APPENDIX B

LITERATURE SEARCH AND LABELING OF ACM DIGITAL LIBRARY

This appendix contains the specific details about the search described in Chapter 3, Section 2.2 of the ACM Digital Library to identify the degree of computer science research efforts in regards to assistive technologies for reading and learning disabilities.

1 Search Terms

The search of the ACM Digital Library (http://portal.acm.org/dl.cfm was conducted on August 17, 2009. Through trial and error, it was determined that the library’s search engine ignored punctuation, meaning that the search term “learning disabled” would return the same results as “learning-disabled.” It was also determined that the search engine did not automatically perform stemming. This necessitated manual including both singular and plural terminology among the search terms. Additionally, adjective forms (“dyslexic” and “disabled” were included in the search terms. With the results shown in Table B.1, four separate searches using the following search terms were conducted:

- **Reading Disability Search (RD only)**
  
  This search sought to find all papers referring to reading disabilities. Several variants of both dyslexia and RDs were used as search terms: dyslexia or dyslexic Or dyslexics or “reading disability” or “reading disabilities” or “reading disabled”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>% Disability</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD only</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Only</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD + LD</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>6,621</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Searched</td>
<td>255,808</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1: Results for the four searches of the ACM Digital Library.
• **Learning Disability Search (LD only)**
  Given the high co-occurrence of learning disabilities and reading difficulties, a separate search was conducted for papers concerning LDs using the terms: “learning disability” or “learning disabilities” or “learning disabled”.

• **Reading and Learning Disability Search (RD + LD)**
  Another was conducted using the search terms from the two above searches.

• **Disability Search**
  As the ACM Digital Library contains all publications by the ACM, not all papers involve disability or assistive technologies. To establish a baseline of how common such topics are in the library, a search of terms related to disability was also conducted: disability or disabilities or disabled.

### 2 Analyzing the Search Results

To further understand the ACM search results, the 286 papers in the RD + LD search were analyzed using an open coding analysis (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998) to identify common themes. The themes evolved throughout the analysis process, leading to tags being consolidated or split. A total of three passes were conducted that led to the development of the following labels that were assigned to the search results. Note that a paper could be labeled with multiple tags, although an attempt was made to limit the number of tags as much as possible.

• **Acquired Cognitive Disability**
  This tag applies to any papers regarding cognitive disabilities that were acquired via disease or trauma as opposed to developmental conditions present at birth. This tag was initially two separate tags: acquired dyslexia and other acquired conditions. This tag is exclusive and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.

• **Assistive Reading Technology**
  This tag refers to any publication that discusses in depth any technology for supporting reading for users with RDs or LDs. If multiple papers were found to be part of an extended research effort, those papers were categorized separately. Thus, the tags Deibel and SeeWord were developed.

• **Brief Mention Only**
  This tag applies when a paper briefly mentions a search terms but for only a few sentences.

• **Deibel**
  These refer to papers written by myself, which were part of an ongoing research effort.

• **Diagnosis**
  Papers with these tags describe systems for diagnosing a disability. Due to the scope of the search,
the diagnosis systems are not necessarily for RDs or LDs.

- **Experiment Control**
  Some studies screen their participants for RDs as that might negatively impact their findings. For example, a study of a tool for supporting text entry on cell phones would want to exclude participants with language difficulties. Thus, the paper mentions RDs but is otherwise about a completely different topic. This tag is another exclusive tag and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.

- **In Poor Taste**
  This tag refers to any paper in which the choice of language or perspective was viewed as potentially insulting. In most cases, the slight was unintentional on the part of the authors. For example, a paper on a programming assignment for students might include the theme of a dyslexic clerk who constantly mixes up his letters. Other times, an author directly associates an RD with being bad, unfortunate, or problematic.

- **Includes Other Disabilities**
  This tag applied to a paper if the scope of the paper was beyond a single disability. In most cases, such a paper would dedicate sufficient time to RDs or LDs and then another class of disability as well (i.e., blindness).

- **Non-Reading LDs**
  This tag applies to any paper that focused on a learning disability in which reading was not a major concern. Examples include a paper regarding ADD/HD or dyscalculia.

- **Not a Paper**
  The ACM Digital Library also includes entries for the table of contents of conference proceedings and workshops, calls for participation, and other non-research publications. This tag applies to such search results.

- **Participant Has RD/LD**
  In some papers, reading or learning disabilities are not in the scope of the study. However, one or more participants has an RD/LD and has some bearing or insight worthy of mention. This tag is another exclusive tag and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.

- **Position Paper**
  This tag applies to papers that are not straightforward research or experimental reports. Instead, such papers serve primarily to inform others about or express a philosophical view involving disabilities.
• **Possible Application**
  This tag applies when the authors suggest the technology or technique investigated in the paper may be useful for people with RDs/LDs. Note that such a paper does not study the actual effectiveness of said approach and only suggests that it may be effective.

• **RDs as an Example**
  This tag applies when a paper uses RDs or LDs as a motivating example, but the primary focus is on a different topic. This may involve citing and discussing a paper about RDs. A case study involving a person with RDs is another example.

• **Referenced Paper**
  This tag refers to any paper where the search hit comes from only the bibliography section of the paper. A cited paper’s title or journal involves one of the search terms, but otherwise, the search term is not mentioned anywhere else in the paper. This tag is another exclusive tag and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.

• **Related Work Only**
  This tag refers to any paper in which the only mention of RDs or LDs occurs only in the discussion of what other researchers have done (i.e. the related work sections). This tag is distinct from *RDs as an Example* in that the presence of the search term does serve any motivating purpose for the paper. The goal of the paper is targeted elsewhere.

• **Search Error**
  This tag applies when a search result is in error. For example, the idiosyncrasies of the digital library’s search engine causes “…learning. Disability…” to be matched with the search term “learning disability”. This tag also applies if a paper uses terminology in an atypical fashion, such as referring to blindness as a reading disability. This tag is another exclusive tag and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.

• **SeeWord**
  This tag was branched from Assistive Reading Technology to highlight any paper regarding the SeeWord project (Gregor et al., 2003) from the University of Dundee.

• **Severe LD**
  This tag refers to any paper that primarily focus on learning disabilities in which intelligence is severely impacted. This tag is a union of previous tags separating conditions such as mental retardation and autism spectrum disorders. This tag is another exclusive tag and if applied to a search result, no other tags may be applied to the same result.
Table B.2: Frequency relationship between the ACM search labels. Numbers indicate number of search results labeled with both codes. The shaded diagonal shows the individual occurrence of each label among the 286 search results.

|                               | A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | F   | G   | H   | I   | J   | K   | L   | M   | N   | O   | P   | Q   | R   | S   |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Acquired Cognitive Disability | A   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | A   |
| Assistive Reading Technology  | B   | 18  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 9   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | B   |
| Brief Mention Only            | C   | 111 | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 14  | 0   | 2   | 0   | 4   | 20  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | C   |
| Deibel                        | D   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | D   |
| Diagnosis                     | E   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | E   |
| Experiment Control            | F   | 7   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | F   |
| In Poor Taste                 | G   | 7   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | G   |
| Includes Other Disabilities   | H   | 35  | 0   | 1   | 0   | 4   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | H   |
| Non-Reading LD                | I   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | I   |
| Not a Paper                   | J   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | J   |
| Participant Has RD/LD         | K   | 8   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | K   |
| Position Paper                | L   | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | L   |
| Possible Application          | M   | 35  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | M   |
| RDs as an Example             | N   | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | N   |
| Referenced Paper              | O   | 43  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | O   |
| Related Work Only             | P   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | P   |
| Search Error                  | Q   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | Q   |
| SeeWord                       | R   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | R   |
| Severe LD                     | S   |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 14  | S   |

Literature Search and Labeling of ACM Digital Library
Table B.2 lists the occurrence and frequency of the above tags across the 286 search results. Note that a high number of papers were tagged with Brief Mention Only and only a relatively few papers were labeled Assistive Reading Technology. Moreover, as suggested by the above tags, there have been only two concerted, ongoing efforts efforts involving ATs for RDs: the SeeWord project and my own efforts.

3 Labeled Search results

Listed below in order of most recent publication are the 286 returned results. For each entry, the labels I assigned to it are listed in closed brackets [...]. Also include is a label indicating which of the three searches returned the item: LD only, RD only, or RD + LD.

ACM Search Results

R. Varma (2009). Attracting Native Americans to computing. DOI: 1536616.1536650. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]
G. Walsh (2009). Wii can do it: Using co-design for creating an instructional game. DOI: 1520340.1520722. [LD only, Non-Reading LD]
A. C. Cavender, R. E. Ladner, and R. I. Roth (2009). The summer academy for advancing deaf and hard of hearing in computing. DOI: 1508865.1509043. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]
P. G. Neumann (2009). Risks to the public. DOI: 1507195.1517460. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]
K. F. McCoy and A. Waller (2009). Introduction to the Special Issue on AAC. DOI: 1497302.1497303. [RD only, Possible Application, Related Work Only]
D. N. Jutla and D. Kanevsky (2009). wisePad services for vision-, hearing-, and speech-impaired users. DOI: 1435417.1435434. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Includes Other Disabilities, Possible Application]
D. Rømen and D. Svanæs (2008). Evaluating web site accessibility: Validating the WAI guidelines through usability testing with disabled users. DOI: 1463160.1463238. [RD only, Assistive Reading Technology, Includes Other Disabilities]
D. Yarrington and K. McCoy (2008). Creating an automatic question answering text skimming system for non-visual readers. DOI: 1414471.1414537. [RD only, Includes Other Disabilities, Possible Application]
A. Protopsaltis and V. Bouki (2008). Gender and information processing in electronic age. DOI: 1456536.1456563. [RD only, Experiment Control]


J. Yan and A. S. El Ahmad (2008). Usability of CAPTCHAs or usability issues in CAPTCHA design. DOI: 1408664.1408671. [RD + LD, Brief Mention Only]


M. Virnes (2008). Robotics in special needs education. DOI: 1463689.1463710. [LD only, Diagnosis]


A. Sears and V. Hanson (2008). Introduction. DOI: 1361203.1361204. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


L. G. Reid and A. Snow-Weaver (2008). WCAG 2.0: A web accessibility standard for the evolving web. DOI: 1368044.1368069. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]

C. Shayo (2008). The role of technology and authentic task contexts in promoting inclusive learning for disabled and non-disabled college students. DOI: 1355238.1355266. [LD only, Referenced Paper]
D. Grammenos (2008). Game over: Learning by dying. DOI: 1357054.1357281. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]
S. Ferretti, S. Mirri, L. A. Muratori, M. Roccelli, and P. Salomoni (2008). E-learning 2.0: You are We-LCoME!. DOI: 1368044.1368070. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]
A. Simitis, G. Koutrika, Y. Alexandrakis, and Y. Ioannidis (2008). Synthesizing structured text from logical database subsets. DOI: 1353343.1353396. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]
D. F. Zucker and Dick Bulterman (2007). Open standard and open sourced SMIL for interactivity. DOI: 1300655.1300680. [RD only, Possible Application]
D. W. Massaro (2007). Just in time learning: Implementing principles of multimodal processing and learning for education. DOI: 1322192.1322195. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]
A. Andersen and C. Rowland (2007). Improving the outcomes of students with cognitive and learning disabilities: Phase I development for a web accessibility tool. DOI: 1296843.1296882. [RD + LD, Brief Mention Only]
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M. Merzenich (2007). *Neuroscience via computer: Rain exercise for older adults.* DOI: 1273961.1273984. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]

C. W. Phua and R. Fitch (2007). *Tracking value function dynamics to improve reinforcement learning with piecewise linear function approximation.* DOI: 1273496.1273591. [LD only, Search Error]


T. Göttel (2007). *ProBoNO: Transferring knowledge of virtual environments to real world situations.* DOI: 1297277.1297294. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


Z. Obrenovic, J. Abascal, and D. Starcevic (2007). *Universal accessibility as a multimodal design issue.* DOI: 1230819.1241668. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]

P. Salomoni, S. Mirri, S. Ferretti, and M. Rocetti (2007). *Profiling learners with special needs for custom e-learning experiences, a closed case?* DOI: 1243441.1243462. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]


M. Cooper (2007). *Accessibility of emerging rich web technologies: Web 2.0 and the semantic web.* DOI: 1243441.1243463. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]


G. Ebel and M. Ben-Ari (2006). Affective effects of program visualization. DOI: 1151588.1151590. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Includes Other Disabilities]


J. English (2006). The checkpoint automated assessment system. DOI: 1140124.1140245. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


A. Dillon, L. Kleinman, G. Ok Choi, and R. Bias (2006). Visual search and reading tasks using ClearType and regular displays: Two experiments. DOI: 1124772.1124849. [RD only, Experiment Control]


T. L. Wattenberg (2006). Accessibility heuristics utilizing learnability characteristics of synthesized speech applications. DOI: 1127564.1127574. [LD only, RDs as an Example]

S. S. Brown and P. Robinson (2006). A personal information management approach for people with low vision or blindness. DOI: 1127564.1127565. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


C. Brodersen and O. S. Iversen (2005). eCell: Spatial IT design for group collaboration in school environments. DOI: 1099203.1099243. [LD only, Participant Has RD/LD]

J. Gauthier and A. D. Dillard (2005). Casting nets in the waters of adaptive technology. DOI: 1099435.1099455. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]

T. L. Wattenberg (2005). Online focus groups used as an accessible participatory research method. DOI: 10.1090/785.1090819. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Includes Other Disabilities]


E. Gellenbeck (2005). Integrating accessibility into the computer science curriculum. DOI: 10.88791.1088837. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Includes Other Disabilities]

E. McKay (2005). Human-computer interaction closes the digital divide: A multicultural, intergenerational ICT case study. DOI: 11.151681.1151685. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]

L. Pareto (2005). Graphical arithmetic for learners with dyscalculia. DOI: 10.90785.1090836. [LD only, Non-Reading LD]


A. Protopsaltis and V. Bouki (2005). Towards a hypertext reading/comprehension model. DOI: 10.85313.1085349. [RD only, Experimental Control]


C. Bodine (2005). Cognitive impairments, information technology systems and the workplace. DOI: 11.02187.1102192. [LD only, Severe LD]

P. Gregor and A. Dickinson (2005). Cognitive difficulties and access to information systems: An interaction design perspective. DOI: 11.02187.1102197. [RD only, Includes Other Disabilities, SeeWord]

D. H. Rose (2005). Cognition and learning: Meeting the challenge of individual differences. DOI: 11.02187.1102193. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


S. Murphy (2005). Accessibility of graphics in technical documentation for the cognitive and visually impaired. DOI: 10.85313.1085320. [RD + LD, Assistive Reading Technology, Includes Other Disabilities]


J. Dodd (2005). Accessibility from the front line: A UK industry perspective of web accessibility. DOI: 10.77238.1077242. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


C.L. Willis and L. Miertschin (2004). *Tablet PC’s as instructional tools or the pen is mightier than the ’board!* DOI: 1029533.1029572. [LD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]


D. Gotterbarn (2004). *UML and agile methods: In support of irresponsible development*. DOI: 1024338.1024344. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, RDs as an Example]

T. Koschmann, G. Stahl, and A. Zemel (2004). *The video analyst’s manifesto: (or the implications of Garfinkel’s policies for the development of a program of video analytic research within the learning sciences)*. DOI: 1149126.1149159. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


T. Wattenberg (2004). *Beyond standards: Reaching usability goals through user participation*. DOI: 1040053.1040055. [LD only, Includes Other Disabilities]


C. Binkerd and J. D. Fernandez (2004). *New approaches to advising and mentoring in science and technology*. DOI: 1050231.1050262. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


R. D. McFarland (2003). Teaching students to learn in the computer science and information systems curriculum: Creating a distinction between content and methods. DOI: 948737.948771. [LD only, Referenced Paper]


M. Weideman and W. Kritzinger (2003). Concept mapping vs. web page hyperlinks as an information retrieval interface: Preferences of postgraduate culturally diverse learners. DOI: 954014.954022. [LD only, Related Work Only]

M. E. Campbell (2003). The art circuit. DOI: 778473.778475. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


S. Williams (2003). Language choice models for microplanning and readability. DOI: 1073416.1073419. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]


S. Milne (2003). Taking back the interface for older people. DOI: 976261.976267. [RD only, RDs as an Example]

B. Disseldorp and D. Chambers (2003). Selecting the right technology for students in a changing teaching environment: A case study. DOI: 857097.857107. [LD only, Assistive Reading Technology]

J. B. Johannessen, K. Hagen, and P. Lane (2002). The performance of a grammar checker with deviant language input. DOI: 1071884.1071894. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]

A. Dickinson, P. Gregor, and A. F. Newell (2002). Ongoing investigation of the ways in which some of the problems encountered by some dyslexics can be alleviated using computer techniques. DOI: 638249.638268. [RD only, SeeWord]

G. S. Stager (2002). Computationally-rich constructionism and at-risk learners. DOI: 820060.820080. [LD only, Brief Mention Only]


Y. Gal (2002). An HMM approach to vowel restoration in Arabic and Hebrew. DOI: 1118637.1118641. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]

M. Back and S. Harrison (2002). The roads not taken: Detours and dead ends on the design path of speeder reader. DOI: 778712.778741. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Possible Application]


J. English (2002). Experience with a computer-assisted formal programming examination. DOI: 544414.544432. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


C. Paddison and P. Englefield (2002). Applying heuristics to perform a rigorous accessibility inspection in a commercial context. DOI: 957205.957228. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]

S. J. Kerr (2002). Scaffolding: Design issues in single & collaborative virtual environments for social skills learning. DOI: 509709.509723. [LD only, Severe LD]

M. Campbell (2001). What’s happening. DOI: 384076.384078. [LD only, Not a Paper]

M. Zachry, K. C. Cook, B. D. Faber, and D. Clark (2001). The changing face of technical communication: New directions for the field in a new millennium. DOI: 501516.501573. [LD only, Non-Reading LD]

W. Chisholm, G. Vanderheiden, and I. Jacobs (2001). Web content accessibility guidelines 1.0. DOI: 379537.379550. [LD only, Includes Other Disabilities]


T. G. West (2000). *When the world plague was stopped by a digital artist.* DOI: 369215.369223. [RD only, Referenced Paper]


P. Gregor and A. F. Newell (2000). *An empirical investigation of ways in which some of the problems encountered by some dyslexics may be alleviated using computer techniques.* DOI: 354324.354347. [RD + LD, SeeWord]


T. Elmer (2000). *Tom’s tool.* DOI: 364132.364231. [LD only, Assistive Reading Technology]

E. Hatfield, M. Davis, and D. Kilpatrick (2000). *Speech-enabled application programs in Java for use in education.* DOI: 364132.364219. [RD only, Brief Mention Only, Includes Other Disabilities]


F. Culwin (1999). *An introduction to the java foundation classes (JFC).* DOI: 632716.632795. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


T. G. West (1997). Images and reversals: Following the gifts visual talent and trouble with words. DOI: 271283.271286. [RD only, Position Paper]


T. G. West (1997). Images and reversals: Following the gifts visual talent and trouble with words. DOI: 271283.271286. [RD only, Position Paper]

C. Friedlander (1997). Speech facilities for the reading disabled. DOI: 257874.257891. [LD only, Severe LD]

C. Friedlander (1997). A user essay: I need help while I am using speech as an information medium for the reading disabled. DOI: 250025.250027. [RD only, RDs as an Example]

K. Kahn (1996). Drawings on napkins, video-game animation, and other ways to program computers. DOI: 232014.232028. [RD only, Brief Mention Only]


E. Cole and Parto Dehdashti (1990). Interface design as a prosthesis for an individual with a brain injury. DOI: 101288.101293. [LD only, Acquired Cognitive Disability]

SIGART Bulletin staff (1990). Recent AI-Related Dissertations. DOI: 379534.1056290. [LD only, Not a Paper]


C. A. MacArthur and B. Shneiderman (1986). Learning disabled students’ difficulties in learning to use a word processor: Implications for design. DOI: 15671.15675. [LD only, Assistive Reading Technology]
