited in chapter5.de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.a.(Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University.

Huttenlocher,J., Smiley, P., and Ratner, H. (1983). Cited in Pan 5. Seiler, Th. B., and Wannermacher, W. (Eds). *Concept Development and the Develop0 ment of Word meaning* (Pp 210-234). New York : Springer Verlag. 1983.

Islomina,*'Z M.* (1963). CitedinChapier5.dcVilliers, I.G., and de Villiers, p.A. (Eds). *Language Acqui0 sition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard Univer0 sity Press. 1982.

James, S.L., and Miller, J.f. (1973). Cited in Part II (2.3) Tunmer, W.E., Pratt, C, and Herriman, M.L. (Eds). *Metalinguistic Awareness in children.* New York : springer Verlag. 1984.

Johnson, E.G. (1970). cited in chapter 5.de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acqui0 sition.* (121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Kamalini, P. (1986). *ID-Language AcquisitionTest and the Mentally Retarded.* Dissertation. Mysore : University of Mysore.

Karnnlh, P. (1980). *A Comparative Analysis of Aphasia and Schizophrenic Language.* Doctoral Thesis. Mysore : University ol Mysore.

Karanth.P. (1980) b. *"Linguistics and Aphasia - testing and Therapy"* - Seminar on Neurolinguistics an Aphasia. Annual Conference LSHA. Hyderabad.

Karanth.P. (1981). Linguistics : The Evaluation and Remediation of Language in Aphasics. *Indian Linguistics,* 3-4, (Pp 181-187). Pune.

Karanlh.P. (1984). *Inter - relationships of Linguistic Deviance and Social Deviance* - ICSSR Young Social Scientist's Fellowship Report. Mysore : CHL.

Karanlh.P. and Rangamani.G. (1988). *Linguistic Profile Test - Implications for the Diagnosis and Management of Language Disorders.* XIV Annual Conference of Dravidian Linguistic Association.

Karanlh.P. Ahuja.J.K., Nagaraja,D., Pandit.R., and Shivashankar,N. (1990). *Cross Cultural Studies of Aphasias Symposium on Aphasias - Language and Cognition.* Proceedings of the XIV World Congress

of Neurology. Hillsdale.N.J : Lawrence Erblaum Associates

Karanth,P., Ahuja.G.K., Nagaraj.D., Pandit.R., and Shivashankar.N. (191). *Language Disorders in Indian Neurological Patients - A study in Neurolinguistics in the Indian Context-A report* - An Interinstitutional Project in collaboration with AIIMS, Delhi ; N1MHANS, Bangalore - funded by 1CMR (No. 9/8/10-1 (oto)/84-NCD-l IRIS Cell, ICMR 8403810).

Karanth.P. *The Linguistic Profile Test - A new look at Aphasic Symptoms* - being processed

Karanth,p. & Suchitra, M.G., *Literacy Acquisition and Grammaticality Judgement in children.* In R. School & perspectives. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (In press)

Karmiloff'-Smith, A (1979). Language Development after 5 years. In 1'. Fletcher and M Garman (Eds), *Language Acquisition* (P 307-324). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Kessel, F.S. (1970) cited in Chamber 2. Hakes, D.T. *The Development of Metalinguistic Abilities in children.* Berlin : Springer Verlag. 1980.

Kuccra H. & Francis W.N. (1967). Cited in Chap. 5 de Villiers, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Kudva, A. (1991). *The Literacy Factor in syntactic Judgment and Comprehension in children.* Unpublished Dissertation Mysore : University of Mysore.

Linebarger, M.C. Schwartz, M.F and Saffian, E.M. (1983).Sensitivity to grammatical structure in so-called agrammatic aphasics. *cognition,* 13, PP 361-392.

Nelson, K & Benedict, h (1974). Cited in Part 5, Sailer, Th. B. Wannenmacher, W (Eds). *Concept Development and the Development of word meaning.* (Pp 210-234). New York. Springer-verlag.

Nelson,K. (1974). Cited in Chapter 5, deVilliers.J.g. and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Rosch.E., and Morvis, C.g. (1975). Cited in Chapter 5, de Villicrs, J.G. and de Villicrs, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition,* (121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1982.

Sack H.G. and Bcilin, H. (1971) cited in Chapter 2, Hakes, D.T. *The Nature and Development of Metalinguistic abilities* (Pp 21-40). Berlin : Springer-Verlag. 1980

Schultz., T.R. and Pilon R (1973) cited in Chapter 2. Hakes. D.T. *The Nature and Development of Metalinguislic abilities(pp2\-40).* berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1980.

Sinclair-de-Zvvart, H. 1969. Cited in Chapter 5. de Villicrs, J.G., and de Villiers, P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.*

Sudha, K.M. (1981). *A Syntax Screening Test in Tamil.* Dissertation, Mysore ; University of Mysore Tunmer.W.E. and Bowey, J.A. (1984). Metalinguistic Awareness and Reading Acquisition. Part III (3.2). In Tunmcr, W.E., Pratt, c., and Hcrriman, ML (Eds). *Metalinguistic Awareness in children.* (Pp 144-168). Berling : Springer-Verlag, 1984.

Usha.K.R. (1986). *3D-Language Acquisition Test and the Hard of Hearing.* Dissertation. Mysore : University of Mysore.

Van Kleek, A. (1982). *The Emergence of Linguistic awareness: A Cognitive framework.* Merrill-Parlmer Quarterly. 28, P. 237.

Vasantha, D, Sastry, J.V., and Maruth, R. (1989). *Ggrammatically judgements of Telugu Speaking Elementary School children. Interdisciplinary National Seminar on Language Processes and Language Disorders* : Hyderabad : Osmania University.

Vijayalakshmi.A.R. (1981). *Test of Acquisition of Syntax in Kannada.* Doctoral. Mysore ; University of Mysore.

Wepman and Hess (1969). Cited in Chapter 5. de Villiers, J.G. and de Villiers P.A. (Eds). *Language Acquisition.* (Pp 121-150). Cambridge : Harvard University. 1982.