

## A STUDY OF SOCIAL MATURITY AND SELF ESTEEM OF HEARING IMPAIRED AND NORMAL CHILDREN

**Dr. Tripti Bhargava\* & Mrs. Sunita Godara\*\***

### ABSTRACT

*The investigation is humble effort to examine social maturity and self esteem of hearing impaired and normal children. This problem has sociological, psychological & educational significance. The research was conducted on a target population of 200 students from two schools. Random purposive sampling was used for the study of difference between hearing impaired and normal children. The researcher found that normal children are more mature than hearing impaired children. In reference to social maturity and self esteem it is found that both are equal.*

### INTRODUCTION

Deaf children and adults have long been a source of fascination and interest in the late 16th century, one of the first educational program for exceptional children of any kind a school for the deaf children of noble families was established in Spain by Pedro Ponce de Leon (1520 1524). Ponce De Leon reportedly achieved success in teaching speech, writing, reading, architecture and foreign languages to some of his deaf students (Hewitt & Forness, 1977; sacks, 1986). During the 18th century, schools for deaf children were set up in England, France, Germany, Holland and Scotland. Both oral and manual methods of introduction were used.

Deaf children were among the first groups of individuals with disabilities to receive, Special Education in the United States also. The American, Asylum for the Educational of the Deaf and Dumb opened in Hart Fort, Connecticut in 1817. The original name of this institution indicates the prevailing philosophy of the early 19th century. When person who were deaf were viewed as incapable of benefiting from oral institution. At that time, Deaf students were considered not appropriately served in Asylums, special sanctuaries removed from normal society. Many of the private, public and parochial schools torn deaf students founded in the 19th century were in fact, located in small towns, away from major centres of population. For the most part, these were residential institutions.

During the second half of the 19th century, institutions in speech and speech reading became widely available to deaf

students throughout the United States. The invention of the audiometer in the 1920's and its acceptance as a useful tool for discovering children who had Hearing Impairments gave impetus to organization of programs for Hard of Hearing children in the larger urban centers of our country during the 1930's. The combined brought about a gradual awareness of the needs of Hard of Hearing children.

A principal aim in the Education of Hearing Impaired pupils is to develop their use and understanding of the spoken Language, so necessary for full participation in society. The question then is which educational environment is most likely to develop this special school or ordinary class.

If ordinary class is considered, another important question is how far the ordinary teacher and Hearing pupils should ( or can ) accommodate the special needs of the Hearing Impaired pupils or conversely, how far the Hearing Impaired pupils can responsibly be excepted to accommodate the demands of the ordinary classroom. Certainly awareness of the implications of different teaching systems and classrooms practices is important when consideration is being given to placement of the Hearing Impaired pupil in the mainstream. Hans Further ( 1973 ), a psychologist who devoted much of his career to study the language development of Hearing Impaired people suggests that a good way to approximate the experience of a child who is a deaf from birth or early childhood is to watch a television program in which a foreign language is being spoken with

\*Principal, DDR College of Education, Khandewla, Gurgaon (HR)

\*\*Asstt. Prof., DDR College of Education, Khandewla, Gurgaon (HR)

the sound on the TV set listened off. You would face double problem lips and understanding an unfamiliar language.

As Paul and Quigley (1990) point out, however the educational, vocational and social development of a Hearing Impaired individual to the type and degree of Hearing loss.

### OBJECTIVES

The main aim of the present study is to compare Social maturity and Self-Esteem of Hearing Impaired and Normal Children and It can be achieved through the following objectives:-

- 1) To study Social maturity of Hearing Impaired Children.
- 2) To study Social maturity of Normal Children.
- 3) To study Self-Esteem of Hearing Impaired of Hearing Impaired Children
- 4) To study Self-Esteem of normal Children.
- 5) To Compare Social maturity of Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children.
- 6) To Compare Self-Esteem of Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children.
- 7) To compare Hearing impaired boys and Normal boys with reference to Social maturity.
- 8) To compare Hearing impaired girls and Normal girls with reference to Social maturity.
- 9) To compare Hearing impaired boys and Normal boys with reference to Self-Esteem.
- 10) To compare Hearing impaired girls and Normal girls with reference to Self-Esteem.

### HYPOTHESES

- 1) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired children and Normal Children with reference to Social maturity.
- 2) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children with reference to Self- Esteem.
- 3) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired boys and Normal boys with reference to Social maturity.
- 4) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired girls and Normal girls with reference to Social maturity.
- 5) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired boys and Normal boys with reference to Self- Esteem.

- 6) There is no significant difference between Hearing Impaired girls and Normal girls with reference to Self- Esteem.

### SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The researches have selected a sample of 100 Hearing Impaired children from an institution named as "Welfare Centre for Hearing and Speech Handicapped", situated at Gurgaon. The researcher has selected another sample of 100 Normal children from "Anantam Public School Gurgaon. Random purposive sampling technique was adopted for selecting sample.

### SELECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS EMPLOYED

With a view to ascertain the Social maturity and Excitability of Hearing Impaired and Normal Children, the selected tools are described here:

- 1) Social maturity Scale (SMS) constructed by (Dr. R.P. Srivastava) in 1983.
- 2) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale constructed by Rosenberg in 1965.

### STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED

To arrive at the meaningful results and conclusions of the present study suitable statistical techniques are employed by the researcher. The statistical techniques which are used to analyze the data are as under:-Mean Standard Deviation, and Test of Significance.

### CONCLUSION THROUGH VARIOUS HYPOTHESES

#### HYPHOTHESIS 1

Variation existing between two groups is of great statistical importance. Hence, as regards the present study, to know the difference of Hearing Impaired and Normal Children in relation to Social adjustment, a test of significance was applied for comparison of the two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table1: Mean SD and t-value of the Social Quotient scores of HIC and NC.**

S.NO.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIC	74.38	2.91	8.56
2.	NC	84.1	7.49	

\*p>.01

Table 1 reveals that calculated t-value (8.56) in relation to Social maturity is found significant at 0.05 levels and 0.01 levels. Hence, hypothesis 1 is rejected because there is significant difference between Hearing Impaired Children in relation to Social maturity. Therefore, it can be said Social adjustment, inter-personal response, Civil responsibility, Communication, Home working, Self realization abilities which are included in social adjustment are comparatively low in Hearing Impaired Children. Therefore, it can be said that Normal children are mature than Hearing Impaired Children in reference to Social maturity. Normal children are more social than Hearing Impaired Children.

### HYPOTHESIS 2

As regard the present study, to know the differences of Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children in relation to Self-Esteem, a test of significant was applied for comparison of the two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table 2: Mean, SD and t-value of the Self-Esteem scores of HIC and NC**

S.NO.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIC	15.38	2.68	1.95
2.	NC	16.7	3.97	

\* $p < .05$

1. HIC-Hearing Impaired Children
2. NC-Normal Children

Table 2 reveals that computed t-value in reference to Self-Esteem is found non-significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Hypothesis 2 is accepted because there is non-significance difference between Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children in relation to Self-Esteem. Hence, it can be said that there exists no significant differences between Hearing Impaired children and Normal Children. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children are almost equal in Self-Esteem. Whatever differences are observed between the mean scores may be due to sample error or chance factor. Thus it can be said that the Hearing Impaired Children and Normal Children do not differ in Self-Esteem.

### HYPOTHESIS 3

As regards the present study, to know the differences of Hearing Impaired boys and Normal boys in relation to Social maturity, a test of significance was applied for comparison of the two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table 3: Mean, SD and t-value of the Social Quotient scores of Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys**

S.No.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIB	74.42	2.94	8.52
2.	NB	83.7	7.12	

\* $p > .01$

1. HIB-Hearing Impaired Boys
2. NB-Normal Boys

Table 3 reveals that computed t-value (8.52) in references to Social maturity is found significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 level. Hypothesis 3 is rejected because there is significant difference between Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys in relation to Social maturity. Hence, it can be said that there exist significant statistical differences between Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys. Normal boys are more mature in Social maturity as compare to Hearing Impaired Boys.

### HYPOTHESIS 4

As regards the present study, to know the differences of Hearing Impaired girls and Normal girls in relation to Social adjustment for comparison of the two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table 4.4: Mean, SD and t-value of the Social Quotient scores of HIG and NG**

S.NO.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIG	74.34	2.81	9.32
2.	NG	84.5	7.18	

\* $p > .01$

1. HIG-Hearing Impaired Girls
2. NG- Normal Girls

Specification of the table presented above affirms that the difference between scores of Normal Girls and Hearing Impaired Girls is statistically significant at a 0.05 level and 0.01 level.

Hypothesis 4 is rejected because there is significant difference between Hearing Impaired Girls & Normal Girls in relation to Social maturity. Thus, it can be concluded that Normal Girls are superior to Hearing Impaired Girls in relation to Social adjustment.

**HYPOTHESIS 5**

As regards the present study, to know the differences of Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys in relation to Self- Esteem, a test of significant was applied for comparison of the two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table5: Mean, SD and t-value of the Self-Esteem Scores of Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys**

S.NO.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIB	15.62	2.3	3.21
2.	NB	17.66	3.91	

\*p>.01

1. HIB-Hearing Impaired Boy
2. NB-Normal Boys

Table.5 reveals that computed t-value in relation to Self-Esteem of Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys is found significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Hypothesis 5 is rejected because there is significant difference between Hearing Impaired Boys and Normal Boys in relation to Self-Esteem. Therefore, it can be concluded that Normal Boys are active than Hearing Impaired Boys.

**HYPOTHESIS 6**

As regards the present study, to know the differences of Hearing Impaired Girls and Normal Girls in relation to Self-Esteem, a test of significant was applied for comparison of two means. The results are depicted in the table given below:-

**Table.6 Mean, SD and t-value of the Self-Esteem scores of Hearing Impaired Girls & Normal Girls**

S.NO.	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	HIG	15.14	3.0	0.88
2.	NG	15.74	3.82	

\*p<.05

1. HIG-Hearing Impaired Girls
2. NG-Normal Girls

Table.6 reveals that computed tvalue in reference to Self-Esteem is found non-significant difference between Hearing Impaired Girls & Normal Girls in relation to Self-Esteem. Therefore, it can be concluded that Hearing Impaired Girls & Normal Girls are equal in Self-Esteem. Whatever differences are observed between the mean of scores may be due to sample error said that the Hearing Impaired Girls & Normal Girls do no differ in Self-Esteem.

**EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS**

By establishing a relationship between the Hearing impaired students and normal students and their social adjustment and self esteem the students can thus modify their behavior pattern in the relevant direction. The study will be more useful for the students who may locate studies by observing in different situations. Hearing impaired students can arrange for the substitute in a more logical manner.

**CONCLUSION**

1. Normal children are mature than hearing impaired children in reference to social adjustment
2. Hearing impaired children and normal children do not differ in self esteem
3. Normal boys are mature in social adjustment as compare to hearing impaired boys.
4. Normal girls are superior to hearing impaired girls in relation to social adjustment.
5. Normal boys are active than hearing impaired boys
6. Hearing impaired girls and normal girls are equal in self esteem.

**REFERENCES**

Abu-Rabia, Salim. (2002) Psychological Abstracts, Vol.90, no. 1-2, p.540

Agarwal. (1998)Indian Educational Abstracts, Issue 7&8, p .52

Bacon. (2002) Psychological Abstracts, Vol. 89, No.7-8, and p.2753

Bosworth. (2002) Psychological Abstracts, Vol. 89, no.9-10, p.3530

- Cole. (2000) Psychological abstracts, Vol.89, No.9-10, p.3530
- Crowe. (2003) Psychological Abstracts, Vol.90, No.5-6, p.1859
- Curry, M.D. (2002) Psychological Abstract, Vol.89, No.7-8 , p.2754
- Dunbo . (2001) Psychological Abstracts, Vol .88, No. 11-12, p.4407
- Ebbels, S. (2000) Psychological Abstracts, Vol. 87, No. 7-8, p. 2688
- Garnier, S(1999) Psychological Abstracts , Vol .86 , No. 11-12, p.4465
- Golden-Meadow (2000) Psychological Abstracts, Vol. 87, No. 11-12, p.4309
- Hunses, L.E. (2000) Psychological Abstracts, Vol. 87, No .11-12, p.4309