

# 1

## **Introduction**

---

Children are the invaluable possessions of every nation and are different from each other in their skills and talents. Noteworthy physical, behavioral and learning differences are found everywhere.

Children with disabilities vary in their abilities to learn and adjust in the society. The existence of different interpretations of disability in the society viz., historical, social, legal and philosophical effects makes the concept of disability very complex. Although there are some common impacting factors of disability but it is experienced differently by the people. Disability has been defined as a restriction or inability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being, mostly resulting from impairment (Disabled World towards Tomorrow 2009). Disability is associated with a loss of physical functioning (e.g., loss of sight, hearing or mobility), or a challenge in learning and social adjustment that significantly interferes with typical growth and development. Disability refers to the functions that are performed by an individual including physical disability, impairments of cognition, senses and

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

intellect, mental illness etc. and various other kinds of chronic diseases. (Hardman, 2014)

Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) defines a disabled person as someone who has a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. The DDA sets out the circumstances under which a person is 'disabled'. A person is disabled if: he/she has a mental or physical impairment, the impairment has an adverse effect on his/her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities, the adverse effect is substantial and long-term (meaning it has lasted for 12 months, or is likely to last for more than 12 months or for the rest of the person's life), in addition, there are also some special provisions under the Act that cover, for example, progressive conditions and past disabilities. In defining 'normal day-to-day activities' the DDA states that at least one of the following areas must be badly affected: Mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination, continence, ability to lift, carry or move everyday objects, speech, hearing or eyesight, memory or ability to concentrate, learn or understand, understanding of the risk of physical danger.

The ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) has a three-part definition of "disability" which indicates the disabilities that people with disabilities go through being based on the Rehabilitation Act. Also, it is different from the disability definitions of laws like, State workers, compensation, federal and state laws that work for the welfare of individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA, an individual with a disability is a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, who has a record of such impairment and who is considered as having impairment. Disability is a term that includes impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. Impairment is a partial problem in the functioning or structure of a body; an activity limitation is a trouble faced by a person in performing some work; and a participation

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

restriction is, a trouble faced by an individual while dealing with the life situations. Consequently, disability becomes a multifaceted phenomenon and the problems experienced by the individuals with difficulties can be reduced by adopting the appropriate interventional strategies to eliminate the barriers of the environment.

Impairment, Disability and Handicap are the three magnitudes of disability as per the International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH). To make the revisions to these magnitudes it was planned to change the nomenclature of "handicap" to "participation".

### **Impairment**

Any loss or deviation of psychological, physiological or functional structure is impairment. Impairment occurs at the organ or system functioning level. Disability is concerned with functional performance or activity, affecting the whole person.

### **Disability**

Disability is a restriction or inability of performing a task involving physical activity in a way that is perceived typical for an individual.

### **Handicap**

The weakness due to an impairment or disability that restricts or makes it difficult for an individual to perform a role that is considered normal is termed as handicap.

Impairment, activity, participation and context are the four dimensions of disability outlined in the current definition of the International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH).

### **Impairment**

Any deviation or loss of physiological or psychological functioning in body structure is impairment.

### **Activity**

The physical functioning of an individual to perform some tasks is termed as an activity.

### **Participation**

The person's contribution in activities related to situations of life and other contextual aspects is termed as participation. Participation is considered within the given domains: personal maintenance, mobility, exchange of information, social relationships, education, work, leisure and spirituality; economic life and civic and community life.

### **Context**

The environment viz., physical, social and attitudinal in which people live and carry on their life goals is termed as a context (Disabled World Towards Tomorrow 2009).

The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) attempts to bridge many of the definitions by considering disability as an umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. Disability is a slope on which every person functions at distinct levels due to personal and environmental factors.

Disability is a term that is conservatively used to refer to the characteristics that are very severe to interfere with the normal routine activities. The long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments in an individual makes him disabled (UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities CRPD). CRPD emphasized that disability is “an evolving concept” and it results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barricades that prevents their active participation in society on an equal basis with able-bodied persons”. Approaches to disability have been changed affectively. Presently the move has been away from a medical consideration towards a social consideration. In any situation, people with disability are disabled not because of an inherent inability

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

to compensate, but because they are in an environment that requires tasks they are unable to perform. Disability can be reduced rather removed from the society if environment is improved. The CRPD reflects this emphasis on removing environmental barriers which prevents inclusion. However, in the contemporary world, disability is increasingly growing (Disabled World towards Tomorrow 2009)

### **1.1 International Scenario of Disability**

The number of differently able persons in the world is more than one billion. Among them there are 110-190 million people who suffer moderate to severe disabilities. With the worldwide increase in life expectancy chronic health conditions are also gaining an upward trend, which are responsible for the growing prevalence of worldwide disability. Unemployment is commonly found in individuals with disabilities in comparison to the persons without disabilities. The required health care does not reach the persons with disabilities. They tend to report that they are encountered with the health care providers whose skills are insufficient, are denied health care and treated very badly than people without disabilities. There is an insufficient strength of disabled children in schools. Although, gaps in completion of education are prevalent in all age groups across all countries, but the socio-economically low profile countries are badly hit. There are countries where majority of children without disabilities go to school but a sizeable number of disabled children do not go to school. Like in Indonesia, over 80% of the children without disabilities go to school and only 25% of children with disabilities go to school. Limited involvement in the community's due to increased dependence of people with disabilities is found across the countries. 20-40% of people are helpless to the extent that they are completely dependent to carry their day-to-day tasks. The increased rate of disability is influenced by trends in health and environment—such as road traffic accidents, natural disasters, fights, food pattern and substance abuse. In comparison to men women are more prone to disabilities. Since

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

elderly are frail and weak they possess a large chunk of disability population. Age-old views of disability emphasize wheelchair users and blind people and deaf people. However, the disability experience varies greatly. Although, disability associates with disadvantage, but all individuals with disabilities are not equally disadvantaged. School enrolment rates differ, with physically impaired children mostly progressing better than those with intellectual or sensory impairments. Severely disabled population experiences significant difficulties and disadvantages. Services in the sector of health, education, employment, and transport that include insufficient policies and standards, undesirable attitudes, deficiency of service provision, insufficient funding, absence of accessibility, poor information and communication and absence of participation in decisions that directly affect the lives of persons with disabilities does not reach them without experiencing difficulties. Disabilities have an imperative effect on the health and socio-economic status of the people. Generally, persons with disabilities experience poor health, lower education successes, reduced economic participation and poverty than persons without disabilities. The disadvantages connected with the disabilities and the difficulties faced by people with disabilities can be easily overcome with the minimum possible efforts of the administrators and policy makers (World Report on Disability 2011).

Removing the social and physical barriers which limit the actions of persons with disabilities in their day to day lives can enhance the social participation. The experience and degree of disability is attributed to the environment of an individual. It should be highly accessible otherwise it adds to disability by forming barricades to participation and inclusion. Some of the likely adverse impacts of the environment include: a hearing impaired person who does not have access to a language interpreter, a person who uses a wheelchair in his home or building without a ramp or elevator, a blind person using a computer without screen-reading software. The

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

environment may be altered to improve health conditions, avoid handicapping conditions, and improve outcomes for persons with disabilities. Such changes can be brought about by legislation, policy changes, capacity building, or technological developments leading to, for instance: proper infrastructure as per the need and desire, accessible layout of the constructed environment and transport; signage for the people with sensory impairments; accessible health, rehabilitation, education, and support services; more opportunities for work and employment for persons with disabilities. Disability is experienced quite differently by children in comparison to adults as they tend to take part in several types of activities in the school as well as at home. Disability was experienced by 5.2 million or 8.4 percent of children out of 62.2 million children under the age of 15. About 50% (2.6 million) of children had a severe disability. Disability was defined as having either a developmental delay, or having difficulty moving their arms or legs in children who were less than 3 years old and 2.3% of them had one or both disabilities. Disability was defined on a broader variety of activities and impairments for children in the age-group of 6–14 years. Among the total of 4.5 million 6- 14 years old disabled children approximately 5.3 percent of them suffered a severe disability and 0.8 percent were completely dependent for their daily activities. 2.3 million children experienced severe problems in accomplishing their school and home assignments and 1.6 million children were provided special education services. Mental, emotional, or developmental condition were experienced by around 3.4 million children (9.3 percent), learning disability by 692,000, 1.9 million had Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) by 1.9 million, and 1.7 million had an intellectual or developmental disability. (Americans with Disabilities, 2010)

### **1.2 National Scenario of Disability**

According to the 2011 Census, the population of persons with disabilities is approximately 26 million of the total population.

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

Rural areas cover a higher number of disabled individuals in comparison to urban areas. Among the types of disability persons with orthopedic impairments comprises of (20%) of the population of India. Persons with hearing impairments constitute about (20%), and visual impairments (18.7%), multiple disabilities (7.89%), speech impairments (7.4%), mental retardation (5.6%) and mental illness (2.69%) of the population. The percentage of disability in males and females was found to be similar. Since the last decade disability has increased in rural and urban areas.

**Table 1.1: Proportion of disabled population by type of disability India, 2011**

Type of disability	Percentage	Males (%)	Females (%)
Total	100	100	100
Loco motor Disability	20	23	18
Hearing Impairment	19	18	20
Visual Impairment	19	18	20
Speech Impairment	8	8	7
Mental Retardation	6	6	5
Mental Illness	3	3	3
Any Other	18	18	19
Multiple Disorders	8	8	8

**Source:** C-series, Table c-20, Census of India, 2011

Census 2011 reports that visual and hearing impairment is more among females. Loco-motor disability is more among males.

A specialized scheme ADIP (Scheme of Assistance to disabled persons for purchase/ fitting of AIDS /Appliances) is run by the Government of India since 2014 for differently abled persons to help them live a comfortable and progressive life by providing free aids and appliances. The Scheme mainly aims to assist the disabled persons in procuring tough, classy and technically manufactured



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

contemporary, standard aids and appliances for their good physical, social and psychological rehabilitation. Likewise, the state Government constantly makes efforts to begin with beneficial programs for the differently abled persons which includes the provision of various aids and appliances at least prices. Despite the State Government's initiative, the differently able persons do not have access to these schemes because of their unawareness and lack of knowledge to fulfill the formalities required for their access. These people do not receive the training on the use of different aids that assist in the movement of an individual with orthopedic impairments. The far-flung areas of the State are badly affected as they hardly receive any benefit of these programmes implemented by the Government but put forward by the non-government organizations who have hardly reached any beneficiary so far. Although, the state Government initiated various plans, policies and schemes for the individuals with disabilities, but the goal of their execution has not been attained owing to the weak efforts on part of the state government (Bashir and Ganie, 2013).

The state Government started to implement many acts and policies whereby a 3 per cent quota in government jobs and establishment of new schools for differently able persons from all districts was made functional. (India Country Profile March. 2003), but, in practice few of these services exist. There are just few institutions for the care and rehabilitation of differently able individuals in the state with not more than 40% in-take capacity. Among the total population of persons with disabilities in the state only (0.05%) of differently abled individuals has access if any to education and rehabilitation services. The institutions in the Jammu region which have an intake capacity of 150 students each are hardly fulfilling the requirements of the disabled in the state (Gupta, *et al.*, 2011, 32). The reservation of jobs in known government sectors is not serving its purpose satisfactorily, as only the low-profile vacancies are being

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

filled up. It is very clear that the capabilities of persons with disabilities are not the same and may not meet the requirements of a specific job (Rajalakshmi, 2002). Even National Handicapped Finance and Development Corporation (NHFD) has failed to achieve its goal of providing finances for many self-employment and educational activities to differently able individuals due to the tedious process and extra formalities involved in its approach. There are least punitive procedures for non-implementation of the measures for the persons with disabilities. As per the directives of the Act the initiation and implementation of the policies and programs would depend on the financial capacity of the state. The implementation of these policies depends on the law regulating organizations. It results in making the implementation of the provisions of the law arguable and completely reliant on the generosity of the State (Advani 1997, Mohit, 2000). Therefore, the state government and many other organizations who aim to make the public buildings accessible have claimed deficiency of capital as a cause for non-implementation of the provisions. The aim of disability organizations to make the buildings disability friendly has not reached its target satisfactorily in rural areas whereas in urban areas it is still to reach its cent percent satisfaction. As per the instructions of Supreme Court the air travel has been made disability friendly but the buses and trains that are used for frequent travel to cover the short distances are still not within the reach of persons with disabilities (Rajalakshmi, 2002).

### **1.3 State level Scenario of Disability**

The scenario of disabilities has shown an upward trend from 2001 to 2011. It has increased from 21 million in 2001 to 26 million in 2011. The gender wise disabilities were 12.6 million males in 2001 to 14.9 million in 2011 and 9.3 million females in 2001 to 9.8 million females in 2011. As per 2001 Census, visual impairments (48.5%) was the highest disability followed by impairment of movements (27.9 %), mental (10.3%), speech (7.5%), and hearing (5.8%) disabilities.

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

Visual and hearing disabilities were more in females than males (Census of India, 2001).

In Jammu and Kashmir, the disability rates were quite alarming as per census 2001. The total disabled population of the state was 3,02,670 lakhs out of which (2.8 lakhs) were visually impaired, (0.38 lakhs) physically handicapped, (0.17 lakhs) speech impaired and (0.13 lakhs) were hearing impaired. A substantial number of 24,879 individuals were estimated as mentally retarded in the state. There has been an upward trend in the scenario of disabilities from 2001 to 2011 (Census 2011). The total disabled population has risen to 361153, showing an increase of more than fifty thousand persons with disabilities in the state. Thus includes (20.5%) hearing impaired, (18.3%) visually impaired, (5.1%) speech impaired, (16.0%) orthopedically crippled, (4.6%) mentally challenged, (4.3%) mentally ill, (18.5%) other disabilities and (12.3%) multiple disabilities. An increase of 181 million populations was recorded during the decade 2001-2011. 2.87 percent of population was disabled in Jammu and Kashmir which is increasing with every passing day. (Census of India, 2001 and 2011).

**Table 1.2: Disabled persons by age-group in J&K 2011**

Age group	Persons	Males	Females
Total	361153	204834	156319
0-4	17771	9712	8059
5-9	25395	14165	11230
10-19	85262	32489	25773
20-29	52668	31737	20931
30-39	46691	28588	18103
40-49	41709	24775	16934
50-59	34356	19050	15306
60-69	36585	19271	17314
70-79	29260	15266	13994
80-89	13363	6973	6390
90*	4679	2551	2128
Age not stated	414	257	157

**Source:** Disabled persons in India, A statistical Profile 2016

#### **1.4 Disability Programs in Jammu and Kashmir**

The Constitution of India has issued an order according to which the people in a welfare state are expected to enjoy the right to equality, freedom, and justice. With the changed attitude of society towards persons with disabilities, they have been given a chance to live a good life with equal opportunities and effective access to rehabilitation services. The State Social Welfare Department has implemented various programs and schemes for the welfare of differently able individuals which includes: State Disability Pension Scheme, Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension Scheme, Educational Scholarships, Unemployment allowances, Special schools for persons with disabilities, Scholarship & stipend for higher studies, Self-employment Programs, Reservations in jobs Educational Institutions and poverty alleviation Programs. Among the efforts put forth by the state of J&K the following policies and programs have been initiated: Project Integrated Education was started in 1975 for the persons with disabilities but the aim with which it was started could not be achieved as the scheme was not monitored by the state Government for its smooth functioning.

The Mental Health Act (1987) of the Government of India clearly excluded person's with mental retardation from the definition of those with mental illness. National Policy on Education (1986) and Plan of Action (1992) advocated the policy of integrating the physically and mentally handicapped population with the general community as equal partners with the objective that the persons with disabilities should have access to quality education comparable to normal children. In response to international developments and increasing pressure from disability activists in India, the Government of India enacted the Persons into force only in February 1996 (Mohit 2000). Eventually, the reason put forward for the non-implementation of the provisions by the state government and local bodies was non-availability of funds. The Government of India has also launched

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

the Integrated Social Security Scheme (ISSS) and Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension Scheme (IGNDPS) for the persons with Disabilities. Since it involves a tedious process to have access to the scheme, therefore, most of the persons with severe disabilities are unable to get benefit from these schemes. Although, the Government covers a wide range of policy formulations, programs plan, execution of schemes and legal enactments related to persons with disabilities, the enthusiasm is appreciable particularly for a long-neglected section of our society, but there are several problems which need to be discussed in a coordinated establishment of a social system for the protection of the persons with disabilities. In the state of Jammu and Kashmir, there exists a limited professional research in disability Rehabilitation. The overall benefits of specialized schemes for persons with disabilities in the State are less because most of the schemes are registered under central Government which is not applicable in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. (Bashir and Ganie, 2013)

Programs advocating education of persons with disabilities like the Integrated Education of Persons with disabilities Scheme (IEDC) 1974 and the Project Integrated Education for the Persons with disabilities (PIED) 1987 achieved a limited success as exclusionary policies and practices prevalent all over India still deny admission to persons with disabilities in regular schools. The lack of comprehensive planning and political will to achieve integration resulted in the poor implementation of the program provisions like orientation and training of school teachers etc. Thus, education of people with disabilities has remained confined mostly to special schools in urban areas. The aim of the Universal Primary Education (1997) program to integrate special and general schools for children with visual, hearing, orthopedic and learning disabilities at the primary school level has not been completely attained. In recent years, the District Primary Education Program (DPEP) has had a powerful

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

impact on integrating persons with disabilities as it addressed core issues related to curriculum. However, the provision of only three resource teachers per block under the DPEP pattern has proved inadequate, as schools are spread over vast geographical stretches, limiting interactions between the teachers and students. Most schools have not been able to remove architectural barriers and hence still refuse admission to persons with disabilities (Zachariah, 2001).

Since physically challenged people constitute a large section of the society, they differ in their characteristics, attitudes; interests, behavior, needs and achievements. Undoubtedly there are differences in their personalities, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement. The limitations and demands imposed by their disabling conditions have a definite impact on their lives. These limitations may lead to poor personality development, low self-esteem, inefficient study habits and poor academic performance. It has been realized that if the psychological and educational characteristics of physically challenged school going children are studied, specific changes may be made to the curriculum to make it suitable for these children. As the limitations imposed by their disabilities directly affect the psychological makeup of the physically challenged children, therefore it becomes important to study their personality and its related parameters to help them be steadfast in life and to attain a good academic and vocational career.

Physically challenged people are generally considered as most backward; least bothered about and remains highly neglected. The growth of personality faces many challenges not only due to the disability or impairment by which they are suffering but also from their families, peers and friends. (Shyder, Kleck, Strent and Mentzen, 1979) Unusually, challenged from high socio-economic status display maximum magnitude of aspiration, while its minimum magnitude was seen in low socio- economic status group (Khan, 2006) Disabilities also affect the psychogenic needs of the individuals as congenitally

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

blind children have more need for achievement, autonomy change and endurance (Sharma, 1994) as compared to non-handicapped children. (2011).

Disabilities have a profound influence on the academic performance as physically normal students tend to have high academic achievement than the physically challenged (Pandit *et al.* 2012). However, hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students do not differ significantly on academic achievement (Pandit, 2011)

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

Physically challenged school going children are the invaluable assets of any nation. Their welfare is the welfare of a family, society and nation. They can bring laurels to the Nation if they are brought up with proper care, love and affection. With better nutrition, health care services and education the physically challenged school going children can foresee a better life. If they are given an opportunity to avail the effective excess to education and rehabilitation measures they can be at par with the able- bodied children in all areas of life. Education boosts the development of confidence, self-esteem and balanced personality among children. Since the constitution of India ensures equality, freedom, justice and dignity of all the individuals. It declares that all individuals can avail the opportunity for education, employment, shelter, social security and acquisition of knowledge depending upon one's capacities. So being the citizens of democratic India, persons with disabilities have an equal right to access these services. Physically challenged children differ in their characteristics, attitudes, interests; behavior, needs and achievements. Undoubtedly there are differences in their personalities, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement. The limitations and demands imposed by their disabling conditions have a definite impact on their lives. These

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

limitations may lead to poor personality development, low self-esteem, poor academic performance and inefficient study habits. It has been realized that if the psychological and educational characteristics of physically challenged school going children are studied, specific changes may be made to the curriculum to make it suitable for these children. As the limitations imposed by their disabilities directly affect the psychological makeup of the physically challenged children, therefore it becomes important to study their personality and its related parameters to help them be steadfast in life and to attain a good academic and vocational career.

Disabilities hamper the smooth and healthy development of an individual's personality and personality itself is the strong indicator of the overall traits of a person. Persons with high self-esteem hold a high image of their 'self' and set appropriate goals. They can adjust in all complex situations. While the reverse is true of children with low self-esteem, un-stable personality, in-efficient studies and poor academic achievement. Considering the interrelationship among these variables i.e., personality, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement, the present study aims to explore these variables among the visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children. This study can contribute significantly to the understanding of physically challenged children. So, it becomes imperative to ascertain not only the why and how of the difference in physically challenged and normal children but also to analyze the intergroup difference among the visually, hearing and orthopedically impaired school going children. The present investigation is an attempt in this direction. It aims at finding an insight into the visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children's unique personality traits, self-esteem, study habits and academic performance. Because the physically challenged school going children occupy a considerable space on the globe it becomes imperative to investigate their psychological



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

characteristics to gain a new insight in disability. There is a need to do research in disability to enhance the capabilities of physically challenged children to live a self-reliant life with dignity and respect. The researcher feels the rationale of doing research on the physically challenged children to bridge the gap between the physically challenged and normally growing children. So far, no investigation has been directed to study these parameters in different combinations. Most of these have been studied in parts thus not giving a holistic picture. Therefore; the present study is an attempt to understand the personality traits, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement of visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children.

### **1.6 Statement of the Problem**

The problem for the present study is stated as follows:  
“Personality factors, Self-Esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children in Districts Anantnag and Srinagar”.

### **1.7 Objectives of the Study**

The study was undertaken with the following objectives

1. To identify the sample of visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going students of rural and urban areas.
2. To study and compare physically challenged and physically normal subjects on Personality Factors.
3. To study and compare physically challenged and physically normal subjects on Self-esteem.
4. To study and compare physically challenged and physically normal subjects on Study Habits.
5. To study and compare physically challenged and physically normal subjects on Academic Achievement.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

6. To undertake intergroup comparison of physically challenged categories on Personality, Self-esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement.
7. To compare rural and urban visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on personality factors, self- esteem, study habits and academic achievement.
8. To suggest some interventional strategies for care and education of physically challenged school going children.

### **1.8 Operational Definitions of Terms and Variables**

The terms and variables have operationally been defined as under:

#### **1. Personality Factors**

In the present study personality factors, shall refer to the scores obtained by the subjects on Potter and Cattell's Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ 1979).

#### **2. Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem refers to the scores obtained by the subject's on Cooper smith's Self-Esteem Inventory (1976).

#### **3. Study Habits**

Study habits have been operationally defined as the scores obtained by the subjects on Mathur's Test of Study Habits and Attitudes.

#### **4. Academic Achievement**

Academic achievement refers to the aggregate percentage of marks obtained by the subjects in their previous examination.

#### **5. Physically Challenged Children**

Children who are suffering from any physical defect viz., visual impairment, hearing impairment and orthopedically crippled and have sought admission in the schools.

**6. Physically Normal Children**

The students who are physically fit and have no defect in their body and are pursuing education in the same schools where from the physically challenged sample shall be drawn.

**7. School Going Children**

6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> standard students in the age range of 12-15 years in Government and Private schools of Districts Anantnag and Srinagar shall be school going children for the present study.

# 2

## **Review of Literature**

---

Literature review is a script of an academic paper which comprises of the contemporary information with practical results, as well as academic and procedural contributions to a topic. It is very imperative in research as it offers an updated knowledge of the subject assists in the identification of the methods used in the previous research and provides the evidences for the research findings. It helps the researcher to experience the in-depth knowledge about the topic of research. It provides guidance to decide about the importance of the work accomplished and points out the existence of the gaps in the field of research.

A systematic procedure has been followed in reviewing related literature for this study. A total of 53 studies have been reviewed under this section. 27 studies have been carried by Indian authors and 24 studies by foreign authors. 18 studies have been conducted on visually impaired, 13 on hearing impaired and 22 on orthopedically crippled children. The studies have been classified as per the following:

1. Studies on Visually impaired
2. Studies on Hearing impaired.
3. Studies on Orthopedically crippled.

## **2.1 Studies on Visually Impaired**

Fotiadou, et al. (2014) studied the motor development and self-esteem of children and adolescents with visual impairment. 37 children and adolescents with visual impairment aged (8-14 years) and an equal number i.e. (37) typically developing children and adolescents formed the sample for the study. Bruininks and Bruininks (2005) Test of Motor Proficiency and Coopersmith's (1987) Self-esteem Inventory were the tools used. Data was statistically analyzed using SPSS version 16.0. Results indicated that visually impaired subjects scored less on motor development and self-esteem as compared to their typical peers.

Gulhane, (2014) investigated the academic achievement of 480 visually impaired and hearing impaired boys and girls selected purposefully from 40 schools belonging to five districts of Maharashtra. Data was collected using a check list to enquire about the educational facilities available for disabled students in the institutions. To measure the scholastic performance of the students in language and mathematics a separate test was constructed. The findings indicated a significant difference in visually and hearing impaired boys and girls on academic achievement in language and elementary academics. Hearing impaired boys and girls performed better in language and elementary mathematics than their visually impaired peers.

Rajknowar et al. (2014) studied the adjustment, level of aspiration, self-concept and academic achievement of visually handicapped school children in Assam. 400 visually impaired school going children (200 boys and 200 girls) in the age group of 12-16 years were randomly selected from six special schools of Assam. No significant difference in academic achievement was found based on gender. It was evident from the findings that the academic achievement of the children was not at all influenced by their self-concept.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

Mishra (2013) studied self- concept in relation to ego-strength of (14-18years old) 40 sighted and 40 visually impaired students selected purposively from Chandigarh and Haryana. Descriptive method of research was used for the study. Children's self-concept scale by Ahluwalia and Ego-strength by Hasan were the main tools used. The results revealed that there was a positive relationship between self-concept and adjustment. There was a significant difference between visually impaired and sighted adolescents on self-concept. Sighted adolescents had higher self-concept than visually impaired subjects. Ego strength of sighted students was better than that of visually impaired adolescents.

Yeger and Deher (2013) investigated and compared visually impaired children's participation and socio-demographic parameters. Hearing and visually impaired children showed significant limited participation as compared to their normal peers. The participation was more seen among visually impaired children. Socio-demographic variables i.e., age, mothers education and socioeconomic level correlated with participation dimensions in both groups.

Kasomo (2012) studied the psychological assessment of visually impaired children in Integrated and special schools. The aim of the study was to compare 20 blind children studying in 5<sup>th</sup> -7<sup>th</sup> standard receiving education in integrated (N=10) and special (N=10) schools. Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were the main tools employed in the study. The other variables included student to student interaction and teacher to student interaction. Data was analyzed using t-test. A significantly higher self-concept was found in the blind students studying in the integrated schools than their peers in the special schools. Findings revealed that favorable social environment is offered by the integrated schools for the development of positive self-concept.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

Narimani and Mousazadeh (2010) compared the self-esteem and self-concept of 1720 visually impaired and sighted (10-20 year) old students studying in 86 schools of Ardabil province. Cooper Smith's Self Esteem Inventory and Beak and Stiller's Self Concept Scale was used to collect the data. Analysis was done with the help of MNOVA. Findings indicated better self-esteem in individuals with normal vision and high scores of self-concept in students with visual impairment.

Were Michael et al. (2010) intended to ascertain the gender differences in self-concept and academic achievement among visually impaired pupils in Kenya. The sample included 291 visually impaired (210 partially sighted and 81 blind) class 8<sup>th</sup> students selected through stratified random sampling. Data was gathered using Pupils Self-Concept and Academic Achievement Test and analyzed statistically through ANOVA. Findings indicated significant difference in academic achievement of partially sighted and blind pupils. However, visually impaired girls possessed elevated level of self-concept as compared to the visually impaired boys.

Soulis and Christodoulous (2010) observed the self-esteem of children with and without visual impairment. (8-12 year) old children were selected as a sample. The results of the study showed that visually impaired children attained a low score in self-esteem as compared to their typical participants.

Majda and Naima (2009) investigated self-esteem and emotional stability of 100 (5-18 year) old visually impaired students. 63 boys and 37 girls studying in Ahmadi School for blind, Aligarh Muslim University formed the sample for the study. The study aimed to find out the demographic variable as determinants of self-esteem and emotional stability among the study group. Muslim University Self Esteem Inventory by Prasad and Thakur (1977) and Emotional Stability Test for Children by Sen Gupta and Singh (1985) were the main tools employed in the study. Stepwise regression analysis was

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

used to analyze the data statistically. Gender emerged as a significant predictor of emotional stability among visually impaired students. None other variables i.e. age, class, family type and area of living were reported as the indicators of self-esteem among the students.

Garaigordobil and Bernaras (2009) examined the self-concept, self-esteem, other personality traits and psychopathological symptoms in 12-17-year-old 90 adolescents (61 with no impairment and 29 with visual impairment). The findings indicated no significant difference in self-concept and self-esteem of the study groups however, adolescents with visual impairment scored significantly higher in various pathological symptoms. Visually impaired girls obtained a low score in self-esteem but a high score in various psychological symptoms i.e. low hostility, low psychotism, high extraversion which were identified as predictors of high self-esteem.

Verma (2008) conducted a study on 100 visually impaired and normal college students randomly selected from different colleges in west Bengal. The study aimed at comparing self-concept and study habits using Self Concept Scale by Caplan and Naidu and Gopal Rao's Study Habits Inventory. Significant difference existed in the two groups on self-concept and study habits. Visually normal students showed better study habits and obtained a good score on self-concept.

Lifshitz et al. (2007) investigated self-esteem, adjustment to blindness and quality of Friendship among 41 sighted and 40 visually impaired adolescents. Self-esteem Questionnaire by (Glanz, 1981) was administered to measure the self-esteem of the subjects. The findings revealed that visually impaired adolescents had higher scores of self-esteem compared to their peers.

Sangeeta (2006) conducted a study on personality traits of the visually challenged. The main objectives of the study included assessment of self-concept, locus of control and mental health of 460



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

visually impaired and 230 sighted students of class VII to X studying in the residential schools for blind and in general schools of Haryana, Delhi and Chandigarh. Mohsin's Self-concept Inventory, Rotter's I-E Scale Hindi Adaptation, Eysenck's Personality questionnaire and Cornell Medical Index – Health Questionnaire were the major tools used in the study. The findings revealed that the visually impaired boys possessed a better self-concept than the sighted ones. With respect to personality traits the visually impaired boys were found to have a feeling of inadequacy and depression, they were likely to be more sensitive, aggressive, tense and restless in comparison to their sighted peers. No significant difference on neuroticism and anxiety was found in the visually impaired and sighted boys.

Griffin and Nes (2005) investigated self-esteem and empathy among 71 visually impaired and 88 sighted pre-adolescents. The findings revealed no significant difference between the two groups on self-esteem and empathy.

A study by Ntzamilis (2004) was undertaken to assess academic potential in mathematics among 50 visually and 50 hearing impaired students randomly selected from 42 elementary schools in Athens. After analyzing the data statistically results revealed no significant difference between visually impaired and hearing impaired students on academic performance in mathematics.

Fok and Fung (2004) assessed the self-esteem and self-concept of 115 (52 blind and 63 sighted) adolescents studying in the university of Hong Kong. The results revealed that, the visually impaired and sighted adolescents possessed a similar level of self-esteem and self-concept.

Kef (2002) investigated the psychosocial adjustment of visually impaired Dutch teenagers (aged 14 to 24). The findings revealed that a sizable number of these teenagers had high self-esteem, were generally happy, and did not feel lonely. Also, most of them had accepted the implications of their impairment. No

significant differences were found between blind and individuals with low-vision, though the scores for the severely visually impaired were more negative. No significant difference was found between these two groups and sighted adolescents. Sighted adolescents tended to have a larger network of family and friends although individuals who were blind or had low-vision were satisfied and believed they received enough support from parents and peers.

## **2.2. Studies on Hearing Impaired**

Stephanic et al. (2014) compared hearing impaired children's self-esteem with those of normal hearing children to find out the influence of communication, type of education and audio logical characteristics. 252 Children (123 hearing impaired and 129 with normal hearing) up to 12 years of age were selected as a sample. Results indicated low self-esteem in hearing impaired children in comparison to their normal peers.

Neerja and Leelavathi (2014) aimed to assess the self-concept of 32 hearing impaired (11-14 years old) boys and girls selected randomly from SV deaf school, Tirupati. The findings indicated that none of the hearing-impaired children had high self-concept. 56% of the boys had low self-concept and more than 50% of the girls had moderate self-concept.

Oyewumi et al. (2013) conducted a study on personality factors as correlates of perceived quality of life among 75 adolescents with hearing impairment in four special secondary schools in Lagos State, Nigeria. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, World Health Organization (WHO) Quality of Life Scale and the Washington University School of Medicine Quality of Life Questionnaire for Adolescents were the main tools employed in the investigation. Analysis was done through descriptive and inferential statistical treatment. The findings revealed that the impact of personality factors accounted for 14% of variation on the perceived quality of life among hearing impaired adolescents. Results also indicated a considerable

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

influence of onset of “hearing loss” and an insignificant influence of gender on perceived quality of life among adolescents with hearing impairment.

Ayo et al. (2013) studied the psychosocial influence of hearing impairment on interpersonal behavior of 211 young men with hearing loss selected purposively from the Federal College of Special Education Oyo, Nigeria. Data was collected using Psycho-Social Competence Scale (PCS) with reliability coefficient of 0.72. The results indicated that hearing loss affects emotional wellbeing of youth with hearing impairment thus making them feel inferior in company of persons without hearing impairment.

Begum Julaiha and Mehjabeen (2012) examined the self-concept of hearing impaired and normal adolescents regarding gender. 120 adolescents (60 hearing impaired and 60 normal) comprised of the sample. The sample was classified in two groups i.e., (30) early adolescents (13-15 years) and (30) late adolescents (16-18 years). The sample was equally distributed among boys and girls. Self-Concept scale by Harmohan Singh (1961) was the main tool used. The data was statistically treated using mean, SD and t-value. The findings indicated that gender had no influence on the self-concept of early and late hearing impaired adolescents. No significant difference was found in early adolescent normal boys and girls. However, late adolescent normal boys revealed an elevated level of self-concept in comparison to their counter parts.

Heine and Slone (2008) investigated the impact of mild central auditory processing disorder on school performance during adolescence. The results revealed that the children with mild hearing loss had a deficient performance in academics.

Schmidt and Cagran (2008) examined the self-concept of hearing impaired students in an integrated class. The sample comprised of 42 students from 7<sup>th</sup> grade of an elementary school. Self-Concept Scale designed by Cambra and Silvestre (2003) was the

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

tool used to obtain the information. Statistically the data was treated by means of mean, percentages, t-test, f-test and correlation coefficient. The findings indicated that in comparison to typical peers hearing impaired students had a lower academic, social and general self-concept; but a higher physical concept as, these people tend to feel and understand that their physical appearance is similar with that of their normal hearing peers.

Marscharket al. (2007) conducted a research on educating deaf students. The analysis of the findings indicated that “low achievement is characteristic of students who are deaf”.

Jambor and Elliot (2005) studied the self-esteem and coping strategies among deaf students of California State University, Northridge. Self-esteem factors related to deafness viz., means of communication at home, severity of hearing loss with hearing aid and the coping strategies were assessed. Hierarchical regression modeling was employed to treat the data statistically. Results revealed that identification and interaction with deaf community significantly worked to develop positive self-esteem in them.

Vaishya (2005) explored the comparison of male and female hearing and visually impaired students on level of aspiration and academic achievement. 20 male and 20 female students with either hearing or visual impairment formed the sample for the study. Findings were evident of the fact that hearing and visually impaired students did not differ significantly on aspiration and academic achievement.

Gagandeep and Verma (2004) assessed the real self, ideal self and reflected self of 50 hearing impaired and 50 crippled female adolescents selected randomly from Southern part of Guwahati. Data was statistically analyzed by using different techniques. Results indicated no significant difference in the self-concept of hearing impaired and crippled female students.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

Dumanhuri (2003) attempted to evaluate the level of aspiration and academic growth among hearing impaired and crippled male students selected from all parts of the metropolitan areas of Indonesia. The area was surveyed for getting data pertaining to hearing impaired and crippled students below the age of 18 years. The findings showed no significant difference in the two study groups with respect to the level of aspiration and academic growth.

Jefferson and Anderson (2000) attempted to investigate the level of aspiration and self-concept of 125 hearing impaired and an equal number of orthopedically crippled 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade school going children in UK. The findings revealed no significant difference between hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled children on different dimensions of self and levels of aspiration.

### **2.3 Studies on Orthopedically Crippled**

Syeda et al. (2016) compared the personality traits of physically disabled and normal students. 100 upper and lower limbs physically disabled students from Kingston School Inclusive Education System Abbotabad and 100 normal students from various schools of Abbotabad, Haripur were purposively selected for the present study. Goldberg five big personality traits scale was used to measure the personality of the sample. Results indicated a significant difference on personality between physically disabled and normal students. Normal students attained a high score on personality traits as compared to the physically disabled students.

Nair and Starlet (2015) compared the achievement motivation and self-esteem of 40 physically handicapped school going children with that of 40 age, gender and education matched normal school going children. Children with visual and speech impairments were excluded from the sample. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and Achievement Motivation Questionnaire were used to obtain the data. Findings revealed that achievement motivation and self-esteem were

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

significantly lower in physically handicapped students compared to their healthy controls.

Talwar and Kour (2015) studied the self-concept and academic achievement of 30 normal and 30 physically challenged class 10<sup>th</sup> students of district Ambala and Yamuna Nagar in Chandigarh. Three main categories of the physically challenged students viz; hearing impaired N=10, visually impaired N=10 and loco-motor disability N=10 were selected through purposive sampling technique. Random sampling was used to select the normal students. Self-concept was measured by Sagar and Sharma's Self Concept Inventory (1971) and Academic Achievement referred to the average marks obtained by the subjects in 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> classes. Mean, S.D and t-test were applied to the data for statistical analysis. Results revealed that normal students had good academic achievement than the physically challenged students.

Monika and Sameer (2014) in their study attempted to ascertain the relationship between academic achievement and personality. For this purpose, 400 orthopedically crippled students of 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> standard studying in government schools of Panipat, Kaithal, Karnal and Kurukshetra were selected as a sample. Bhargava's Dimensional Personality Inventory (2003) and Bell's Adjustment Inventory (1994) were the major tools used. Previous three years' annual examination scores served as the source of academic achievement. Mean, S.D, t-ratio and correlation was employed to analyze the data. The results indicated a significant positive relationship between academic achievement and personality of orthopedically crippled students.

Lakshmi and Anuradha (2014) in their research assessed the self-esteem of 120 adolescents (60 crippled and 60 visually impaired). Both boys and girls with equal distribution were included in the sample. The main tool used was Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Inventory. Analysis of the data was done using T-test. Results

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

highlighted a significant difference in self-esteem between the crippled and visually impaired subjects. Visually impaired adolescents reflected more self-esteem than their crippled counterparts.

Mucharunga and Pitso (2014) investigated the psychosocial challenges faced by physically impaired children in rural South Africa. An open-ended questionnaire was employed to collect the information required from the literate and illiterate impaired children. After statistical analysis of the data the findings revealed that the physically impaired children often face challenges, for example: isolation, neglect, lack of basic and extracurricular facilities.

Bashir and Ganie (2013) conducted a study on critical appraisal of the disability programs in Jammu and Kashmir with special reference to children and found that the physically challenged individuals receive less benefits from the specialized schemes introduced for their welfare in the State.

Puju et al. (2012) investigated the mental health and academic achievement of 100 visually impaired and crippled students randomly selected from various teaching departments of Kashmir University. The information pertaining to the objectives of the study was obtained by using Alpana Sen Gupta's Mental Health Battery. Data was statistically analyzed by using mean, S.D. and t-value. Findings indicated a significant difference in the academic achievement of visually impaired and crippled students. Crippled students showed better academic achievement than visually impaired students.

Self-concept, level of aspiration and academic achievement of physically challenged and normal students at secondary level in district Baramulla was assessed by Pandit et al. (2012). The sample comprised of 300 students (150 physically challenged) and (150 physically normal) selected purposively and randomly respectively. Sagar and Sharma's Self-Concept Inventory and Mahesh Bhargava's and M.A. Shah's level of Aspiration Scale were used as tools to

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

collect the data. The findings revealed that physically normal students had high academic achievement than the physically challenged students.

A study on academic achievement of 150 hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students of district Baramulla was conducted by Pandith (2011). The sample was selected from 90 higher secondary schools. Academic achievement represented the total marks obtained by the students in two previous classes. Data collected was statistically analyzed using mean, S.D and t-test. The findings revealed no significant difference in hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students on academic achievement.

Bhardwaj (2010) analyzed the personality factors and self-concept of selected nature and degree of disabilities classified into blind, partially blind, deaf; hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled (12-15) year's old boys. A group of 300 subjects (50 in each category) randomly selected from various schools and rehabilitation centers of Punjab, Haryana, Delhi, M.P. and Chandigarh formed the sample for this investigation. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) was the main tool used for data collection. Results revealed a significant difference in personality factors among the sample groups. Orthopedically crippled students were found to be more out-going, warm hearted, participative, over-active, lively, impatient, assertive and independent. Visually impaired children were less out-going, highly intelligent, demanding, impatient and inactive. Likewise, the hearing impaired children possessed personality traits like emotional stability, intelligence, assertiveness, independence and obedience.

Salami and Alawode (2008) conducted a study on the influence of impairment on the academic achievement of 200 senior secondary students randomly selected from five secondary schools. The data were gathered through academic records of the students



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

and was statistically treated by using mean, t-test and correlation. Results revealed a significant difference in the academic achievement of handicapped and non-handicapped students with handicapped students having less academic achievement than non-handicapped ones.

Hussain (2006) investigated the impact of disability on self-concept of 90 physically challenged and normal school going adolescents of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades selected purposively from three different schools of Delhi. Physically challenged students were classified into two categories viz; blind and orthopedically crippled. The total number of sample was 90 which included 30 blind, 30 orthopedically crippled and 30 normal subjects. In each category 15 male and 15 females were included. The main tool used in the study was Mohsin's Self-Concept Inventory. Results indicated that physically challenged students had significantly low self-esteem than their normal peers. Likewise, girls were also found significantly low on self-concept when compared to boys.

Miyahara and Piek (2006) attempted to ascertain the impact of minor and major physical disabilities on self-esteem of children and adolescents. The work was based on the blend of the previous investigations to understand the relationship between physical disabilities and self-esteem. Meta-analysis of 13 investigations was done which included 1984 subjects. The findings revealed a mild effect on self-esteem because of major disabilities in comparison to the minor disabilities.

Yenagi (2006) conducted a research on study habits as a function of Self Perception among 1020 intellectually gifted and non-gifted pre-university students randomly selected from colleges in Hubli and Dharwad cities of Karnataka. Patel's Study Habits Inventory (1976) and Soar's and Soar's Self-Perception Inventory (1976) were the tools employed for the present study. The findings

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

indicated a significant difference in intellectually gifted and non-gifted groups.

Chandra and Koul (2006) analyzed the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled children on academic performance, level of education and level of aspiration in Northern Assam. The findings revealed no significant difference on level of aspiration and level of education of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled children. Also, no significant difference was found with respect to academic performance of visually impaired and orthopedically handicapped children.

Macy (2005) studied the academic achievement of 350 normal and physically challenged students. The subjects were culturally diverse, third graders from six California Public Elementary schools. Interviews were conducted by the researcher in the fall and spring of the school year. The school provided test scores from the students grade three academic achievement test (mathematic, reading and language arts) which were administered in the spring. Results indicated high academic achievement in normal students in comparison to the physically challenged ones.

Stuart (2004) investigated the self-concept, level of aspiration, mental health and academic achievement of 250 handicapped and 250 normal teenagers in New Jersey U.S.A. Various statistical techniques were employed to the data collected and it was found that the handicapped teenagers differ significantly from the normal teenagers on self-concept, level of aspiration, mental health and academic achievement.

Sharma (2004) conducted a study on personality characteristics of primary school students with learning disabilities and their non-learning-disabled peers. The sample comprised of 180 boys and girls of ages 8, 9 and 10 with learning disabilities in 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade in urban and rural primary schools of Andhra Pradesh. An adapted version of (CPQ) Children Personality Questionnaire was

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

the main tool used to collect data from the subjects. The findings indicated a significant age difference in the personality factors of (LD) learning disabled children. Study indicates maladaptive tendencies in personality disposition of the LD children in comparison to the (NLD) non-learning-disabled subjects. The LD children were more Schizothymic, rigid and phlegmatic compared to the NLD children. No significant gender difference was found in personality factors of LD boys and girls except in factor E (Submissiveness v/s Dominance). Significant age differences were noted for factors- A, B, G and Q<sub>4</sub> of the LD children. Results also indicated that social and emotional maladaptive behavior tends to become more pronounced with age in LD children.

Shan and Schrawat (2003) assessed the self-concept and level of aspiration among urban and rural physically challenged 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled high school students selected from 20 districts of Haryana. The sample included 211 boys and 258 girls selected from urban areas and 288 boys and 243 girls selected from rural areas of Haryana. Children's Self-Concept Scale (CSCS) by Ahluwalia and Level of Aspiration Test developed by Patel were the tools employed for the investigation. Findings indicated that the physically challenged urban school children had better self-concept as compared to their rural counterparts.

Nicholas and Geers (2003) reported that the self-perceptions of deaf students in integrated classes appear to be generally positive even when they are not accepted by hearing peers. A picture assessment of self-image was used in a sample of 181, 8 to 9-year-old children who had been implanted in the last four or more years. Results indicated that self-perceptions were positive in most aspects of daily life. Whether positive self-perceptions among deaf students continue into adolescence is unknown so far. It is also important to assess how social identity relates to self-perceptions and

psychological well-being in adolescents, given that social identity reflects a conscious affiliation with a shared social group, thereby providing stability and continuity in self-perceptions.

An intercultural study in which the Self-concept of young people with physical disability was compared with the students without a disability in the Czech Republic and the United States was conducted by Mrug and Wallender (2002). The results confirmed that self-concept of young people with a physical disability integrated into regular classrooms was like that of the self-concept of their normal peers.

### **2.4. Overview**

A total of 53 studies have been reviewed under this section. Fotiadou *et al.* (2014) in their study revealed that the visually impaired children scored less on motor development and self-esteem as compared to their typical peers. Gulhane (2014) indicated a significant difference in visually and hearing impaired boys and girls on academic achievement in language and elementary academics. Hearing impaired boys and girls performed better in language and elementary mathematics than their visually impaired peers. Rajknowar *et al.* (2014) found no significant difference in academic achievement based on gender. Further, it was noted that the academic achievement of the children was not at all influenced by their self-concept. Mishra (2013) in a study of self-concept in relation to ego-strength of sighted and visually impaired students proved that there was a positive relationship between self-concept and adjustment. There was a significant difference between self-concept among visually impaired and sighted adolescents. Sighted adolescents had higher self-concept than visually impaired subjects. Ego strength (a key component of personality) of sighted students was better than that of visually impaired adolescents. Yeger and Deher (2013) compared visually impaired children's participation and socio-demographic parameters and found that hearing and visually

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

impaired children showed significant limited participation as compared to the normal peers. The participation was more seen among visually impaired children. Socio-demographic variables i.e. age, mothers education and socioeconomic level correlated with participation dimensions in both the groups. Kasomo (2012) observed a significantly higher self-concept in the blind students enrolled in the integrated schools than their counter parts in the special schools. Also, favorable social environment offered by the integrated schools aids in the development of positive self-concept. Narimani and Mousazadeh (2010) in their study indicated a better self-esteem in individuals with normal vision and high scores of self-concept in students with visual impairment. Were Michael *et al.* (2010) while attempting to ascertain the gender differences in self-concept and academic achievement among visually impaired pupils in Kenya found a significant difference in academic achievement of partially sighted and blind pupils. Also, it was observed that the visually impaired girls possessed elevated level of self-concept as compared to their sighted peers. Soulis and Christodoulous (2010) found that the visually impaired children attained a low score in self-esteem as compared to their typical participants. Majda and Naima (2009) after investigating the self-esteem and emotional stability of visually impaired school children found that none of the variables i.e. gender, age, class, family type and area of living were reported as the indicators of self-esteem among visually impaired school children. It was stressed that gender emerged as a significant predictor of emotional stability. Garaigordobil and Bernaras (2009) insisted that there exists no significant difference in self-concept and self-esteem of visually impaired and sighted adolescents. It was further maintained that visually impaired adolescents scored significantly higher in various pathological symptoms. Visually impaired girls obtained a low score in self-esteem but a high score in various psychological symptoms i.e. low hostility, low psychotism, high

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

extraversion which were identified as predictors of high self-esteem in them. Verma (2008) observed a significant difference in visually impaired and sighted adolescents on self-concept and study habits. Better study habits were found in sighted students. Also, a proficient level of self-concept was observed in them. Lifshitz *et al.* (2007) in their investigation about the self-esteem, adjustment to blindness and quality of friendship among adolescents with visual impairments noted that visually impaired adolescents had higher scores of self-esteem compared to their peers. Sangeeta (2006) while observing the visually impaired boys maintained that the visually impaired boys possessed a better self-concept than the sighted ones. With respect to personality traits the visually impaired boys were found to have a feeling of inadequacy and depression, they were likely to be more sensitive, aggressive, tense and restless in comparison to their sighted peers. No significant difference on neuroticism and anxiety was observed between the visually impaired and sighted boys. Griffin *et al.* (2005) in a study of self-esteem and empathy among visually impaired and sighted pre-adolescents revealed no significant difference between the two groups of students in their level of self-esteem and empathy towards others. Ntzamilis (2004) found no significant difference in visually impaired and hearing impaired elementary education students on academic performance in mathematics. Fok and Fung (2004) revealed that, the visually impaired and sighted people possess a similar level of self-esteem and self-concept. Kef (2002) while investigating the psychosocial adjustment of visually impaired Dutch teenagers (aged 14 to 24) revealed that a sizeable number of these teenagers had high self-esteem, were generally happy, did not feel lonely and that most had accepted the implications of their impairment. No significant difference was found between blind and individuals with low-vision, although the scores for the severely visually impaired tended to be more negative. No significant difference was found between these two groups and sighted

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

adolescents. Sighted adolescents tend to have a larger network of family and friends although individuals who were blind or had low-vision were satisfied and believed that they received enough support from parents and peers. Stephanic et al. (2014) focused on the self-esteem of hearing impaired and normal children and established that hearing impaired children had lower levels of self-esteem than children with normal hearing. Neerja and Leelavathi (2014) aimed to assess the self-concept of 32 hearing impaired (11 -14 year) old boys and girls and maintained that none of the hearing impaired children had high self-concept. However, 56% of the boys had low self-concept and more than 50% of the girls had moderate self-concept. Oyewumiet al. (2013) noted a major influence of onset of hearing loss and an insignificant influence of gender on perceived quality of life among adolescents with hearing impairment. Ayo et al. (2013) revealed that hearing loss affects emotional well-being of youth with hearing impairment and they tend to feel inferior in company of persons without hearing impairment. The research findings of Begum Julaiha and Mehjabeen (2012) examined the self-concept of hearing impaired and normal adolescents regarding gender and found no significant difference in early adolescent normal boys and girls. However, late adolescent normal boys revealed an elevated level of self-concept when compared to their counter parts. Heine and Slone (2008) stressed that the children with mild hearing loss had a deficient performance in academics. Schmidt and Cagran(2008) in their study found that in comparison to the typical peers hearing impaired students had a lower academic, social and general self-concept; but a higher physical concept as, these people tend to feel and understand that their physical appearance is similar with that of their normal hearing peers. Marschark et al. (2007) in a research on educating deaf students maintained that "low achievement is characteristic of deaf students". Jambor and Elliot (2005) emphasized that identification and interaction with deaf society

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

significantly contributes to positive self-esteem. Vaishya (2005) stressed that hearing and visually impaired students do not differ significantly on their level of aspiration and academic achievement. Gagandeep and Verma (2004) in their study of self- concept among hearing- impaired and crippled female adolescents found no significant difference in the two groups. Dumanhuri (2003) revealed no significant difference between the hearing impaired children and crippled children with respect to their level of aspiration and academic growth. Jefferson and Anderson (2000) in their study revealed no significant difference between hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled children on different dimensions of self and levels of aspiration. Syeda et al. (2016) found a significant difference in personality traits between physically disabled and normal students. Normal students attained a high score on personality traits as compared to the physically disabled students. Nair and Starlet (2015) pointed out that achievement motivation and self-esteem were significantly lower in physically handicapped students compared to their healthy controls. Talwar and Kour (2015) in their study hold the view that normal students have good academic achievement than the physically challenged students. Monika and Sameer (2014) observed a significant positive relationship between academic achievement and personality of orthopedically crippled students. Lakshimi and Anuradha (2014) in their research indicated a significant difference in the crippled and visually impaired subjects on self-esteem. Visually impaired adolescents reflected more self-esteem than their crippled counter parts. Mucharunga and Pitso (2014) while investigating the psychosocial challenges faced by physically impaired children in rural South Africa revealed that the physically impaired children face challenges such as isolation, neglect, lack of basic and extra-curricular facilities. Bashir and Ganie (2013) critically analyzed the disability programs in Jammu and Kashmir with special reference to children and found that the physically challenged individuals



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

receive less-benefits of the specialized schemes in the State. Puju et al. (2012) found a significant difference in the academic achievement of visually impaired and crippled students. Crippled students showed better academic achievement than visually impaired students. Pandith et al. (2012) emphasized that physically normal students had high academic achievement than the physically challenged students. Pandith (2011) found no significant difference between hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students on academic achievement. Bhardwaj (2010) recognized a significant difference in the blind, partially blind, deaf, hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled adolescent boys on personality factors. Salami and Alawode (2008) in their study revealed a significant difference in the academic achievement of handicapped and non-handicapped students with handicapped students having less academic achievement than non-handicapped ones. Hussain (2006) in his investigation of self-concept among physically challenged and normal adolescents found that physically challenged students had significantly low self-esteem than their normal peers. Likewise, girls were also found significantly low on self-concept when compared to boys. Miyahara and Piek (2006) revealed a mild effect on self-esteem because of major disabilities in children and adolescents in comparison to the minor disabilities. Yenagi (2006) noted a significant difference in intellectually gifted and non-gifted groups. Chandra and Koul (2006) found no significant difference with respect to level of aspiration and level of education of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled children. Also, no significant difference was found in academic performance of visually impaired and orthopedically handicapped children. Macoy (2005) observed that high academic achievement favors normal students in comparison to the physically challenged ones. Stuart (2004) maintained that the handicapped teenagers differ significantly from the normal teenagers on self-concept, level of aspiration, mental health and academic

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

achievement. Sharma (2004) indicated a significant age difference in the personality factors of learning disabled and non-learning-disabled children. Study indicates maladaptive tendencies in personality disposition of the learning disabled children in comparison to the non learning disabled subjects. The learning disabled were more Schizothymic, rigid and phlegmatic compared to the NLD children. No significant gender difference was found in personality factors of learning disabled boys and girls except in factor E (Submissiveness v/s Dominance). Significant age differences were noted for factors- A, B, G and Q<sub>4</sub> of the LD children. Results also indicated that social and emotional maladaptive behavior tends to become more pronounced with age in L.D children. Shan and Schrawat (2003) in their study indicated that the physically challenged urban school children had better self-concept as compared to their rural counterparts. Nicholas and Geers (2003) reported that the self-perceptions of deaf students in integrated classes appear to be generally positive even when they were not accepted by hearing peers. The results of the study conducted by Mrug and Wallender (2002) confirmed that self-concept of young people with a physical disability integrated into regular classrooms did not differ from the self-concept of their normal peers.

The review of the selected literature provides a complete understanding of the topic undertaken by the researcher. The general views related to the topic are clearly outlined in the reviewed literature. The description of the studies suggests that the physically challenged children's personality, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement are influenced by many factors and they need a better environment to live in.

# 3

## Results

---

The results of the data must be simple and comprehensive. It is one of the most important steps in research. It involves the critical investigation of the findings in view of all the limitations of the data collected. It is the transformation of the data with the objective of extracting useful information and facilitating the conclusion.

In the present research, the attempt has been made to study the personality factors, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement of physically challenged and normal school going children in districts Anantnag and Srinagar. Based on the tools employed, the information collected from the physically challenged and normal school going children was put to appropriate statistical analysis in order to arrive at definite conclusions in the light of proposed objectives. The data was statistically analyzed by using mean, S.D. and t-test. The statistical analysis of the data has been presented in the tabular form as under:

1. Identification of physically challenged and normal school going children. Tables(3.0-3.1)

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

2. Comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children on personality factors, self- esteem, study habits and academic achievement. Tables (3.2-3.7)
3. Comparison of rural/urban physically challenged and normal school going children on personality factors, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement. Tables(3.8-3.19)
4. Inter-comparison within the categories of disability (3.2.0-3.3.7)
5. Comparison of rural/urban visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on personality factors, self- esteem, study habits and academic achievement. Tables (3.3.8-3.5.5)

#### 3.1 Section: (A) Identification of Physically Challenged and Normal School going Children

The breakup of the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children is shown in the below given tables:

**Table 3.0: Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children of Anantnag (Rural)**

Category	No. of Schools	Gender		Age Group		Total
		Boy	Girl	12-13	14-15	
VI	09	20	10	08	22	30
HI	21	13	17	08	22	30
OC	17	20	10	08	22	30
Total	47	53	37	24	66	90

VI=Visually Impaired

HI=Hearing Impaired

OC=Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.0 shows the distribution of visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children in upper primary and high classes of rural areas. It is evident from the table that a total of 30 visually impaired children which included 20 boys and 10

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 20 boys and 10 girls were purposively selected from 9, 21 and 17 government and private schools of rural areas. The data shows that a sizeable number of the subjects belonged to the age group of (14-15 years).

**Table 3.1: Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children of Srinagar (Urban)**

Category	No. of Schools	Gender		Age Group		Total
		Boy	Girl	12-13	14-15	
VI	16	16	14	14	16	30
HI	7	13	17	11	19	30
OC	23	19	11	16	14	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>90</b>

VI=Visually Impaired

HI=Hearing Impaired

OC=Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.1 shows the distribution of visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children in upper primary and high classes of urban areas. It is evident from the table that a total of 30 visually impaired children which included 16 boys and 14 girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 19 boys and 11 girls were purposively selected from 16, 7 and 23 government and private schools of urban areas. The data shows that a sizeable number of the subjects belonged to the age group of (14-15 years).

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**3.2 Section: (B) Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors, Self-Esteem, Academic Achievement and Study Habits. Tables (3.2-3.7)**

**Table 3.2: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E(N=180 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>A</b>	P C	5.00	1.57	4.71	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	79	60		
<b>B</b>	P C	4.88	1.65	4.03	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.62	1.84		
<b>C</b>	P C	4.96	1.70	2.89	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.49	1.78		
<b>D</b>	P C	4.60	1.65	2.42	Significant at 0.05 level
	Nrml	5.03	1.69		
<b>E</b>	P C	4.26	1.53	4.85	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.08	1.67		

PC=Physically Challenged

Nrml=Normal

Table 3.2 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of a significant difference between the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors A, B, C, D and E. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were Schizothymic/reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, phlegmatic/undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas, the normal

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

school going children were warmhearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.

**Table 3.3: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=180 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	P C	4.60	1.65	2.42	Significant at 0.05 level
	Nrml	5.03	1.69		
<b>G</b>	P C	4.99	1.59	2.40	Significant at 0.05 level
	Nrml	5.42	1.76		
<b>H</b>	P C	4.94	1.65	0.59	Not Significant
	Nrml	5.04	1.54		
<b>I</b>	P C	5.91	1.84	4.72	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.02	1.72		
<b>J</b>	P C	4.65	1.89	3.07	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.25	1.69		

PC=Physically Challenged

Nrml=Normal

Table 3.3 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of significant difference between the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors F, G, I and J. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were sober, disregarded rules, more tender minded and zestful. Whereas the normal school going children were enthusiastic, conscientious, less tender-minded and circumspect. However, the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

did not differ significantly on factor H of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ)

**Table 3.4: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=180 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>N</b>	PC	4.39	1.79	3.49	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.01	1.50		
<b>O</b>	PC	5.12	1.86	5.84	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	4.10	1.66		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	PC	5.07	1.77	5.00	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	5.94	1.52		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	PC	5.76	1.74	5.21	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	4.80	1.77		

PC=Physically Challenged

Nrml=Normal

Table 3.4 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics on Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The table highlights the existence of a significant difference in the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. More specifically the results indicated that physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were forthright, apprehensive, less controlled and tense. Whereas, the normal school going children were artful, self-assured, more controlled and relaxed.

**Table 3.5: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Self -Esteem (N=180 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
PC	11.28	2.67	2.04	Significant at 0.05 level
Nrml	11.83	2.42		



## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

PC=Physically Challenged

Nrml=Normal

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school children with N=180 in each case on self-esteem is shown in Table 3.5. The results depicted a significant difference between the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on self-esteem, with physically challenged school going children scoring less than their normal peers.

More specifically the results indicated that the physically challenged school going children were shy, sensitive, had too many parental expectations, felt discouraged at school and home and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. Whereas the normal school going children were confident, easy going, independent, least bothered, and friendly with parents.

**Table 3.6: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Study Habits (N=180 each)**

Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
ATT & E	PC	3.77	0.77	1.41	Not Significant
	Nrml	3.66	0.71		
HE	PC	1.41	0.61	26.46	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	3.28	0.71		
SH&H	PC	10.08	1.97	3.23	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	10.68	1.47		
MC	PC	1.42	0.88	1.16	Not Significant
	Nrml	1.31	1.00		
E&C	PC	8.37	1.30	7.04	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	9.39	1.44		
SC	PC	1.16	0.66	13.03	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	1.88	0.32		
Total	PC	26.23	3.25	12.39	Significant at 0.01 level
	Nrml	30.05	2.54		

PC=Physically Challenged, Nrml=Normal

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

ATT &E=Attitude towards Teachers Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison between physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in each case on six dimensions of study habits is shown in Table 3.6. The findings highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the physically challenged and normal school going children on four dimensions of study habits i.e. home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the physically challenged school going children, the normal school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) examination and concentration (E&C), and self-confidence (SC). However, the two groups i.e., physically challenged school going children and their normal peers did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and mental conflict (MC).

**Table 3.7: Mean Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=180 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
P C	49.85	16.89	2.28	Significant at 0.05 level
Nrml	53.94	17.03		

PC=Physically Challenged

Nrml=Normal

Table 3.7 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of physically challenged and normal school going children with N=180 in

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

each case on academic achievement. The results indicated a significant difference at(0.05 level) in the two groups i.e., physically challenged and normal school going children on academic achievement. The statistical analysis of the data showed that the performance of physically challenged children in academics was lower compared to the performance of their normal peers.

#### 3.3 Section: (C) Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors, Self- Esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement. Tables (3.8-3.1.9)

**Table 3.8: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=90 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
A	Rural	4.67	1.47	2.90	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.33	1.60		
B	Rural	4.49	1.40	3.24	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.27	1.78		
C	Rural	4.74	1.45	1.71	Not Significant
	Urban	5.18	1.91		
D	Rural	4.14	1.55	3.82	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.06	1.63		
E	Rural	4.36	1.50	0.87	Not Significant
	Urban	4.16	1.56		

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on first five personality factors can be seen in Table 3.8. It is evident from the data that rural physically challenged

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

school children differ significantly from urban school going children on three personality factors of CPQ. The factors are A, B and D. More specifically the findings revealed that rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to the urban physically challenged school going children were reserved, less intelligent and undemonstrative. Whereas, the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent and excitable. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors C and E.

**Table 3.9: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=90 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>F</b>	Rural	4.51	1.56	0.79	Not Significant
	Urban	4.69	1.44		
<b>G</b>	Rural	4.97	1.66	0.18	Not Significant
	Urban	5.01	1.53		
<b>H</b>	Rural	5.08	1.76	1.12	Not Significant
	Urban	4.80	1.54		
<b>I</b>	Rural	5.70	1.80	1.50	Not Significant
	Urban	6.11	1.87		
<b>J</b>	Rural	4.21	1.64	3.31	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.12	2.02		

Table 3.9 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in rural physically challenged school going children and their urban

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

peers on personality factor J. More specifically the results indicated that the rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less zestful. Whereas the urban physically challenged children were more zestful. However, the two groups had no significant difference on personality factors F, G, Hand I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.1.0: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=90 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	Rural	4.02	1.77	2.83	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	4.77	1.75		
<b>O</b>	Rural	4.57	1.69	4.16	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.68	1.88		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	Rural	5.26	1.77	1.38	Not Significant
	Urban	4.89	1.77		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	Rural	5.70	1.64	0.51	Not Significant
	Urban	5.83	1.84		

Table 3.1.0 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in rural physically challenged school going children and their urban peers on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated that the physically challenged rural school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less forthright and self-assured. Whereas the normal school going children were more forthright and apprehensive. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

participants had no significant difference on personality factors Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.

**Table 3.1.1: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=90 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>A</b>	Rural	5.56	1.46	1.97	Significant at 0.05 level
	Urban	6.02	1.70		
<b>B</b>	Rural	5.19	1.67	3.23	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	6.06	1.91		
<b>C</b>	Rural	5.17	1.77	2.49	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.82	1.74		
<b>D</b>	Rural	4.67	1.56	2.91	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.39	1.75		
<b>E</b>	Rural	4.61	1.45	3.87	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.54	1.76		

Table 3.1.1 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in rural normal school going children and their urban peers on all personality factors i.e., factor A, B, C, D and E of CPQ (Children Personality Questionnaire). More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less warm hearted, less intelligent, less emotionally stable, undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were more warm hearted, more intelligent, more emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.

Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

**Table 3.1.2: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=90 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	Rural	4.72	1.59	2.64	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	5.38	1.72		
<b>G</b>	Rural	5.51	2.01	0.71	Not Significant
	Urban	5.32	1.48		
<b>H</b>	Rural	5.12	1.57	0.72	Not Significant
	Urban	4.96	1.52		
<b>I</b>	Rural	4.78	1.57	1.87	Not Significant
	Urban	5.26	1.83		
<b>J</b>	Rural	5.12	1.62	1.01	Not Significant
	Urban	5.38	1.77		

Table 3.1.2 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in rural normal school going children and their urban peers on personality factor F of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). More specifically the results indicated that the rural school going children in comparison to their urban participants were sober. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were enthusiastic. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors G, H, I and J.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.1.3: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=90 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	Rural	5.14	1.40	2.83	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	4.87	1.59		
<b>O</b>	Rural	4.14	1.48	4.16	Significant at 0.01 level
	Urban	4.06	1.83		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	Rural	5.83	1.51	1.38	Not Significant
	Urban	6.06	1.53		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	Rural	4.83	1.74	0.51	Not Significant
	Urban	4.77	1.81		

Table 3.1.3 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in rural normal school going children and their urban peers on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were artful and self-assured. Whereas the urban normal school going children were forthright but less self-assured. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factor Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.



Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

**Table 3.1.4: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=90 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
Rural	11.22	2.23	0.31	Not Significant
Urban	11.33	2.61		

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case is shown in Table 4.1.4. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups on self-esteem.

**Table 3.1.5: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=90 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
Rural	11.50	2.57	1.65	Not Significant
Urban	12.16	2.74		

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case is shown in Table 3.1.5. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups on self-esteem. More specifically the results revealed that the rural normal school going children were sensitive, less confident and dependent, discouraged at school and home and felt that most people are better liked than them.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.1.6: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Study Habits (N=90 each)**

<b>Dimension s</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>ATT &amp;E</b>	RPC	3.68	0.80	1.44	Not Significant
	UPC	3.85	0.74		
<b>HE</b>	RPC	1.27	0.61	3.10	Significant at 0.01 level
	UPC	1.55	0.58		
<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	RPC	9.42	1.71	4.79	Significant at 0.01 level
	UPC	10.75	2.00		
<b>MC</b>	RPC	1.68	0.96	4.13	Significant at 0.01 level
	UPC	1.16	0.70		
<b>E&amp;C</b>	RPC	8.32	1.37	0.51	Not Significant
	UPC	8.42	1.24		
<b>SC</b>	RPC	1.05	0.60	2.13	Significant at 0.05 level
	UPC	1.26	0.71		
<b>Total</b>	RPC	25.43	3.27	3.39	Significant at 0.01 level
	UPC	27.03	3.04		

RPC= Rural Physically Challenged & U.P.C= Urban Physically Challenged

ATT &E=Attitude towards Teachers &Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban physically challenged school going children with N=90 in each case on six dimensions of study habits is shown in Table 3.1.6. The findings highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

rural and urban physically challenged school going children on four dimensions of study habits i.e. home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically, the results indicated that in comparison to the rural physically challenged school going children, the urban physically challenged school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC). Rural physically challenged school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than urban physically challenged school going children. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban physically challenged school going children did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and examination and concentration (E&C).

**Table 3.1.7: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Study Habits (N=90 each)**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>																																																			
<b>ATT &amp; E</b>	Rural	3.37	.62	5.82	Significant at 0.01 level																																																			
	Urban	3.94	.67			<b>HE</b>	Rural	3.34	.73	1.14	Not Significant	Urban	3.22	.69	<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	Rural	10.70	1.37	0.15	Not Significant	Urban	10.66	1.57	<b>MC</b>	Rural	1.03	.87	3.82	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	1.58	1.05	<b>E&amp;C</b>	Rural	8.86	1.01	5.25	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	9.92	1.60	<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant	Urban	1.87	.32	<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level
<b>HE</b>	Rural	3.34	.73	1.14	Not Significant																																																			
	Urban	3.22	.69			<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	Rural	10.70	1.37	0.15	Not Significant	Urban	10.66	1.57	<b>MC</b>	Rural	1.03	.87	3.82	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	1.58	1.05	<b>E&amp;C</b>	Rural	8.86	1.01	5.25	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	9.92	1.60	<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant	Urban	1.87	.32	<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	31.01	2.41						
<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	Rural	10.70	1.37	0.15	Not Significant																																																			
	Urban	10.66	1.57			<b>MC</b>	Rural	1.03	.87	3.82	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	1.58	1.05	<b>E&amp;C</b>	Rural	8.86	1.01	5.25	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	9.92	1.60	<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant	Urban	1.87	.32	<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	31.01	2.41															
<b>MC</b>	Rural	1.03	.87	3.82	Significant at 0.01 level																																																			
	Urban	1.58	1.05			<b>E&amp;C</b>	Rural	8.86	1.01	5.25	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	9.92	1.60	<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant	Urban	1.87	.32	<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	31.01	2.41																								
<b>E&amp;C</b>	Rural	8.86	1.01	5.25	Significant at 0.01 level																																																			
	Urban	9.92	1.60			<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant	Urban	1.87	.32	<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	31.01	2.41																																	
<b>SC</b>	Rural	1.88	.31	0.23	Not Significant																																																			
	Urban	1.87	.32			<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level	Urban	31.01	2.41																																										
<b>Total</b>	Rural	29.08	2.32	5.45	Significant at 0.01 level																																																			
	Urban	31.01	2.41																																																					

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

ATT&E= Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on six dimensions of study habits is shown in Table 3.1.7. The findings highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the rural and urban normal school going children on three dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC) and examination and concentration (E&C). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the rural normal school going children, the urban normal school going children had better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), and examination and concentration (E&C). Urban normal school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than their rural peers. However, the three groups i.e., rural and urban normal school going children did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC).

**Table 3.1.8: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=90 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
Rural	46.13	18.3 2	3.01	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	53.57	14.5 0		

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children with

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

N=90 in each case on academic achievement can be seen in Table 3.1.8. It is evident that the rural physically challenged school going children differed significantly from the urban school going children on academic achievement, with urban physically challenged children having better academic performance than their rural physically challenged peers.

**Table 3.1.9: Mean Comparison of Rural/Urban Normal School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=90 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
Rural	49.30	17.97	3.78	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	58.58	14.71		

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children with N=90 in each case on academic achievement can be seen in Table 3.1.9. It is evident that the rural physically challenged school going children differed significantly from the urban school going children on academic achievement, with urban physically challenged children having better academic performance than their rural physically challenged peers.

#### 3.4. Section-(D) Inter-comparison within the categories of disability (3.2.0-3.3.7)

**Table 3.2.0: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors A,B,C,D and E (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
A	VI	5.00	1.13	3.94	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	4.13	1.26		
B	VI	4.98	1.45	5.50	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.73	0.98		
C	VI	5.12	1.47	4.96	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.88	1.23		
D	VI	4.32	1.43	1.71	Not Significant
	HI	3.92	1.10		
E	VI	3.62	1.39	1.48	Not Significant
	HI	4.00	1.43		

VI =Visually Impaired

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

HI =Hearing Impaired

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children with N=60 in each case on first five personality factors is depicted in Table 3.2.0. The results revealed that the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children differ significantly on personality factors A, B and C. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were warm hearted, intelligent and emotionally stable whereas, their hearing impaired counterparts were reserved, less intelligent and emotionally less stable. However, the two groups i.e., the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factors D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.1: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=60 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>F</b>	VI	4.58	1.09	4.04	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.63	1.24		
<b>G</b>	VI	4.87	1.21	4.44	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.97	0.99		
<b>H</b>	VI	4.97	1.47	3.87	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.97	1.35		
<b>I</b>	VI	6.27	1.62	0.54	Not Significant
	HI	6.10	1.71		
<b>J</b>	VI	4.68	1.83	4.19	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.45	1.34		

VI =Visually Impaired

HI =Hearing Impaired

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

Table 3.2.1 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children with N=60 in each case on next five personality factors of (CPQ).The results revealed that the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children differ significantly on personality factors F,G,H and J. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender-minded and zestful. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were serious, self-indulgent, withdrawn, tender-minded and zestful. However, the two groups i.e., the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factor I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.2: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
N	VI	4.38	1.64	4.23	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.28	1.15		
O	VI	5.23	1.83	1.48	Not Significant
	HI	5.73	1.84		
Q <sub>3</sub>	VI	5.50	1.63	6.39	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	3.78	1.29		
Q <sub>4</sub>	VI	5.23	1.74	3.34	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	6.22	1.47		

VI =Visually Impaired

HI =Hearing Impaired

Table 3.2.2 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children with N=60 in each case on last four personality factors of (CPQ).The

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

results revealed that the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children differ significantly on personality factors N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were less forthright, uncontrolled and frustrated. However, the two groups i.e., the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factor O of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.3: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>A</b>	HI	4.13	1.26	2.74	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	4.78	1.32		
<b>B</b>	HI	3.73	0.98	3.89	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	4.57	1.33		
<b>C</b>	HI	3.88	1.23	1.68	Not Significant
	OC	4.27	1.26		
<b>D</b>	HI	3.92	1.10	0.99	Not Significant
	OC	4.13	1.26		
<b>E</b>	HI	4.00	1.43	0.21	Not Significant
	OC	4.05	1.14		

HI =Hearing Impaired

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.2.3 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on the first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two



**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor A and B of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled children, the hearing impaired school going children were less reserved and less intelligent. Whereas the orthopedically crippled school going children were more reserved and intelligent. However, the two groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors C, D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.4: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors F,G, H, I and J (N=60 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>F</b>	HI	3.67	1.24	1.47	Not Significant
	OC	3.98	1.09		
<b>G</b>	HI	3.97	0.99	2.35	Significant at 0.05 level
	OC	4.55	1.64		
<b>H</b>	HI	3.97	1.35	1.35	Not Significant
	OC	4.32	1.47		
<b>I</b>	HI	6.10	1.71	0.00	Not Significant
	OC	6.10	1.71		
<b>J</b>	HI	3.45	1.34	2.74	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	4.12	1.31		

HI =Hearing Impaired

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.2.4 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor G and J of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children were more zestful and disregarded rules. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled children were less zestful and expedient. However, the two groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors F, H and I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.5: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=60 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	HI	3.28	1.15	3.08	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	3.95	1.21		
<b>O</b>	HI	5.73	1.84	2.76	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	4.85	1.64		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	HI	3.78	1.29	6.53	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	5.38	1.39		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	HI	6.22	1.47	3.80	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	5.18	1.50		

HI =Hearing Impaired

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.2.5 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on all four factors i.e., factor N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children were more forthright, apprehensive, uncontrolled and frustrated. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were less forthright, self-assured, controlled and tense.

**Table 3.2.6: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors A,B,C,D and E (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>A</b>	VI	5.00	1.13	0.96	Not Significant
	OC	4.78	1.32		
<b>B</b>	VI	4.98	1.45	1.63	Not Significant
	OC	4.57	1.33		
<b>C</b>	VI	5.12	1.47	3.39	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	4.27	1.26		
<b>D</b>	VI	4.32	1.43	0.74	Not Significant
	OC	4.13	1.26		
<b>E</b>	VI	3.62	1.39	1.86	Not Significant
	OC	4.05	1.14		

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

VI =Visually Impaired

Table 3.2.6 depicts the mean, S.D and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor C of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

were emotionally stable. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were emotionally less stable. However, the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors A, B, D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.7: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	VI	4.53	1.09	2.47	Significant at 0.05 level
	OC	3.98	1.09		
<b>G</b>	VI	4.87	1.21	1.20	Not Significant
	OC	4.55	1.64		
<b>H</b>	VI	4.97	1.47	2.41	Significant at 0.05 level
	OC	4.32	1.47		
<b>I</b>	VI	6.27	1.62	0.54	Not Significant
	OC	6.10	1.71		
<b>J</b>	VI	4.68	1.83	1.94	Not Significant
	OC	4.12	1.31		

VI =Visually Impaired

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.2.7 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor F and H of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children were serious and careful. Whereas, the

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

orthopedically crippled children were sober and timid. However, the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors G, I and J of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

**Table 3.2.8: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=60 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>N</b>	VI	4.38	1.68	1.64	Not Significant
	OC	3.95	1.21		
<b>O</b>	VI	5.23	1.83	1.20	Not Significant
	OC	4.85	1.64		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	VI	5.50	1.63	0.42	Not Significant
	OC	5.38	1.39		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	VI	5.23	1.74	0.16	Not Significant
	OC	5.18	1.50		

VI =Visually Impaired

OC =Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.2.8 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed no significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Personality Questionnaire.

**Table 3.2.9: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children On Self - Esteem (N=60 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
VI	9.48	1.08	4.44	Significant at 0.01 level
HI	10.30	0.92		

VI= Visually Impaired

HI= Hearing Impaired

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children with N=60 in each case on self-esteem is shown in Table 3.2.9. The results revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on self-esteem. More specifically the findings indicated that the visually impaired school going children attained a low score on the self-esteem inventory which shows that they were shy, sensitive, easily bothered, dependent and felt less liked and appreciated by parents and peers.

**Table 3.3.0: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=60 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
VI	9.48	1.08	5.38	Significant at 0.01 level
OC	8.55	0.79		

VI=Visually Impaired

OC=Orthopedically Crippled

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on self-esteem is indicated in Table 3.3.0. The results revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children, with visually impaired school going children scoring better than their orthopedically crippled peers. More specifically the results revealed that the orthopedically crippled school going children in comparison to the visually impaired children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered, had too many parental expectations and felt discouraged at home and school. Whereas the visually impaired school going children were confident, easy going, least bothered and friendly with their parents. However, the scores attained by the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children were considerably low on self-esteem.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.3.1: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=60each)**

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
HI	10.30	0.92	11.13	Significant at 0.01 level
OC	8.55	0.79		

HI=Hearing Impaired

OC=Orthopedically Crippled

As can be seen in Table 3.3.1 the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N=60 in each case on self-esteem indicated a significant difference in the two groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children, with orthopedically crippled school going children scoring less than the hearing impaired children on self-esteem inventory.

More specifically the results conveyed that the orthopedically crippled subjects in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered and felt discouraged and upset. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were less shy, less sensitive and less upset.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.3.2: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Study Habits (N=30 each)**

Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Level of Significance
<b>ATT &amp; E</b>	VI	3.80	0.77	2.13	Significant at 0.05 level
	HI	4.08	0.67		
<b>HE</b>	VI	1.46	0.50	0.14	Not Significant
	HI	1.48	0.72		
<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	VI	11.43	1.79	6.35	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	9.8	1.58		
<b>MC</b>	VI	1.06	0.73	0.98	Not Significant
	HI	1.20	0.75		
<b>E&amp;C</b>	VI	8.4	1.35	0.67	Not Significant
	HI	8.5	1.06		
<b>SC</b>	VI	1.31	0.67	0.78	Not Significant
	HI	1.21	0.71		
<b>Total</b>	VI	27.50	3.21	2.68	Significant at 0.01 level
	HI	26.10	2.58		

VI=Visually Impaired & HI= Hearing Impaired

ATT &E=Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC=Self confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on study habits is shown in Table 3.3.2. The results highlighted the existence of significant difference in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on attitude towards teachers and education



**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

(ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). However, the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

**Table 3.3.3: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Study Habits (N=30 each)**

Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>ATT &amp;E</b>	VI	3.80	0.77	2.63	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	3.43	0.74		
<b>HE</b>	VI	1.46	0.50	1.66	Not Significant
	OC	1.30	0.59		
<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	VI	11.43	1.76	6.29	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	9.35	1.85		
<b>MC</b>	VI	1.06	0.73	6.53	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	2.01	0.85		
<b>E&amp;C</b>	VI	8.43	1.35	1.30	Not Significant
	OC	8.10	1.44		
<b>SC</b>	VI	1.31	0.67	3.22	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	0.95	0.56		
<b>Total</b>	VI	27.50	3.21	3.92	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	25.10	3.48		

VI= Visually Impaired & OC= Orthopedically Crippled

ATT &E=Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

SH&HA=Study habits & Home Environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self Confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N = 30 in each case on study habits is shown in Table 3.3.3. The results highlighted the existence of significant difference in the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) better study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), less mental conflict (MC) and more self-confidence (SC) However, the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on home environment (HE) and examination and concentration (E&C).

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.3.4: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Study Habits (N=30 each)**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>ATT &amp;E</b>	HI	4.08	0.67	5.02	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	3.43	0.74		
<b>HE</b>	HI	1.48	0.72	1.51	Not Significant
	OC	1.30	0.59		
<b>SH&amp;HA</b>	HI	9.48	1.58	0.42	Not Significant
	OC	9.35	1.85		
<b>MC</b>	HI	1.20	0.75	5.55	Significant at 0.01 level
	OC	2.01	0.85		
<b>E&amp;C</b>	HI	8.58	1.06	2.08	Significant at 0.05 level
	OC	8.10	1.44		
<b>SC</b>	HI	1.21	0.71	2.26	Significant at 0.05 level
	OC	0.95	0.56		
<b>Total</b>	HI	26.10	5.49	1.78	Not Significant
	OC	25.10	6.03		

HI= Hearing Impaired & O.C= Orthopedically Crippled

ATT &E=Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study Habits & Home Environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self Confidence

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children with N =30 in each case on study habits is shown in Table 3.3.4. The results highlighted the existence of significant difference in the hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC), examination

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), less mental conflict (MC), better examination and concentration (E&C) and more self –confidence(SC). However, the two groups i.e., hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on home environment (HE) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA).

**Table 3.3.5: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=60each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
VI	43.75	10.48	0.80	Not Significant
HI	41.97	13.94		

VI=Visually Impaired

HI= Hearing impaired

Table 3.3.5 indicates the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on academic achievement. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on academic achievement. More specifically the results revealed that the academic achievement of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children was more or less the same.

**Table 3.3.6: Mean Comparison of Visually Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=60each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
VI	43.74	10.48	0.43	Not Significant
OC	42.90	10.70		

VI=Visually Impaired

OC= Orthopedically Crippled

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

Table 3.3.6 reveals the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups i.e., visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement.

**Table 3.3.7: Mean Comparison of Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going children on Academic Achievement (N=60each)**

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
HI	41.93	13.9	0.42	
		4		
OC	42.92	10.7		Not Significant
		0		

HI=Hearing Impaired

OC=orthopedically crippled

The above table shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement. It is evident from the data that hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly from the orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**3.5 Section (E): Comparison of rural/urban visually impaired, hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on personality factors, self- esteem, study habits and academic achievement. Tables (3.3.8-3.5.5)**

**Table 3.3.8: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Visually Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>A</b>	RVI	4.60	1.22	2.89	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.40	0.89		
<b>B</b>	RVI	4.33	1.70	3.48	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.63	0.71		
<b>C</b>	RVI	4.67	1.66	2.64	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.57	1.10		
<b>D</b>	RVI	3.63	1.52	4.81	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.00	0.94		
<b>E</b>	RVI	3.87	1.43	1.40	Not Significant
	UVI	3.37	1.32		

RVI= Rural Visually Impaired

UVI =UrbanVisually Impaired

Table 3.3.8 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers on personality factors A, B, C, D and E. More specifically the results indicated that the rural school going children with visual impairment were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas, urban visually impaired

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

children were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable and excitable. However, the two groups i.e., rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers had no significant difference on factor E of (CPQ).

**Table 3.3.9: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Visually Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=30 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	RVI	4.07	1.08	3.61	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.00	0.91		
<b>G</b>	RVI	4.50	1.30	2.43	Significant at 0.05 level
	UVI	5.23	1.00		
<b>H</b>	RVI	4.43	1.45	2.98	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.50	1.30		
<b>I</b>	RVI	6.70	1.57	2.12	Significant at 0.05 level
	UVI	5.83	1.57		
<b>J</b>	RVI	3.47	1.47	6.83	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.90	1.26		

RVI=Rural Visually Impaired

UVI=Urban Visually Impaired

Table 3.3.9 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers on all five personality factors i.e., factor F, G, H, I and J. More specifically the results indicated that the rural school going children with visual impairment were sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender minded and zestful. Whereas, the urban school going children with visual

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

impairment were enthusiastic, conscientious, adventurous, less tender minded and circumspect.

**Table 3.4.0: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Visually Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors N,O,Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>(N=30 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>N</b>	RVI	3.23	1.30	7.56	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	5.53	1.04		
<b>O</b>	RVI	4.93	1.59	1.27	Not Significant
	UVI	5.53	2.03		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	RVI	6.13	1.69	3.24	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	4.87	1.30		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	RVI	5.70	1.57	2.13	Significant at 0.05 level
	UVI	4.77	1.79		

RVI =Rural Visually Impaired

UVI =UrbanVisually Impaired

Table 3.4.0 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers on personality factors N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. More specifically the results indicated that the rural visually impaired school going children were forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas the urban visually impaired children were artful, uncontrolled and relaxed. No significant difference was found between the two groups on factor O of CPQ.



**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.1: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>A</b>	RHI	4.20	1.58	0.40	Not Significant
	UHI	4.07	0.86		
<b>B</b>	RHI	4.03	1.06	2.44	Significant at 0.05 level
	UHI	3.43	0.81		
<b>C</b>	RHI	4.50	1.30	4.43	Significant at 0.01 level
	UHI	3.27	0.78		
<b>D</b>	RHI	4.00	1.43	0.57	Not Significant
	UHI	3.83	0.64		
<b>E</b>	RHI	4.30	1.64	1.63	Not Significant
	UHI	3.70	1.14		

RHI=Rural Hearing Impaired

UHI=Urban Hearing impaired

Table 3.4.1 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers on factor B and C of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to urban hearing impaired school going children the rural school going children with hearing impairment were less intelligent and emotionally less stable. Whereas, the urban hearing impaired children were very less intelligent and emotionally less stable. However, the two groups i.e., rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers had no significant difference on factor A, D and E of Personality Questionnaire.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.2: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=30 each)**

Factors	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
<b>F</b>	RHI	3.70	1.17	0.20	Not Significant
	UHI	3.63	1.32		
<b>G</b>	RHI	3.97	1.03	0.00	Not Significant
	UHI	3.97	0.96		
<b>H</b>	RHI	4.20	1.34	1.34	Not Significant
	UHI	3.73	1.33		
<b>I</b>	RHI	6.30	1.55	0.90	Not Significant
	UHI	5.90	1.86		
<b>J</b>	RHI	3.60	1.32	0.86	Not Significant
	UHI	3.30	1.36		

RHI=Rural Hearing Impaired

UHI=Urban Hearing impaired

Table 3.4.2 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics. It is evident from the data that the two groups i.e., rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers had no significant difference on personality factors F,G,H,I and J. More specifically the results revealed that the personality characteristics of the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on factors F, G, H, I and J were almost similar to each other.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.3: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	RHI	3.37	1.18	0.55	Not Significant
	UHI	3.20	1.12		
<b>O</b>	RHI	5.10	1.72	2.80	Significant at 0.01 level
	UHI	6.37	1.77		
<b>Q3</b>	RHI	4.23	1.52	2.86	Significant at 0.01 level
	UHI	3.33	0.80		
<b>Q4</b>	RHI	5.80	1.51	2.26	Significant at 0.05 level
	UHI	6.63	1.32		

RHI=Rural Hearing Impaired

UHI=Urban Hearing impaired

Table 3.4.3 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics. The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers on factor O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Personality Questionnaire. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to urban hearing impaired school going children the rural children with hearing impairment were apprehensive, uncontrolled and tense. Whereas, the urban hearing impaired children were more apprehensive, uncontrolled and highly tense.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.4: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors A, B, C, D and E (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>A</b>	ROC	4.93	1.33	0.87	Not Significant
	UOC	4.63	1.32		
<b>B</b>	ROC	4.50	1.61	0.38	Not Significant
	UOC	4.63	0.99		
<b>C</b>	ROC	4.13	1.19	0.81	Not Significant
	UOC	4.40	1.32		
<b>D</b>	ROC	4.17	1.55	0.20	Not Significant
	UOC	4.10	0.92		
<b>E</b>	ROC	4.10	1.06	0.33	Not Significant
	UOC	4.00	1.23		

ROC=Rural Orthopedically Crippled

UOC=Urban Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.4.4 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children with N=30 in each case on first five factors of Personality Characteristics on (CPQ). The data revealed that the two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers had no significant difference on all five personality factors i.e., factor A, B, C, D and E. More specifically the results revealed that the personality characteristics of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on factors A, B, C, D and E were almost similar to each other.

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.5: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors F, G, H, I and J (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>F</b>	ROC	3.90	1.21	0.58	Not Significant
	UOC	4.07	0.98		
<b>G</b>	ROC	4.87	2.06	1.51	Not Significant
	UOC	4.23	1.00		
<b>H</b>	ROC	4.07	1.61	1.31	Not Significant
	UOC	4.57	1.30		
<b>I</b>	ROC	5.57	1.61	2.51	Significant at 0.05 level
	UOC	6.63	1.67		
<b>J</b>	ROC	4.17	1.34	0.29	Not Significant
	UOC	4.07	1.31		

ROC=Rural Orthopedically Crippled

UOC=Urban Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.4.5 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children with N=30 in each case on next five factors of Personality Characteristics on (CPQ).The data revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers on personality factor I. This implies that in comparison to the urban orthopedically crippled school going children, the rural orthopedically crippled school going children were less tender minded, whereas their urban counterparts were more tender minded. However, the two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factors F, G, H and J of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ)

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.4.6: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> (N=30 each)**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>N</b>	ROC	3.97	1.29	0.10	Not Significant
	UOC	3.93	1.14		
<b>O</b>	ROC	4.47	1.43	1.84	Not Significant
	UOC	5.23	1.77		
<b>Q<sub>3</sub></b>	ROC	5.57	1.50	1.20	Not Significant
	UOC	5.20	1.27		
<b>Q<sub>4</sub></b>	ROC	5.57	1.54	2.10	Significant at 0.05 level
	UOC	4.80	1.37		

ROC=Rural Orthopedically Crippled

UOC=Urban Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.4.6 depicts the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children with N=30 in each case on last four factors of Personality Characteristics on (CPQ).The data revealed that the two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers differ significantly on personality factor Q<sub>4</sub>. More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to urban orthopedically crippled school going children, the rural orthopedically crippled school going children were tense whereas, their urban counterparts were relaxed. However, the two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factors N, O and Q<sub>3</sub> of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

**Table 3.4.7: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Visually Impaired School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
RVI	9.53	1.07	0.35	Not Significant
UVI	9.43	1.10		

RVI=Rural Visually Impaired

UVI=Urban Visually Impaired

The mean, S.D.and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on self-esteem is shown in Table 3.4.7. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural and urban visually impaired school going children on self-esteem.The scores obtained by the rural visually impaired school going children on self-esteem were similar to theirurban counter parts.More specifically the findings indicated that both the rural and urban visually impaired school going children were found to be low on self-esteem scores which shows that the two groups i.e., the rural and urban visually impaired school going children lacked self-confidence, were easily bothered, discouraged at home and school, had too many parental expectations and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them.

**Table 3.4.8: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
RHI	10.30	0.95	0.03	Not Significant
UHI	10.36	0.91		

RHI=Rural Hearing Impaired

UHI=Urban Hearing Impaired

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

The perusal of Table 3.4.8 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N= 30 in each case on self-esteem. The data indicated no significant difference in the two groups i.e.,rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on self-esteem. The scores obtained by the rural hearing impaired school going children on self-esteem were similar to their urban counter parts.

More specifically the findings indicated that both the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children were found to be low on self-esteem scores which shows that they lacked self-confidence, were easily bothered, discouraged at home and school, had too many parental expectations and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. The important positive features of self-esteem lagged significantly in the rural and urban hearing impaired children.

**Table 3.4.9: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Self-Esteem (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
ROC	8.30	0.70	2.56	Significant at 0.05 level
UOC	8.80	0.80		

ROC=Rural Orthopedically Crippled

UOC=Urban Orthopedically Crippled

The perusal of Table 3.4.9 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem. The results revealed a significant difference in rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem, with rural children scoring less than their urban counterparts. More specifically the findings revealed that the rural school going children with crippling conditions were not self-confident, were discouraged at home and school, sensitive, and felt that most



### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

people are better liked than them. Whereas the physically normal children were confident and would never bother about the trivial things that happened around. However, the scores obtained by the rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem Inventory were considerably low.

**Table 3.5.0: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Visually Impaired School Going Children on Study Habits (N=30 each)**

Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
ATT &E	RVI	3.33	0.54	5.79	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	4.26	0.69		
HE	RVI	1.46	0.50	0.00	Not Significant
	UVI	1.46	0.50		
SH&HA	RVI	11.00	1.98	1.94	Not Significant
	UVI	11.86	1.43		
MC	RVI	1.20	0.71	1.42	Not Significant
	UVI	0.93	0.73		
E&C	RVI	8.23	1.38	1.14	Not Significant
	UVI	8.63	1.32		
SC	RVI	1.26	0.63	0.95	Not Significant
	UVI	1.16	0.79		
Total	RVI	26.43	3.11	2.70	Significant at 0.01 level
	UVI	28.56	3.00		

RVI= Rural Visually Impaired & UVI= Urban Visually Impaired

ATT &E= Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA= Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self confidence

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

Table 3.5.0 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on study habits. The results highlight the existence of significant difference in the rural and urban visually impaired school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to rural visually impaired school going children, the urban visually impaired school going children had a better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban visually impaired school going children did not differ on rest of the five dimensions of study habits i.e.,home environment (HE),study habits and home assignments(SH&HA) mental conflict(MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

**Table 3.5.1: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Study Habits (N=30 each)**

Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance																																																			
<b>ATT &amp; E</b>	RHI	4.20	0.66	1.35	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	3.96	0.66			<b>HE</b>	RHI	1.23	0.67	2.82	Significant at 0.01 level	UHI	1.73	0.69	<b>SH &amp; HA</b>	RHI	9.56	1.40	0.40	Not Significant	UHI	9.40	1.77	<b>MC</b>	RHI	1.03	0.85	1.74	Not Significant	UHI	1.36	0.61	<b>E&amp;C</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	1.34	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant
<b>HE</b>	RHI	1.23	0.67	2.82	Significant at 0.01 level																																																			
	UHI	1.73	0.69			<b>SH &amp; HA</b>	RHI	9.56	1.40	0.40	Not Significant	UHI	9.40	1.77	<b>MC</b>	RHI	1.03	0.85	1.74	Not Significant	UHI	1.36	0.61	<b>E&amp;C</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	1.34	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant	UHI	26.10	2.45						
<b>SH &amp; HA</b>	RHI	9.56	1.40	0.40	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	9.40	1.77			<b>MC</b>	RHI	1.03	0.85	1.74	Not Significant	UHI	1.36	0.61	<b>E&amp;C</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	1.34	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant	UHI	26.10	2.45															
<b>MC</b>	RHI	1.03	0.85	1.74	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	1.36	0.61			<b>E&amp;C</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	1.34	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant	UHI	26.10	2.45																								
<b>E&amp;C</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	1.34	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	1.16	0.79			<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant	UHI	1.16	0.79	<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant	UHI	26.10	2.45																																	
<b>SC</b>	RHI	1.26	0.63	0.53	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	1.16	0.79			<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant	UHI	26.10	2.45																																										
<b>Total</b>	RHI	26.10	2.74	0.00	Not Significant																																																			
	UHI	26.10	2.45																																																					

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

RHI= Rural Hearing Impaired & UHI= Urban Hearing Impaired

ATT & E=Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH&HA=Study habits & Home environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self-confidence.

Table 3.5.1 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on study habits. The results highlight the existence of significant difference in the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on home environment (HE). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to rural hearing impaired school going children, the urban hearing impaired school going children had a better home environment (HE). However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

**Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

**Table 3.5.2: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on study Habits (N=30 each)**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>ATT &amp; E</b>	ROC	3.60	0.73	1.76	Not Significant
	UOC	3.26	0.72		Significant
<b>HE</b>	ROC	1.46	0.57	2.26	Significant at 0.05 level
	UOC	1.13	0.57		
<b>SH &amp; HA</b>	ROC	8.93	1.63	1.76	Not Significant
	UOC	9.76	1.99		Significant
<b>MC</b>	ROC	1.73	0.63	2.70	Significant at 0.01 level
	UOC	2.30	0.95		
<b>E&amp;C</b>	ROC	8.26	1.36	0.81	Not Significant
	UOC	7.93	1.52		Significant
<b>SC</b>	ROC	0.93	0.58	0.22	Not Significant
	UOC	0.96	0.55		Significant
<b>Total</b>	ROC	24.86	3.19	0.51	Not Significant
	UOC	25.33	3.79		Significant

RP C= Rural Orthopedically Crippled & UOC= Urban Orthopedically Crippled

ATT & E=Attitude towards Teachers & Education

HE= Home Environment

SH & HA=Study habits & Home Environment

MC= Mental Conflict

E&C=Examination & Concentration

SC= Self confidence

Table 3.5.2 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children with N=30 in each case on study habits. The results highlight the existence

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

of significant difference in the rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on home environment (HE) and mental conflict (MC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to rural orthopedically crippled school going children, the urban orthopedically crippled school going children had a better home environment (HE). The urban orthopedically crippled school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than the rural children. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

**Table 3.5.3: Mean Comparison of Urban and Rural Visually Impaired School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
RVI	41.67	12.87	1.55	Not Significant
UVI	45.83	12.87		

RVI =Rural Visually Impaired

UVI =Urban Visually Impaired

Table 3.5.3 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of rural and urban visually impaired children with N=30 in each case on academic achievement. The results indicated an insignificant difference in the two groups i.e. rural and urban visually impaired school going children on academic achievement.

**Table 3.5.4: Mean Comparison of Rural and Urban Hearing Impaired School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
RHI	38.27	16.30	2.09	Significant at 0.05 level
UHI	45.60	10.07		

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

RHI=Rural Hearing Impaired

UHI=Urban Hearing Impaired

The mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of Rural and urban hearing impaired school going children with N=30 in each case on academic achievement is shown in Table 3.5.4. The results indicated a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural and urban hearing impaired school going children, with rural school going children scoring less than their urban peers.

**Table 3.5.5: Mean Comparison of Urban and Rural Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Academic Achievement (N=30 each)**

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
ROC	39.67	12.56	2.43	Significant at 0.05 level
UOC	46.13	7.31		

ROC= Rural Orthopedically Crippled

UOC= Urban Orthopedically Crippled

Table 3.5.5 shows the mean, S.D. and t-value comparison of Rural and urban orthopedically crippled children with N=30 in each case on academic achievement. The findings revealed a significant difference in the two groups i.e., rural and urban orthopedically crippled children, with urban orthopedically crippled school going children performing better than their rural counterparts.

# 4

## Discussion

---

The discussion of results based on analysis and interpretation of the data has been presented under the following headings:-

### **4.1. Section A: Identification of Physically Challenged School Going Children**

The physically challenged school going children in district Anantnag and Srinagar were identified with the help of a list obtained from the district planning office, Directorate of school Education. A total of 30 visually impaired children which included 20 boys and 10 girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 20 boys and 10 girls were purposively selected from 9, 21 and 17 government and private schools of rural areas.

A total of 30 visually impaired children which included 16 boys and 14 girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 19 boys and 11 girls were purposively selected from 16, 7 and 23 government and private schools of urban areas.

**4.2 Section B: Comparison of Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors, Self- Esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement.**

Physically challenged school going children and normal school going children have been found to differ significantly on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. The physically challenged children in comparison to the normal school going children were Schizothymia/reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, undemonstrative, obedient, sober, disregarded rules, more tender minded, zestful, forthright, apprehensive, less controlled and tense. Whereas, the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable, assertive, enthusiastic, conscientious, less tender minded, circumspect, artful, self- assured, more controlled and relaxed. The two groups did not differ significantly on factor H of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

The finding is in accordance to the finding of the investigation conducted by Syeda *et al.* (2016) who revealed a significant difference on personality between physically disabled and normal students. Normal students attained a high score on personality traits as compared to the physically disabled students. Sangeeta (2006) conducted a study on personality traits of the visually challenged. The findings revealed the visually impaired boys had a feeling of inadequacy and depression, were likely to be more sensitive, aggressive, tense and restless in comparison to their sighted peers. No significant difference on neuroticism and anxiety was observed between the visually impaired and sighted boys. Sharma (2004) investigated the personality characteristics of school children with learning disabilities and their non-learning disabled peers and found a significant difference at (0.01 level) in the personality characteristics of the two groups with a maladaptive



## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

tendency of personality disposition of learning disabled children in comparison to the non-learning disabled children.

The comparison of physically challenged school going children with normal school going children depicted a significant difference on self-esteem, with physically challenged school going children scoring less than their normal peers. The physically challenged school going children were shy, sensitive, had too many parental expectations, felt discouraged at school and home and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. Whereas the normal school going children were confident, easy going, independent, least bothered, and friendly with parents.

The finding confirms the results of the studies that have found that the physically challenged children possessed a low score on self-esteem as compared to their normal peers. Nair and Starlet (2015) in their study proved that the self-esteem was significantly lower in physically challenged children compared to their healthy controls. Fotiadou et al. (2014) studied the self-esteem of children and adolescents with visual impairment using Cooper Smith's (1987) Self-esteem Inventory and found that visually impaired children scored less on self-esteem as compared to their typical peers. Stephanic *et al.* (2014) revealed that hearing impaired school going children had lower levels of self-esteem than their normal controls. The finding of Narimani and Mousazadeh (2010) based on the data collection using Cooper Smith's self-esteem Inventory indicated a better self-esteem in individuals with normal vision as compared to the visually impaired subjects. Soulis and Christodoulous (2010) found that visually impaired children attained a low score on self-esteem as compared to their normal participants. Lifshitz et al. (2007) investigated the Self-esteem, Adjustment to blindness and Quality of Friendship among 41 sighted and 40 visually impaired adolescents. It was revealed from the findings that visually impaired adolescents had higher scores of self-esteems compared to their

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

peers. Hussain (2006) found that physically challenged students had significantly low self-esteem than their normal peers. Griffin et al. (2005) investigated self-esteem and empathy among visually impaired and sighted pre-adolescents. The findings revealed no significant difference between the two groups in their level of self-esteem towards others.

The comparison between physically challenged and normal school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the two groups on home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the physically challenged school going children, the normal school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). The two groups i.e., physically challenged school going children and their normal peers did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and mental conflict (MC).

The comparison of physically challenged school going children with normal school going children indicated a significant difference on academic achievement. The performance of physically challenged children in academics was lower compared to the performance of their normal peers. The finding is inconsistent with the results of Talwar and Kour (2015) who found that physically challenged students had a deficient performance in academics as compared to their normal participants. The finding of the present study is also supported by the finding of Pandit et al. (2012). They assessed the academic achievement of physically challenged and normal students and found that physically challenged students had low academic achievement whereas the physically normal children had high academic achievement. Salami and Alawode (2008) in their study revealed a significant difference in the academic achievement

of handicapped and non-handicapped students with handicapped students having less academic achievement than non-handicapped ones. Stuart (2004) investigated the self-concept, level of aspiration, mental health and academic achievement of 250 handicapped and 250 normal teenagers in New Jersey USA. He found that the handicapped teenagers differed significantly from the normal teenagers on academic achievement. Macoy (2005) studied the academic achievement of 350 normal and physically challenged students and the results indicated high academic achievement in normal students in comparison to the physically challenged ones.

### **4.3. Section C: Comparison of Rural/Urban Physically Challenged and Normal School Going Children on Personality Factors, Self-Esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement**

The comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children depicted a significant difference on personality factors A, B, D, J, N and O. More specifically the findings revealed that rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to the urban physically challenged school going children were reserved, less intelligent, undemonstrative, zestful, less forthright and self-assured. Whereas the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent, excitable, circumspect, more forthright and apprehensive. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors C, E, F, G, H, I, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.

The comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factors A, B, C, D, E, F, N and O of CPQ (Children Personality Questionnaire). More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less warm hearted, less intelligent, less emotionally stable,

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

undemonstrative, obedient, sober, forthright and less self-assured. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were more warm-hearted, more intelligent, more emotionally stable, excitable and assertive, enthusiastic, forthright and less self-assured. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors G, H, I, J, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.

The comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children indicated no significant difference on their self-esteem. More specifically the results revealed that the rural physically challenged school going children were sensitive, less confident, dependent and discouraged at school and home and felt that most people are better liked than them.

The comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children indicated no significant difference on their self-esteem. More specifically the results revealed that the rural normal school going children were sensitive, less confident, dependent and discouraged at school and home and felt that most people are better liked than them.

The comparison of rural and urban physically challenged school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the rural and urban physically challenged school going children on home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the rural physically challenged school going children, the urban physically challenged school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC). Rural physically challenged school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than urban physically challenged school going children. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban physically challenged school going children did not differ significantly

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and examination and concentration (E&C).

The comparison of rural and urban normal school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the rural and urban normal school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC) and examination and concentration (E&C). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the rural normal school going children, the urban normal school going children had better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), and examination and concentration (E&C). Urban normal school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than their rural peers. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban normal school going children did not differ significantly on study habits i.e., home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC).

The rural physically challenged school going children differed significantly from the urban school going children on academic achievement, with urban physically challenged children having better academic performance than their rural physically challenged peers.

The comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children indicated a significant difference on academic achievement. The urban physically challenged children showed a better academic performance than their rural normal peers.

### **4.4. Section D: Inter Comparison within the Categories of Disability**

While comparing the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on personality factors the findings revealed that the two groups differed significantly on factors A, B, C, F, G, H, J, N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. In comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were warm hearted, intelligent, emotionally stable, sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender-minded, zestful, forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas their

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

hearing impaired counterparts were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, serious, self-indulgent, withdrawn, tender-minded, zestful, less forthright, uncontrolled and frustrated. The two groups did not differ significantly on factors D, E, I and O of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

The finding is in contrast with the results of the study conducted by (Bhardwaj, 2010) who analyzed the personality factors and self-concept of selected nature and degree of disabilities classified into blind, partially blind, deaf, hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled (12-15) years old boys. The results revealed a significant difference in personality factors among the sample groups. Visually impaired children were less out-going, highly intelligent, demanding, impatient and inactive. Similarly, the finding pertaining to the hearing impaired children indicated that they possessed personality traits like emotional stability, intelligence, assertiveness, independence and obedience

The comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factors of personality characteristics revealed a significant difference on factor A, B, G, H, N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled children, the hearing impaired school going children were less reserved, less intelligent, more zestful, disregarded rules, more forthright, apprehensive, uncontrolled and frustrated. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were more reserved, intelligent, less zestful, expedient, less forthright, self-assured, controlled and tense. The two groups did not differ significantly on factors C, D, E, F, H and I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

The finding is inconsistent and partially confirms the results of the study conducted by (Bhardwaj, 2010) who analyzed the personality factors and self-concept of selected nature and degree of disabilities classified into blind, partially blind, deaf, hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled (12-15)

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

years old boys. The results revealed a significant difference in personality factors among the sample groups. Orthopedically crippled students were found to be more out-going, warm-hearted, participative, over-active, lively, impatient, assertive and independent. Similarly, the finding pertaining to the hearing impaired children indicated that they possessed personality traits like emotional stability, intelligence, assertiveness, independence and obedience. However, the finding is in contrast with the finding of the study conducted by (Jefferson and Anderson, 2000) indicating no significant difference between hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled children on different dimensions of personality.

A comparison was made between visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factors of personality characteristics, it was found that the two groups differed significantly on factor C, F and H. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children were emotionally stable, serious and careful. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were emotionally less stable, sober and timid. The two groups did not differ significantly on factors A, B, D, E, I, J, N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

This finding is inconsistent with and partially confirms the finding of the research conducted by (Bhardwaj, 2010) who analyzed the personality factors and self-concept of selected nature and degree of disabilities classified into blind, partially blind, deaf, hard of hearing, upper and lower extremity affected orthopedically crippled (12-15) years old boys. The results revealed a significant difference in personality factors among the sample groups. Orthopedically crippled students were found to be more out-going, warm hearted, participative, over-active, lively, impatient, assertive and independent. Visually impaired children were less out-going, highly intelligent, demanding, impatient and inactive.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

The comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on self-esteem revealed no significant difference in the two groups. The visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children attained a low score on the self-esteem inventory which shows that they were shy, sensitive, easily bothered, dependent and felt less liked and appreciated by parents and peers. Self-esteem is a principal requisite for healthy psychosocial development and enables children to adjust to stress and burdens. Physically challenged children often face demanding situations so it is more important for them to have sufficient levels of self-esteem.

Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children revealed a significant difference on self-esteem. Visually impaired school going children were found to score better than their orthopedically crippled peers. The orthopedically crippled school going children in comparison to the visually impaired children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered, had too many parental expectations and felt discouraged at home and school. Whereas the visually impaired school going children were confident, easy going, least bothered and friendly with their parents. The scores attained by the two groups on self-esteem were considerably low. This finding is consistent with the finding of the research conducted by Lakshmi and Anuradha (2014) who focused on the self-esteem of physically disabled and visually impaired adolescents. The results revealed that the visually impaired students reflected more self-esteem than their crippled counterparts.

The comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem indicated a significant difference in the two groups. Orthopedically crippled school going children were found to have scored less than the hearing impaired children on self-esteem inventory.



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

Orthopedically crippled subjects in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered and felt discouraged and upset. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were less shy, less sensitive and less upset. The finding may be attributed to the fact that the orthopedically crippled children's self-esteem is, affected more due to their apparent disability whereas the hearing impaired children feel that they are like normal individuals because their disability remains hidden unless they engage in interaction with people.

The finding is in contrast with the finding of research carried out by Gagandeep and Verma (2004) on the real self, ideal self and reflected self of and hearing impaired and crippled school children, indicating no significant difference in the self-concept of hearing impaired and crippled school children.

The comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). In comparison to hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). The two groups did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children were compared on study habits, and a significant difference was found between the two groups on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), better study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), less mental conflict (MC) and more self-confidence (SC). The two groups did not differ significantly on home environment (HE) and examination and concentration (E&C).

A comparison was made between hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on study habits, a significant difference was found in the two groups on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), less mental conflict (MC), better examination and concentration (E&C) and more self-confidence (SC). The two groups did not differ significantly on home environment (HE) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA).

The comparison of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on academic achievement indicated no significant difference in the two groups. The academic achievement of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children was almost same. The finding is in line and confirms the finding of Vaishya (2005) that focused on the comparison of male and female hearing and visually impaired students on level of academic achievement. The results indicated no significant difference in the two groups i.e., male and female hearing and visually impaired students on level of academic achievement. The finding is also in accordance with and partially confirms the finding of research conducted by Ntzamilis (2004) who found no significant difference in visually impaired and hearing impaired students on academic performance in mathematics. Gulhane (2014) in his research on academic achievement of visually impaired and hearing impaired students found that the academic achievement of boys and girls with hearing impairment in language

and elementary mathematics is better than boys and girls with visual impairment

The comparison of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement indicated no significant difference in the two groups. The finding is in tune with the finding of the research conducted by Chandra and Koul (2006) who found no significant difference in the academic achievement of visually impaired and orthopedically crippled children.

The comparison of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement revealed no significant difference. The finding is consistent and confirms the finding of the research conducted by Pandit et al. (2012) who found no significant difference in the academic achievement of hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students. In contrast Dumanhuri (2003) found no significant difference in the academic growth of hearing impaired and crippled male students selected from all parts of the metropolitan areas of Indonesia.

#### **4.5. Section E: Comparison of Rural/Urban Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired and Orthopedically Crippled School Going Children on Personality Factors, Self-Esteem, Study Habits and Academic Achievement**

Comparison of rural visually impaired school going children with urban visually impaired school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factors A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. The rural visually impaired school going children were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, undemonstrative, obedient, sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender minded, zestful, forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas the urban children with visual impairment were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable enthusiastic, conscientious, adventurous, less tender minded, circumspect, artful, uncontrolled and relaxed. The two groups had no significant difference on factor E and O of (CPQ).

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

A comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on factors of Personality Characteristics revealed a significant difference on factor B, C, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. In comparison to urban hearing impaired school going children the rural school going children with hearing impairment were less intelligent and emotionally less stable, less apprehensive, uncontrolled and tense. Whereas the urban hearing impaired children were very less intelligent, emotionally less stable more apprehensive, uncontrolled and highly tense. The two groups had no significant difference on factor A, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and N of Personality Questionnaire.

The hearing impaired children of urban as well as rural areas lacked the features of a good personality. The finding may be attributed to the fact that the hearing impaired school going children were not facilitated with trained instructors in both rural as well as urban areas.

While comparing rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on factors of personality characteristics it was found that the two groups differed significantly on factors I and Q<sub>4</sub>. This implies that in comparison to the urban orthopedically crippled school going children, the rural orthopedically crippled school going children were less tender minded and tense. Whereas their urban counterparts were tender- minded and relaxed. The two groups did not differ significantly on factors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, N, O and Q<sub>3</sub> of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

The personality characteristics of rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on factors A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, N, O and Q<sub>3</sub> were almost similar to each other.

No significant difference was found between rural and urban visually impaired school going children on self-esteem. The scores obtained by the rural visually impaired school going children on self-esteem were similar to their urban counter parts. The rural and urban visually impaired school going children were found to be low on

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

self-esteem scores which showed that the two groups lacked self-confidence, were easily bothered, discouraged at home and school, had too many parental expectations and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. The important positive features of self-esteem lagged significantly in the rural and urban visually impaired children.

The comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going indicated no significant difference on self-esteem. The scores obtained by the rural hearing impaired school going children on self-esteem were similar to their urban counter parts.

The rural and urban hearing impaired school going children were found to be low on self-esteem scores which shows that they lacked self-confidence, were easily bothered, discouraged at home and school, had too many parental expectations and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. The important positive features of self-esteem lagged significantly in the rural and urban hearing impaired children.

While comparing rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem a significant difference was found between the two groups. The rural school going children with crippling conditions were not self-confident, were discouraged at home and school, sensitive, and felt that most people are better liked than them. Whereas, the physically normal children were confident enough to deal with the things. They did not bother about the trivial things happening around. The scores obtained by the rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem Inventory were considerably low.

A comparison of rural and urban visually impaired school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the two groups on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). In comparison to rural visually impaired school going children, the urban visually impaired school going

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

children had a better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). However, the two groups did not differ on rest of the five dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

The comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children highlighted the existence of a significant difference on home environment (HE). In comparison to rural hearing impaired school going children, the urban hearing impaired school going children had a better home environment (HE). The two groups did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

Rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children revealed a significant difference on home environment (HE) and mental conflict (MC). In comparison to rural orthopedically crippled school going children, the urban orthopedically crippled school going children had a better home environment (HE). The urban orthopedically crippled school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than the rural children. However, the two groups did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH & HA), examination and concentration (E & C) and self-confidence (SC).

The comparison of rural and urban visually impaired children indicated no significant difference on academic achievement.

Comparison of rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on academic achievement indicated a significant difference in the two groups. Rural school going children were found to have scored less in academics than their urban peers. The finding may be attributed to the fact that the rural hearing impaired children in

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

comparison to the urban children lacked the motivation towards academics owing to the lack of basic facilities required to cater their disability. The hearing impaired children have a considerable difficulty succeeding in an educational system that depends primarily on the spoken word and written language to transmit knowledge.

Hardman et al. (2013) stated that the hearing-impaired children have a considerable difficulty succeeding in an educational system that depends primarily on the spoken word and written language to transmit knowledge. Heine and Slone (2008); Marscharket al. (2007) stated that low achievement is the characteristic of students with hearing impairment

Rural and urban orthopedically crippled school children were compared on academic achievement and a significant difference was found in the two groups. Urban orthopedically crippled school going children were found to have performed better in academics than their rural counterparts. The finding may be attributed to the fact that the rural orthopedically crippled school children lacked the motivation to develop a favorable attitude towards academics. The basic facilities which cater the needs of these children are not met by the schools. At the ground level there are no facilities available in the government and private educational institutions to cater to the needs of orthopedically crippled children .The infrastructure which is the prime requirement for these children to have an access in the schools is not disability friendly. There is no fun of the ramps constructed near the base of the buildings as, inside the schools no such accessibility is taken care of. As such, a policy must be framed at school level to have proper academic ambience for these children in both the sectors.

# 5

## Summary and Conclusion

---

The present investigation was undertaken to study the “Personality factors, Self-esteem, Study habits and Academic achievement of physically challenged and normal school going children in districts Anantnag and Srinagar”. The study was conducted on the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> standard physically challenged and normal school children selected from various private and government schools of rural and urban areas of districts Anantnag and Srinagar. The size of the sample was 360 (180 physically challenged and 180 normal school going children). The physically challenged school going children were categorized into three main classes i.e., visually impaired (N= 60), hearing impaired (N = 60) and orthopedically crippled (N = 60). Physically challenged children were selected purposively from various government and private upper primary, high and higher secondary schools till the quota was fixed, whereas random sampling technique was employed for the selection of normal children in the same schools. The tools used in the study included Children’s Personality Questionnaire (CPQ) by Potter and Cattell (1979), Self- esteem Inventory by Cooper Smith (1967), Mathur’s Test of Study habits and Examination records for Academic Achievement.



## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

Data were analyzed using SPSS. The collected data were statistically treated to show the mean, standard deviation and t-test for all sets of variables i.e., personality, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement of physically challenged and normal school going children.

Based on the analysis of data, the following findings have been drawn:

1. A total of 30 visually impaired children which included 20 boys and 10 girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 20 boys and 10 girls were purposively selected from 9, 21 and 17 government and private schools of rural areas respectively. A sizeable number of the subjects belonged to the age group of (14-15 years)
2. A total of 30 visually impaired children which included 16 boys and 14 girls, 30 hearing impaired school going children which included 13 boys and 17 girls and 30 orthopedically crippled school going children which included 19 boys and 11 girls were purposively selected from 16, 7 and 23 government and private schools of urban areas respectively. A sizeable number of the subjects belonged to the age group of (14-15 years).
3. A significant difference was found in the physically challenged and normally developing school going children on factors A, B, C, D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). Physically challenged children in comparison to the children of the corresponding normally developing age group were Schizothymic/reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, phlegmatic/undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas the normal children were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.
4. Physically challenged and typically developing school going children differ significantly on factors F, G, I and J. Physically

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

challenged children in comparison to the children of the corresponding normally developing age group were sober, disregarded rules, more tender minded and zestful. Whereas the normally developing children were enthusiastic, conscientious, less tender-minded and circumspect. The two groups did not differ significantly on factor H of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

5. It has been found that the physically challenged and normally developing school going children differ significantly on factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Children Personality questionnaire. Physically challenged children in comparison to the children of the corresponding normally developing age group were forthright, apprehensive, less controlled and tense. Whereas, the normally developing children were artful, self-assured, more controlled and relaxed.
6. Significant difference was found in physically challenged and normally growing school children on self-esteem, with physically challenged school going children scoring less than their normal peers. It implies that physically challenged school going children were shy, sensitive, had too many parental expectations, felt discouraged at school and home and had a feeling that most people are better liked than them. Whereas, the normally growing children were confident, easy going, independent, least bothered, and friendly with parents.
7. The study reveals a significant difference in the physically challenged and normal school going children on home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the physically challenged school going children, the normal school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) examination and concentration

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

(E&C), and self-confidence (SC). The two groups i.e., physically challenged school going children and their normal peers did not differ significantly on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and mental conflict (MC).

8. It has been found that the physically challenged and normal school going differ significantly on academic achievement. The performance of physically challenged children in academics was lower compared to the performance of their normal peers.
9. Rural physically challenged school children differ significantly from urban school going children on A, B and D factors. In comparison to the urban physically challenged school going children the rural children were reserved, less intelligent and undemonstrative. Whereas the normal school going children were warm hearted, more intelligent and excitable. No significant difference was found between the two groups on personality factors C and E.
10. The findings indicated a significant difference in rural physically challenged school going children and their urban peers on personality factor J. The rural physically challenged school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less zestful. Whereas the urban physically challenged children were more zestful. However, the two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors F, G, H and I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
11. The comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated that the physically challenged rural school going children were less forthright and self-assured in comparison to their urban participants. Whereas the normal school going children were more forthright and apprehensive. However, the

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

- two groups i.e., rural physically challenged school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.
12. A significant difference was found in rural normal children and their urban peers on personality factors A, B, C, D and E. The rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were less warm hearted, less intelligent, less emotionally stable, undemonstrative and obedient. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were more warm- hearted, more intelligent, more emotionally stable, excitable and assertive.
  13. Rural normal and urban normal school going children revealed a significant difference on personality factor F of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). The rural school going children in comparison to their urban participants were sober. Whereas, the urban normal school going children were enthusiastic. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factors G, H, I and J.
  14. The comparison of rural normal and urban normal school going children on last four factors of Personality Characteristics revealed a significant difference on personality factors N and O. More specifically the results indicated that the rural normal school going children in comparison to their urban participants were artful and self-assured. Whereas the urban normal school going children were forthright but less self-assured. However, the two groups i.e., rural normal school going children and their urban participants had no significant difference on personality factor Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>.
  15. It has been found that the comparison of rural physically challenged and urban physically challenged school going children indicated no significant difference in the two groups on self-esteem.

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

16. The findings of the comparison between rural normal and urban normal school going children indicated no significant difference in the two groups on self-esteem.
17. The comparison of rural and urban physically challenged school going children on study habits highlighted the existence of a significant difference on home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the rural physically challenged school going children, the urban physically challenged school going children had better home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC). Rural physically challenged school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than urban physically challenged school going children. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban physically challenged school going children did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and examination and concentration (E&C).
18. Rural and urban normal school going children revealed a significant difference on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC) and examination and concentration (E&C). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to the rural normal school going children, the urban normal school going children had better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), and examination and concentration (E&C). Urban normal school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than their rural peers. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban normal school going children did not differ significantly on the two dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) and self-confidence (SC).

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

19. The findings revealed that the rural physically challenged school going children differ significantly from the urban school going children on academic achievement with urban physically challenged children having better academic performance than their rural physically challenged peers.
20. Rural normal school going children differ significantly from the urban normal school going children on academic achievement, with urban normal children having better academic performance than their rural peers.
21. Significant difference was found in visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on personality factors A, B and C. In comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were warmhearted, intelligent and emotionally stable whereas, their hearing impaired counterparts were reserved, less intelligent and emotionally less stable. Visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factors D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
22. The results indicated a significant difference in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on personality factors F, G, H and J. In comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender-minded and zestful. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were, serious, self-indulgent, withdrawn, tender-minded and zestful. Visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factor I.
23. The study reveals a significant difference in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on personality factors N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. In comparison to the hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children were forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas, the hearing impaired

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

children were less forthright, uncontrolled and frustrated. Visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on factor O of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).

24. Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children differ significantly on factor A and B of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled children, the hearing impaired school going children were less reserved and less intelligent. Whereas the orthopedically crippled school going children were more reserved and intelligent. Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors C, D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
25. It has been found that the hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children differ significantly on factor G and J of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing-impaired school going children were more zestful and disregarded rules. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled children were less zestful and expedient. Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors F, H and I of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
26. The results showed a significant difference in the hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children were more forthright, apprehensive, uncontrolled and frustrated. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were less forthright, self-assured, controlled and tense.

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

27. Significant difference was found in the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor C of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children were emotionally stable. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled school going children were emotionally less stable. Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors A, B, D and E of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
28. The findings indicated a significant difference in the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on factor F and H of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children were serious and careful. Whereas, the orthopedically crippled children were sober and timid. Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors G, I and J of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
29. It has been found that the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on factors N, O, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of (CPQ).
30. On self-esteem, a significant difference was found in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children.
31. It has been found that the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children differ significantly on self-esteem, with visually impaired school going children scoring better than their orthopedically crippled peers. Orthopedically crippled school going children in comparison to the visually impaired children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered, had too many parental expectations and felt discouraged at home and school. Whereas, the visually impaired school going children were confident, easy going, least bothered and friendly with their parents. However,



### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

the scores attained by the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem were considerably low.

32. Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children were found to differ significantly on self-esteem, with orthopedically crippled school going children scoring less than the hearing impaired children on self-esteem inventory. Orthopedically crippled subjects in comparison to the hearing impaired school going children were shy, sensitive, easily bothered and felt discouraged and upset. Whereas, the hearing impaired children were less shy, less sensitive and less upset.
33. The results revealed a significant difference in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). In comparison to hearing impaired school going children, the visually impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E) and study habits and home assignments (SH&HA). Visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).
34. The study showed a significant difference in the visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the visually impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), better study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), less mental conflict (MC) and more self-confidence (SC). Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

- significantly on home environment (HE) and examination and concentration (E&C).
35. Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children were found to differ significantly on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC). In comparison to the orthopedically crippled school going children, the hearing impaired school going children had good attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), less mental conflict (MC), better examination and concentration (E&C) and more self-confidence (SC). Hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on home environment (HE) and study habits and home assignments. (SH&HA).
  36. No significant difference was found in the visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children on academic achievement. The academic achievement of visually impaired and hearing impaired school going children was almost same.
  37. Visually impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children revealed no significant difference on academic achievement.
  38. It was found that the hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly from the orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement.
  39. The study reveals a significant difference in the rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers on personality factors A, B, C and D. The rural school going children with visual impairments were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, less demonstrative and obedient. Whereas, the urban children with visual impairments were warm hearted, more intelligent, emotionally stable and excitable. Rural

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

visually impaired school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factor E of (CPQ).

40. Rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers were found to differ significantly on factor F, G, H, I and J. Rural school going children with visual impairment were sober, disregarded rules, shy, tender minded and zestful. Whereas, urban school going children with visual impairment were enthusiastic, conscientious, adventurous, less tender minded and circumspect.
41. It has been found that the rural visually impaired school going children and their urban peers differ significantly on personality factors N, Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub>. Rural children with visual impairment were forthright, controlled and tense. Whereas the urban visually impaired children were artful, uncontrolled and relaxed.
42. The findings highlighted the existence of a significant difference in the rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers on factor B and C of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to urban hearing impaired school going children the rural school going children with hearing impairments were less intelligent and emotionally less stable. Whereas, the urban hearing impaired children were very less intelligent and emotionally less stable. The two groups i.e., rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factor A, D and E of Personality Questionnaire.
43. Rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on personality factors F, G, H, I and J. The personality characteristics of the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on factors F, G, H, I and J were almost like each other.
44. The study revealed a significant difference in the rural hearing impaired school going children and their urban peers on factor O,

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

- Q<sub>3</sub> and Q<sub>4</sub> of Personality Questionnaire. In comparison to urban hearing impaired school going children the rural children with hearing impairments were apprehensive, uncontrolled and tense. Whereas, the urban hearing impaired children were more apprehensive, uncontrolled and highly tense.
45. Rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on personality factors A, B, C, D and E.
  46. The rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers differ significantly on personality factor I. In comparison to the urban orthopedically crippled school going children, the rural hearing impaired school going children were less tender minded, whereas their urban counterparts were more tender-minded. The two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factors F,G, H and J of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ)
  47. Rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers differed significantly on personality factor Q<sub>4</sub>. In comparison to urban orthopedically crippled school going children, the rural orthopedically crippled school going children were tense whereas, their urban counterparts were relaxed. The two groups i.e., rural orthopedically crippled school going children and their urban peers did not differ significantly on factors N, O and Q<sub>3</sub> of Children Personality Questionnaire (CPQ).
  48. On self-esteem, no significant difference was found in the rural and urban visually impaired school going children.
  49. No significant difference was found in the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children on self- esteem.
  50. Results indicated a significant difference in rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on self-esteem, with rural children scoring less than their urban counterparts.

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

51. Significant difference was found in the rural and urban visually impaired school going children on attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). In comparison to rural visually impaired school going children, the urban visually impaired school going children had a better attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E). The two groups i.e., rural and urban visually impaired school going children did not differ on rest of the five dimensions of study habits i.e., home environment (HE), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA) mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self- confidence (SC).
52. In case of the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children, a significant difference was found on home environment (HE). In comparison to rural hearing impaired school going children, the urban hearing impaired school going children had a better home environment (HE). The two groups i.e., rural and urban hearing impaired school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits and home assignments (SH&HA), mental conflict (MC), examination and concentration (E&C) and self- confidence (SC).
53. The results highlight the existence of significant difference in the rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on home environment (HE) and mental conflict (MC). More specifically the results indicated that in comparison to rural orthopedically crippled school going children, the urban orthopedically crippled school going children had a better home environment (HE). The urban orthopedically crippled school going children experienced more mental conflict (MC) than the rural children. However, the two groups i.e., rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children did not differ significantly on rest of the four dimensions of study habits i.e., attitude towards teachers and education (ATT&E), study habits

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

and home assignments (SH&HA), examination and concentration (E&C) and self-confidence (SC).

54. On academic achievement, no significant difference was found in the rural and urban visually impaired school going children.
55. It has been found that the rural and urban hearing impaired school going children differ significantly on academic achievement, with rural school going children scoring less than their urban peers.
56. The results revealed a significant difference in the rural and urban orthopedically crippled school going children on academic achievement, with urban orthopedically crippled school going children performing better than their rural counterparts.

### **5.1 Conclusion**

The study depicts that the physically challenged school going children performed poorly on personality factors, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievements. The rural physically challenged school going children showed a deficient performance on some of the personality factors. They were at par with the urban children on self-esteem. However, their study habits and academic achievement were not as good as urban children. Hearing impaired children performed poorly on personality factors among the three categories. Better performance on personality factors was noticed in visually impaired children. Orthopedically crippled school children reflected a poor self-esteem. Self-esteem was found to be better in hearing impaired children among the three categories, Better study habits were noticed in hearing impaired children followed by visually impaired and orthopedically crippled children. However, Academic achievement was found to be similar in all the three categories.

### **5.2 Suggestions for Further Research**

The findings of the present study suggest conducting further research on the following problems:

## **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

1. The sample for the present study included children studying in classes 6<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>. Further studies may be conducted on the variables included in the study at the lower and the higher levels of education as well.
2. Sample for the present study was drawn from the inclusive/normal schools. A similar study may be carried out by drawing the samples from integrated and inclusive settings of these areas.
3. Children and adolescents with other disabilities like, speech impairment and learning disabilities may be selected as a sample for the similar study.
4. Further research may be conducted on the physically challenged school going children by selecting the variables like, intelligence, attitude of parents and teachers, frustration tolerance etc.
5. Comparison between the physically challenged children studying in special schools and normal schools may be considered.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Following are the major recommendations of this research work:

1. Since all children differ in their capabilities and intelligence, parents of the physically challenged children should refrain from imposing demands on their children regarding their academic performance. Academic and professional guidance should be compulsorily provided to teachers to increase the academic performance of physically challenged children.
2. It is important for parents to put less restrictions to discipline their physically challenged children, not robbing them of their independence by continuing the babyhood care but using optimum affective punishment.
3. Educating the physically challenged should emphasize on enhancing their intellectual growth by helping them to develop the ability to think rationally, act purposefully and deal effectively with the environment.

### **Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics**

---

4. All educational Institutions should be made inclusive by removing physical barriers, barriers created by admission procedures (screening, identification, parental interaction and selection).
5. The number of students should not exceed 20 in case the class includes children with special education needs. Counseling sessions for parents should be organized frequently to reduce the burden on the parents and help them in adopting the appropriate coping strategies.
6. Since schools play a significant role in the over-all development of children with disabilities, there should be the provision of extra-curricular activities with the aim to ensure more and more participation of physically challenged children.
7. Apart from the academic curriculum, children with disabilities should be given vocational training to make them economically self-reliant.
8. Training programmes should be organized for teachers and Aanganwari workers to make them capable of working in an inclusive setting. They should be enough qualified to identify the needs and desires of the physically challenged children.
9. There is a need for proper implementation and functioning of beneficial schemes, welfare programmes and policies at the state level. These programmes should be timely evaluated, monitored and followed up for the development of physically challenged children.
10. There should be a comprehensive reservation policy for the persons with disabilities at all levels and in all areas at state level.
11. Guidance and counseling cells should be made available to the physically challenged children, their parents and teachers to assist them and provide the needed care.
12. Grievance cells should be established in all educational institutions and its services should be made available to the parents, teachers and the physically challenged children.



13. To reduce the disability, a team of people which consists of the teachers, parents, doctors, therapists, counselors etc., are required to cooperate with each other and collectively work towards the maintenance of personal relationships with the physically challenged children to help them channelize their energy in the appropriate direction. Attempts should be made to make these children socially responsible and thus enhancing their personality, self-esteem, study habits and academic achievement.

#### **5.4 Interventional Strategies Proposed for Care and Education of Physically Challenged Children**

The following are some of the interventional strategies proposed for the physical care and education of physically challenged children:

##### **Medical Intervention**

Physically challenged children often need medical intervention. It is very important for the parents and teachers to take doctor's instructions carefully concerning the treatment of children with health problems. Teachers and parents need to be in close contact to each other to keep up with the medical update of the physically challenged children and be able to access the level of activity for those children. It is important to immunize the children when they are young and to attend to their health needs with improved nutrition.

##### **Physiotherapy**

It is a significant intervention which includes exercises done by the physiotherapists to evaluate the motor functioning and limitations of the children with disabilities. Its purpose is to alleviate pain, correct or minimize the muscular deformities and to increase strength and mobility. It also includes the knowledge about the use of crutches, braces, prosthesis and other supportive devices.

**Occupational Therapy**

The aim of the occupational therapy is to facilitate arm, head and mouth movements based on the evaluation of child's motor functioning. It may also include physiotherapy. Occupational therapy intends to help the child be independent for self-care, household chores and employment related activities.

**Self-care Skills**

Self-care skills include activities like ability to feed, bathe, groom and clothe oneself. One of the main goals of the preschool is to train the children with disabilities to manage their daily activities and personal hygiene.

**Barrier Free Access**

To prevent emotional disturbances and enhance free mobility the houses, pavements, schools and classrooms should be made accessible to the differently able students. Accessibility to the above areas of activity should be wheel chair, crutches and prosthesis friendly.

**Adaptive and Assistive Devices**

Adaptive and assistive devices which include standing tables, mobile boards, head pointers, book turners, line readers, incontinence aids, adapted games, special scissors etc. help them to work and cope- up with their own expectations in the class room.

**Counseling Services**

Children with disabilities keep on nursing the trauma of their disability and become emotionally sensitive as they mature with passing years. Psychological intervention through counseling of both the children and their parents helps them grow out of these insecurities. Assurances and reassurances from time to time help them accept their condition as a variation of the normal and not an abnormality per se. This feeling if inculcated from very early childhood helps them to resolve their inner conflicts and move on with their lives.

### **Educational Programmes**

Physically challenged children should be assisted to fit in the educational programmes as per their degree of severity. Children with mild disability can be admitted to normal public schools. Children with severe disabilities should be given priority in special schools where teachers must be trained to give some remedial classes when the kids miss school due to some medical issues. These severely disabled children may lag with their class mates and thus should be counseled from time to time and given the necessary emotional support during the period of crises.

### **References**

1. ADIP (2014) Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Shashtri Bhavan New Delhi. [www.niohkol.nic.in/adipdetails.pdf](http://www.niohkol.nic.in/adipdetails.pdf) Cited in Bashir, A. and Ganie, Z. A. (2013). *Critical Appraisal of the Disability Programs in Jammu and Kashmir with Special Reference to Children. International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)ISSN (Online): 2319-7064, Vol. 2 Issue 10, October 2013.*[www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)
2. Advani, 1997 cited in Nandini Gosh (2012). *Disability; definitions, impaired policies, reflections on limits of dominant concepts of disability. Institute of developmental studies, Kolkata*
3. *Americans with Disabilities (2010). Census. gov* [www.Census.gov/newsroom/cspan/disability/20120726\\_disability\\_slides.pdf](http://www.Census.gov/newsroom/cspan/disability/20120726_disability_slides.pdf)
4. Ann, L. (2016). *How do orthopedic Impairments Affect Special Needs Students?* [http:// www.verywell.com](http://www.verywell.com)
5. Ayo, S., Olufemi, A. Z and Gregory, U.G. (2013). *Psychosocial influence of hearing impairment on the interpersonal behavior of youths with hearing impairment in Oyo state, Nigeria. Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation, 14(1), 33-44*

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

6. Barnes, C., Mercer, G and Shakespeare, T. (1999). *Exploring Disability: A Sociological Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
7. Bashir, A. and Ganie, Z. A. (2013). *Critical Appraisal of the Disability Programs in Jammu and Kashmir with Special Reference to Children*. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN (Online): 2319-7064*, Vol. 2 Issue 10, October 2013. [www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)
8. Bat-chava, Y. (1993). *Antecedents of self-esteem in deaf people: A meta-analytic review*. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 38, 221-234.
9. Bat-chava, Y. (2000). *Diversity of deaf identities*. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145, 420-427.
10. Batshaw, M., Pellegrino, L and Rozien, N. J. (2008). *Children with disabilities*, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
11. Begum, L. J and Mahjabeen (2012). *A comparative study on the self-concept of hearing impaired and normal adolescents with reference to gender*. *Indian Streams Research Journal*. Vol. 2, Issue.11, Dec 2012.
12. Bharadwaj R.L. (1999). *Assessment of psychogenic needs of normal, congenitally blind and cerebral palsied children*. *Disabilities and Impairment*, 13,86-93
13. Bhardwaj, V. (2010). *Comparative analysis of personality traits and self-concept with respect to nature and degree of physical disabilities*. *Unpublished thesis of Doctor of Philosophy in Physical Education, submitted to Lakshmibai National Institute of Physical Education, (Deemed University, Gwalior M.P.), India.*
14. Booth, T. (2000). *Progress in Inclusive Education*. Paper presented at *Meeting Diverse Educational Needs: Making Inclusion a Reality*.
15. Brault, Matthew W., *Americans with Disabilities (2005)*. *Current Population Reports*, p. 70-117, U.S. Census Bureau,

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

- Washington, DC, 2008, available at Day, Jennifer Cheeseman, "Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2050,"
16. Census of India (2011). Data on Disability Size New Delhi, [www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in](http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in)
  17. Census of India (2011). Disabled Population enabled.in
  18. Census, Data. (2001). CD released by Department of Census, Government of India, New Delhi,
  19. Chandra, R and Koul, K. (2006).Comparative analysis of visually impaired and orthopedically handicapped children on academic performance, level of education and level of aspiration in Northern Assam. Cited in M.B. Buch.5<sup>th</sup> Survey of Research in Education, New Delhi.NCERT.
  20. Chountoumadi, Pateraki&Xenaki (2008).Concept of Self-esteem.Cited in EleniFoutiadouet al. (2014),Motor development and Self-esteem of children and adolescents with visual impairment. Journal of Education and Practice, 5(37), 97-105.
  21. Commission on Social Determinants of Health (2008).Closing the gap in a generation: Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Geneva, World Health Organization.
  22. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Geneva, United Nations, (2006). (<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/disabilities-convention.htm>, accessed 16 May 2009).
  23. Cooper, S. S. (1967). The Antecedents of Self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
  24. Crowe, T.V. (2003). Self-esteem scores among deaf college students: An examination of gender and parents hearing status and signing ability. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 8, 199-206.

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

25. *Current, Population Reports, P25-1130, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC, available at Greene, Vernon L. and Ondrich, Jan I.*
26. *Disabled persons in India, A statistical profile 2016- Social Statistics Division, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. Government of India. [http:// www.mospi.gov.in](http://www.mospi.gov.in)*
27. *Disabled World Towards Tomorrow (2009). Children with orthopedic impairments. [www. Disabled-world.com](http://www.Disabled-world.com)*
28. *Dumanhuri, E. (2003). Evaluation of level of aspiration and academic growth of physically challenged male students in Bandung Metropolitan Area of Indonesia. Journal of Special Education, 3(6).*
29. *Edina, J., Marta, E. (2005). Self-esteem and coping strategies among deaf students. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 10(1), 63-76.*
30. *Emerton, R.G. (1996). Marginality, biculturalism and social identity of deaf people. I. Parasnis (Ed.), Cultural and Language diversity and the deaf experience (136-145). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
31. *Fok, L. T and Fung, H. H. (2004). Self-concept among people with and without visual impairment: The role of achievement motivation. Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies, 5(1), 7-24.*
32. *Fotiadou, E. et al. (2014). Motor development and Self-esteem in Children and Adolescents with Visual impairment. Journal of Education and Practice, 5(37), 97-105.*
33. *Gagandeep, S.J and Verma, B.K. (2004). A study of real self, ideal self and reflected self of hearing impaired and crippled female adolescent students in Southern part of Ghawahati in India. Indian Journal of Psychology .3.*

34. *Gallaudet Research Institute (2001). Annual survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University*
35. *Ganesh, K. S., Gautam, R and Sitanshu, S. K.(2012). Disability and Rehabilitation services in India: Issues & Challenges. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care (JFMPC), 1(1), 69-73 <http://www.ncbi.nlm>*
36. *Garaigordobil, M. and Bernaras, E. (2009).Self-concept, Self-esteem, Personality traits and Psychological symptoms in Adolescents with and without Visual Impairments.The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 12(1),149-160.*
37. *Good, C.V. (1959). Dictionary of Education (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) New Delhi, Mc. Graw Hill book.com/nc*
38. *Griffin, S. N and Nes, S. L. (2005). Self-esteem and empathy in sighted and visually impaired adolescents. Journal of visual Impaired and Blindness, 99(5), 276-285.*
39. *Gulhane, G. (2014). Visually and hearing impaired students and their academic achievement. Sai Om, Journal of Arts and Education. A peer Reviewed International Journal, 1, Issue 11, 1-8*
40. *Gupta, A. K and Kapoor, D. R.(2011). Functional Profile of Jammu and Kashmir State in Mental Retardation": MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends & Practices: Vol. 1 (1) pp. 32*
41. *Hardman, M. L., Drew, C. J. and M. Egan.W. (2014). Human Exceptionality; School, Community& Family, 11<sup>th</sup> Ed. Wads-Worth, 5,6,9,11,318-328,335-344.*
42. *Heine, C and Slone, M. (2008).The impact of mild central auditory processing disorder on school performance during adolescence. Cited in Human Exceptionality! School, Community and Family. Michael, L. Hardman, Clifford J. Drew, M, Winston Egan 2013- Education. 325-326 ed. 11.*

### Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

43. Heward, W. L and Orlansky, M. D. (1980). *Exceptional children; An introductory survey to special education*. Merrill Publishing Co. 80-81.
44. Howley, C. (2002). *Research about Mathematics Achievement in Rural Circumstance*. Working Paper, No. 4, Appalachian Collaborative Centre for the study of Learning, Assessment and Instruction in Mathematics, Athens, Ohio, 2002.
45. Hussain, A. (2006). *Impact of disability on self-concept of physically challenged adolescents*. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32, (1), 43-46.
46. ICIDH, 1980 cited in *Disabled World towards Tomorrow* (2009). [http:// www.disabled- world. Com](http://www.disabled-world.com)
47. IEDC (1974) cited in *Education of the Disabled* (2000) [pib.nic.in/feature/ feyr2000/fdec2000/f011220001.html](http://pib.nic.in/feature/ feyr2000/fdec2000/f011220001.html)
48. *Impact of study habits on academic performance of students*, [research clue.com](http://research.clue.com) [nairaprojects.com](http://nairaprojects.com)>projects
49. *India Country Profile March (2003)* cited in Bashir, A. and Ganie, Z. A.(2013). *Critical Appraisal of the Disability Programs in Jammu and Kashmir with Special Reference to Children*. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-7064, Vol. 2 Issue 10, October 2013. [www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)
50. *International world disabilities report (Department of Violence and Injury Prevention and Disability, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, Switzerland. Email: mackenzier@who.int)*
51. Jambor, E and Elliot, M. (2005). *Self-esteem and coping strategies among deaf students*. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 10(1), Oxford University Press.
52. Javed, A. T. (2017). *Status of persons with disabilities in J&K Greater Kashmir*, Friday, January 27, 2017



## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

53. *Jefferson and Anderson. (2006). Study of level of aspiration and self- concept of hearing impaired and orthopedically crippled school going children of UK. Educational Applied Research Centre, UK.*
54. *Kakavoulis, A. (2008). Psychology and Education of a person. Athens: Alexander Kakavoulis.*
55. *Kasomo, D. (2002). Psychological assessment of visually impaired children in integrated and special schools. Journal of Education, 2(1), 35-40.*
56. *Kef, S. (2002). Psychosocial adjustment and the meaning of social support for visually impaired adolescents. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 96(1), 22-37.*
57. *Khan, Z.N. (2006) Determinants of insecurity feeling and anxiety in step and non-step children. Journal of Psychological Researches, 5,114-115. Moynihan, L.M. and Peterson, R.S (2001)*
58. *Krishna, K. Handiqui. (1986). State Open University. Introduction to National Policy on Education 1992 www.kkhsou.in>main>national\_policy...*
59. *Lakshmi, N. K and Anuradha, S. (2014). Self-esteem among physically disabled and visually disabled late adolescents. International Journal of Technical Research and Applications. Issue10: 31-39.*
60. *Leonardi, M.et al. (2006).MHADIE Consortium. The definition of disability: what is in a name? Lancet, 368:1219-1221. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69498-1 PMID:17027711*
61. *Lifshitz, H., Hen. I and Weisse, I (2007).Self-concept, adjustment to blindness and quality of friendship among adolescents with visual impairments. JVI B Journal of Visually Impaired and Blind,101(2).*

62. Macoy, K. (2005). Cited in Shodhganga 07 chapter 2.pdf  
*Shodhganga.*  
*inlibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28900/7/07\_chapter%202.pdf*
63. Majda, T and Naima, K. (2009). *Self-Esteem and Emotional Stability of Visually Challenged Students.* *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35(2), 245-256.
64. Marc, M., Harry, G. L and John, A. A. (2007). *Educating Deaf Students.* Cited in *Human Exceptionality! School, Community and Family.* Hardman, M.L., J. Drew, C.J. M and Egan, W 2013-*Education.* 325-326 Ed., 11.
65. Marschark, M., Lang, H.G and Albertini, J. A. (2007). *Educating deaf students: From research and practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.
66. Marsh, H.W. (1990). "Casual ordering of academic self-concept and academic achievement: A multi-Wave, longitudinal path analysis," *Journal of Educational Psychology.* 82 (4) 646-656.
67. Mathur, C.P. (1971). *Test of Study Habits and Attitudes.* National Psychological Corporation. Kacheri Gath, Agra.
68. Mishra, V. (2013). *A study of self- concept in relation to ego strength of sighted and visually impaired students.* *International Journal on new trends in Education and their implications.* 4(1), 203-207.
69. Miyahara, M. and Piek, J. (2006). *Self-esteem of children and adolescents with physical disabilities.* Quantitative evidence from meta-analysis. *Journal of Development and Physical Disabilities*, 18(3).
70. Mohit, A. (2000). *Governance and legislation: initiatives of Government of India to advance Asia & Pacific Decade of Persons with disabilities.* *Disability World* 2, Apr-May.

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

71. Mohit, A and Rungta, S.K. (2000). *Regional Experiences: Legal Protection for Persons with Disabilities in India*. Source: [www.interights.org/pubs/Bulletin](http://www.interights.org/pubs/Bulletin) May 2003.
72. Monika, and Sameer, L. (2014). *A study of academic achievement of orthopedically crippled students in relation to their personality*. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, IT and Social Science*, 4(3).
73. Mrug, S and Wallander, J. L. (2002). *Self-concept of young people with physical Disabilities: does integration play a role?* *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49, 267-280.
74. Mucharunga, T and Pitso, T. (2014). *The physically impaired children in rural South Africa. The assessment of their Psychosocial challenges*. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23).
75. Nadeem, N.A., Puju, J.A and Bhat, S.A. (2015). *Study habits and Academic Achievement of Kashmiri and Ladakhi Adolescent girls. A comparative study*. *Turkish online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 15(2), Article 7.
76. Nair, L. K and Starlet, S. (2015). *Achievement motivation and self-esteem in physically handicapped school children*. *Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences*, 6(2) p. 1646.
77. Narimani, M. and Mousazadeh, T. (2010). *Comparing self-esteem and self-concept of handicapped and normal students*. *Journal of Social and Behavioral Science*, 2(2), 1554-1557. Elsevier's Open Access Journal.
78. *National Policy on Education (1986)*. Cited in Sangeeta. (2006). *Personality Traits of the Visually Challenged*. The Associated Publications, Ambala, 8.
79. Neerja, P. and Leelavathi, K. (2014). *IJSR- International Journal of Scientific Research*. (3) Issue 2.

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

80. *Nicholas, J and Geers, A. (2003). Personal, social, and family adjustment in school- aged children with a cochlear implant. Ear & Hearing, 24, 69S-80S.*
81. *Ntzamilis, G. H. (2004). Academic potential in Mathematics among visually impaired and hearing impaired Elementary students in Athenes.Athenes Journal of Psychology, 2.*
82. *Orthopedic, Impairment (2015). Ohio Department of Education, education. ohio.gov>special-education. Prevalence and Incidence of Orthopedic disorders, www.rightdiagonis.com*
83. *Oyewumi, A., Akangbe, T. and Adigun, O. (2013). Personality factors as correlates of perceived quality of life among adolescents with hearing impairment in selected secondary schools in Lagos state, Nigeria. Journal of Education and Practice (on line), 4(9).*
84. *Pandit, A. A., Malik, M. H and Ganaie, M.Y. (2012).Self-concept, level of aspiration and academic achievement of physically challenged and normal students in District Baramulla.Journal of Research on Humanities and Social Science, 2(2).*
85. *Pandith, A, A.et al. (2011). Academic achievement of hearing impaired, visually impaired and crippled secondary school students of district Baramulla, J&K. Researcher, 3(9), 1-4.*
86. *Paul, D. L. (1989). Practical Research: planning and design New York: Macmillan; London Collier Macmillan.*
87. *PIED (1987) Cited in AjitMandal and Jayanti Mete Education of Children with Disabilities in India: Concern and Policy Perspective.*
88. *Pierangelo, R., & Giuliani, G. (2007). The educator's manual of disabilities& disorders. San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons. www.education.com.*
89. *Puju, J.A., Parveen, A and Bhat, S.A. (2012). Mental health and academic achievement of visually impaired and crippled*

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

- students. Basic Research Journal of Educational Research and Review. 1(1) 1-3*
90. *Rajalakshmi, T.K. (2002). A law on paper. Frontline April 12.*
91. *Rajaskar, S. (2006). Research Methodology*  
*<http://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0601009>*
92. *Rajknowar, S., Soni.J.C and Jadab.D. (2014). A study of adjustment, level of aspiration, self-concept and academic achievement of visually handicapped school children of Assam. IJDR-International Journal of Development Research, 4, 902-907.*
93. *Ramanujam, P.R. (2000). Social Policies on Disability in India. International Journal of Disability Studies, 1(1), 3- 15. SEE if to keep*
94. *Porter, R F. B., and Cattell, R. B. (1979). Handbook for the Children's Personality Questionnaire. Institute for Personality and ability testing, Inc. Champaign Illinois, U.S.A*
95. *Salami, S.O and Alowode, E.A. (2008). Influence of impairment on the academic achievement of adolescents. check remaining part*
96. *Sangeeta (2006). Personality Traits of the Visually Challenged. The Associated Publications, Ambala, 87-88, 162.*
97. *Schlesinger, H S. (2000). A developmental model applied to problems of deafness. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 5, 349-361*
98. *Schmidt, M., and Cagran, B. (2008). Self- concept of students in inclusive settings. International Journal of Special Education, 23(1).*
99. *Shan, H.R and Schrawat, S.S. (2003). The study of self-concept and level of aspiration among physically challenged students. Insight Journal of Applied Research in Education, 9(104), 33-45.*

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

100. Sharma, (1994). Cited in Ritu, A. *Personality factors harria vs. premisa: A study in relation to socio-economic status and types of children.* [www.voiceofresearch.org/doc/V1\\_I2/V1\\_I2\\_3.pdf](http://www.voiceofresearch.org/doc/V1_I2/V1_I2_3.pdf)
101. Sharma, G. (2004). *A Comparative Study of the Personality Characteristics of Primary-School Students with Learning Disabilities and Their Non-learning-disabled Peers.* *Learning Disability Quarterly* Vol. 27, No. 3, Special International Issue pp. 127-140.
102. Shyder, M.L., Kleck, R.E., Strent, A and Mentzen, J.J. (1979) *Avoidance of handicapped. An attributional ambiguity analysis.* *Journal of Personality and Social psychology* 37, 2297-2306.
103. Smith, E.R and Mackie, D.M. (2007). *Social Psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup>ed.) Hove: Psychology Press ISBN 978-1-84169-408-5
104. Soulis, S.G. and Christodoulous, P. (2010). *The self-esteem of children and adolescents with visual impairments.* 2<sup>nd</sup> National conference of special education, April 15-18, Athens.
105. Stephanic, C. P. M. T., Heunissen, C. Rieffe, A. P., Netten, J. J. Briaire, Winsoede, M., Kouwen B and Johan, H.M. F. S (2014). *Self-esteem in hearing impaired children; The Influence of Communication, Education and Andiological Characteristics.* *PLOS One.* 2014; 9 (4): e 94521.
106. Stuart, B. (2004). *A study of self-concept, level of aspiration, mental health and academic achievement of handicapped and normal teenagers.* Cited in a research article– Sunil Kumar and Mohan Gupta (2014). *A comparative study of level of educational aspiration of secondary class students of government and non-government schools.* *VSRD International journal of Technical and Non- Technical Research.* VI Issue January 1-3.
107. Syeda, T. J., Atiqur, F. K and R, S. A. (2016). *Upper and lower limbs disability and personality traits.* *Journal of Ayub Medical College Abbottabad;* 28(2), 349-352

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

108. Talwar, M. S and Kour, S. (2014). *A comparative study of Self-concept and Academic achievement of physically challenged and normal students.* *Indian Journal of Psychological Science.* 5(2) (67-78).
109. *The Gazette of India.* (2016). *Rights of persons with disabilities Act 2016 Delhi.*  
[www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/RPWD%20ACT%202016.pdf](http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/RPWD%20ACT%202016.pdf)
110. *The Mental Health Act (1987).* Cited in Bashir, A. and Ganie, Z. A. (2013). *Critical Appraisal of the Disability Programs in Jammu and Kashmir with Special Reference to Children.* *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-7064, Vol. 2 Issue 10, October 2013. [www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)
111. *UN Enable-International Year of Disabled,*  
[www.un.org>socdev>enable>disidydp](http://www.un.org/socdev/enable/disidydp)
112. *Universal Primary Education (1997).* Cited in F N Yende (2012). *Children with disabilities in Universal Primary Education in Uganda*  
[https://thesis.eur.nl/pub/13189/Farouk%20Nyende\\_Nyende%20-%20RP\\_1501.pdf](https://thesis.eur.nl/pub/13189/Farouk%20Nyende_Nyende%20-%20RP_1501.pdf)
113. Vaishya, R.C. (2005). *Comparative study of male and female hearing impaired and visually impaired students on level of aspiration and academic achievement. A case study of Allahabad University.* *Indian Educational Abstract Issue: 6<sup>th</sup>*
114. Verdonschot, M.M et al. (2008). *Community participation of people with an intellectual disability: a review of empirical findings.* *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research: JIDR,* 2009, 53:303-318. doi:10.1111 /j.1365-2788, 01144 .x PMID:19087215
115. Verma, A. (2008). *Study of self-concept and study habits of visually impaired and normal students.* Cited in Buch, M.D.

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics

---

- (editor) (1993-2000) *Sixth Survey of Educational Research* NCERT, New Delhi, 2, 1570.
116. Were, Michael. Francis, I. C. and Yalo, John. A. (2010). *Gender differences in self-concept and academic achievement among visually impaired pupils in Kenya*. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1(8), 246-252.
  117. World Health Organization (2001). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. Source: [www3.who.int/online/browser/icf.cfm](http://www3.who.int/online/browser/icf.cfm) February 2004.
  118. World Health Organization definition of Disability cited in *Disabled World Towards Tomorrow* (2009). <http://www.disabled-world.com>
  119. World Health Organization.(1980). *International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities, and Handicaps*. Geneva. World Health Organization.
  120. *World Report on Disability* (2011)[http://www.who.int/disabilities/world\\_report/2011/report.pdf](http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report.pdf)
  121. Yang, R.K and Fetsch, R. J. (2007). *The self- esteem of rural children*. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 22(5),22-25
  122. Yeger, B.E and Deher, S.H. (2013). *Comparing participation in out of school activities between children with visual and hearing impairments and typical peers*. *Journal of Education in Developmental Disabilities*. 34(10), 3124-313
  123. Yenagi, G.V. (2006). *Study habits as a function of Self-perception among intellectually gifted and non-gifted students*. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 9(2).
  124. Zachariah, Job (2001). *Universal light of Knowledge: Opening New Doors*. Source:[www.un.org.in/JANSHALA/march2001/educdisb.htm](http://www.un.org.in/JANSHALA/march2001/educdisb.htm) June 2004



## A Glimpse of Disabilities



**Visually impaired school going children use vision as primary source of learning.**



**Though the use of glasses may not help improve vision but may reduce glare and fatigue.**

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics



**Sign language enhance the communication and language skills of young children with hearing loss.**



**Children with orthopedic impairments need the assistive technology devices to aid them to have access to educational material.**

## Exceptional Children : Personality and Academics



**Occupational therapy may enhance the gross and fine motor abilities and thus reduce the disability**