

A Study Of Mental Health And Academic Achievement Of Physically Challenged And Normal Adolescent Students In District Srinagar

Dr. Mohammad Yousuf Ganie, Dr. Shabir Ahmad Bhat

Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Kashmir, India

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Kashmir, India

E-Mail: showkat80ahmad@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The study was conducted to examine the mental health and academic achievement of physical challenged and physical normal students in district Srinagar (Kashmir, India). The sample for the study consisted of 100 secondary school students (50 physically Challenged and 50 physically Normal). The investigator used Alpana Sen Gupta's Mental Health Battery to study the mental health of sample subjects. The Academic achievement of the students were obtained from the official records of their respective schools. The data collected was subjected to various statistical treatments like mean, S.D. and t-test. After analyzing the data it has been found that physically normal students possessed better mental health and academic achievement than the physically challenged students.

[Mohammad Yousuf Ganie, Shabir Ahmad Bhat. **A Study Of Mental Health And Academic Achievement Of Physically Challenged And Normal Adolescent Students In District Srinagar.** *Researcher* 2012; 4(12):40-45]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 8

Keywords: Academic Achievement, Adolescents, Mental health, Physically Challenged, Physically Normal students

INTRODUCTION

The world has entered in a phase of history of which changes are an essential feature, but change that is radically different from that experienced in the past. Beyond the geopolitical and political upheavals of the last ten years are so which have profoundly altered the international political seen, this change is civilizational in scope. Everything is changing. The very nature of work is changing with the intellectual element continuously increasing while the manual element decreases. This change leads to a change in the need for skills in the different categories of the working population, and creates a need for occupational and social mobility and lifelong education and training. The evaluation of society has been amazing and has proceeded by many steps. From the agricultural society to industrialization, the post industrial society, the information society, and last the knowledge society. The interacting control for people has changed dramatically. From the village to the nation, to the continent, to the whole world, that characterizes the knowledge society.

Education has assumed a place of paramount importance in modern society which is becoming more scientific and technological. It is now regarded as a potent instrument of rapid and effective development through which the standard of a people, their prosperity and security can be considerably improved.

Light is to darkness and knowledge is to ignorance. Education brings knowledge and it is a

necessary part of human development. A society is known for development by the level of education of the people. Social order is possible through understanding the dynamics of sociopolitical frame of a society that can be reflected by education. Economic growth due to scientific and technological advancements and industrial development and agricultural abundance is possible with education.

Growing importance of knowledge in the world today and the ever greater numbers of people being trained at the higher level has increased higher education's responsibility to and its influence within society. On the threshold of a new century, education must come to terms in its teaching, research and scholarship with the effects and consequences of the globalization and internationalization of the life of societies, the development of information technologies, the rapidly evolving structures of employment needs and the steady increase in the demand for highly qualified personal. At the same time the need for refresher courses and further education to broaden general knowledge and occupational skills and for career change retraining, is becoming increasingly urgent, so that education has to be more responsive to this task and make it an integral part of its activities.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To measure the mental health of Physically Challenged and Normal Adolescent students in District Srinagar.
2. To measure the academic achievement of physically challenged and normal adolescent students.
3. To compare physically challenged and normal adolescent students on mental health.
4. To compare physically challenged and normal adolescent students on academic achievement.

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present study.

1. Physically challenged and normal adolescent students differ significantly on mental health.
2. Physically challenged and normal adolescent students differ significantly on academic achievement.

SAMPLE

The sample for the present study consisted of 100 secondary school students (50 physically challenged and 50 physically normal students) selected randomly from the different schools of district Srinagar.

The breakup of the sample are as under:

Group	N	Total
Physically Challenged Students	50	50
Normal Students	50	50
Total		100

TOOLS

Following tools were used for the present study:-

Tools I: - Mental Health Battery by A.K Singh and Sen Gupta (original Hindi version translated by Mrs. Gulnaz in English version).

The following six popular indices of mental health have finally been selected for inclusion in the present battery.

1. Emotional stability
2. Over-all adjustment
3. Autonomy
4. Security insecurity
5. Self concept
6. Intelligence

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

The data collected was subjected to the following statistical treatment.

Mean

S.D

t-test.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

Table 4.1: Showing the mean comparison of physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on emotional stability dimension of mental health battery

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	7.47	2.27	6.46	Significant at 0.01 level
Physically normal Students	9.88	3.14		

The perusal of above table shows the mean comparison of physically challenged and physically normal secondary students on emotional stability of mental health battery. The above table reveals that the mean score of physically normal students is higher

than the mean score of physically challenged students and the difference is significant at 0.01 level. The Physically normal students display better emotional stability as compared to physically challenged students.

Table 4.2: Showing the mean comparison of physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on over all adjustment dimension of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	30.24	3.36	5.80	Significant at .01 level
Physically normal Students	34.19	3.47		

A quick look on the above table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between two

groups of students on overall adjustment of mental health battery. The mean score favours physically normal

students which indicate that physically normal students showed better overall adjustment than the physically challenged students.

Table 4.3: Showing the mean comparison of Physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on autonomy dimension of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	9.61	2.98	5.32	Significant at .01 level
Physically normal Students	12.27	2.11		

The perusal of above table shows that the two groups of student's viz. physically challenged and physically normal secondary students differ significantly on autonomy component of mental health battery and the

difference is significant at 0.01 level. The result reveals that physically normal students are more autonomous and have better independence and self determination in thinking than physically challenged students.

Table 4.4: Showing the mean comparison of physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on security-in security dimension of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	11.62	2.02	6.06	Significant at .01 level
Physically normal Students	15.26	3.76		

A quick look on the above table reveals that there is a significant mean difference between the two groups of students on security-insecurity component of mental health battery and difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. The mean score favours

physically normal students which indicate that physically normal students showed better sense of safety, confidence and freedom from fear than the physically challenged students.

Table 4.5: Showing the mean comparison of physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on self-concept dimension of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	10.12	3.28	2.76	Significant at .01 level
Physically normal Students	12.14	4.11		

The perusal of above table shows the mean comparison of physically challenged and physically normal secondary students on self concept dimension of mental health battery. As the mean score favours physically normal students which indicates that

physically normal students showed better attitude, knowledge of themselves and evaluation of their achievements than the physically challenged students.

Table 4.6: Showing the mean comparison of physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on general intelligence component of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	25.13	3.96	1.33	Insignificant
Physically normal Students	26.20	4.11		

The perusal of above table reveals that there is no significant mean difference between physically challenged and physically normal students on general

intelligence. The table indicates that both the groups displayed somewhat similar intelligence quotient.

Table 4.7: Showing the mean comparison of Physically challenged and Physically normal secondary students on overall dimensions of mental health battery.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	48.72	4.12	4.11	Significant at 0.01 level
Physically normal Students	53.12	6.42		

The perusal of above table shows the mean difference of physically challenged and physically normal students on overall dimensions of mental health battery. The above table reveals that there is significant mean difference between physically challenged and physically normal students on overall dimension of mental health and the difference is significant at 0.01 level. As the mean score favours

physically normal students which indicate that physically normal students displayed better mental health than the physically challenged students.

In view of the above results the hypothesis No.1 which reads, "Physically challenged and physically normal students differ significantly on mental health stands accepted.

Table 4.8: Showing the mean comparison of Physically challenged and Physically normal students on academic achievements.

Category	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Physically challenged Students	45.12	4.22	12.58	Significant at .01 level
Physically normal Students	58.21	6.11		

The perusal of above table shows the mean comparison of physically challenged and physically normal students on academic achievement. The above table reveals that there is significant mean difference between physically challenged and physically normal students and on academic achievement the difference is significant at 0.01 level. As the mean difference favours physically normal students which indicates that physically normal students displayed better academic achievements than physically challenged students.

In view of the above results the hypothesis No.2 which reads, "Physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on academic achievement stands accepted.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The following are some of the conclusions drawn from the present study.

1. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on emotional stability of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to be more emotionally stable than the Physically challenged students.

2. It has been found that Physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on over all adjustment of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to have better overall adjustment than physically challenged students.
3. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on autonomy dimension of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to be more autonomous and self confident than the physically challenged students.
6. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on security-in security dimension of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to have high sense of security than the physically challenged students.
7. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on self-concept dimension of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to have better attitude and knowledge about themselves than the Physically challenged students.
8. No significant difference was found between

physically challenged and Physically normal students on general intelligence. The mean difference favoured physically normal students but the difference failed to arrive at any level of confidence. It has been found that both the physically challenged and physically normal students displayed somewhat similar intelligence.

9. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significantly on overall dimensions of mental health battery. The Physically normal students were found to have better mental health than physically challenged students.
10. It has been found that physically challenged and Physically normal students differ significant on academic achievement. Physically normal secondary students were found to have better academic achievement than physically challenged students.

REFERENCES

1. Alberta E. Pruitt, (2002). How the Physically Handicapped Learn to Read. *Reading Teacher* vol. 7. pp. 131-137. published by International Reading Association. stable
2. Ann Llewellyn and Man Cheung Chung, (2005). Self Esteem of Children With Physically Disabilities Problems and Dilemmas of Research. *Journal of Development of Physical Disabilities*. Published by Division of Psychology, Health Sciences, University of Wolver Hampton WVI, IDJ England.
3. Archana, K. P., (2002). Correlates of Academic Achievement *Indian Journal of Educational Research* Vol. 21 pp. 75-76.
4. Aurn, K. S. & chandha, N. K. (1988). *Research in Psychological Issues*. Published by New Delhi Eurasia Publishing House.
5. Best J.W (1983) *Research and Education*. New Delhi. Published by Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
6. Borg, W. R & Call, M.D. (1979) *Educational Research- an Introduction*: New York. Published by Longman pp. 444-449
7. Borg, W.R & Gall, M.D (1976) *Educational Research an Introduction* .New York Longman Publishers.
8. Buch, M.B. (1974) *A Survey of Research in Education* Center for Advanced Studies in Education.
9. Chatrwrjee, R. (1985) *Self-Concept and Blind Children*, cited in *Journal of Indian Education* vol. 2, No. 5.
10. Chawala Preeti, (2008). *Personal Adjustment of physically Disabled and Normal students at senior secondary students*. Published by *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied psychology*, Vol. 32. pp. 43-46
11. D. F. Elisions Nash, (2002). *Case Study of Physically Handicapped Students*. *The British Medical Journal* vol. 2. No. 511 .p.p. 1534 published by BMJ publishing group stable
12. URL: <http://www.jstro.org/stable/25386Q45>.
13. Donnal, M. Pappenfort and Dee Morgan Kilpatrick, (2002). *Opportunity for Physically Handicapped Children, a Study of Attitudes and Practice in Settlements and Community Centers*. *The Social Service Review* vol. 41. p.p. 179-188 published by the University of Chicago press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstro.org/stable/30020396>.
14. Dr. L. Govinda Rao, (2007). *Perspectives on special education*. Published by Neelkamal Publication Pvt. Ltd. Sultan Bazar Hyderabad.
15. Janardan Prasad, (2007). *Education of the Handicapped Children*. Published by Kanishka Publication, New Delhi
16. Jasic Spataro and Paul, E. Mullen, (2004). *Impact of Child Sexual Abuse on Mental Health*, published by *Researched Based Journal of Education* vol. 4.
17. John Sutton, (2004) *Mental Health*. In Sharma and Sharma (Ed.), *Advanced Applied Psychology* Vol. 1st pp. 366-67, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers
18. John, N. Walton, (2000). *The General Care of the Physically Challenged*. *The British Medical Journal* vol. 2. No. 5437.p.p.1296 published by BMJ publishing group stable URL <http://www.jstro.org/stable/25404610>.
19. Karmani Mohammad, (2007). *Comparing Self-Esteem and Self-Concept of Physically Challenged and Normal students*. *Procedia-social and Behavioral science* published by Elsevier Ltd. Vol. 2. pp. 46-49.
20. Kelsey, B. and Wheeler, V. (2001). *Family Perception of Mental Health Issues, Among College Students Development*.
21. Kerlinger, Fred, N. (1973) *Foundation of Behavioral Research*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winslom publications.
22. Kilenger, P. N. (1983) *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New Delhi. Surjeet Publication.

23. Kobel Darja & Musek Janek, (2001). A study of Self Concepts and Academic Achievement. *British Journal of Psychology* Vol. 3rd pp. 44-47
24. Kovach, Kareni, Fleming, Darey and Wilgosh Lassame (2001). *The Relationship Between Study Skills and Conception of Intelligence for the High School Students*. Published by Korean Journal of Thinking and Problem Solving.
25. Kumar, S. and Kumar, J. (2002). A study of Value Judgment and Academic Achievement Among Primary Students. *International Journal of Psychology* Vol. 20 p.p. 34-38.
26. Louris Caren. (1967) *Educational Research in Class Room and School. A Manual of Materials and Methods*. New York Harper and Raw Publishers.
27. Manyuvanie, E. (2000). *Influence of Home and School Environment of Mental Health of Children* Publishing House New Delhi.
28. Maria Slowey and David Watson, (2003), *Higher Education and the life Course*. Published by Open University Press McGraw- Hill Education vol. pp. 121-25.
29. Mehta, K.K., (2007) *Academic Achievement*. In Neil Davison (Ed.) *General Psychology* (6th Edition), New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill, pp. 538-39.
30. Mellanby, Jane Martine Maryanne and O'Doheaty, John, (2000). *The Gender Gap in Final Examination Results at Oxford University*. Published by British Journal of Psychology, pp. 377-379.
31. Mital, S. R. (1988). *Personality Traits of Educated Blind and Sighted Youth*. Cited in *Indian Educational Review* vol. 26. No. 4.
32. Mrza sajad, (2008). *Effects of parental Behavior on Study Habits and Personal Adjustment of Physically Challenged and Normal students* published by *General Psychology Special Needs* vol. 2.
33. Neeru Shartna Payal Mahajan and Anju Bala, (2005). *School Adjustment of Physically Challenged Institutionalized Children*. P.O. dept. of Home Science University of Jammu.
34. Pallavi Mailra, (2007). *Higher Education and Global Changes*, published by Saurabh Publication House ,New Delhi
35. S. Dandapani, S. Santhanam, (2003). *Advanced Educational Psychology* published by Anmol Publishers pvt.ltd. New Delhi.
36. Samir, Quota, Eyad, EL. (2001). *Mental Flexibility as Resiliency Factor among Children Exposed to Political Violence*. *International Journal of Psychology* Vol. 2nd pp. 34-39.
37. Seginer, R.. (2002). *Family Environment, Education, Aspiration and Academic Achievement in two Cultural Settings*. *Journal of Cross Culture Psychology* Vol. 5th pp. 22-25.
38. Sharama Neeru, (2006). *Inter Desire in Physically Challenged Institutionalized Children (5-13years)* P.G Department of Home science University of Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir
39. Shareta Bharti and Neeru Sharama, (2006). *Social Relationships of Physically Challenged Institutionalized Children*. P.G. dept. of Home Science University of Jammu.
40. Sharrna, S. (1986). *Adjustment Pattern of Visually Handicapped and Sighted Students*. Cited in *Journal of Indian Education*, vol. No. 2.

10/15/2012