

Parents Attitude to Inclusion of Visually Handicapped Children

Kiran Yadav* & Prof Sunita Mishra**

*M.sc Scholar, ** Professor and Dean
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
School for Home Science Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University Lucknow-226025

ABSTRACT:-

Visual impairment or low vision is a severe reduction in vision that cannot be corrected with standard glasses or contact lenses and reduces a person's ability to function at certain or all tasks. Children who are visually impaired must rely upon their remaining senses for gaining knowledge of the world around them. Lack of sight has a major influence on gaining actual knowledge of objection world, which can then be had by touch experience only. The lack of sight causes a detachment from the physical and to some extent from the social environment. Attitude is a vital ingredient for the success or failure of children with visual impairment in their optimum development. parents as educational decision makers; parents as parents; parents as teachers and parents as advocates. Since the parent's attitude is so important, it is essential that the home and school work closely together, especially for children with disabilities. The study was conducted in Lucknow city by selecting the total 60 parents the data was coded, tabulated and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, ANOVE to find differences Parents attitude to inclusion of visually handicapped children . Study Period was 2014 – 2015. This research presents the current status of inclusive education in India with a focus on children with visual impairment in Lucknow. From the findings of the study it can be concluded that the non significant was found Parents attitude to inclusion of visually handicapped children in Lucknow city.

Key Words: Parents attitude; inclusion; visually Handicapped Children

INTRODUCTION:-

A person who is unable to see in normal circumstances is called visually impaired person. It may be due to complete blindness, partial blindness or some other visual defects i.e., light sensitivity, weakness of lens or glasses etc. The term 'inclusive education' is nowadays broadly conceptualized to include students from different backgrounds and with languages other than English, as well as students with disabilities (Ashman, 2002). However, for the purposes of this study, 'the term inclusion is defined as partial or full inclusion in regular classrooms, with the level of inclusion being

dependent upon the severity and number of disabilities and the level of additional support available for that student' (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994, cited in McNally, Cole & Waugh, 2001, p. 258).

A successful system of inclusion requires that the community believe in the competence of the education system to meet the needs of all students. Parents especially have to have confidence in the capacity of the schools to understand and effectively educate their children special needs. Given the current policies of inclusive education, children with special needs are increasingly

being educated with their non-disabled peers in the regular classroom. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of parents of students with disabilities, with regard to the inclusion of their children within the regular education system.

Attitude is a vital ingredient for the success or failure of children with visual impairment in their optimum development. The attitude of parents can have a profound effect on the social and educational integration of visually impaired children. It makes a great difference to these children whether the attitude and actions of parents reflect considerations for their real needs or are merely prompted by pity or monetary limitations. The adjustment of visually impaired children to society begins with the ability to adjust to their own family members. The child brought up with affection and care in the least restrictive environment would be able to cope up better with the sighted world. Therefore, the family shapes the social integration of the child more than a formal school. Turnbull (1) has identified four basic parental roles: parents as educational decision makers; parents as parents; parents as teachers and parents as advocates. Since the parent's attitude is so important, it is essential that the home and school work closely together, especially for children with disabilities.

The Warnock Report (2) stresses the importance of parents being partners in the education of their children. The role of parents should actively support and enrich the educational processes.

OBJECTIVE: - To study the attitude of parents towards adjustment of visually handicapped children.

MATERIALS METHODS:

- Lucknow city was selected for conducting the study.
- The time taken for the study was one year that is July 2014 to may 2015.
- Sample Technique was Purposive random sampling.
- The sample for the study was consisted of 60 respondents. (Sixty respondents) randomly selected for the present study.
- Two institute, in were selected for the study.
- For selecting of the respondents random sampling techniques was adopted in total 60 visual handicapped children were selected between the groups of 9-14 year.
- The main tools were used in the study was self designed interview schedule. The interview schedule consists of general and specific information required for study. And data were collected through interview method.
- Independent variable was Age, Sex, Education of children/parents
- Dependent variable was attitude of parents towards adjustment of visually handicapped children.

RESULT:-

Table no: 1- Testing of Hypothesis- Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the social domain of children (N=60)

Ho2: There is no access to the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across parent’s age.

P<.000*, highly significant

S.No	Parameters	30-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	f	P
1.	Teaching methodology teacher’s comfortable students special needs	1.40±.548	1.14±.351	1.50 ±.516	1.00± .000	4.500	.007
2.	Adapted curriculum students special needs	1.40±.548	1.14±.351	1.13 ±.342	1.80± .422	8.717* *	.000
3.	Visually impaired pupils included your class	1.60±.548	1.34±.484	1.06 ±.250	1.40±.516	2.543	.065
4.	Helpful/useful help people like you school	1.60± .548	1.28± .455	1.13 ±.342	1.30±.483	1.533	.216

P<.000*, highly significant

The above table no.1- Result revealed that discussed that parent's age among the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across the social domain of children. Difference between age of the parents and social domain. Data shown that as the p value were more than 0.05 in all parameter like adopted curriculum students special needs (.000). The result reveled f test was found significant between parent’s age and social domain. Which mean null hypothesis was rejected.




Fig no: 1- Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the social domain of parent’s age.

Table no.2-Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across parents gender (N=60)

S.NO	Parameter	Male	Female	f	P
1.	School community give special service students visual handicapped children	1.24±.435	1.32±.478	.334	.566
2.	Students disabilities interact students without during break and entry time	1.24±.435	1.42±.507	1.938	.169
3.	Bedroom accessible disabled children	1.20±.401	1.58±.507	10.021	.002
4.	Family you regard being close/friendly	1.29±.461	1.26±.452	.054	.817
5.	You happy your visually	1.20±.401	1.32±.478	1.040	.312

	impaired child learning school your community				
6.	Visually impaired pupils included your class	1.15± .358	1.63±.496	18.580* *	.000
7.	Visually impaired pupils included your school	1.29± .416	1.53±.513	3.108	.083

P<.000*,highly significant

The above table no.2-show that parents education among the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across social domain difference between gender of the parents social domain. Data shown that as the p value was more than 0.05 in all parameter like majority of difficulty that limits activities at home (.678) was visually handicapped children. Majority of p value (.026) was enhancement technologies, majority of p value (.055) was difficulties /problem find getting into school the first time, majority of p value (.249) was child difficulty or disability they are sometimes absent from school, majority of p value (.511) was helpful/useful to help people like school, majority of p value (.566) was school community give special service for students with visual handicapped children, majority of (.355) was teaching methodology of teacher's comfortable for students with special needs, majority of p value (.232) was adapted curriculum for students special needs, majority of (.169) was disability interact with students during break and entry time, majority of (.002) was bed room accessible for disabled children, majority of (.711) students with disabilities stigmatized students without disabilities , majority of (.511) students with disabilities participate in

different activities of the school, majority of (.710) home place ,toilet rooms .class room gets ,and there accessible students with disabilities, majority of (.244) was sport field of the school comfortable children with disabilities , majority of (.441) was brother and sister with the same condition, majority of (.817) was family regard being close/friendly, majority of (.201) was cooperate education, majority of (.710) was school call discuss your children academic progress , majority of (.752) was easy to go to children school , majority of (.394) discussed disability or individual disabilities child, majority of (.177) family member other friends home , majority of (.710) classmate help work, majority of (.312) was happy that visually impaired child learning school with community , majority of (.000) was visual impaired pupils included class, majority of (.083) was visual impaired pupils include school.

The data reported highly significant relationship between (p<.000) interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across parents gender. The data reported highly significant relationship between (.000) was visually impaired pupils included in class. Thus null hypothesis alternative was rejected.




Fig no.2-Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across parents gender.

Table no.3-Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across parents education (N=60)

S.NO	Parameter	High school	Intermediat e	Graduation	Post graduation	F	P
1.	Helpful/useful help people like you school	1.56±.527	1.31±.480	1.13±.338	1.29±.469	2.245	.093
2.	School community give special service students visual handicapped children	1.33±.500	1.31±.480	1.17±.318	1.36±.497	.687	.564
3.	Students disabilities interact students without during break and entry	1.33±.500	1.31±.480	1.29±.464	1.29±.469	.023	.995

	time						
3.	Bedroom accessible disabled children	1.67±.500	1.54±.519	1.25±.442	1.00±.000	6.239	.001
4.	Sport field school comfortable children with disabilities	1.11±.333	1.62±.506	1.13±.338	1.50±.519	5.315	.003
5.	Brother or sister same condition of disabilities as yours	1.00±.000	1.38±.506	1.38±.495	150±.519	2.215	.096
6.	Easy to go to your children's school anytime fell like	1.89±.333	142±.515	1.13±.338	1.07±.267	11.815**	.000
7.	You happy your visually impaired child learning school your community	1.00±.0000	1.62±.506	1.04±.204	1.36±.497	8.970**	.000
8.	Visually impaired pupils included your school	2.00±.000	1.46±.519	1.13±.338	1.29±.469	1.1184**	.000

P<.000*,highly significant

The above table no-3-show that parents education among the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across social domain difference between education of the parents social domain. Data shown that as the p value was more than 0.05 in all parameter like majority of difficulty that limits activities at home (.221) was visually handicapped children. Majority of p value (.326) was enhancement technologies, majority of p value (.051) was difficulties /problem find getting into school the first time, majority of p value (.078) was child difficulty or disability they are sometimes absent from school, majority of p value (.093) was helpful/useful to help people like school, majority of

p value (.564) was school community give special service for students with visual handicapped children, majority of (.085) was teaching methodology of teacher's comfortable for students with special needs, majority of p value (.024) was adapted curriculum for students special needs, majority of (.995) was disability interact with students during break and entry time, majority of (.001) was bed room accessible for disabled children, majority of (.945) students with disabilities stigmatized students without disabilities , majority of (.868) students with disabilities participate in different activities of the school, majority of (.018) home place ,toilet rooms .class room gets ,and there

accessible students with disabilities, majority of (.003) was sport field of the school comfortable children with disabilities , majority of (.096) was brother and sister with the same condition, majority of ((.193) was family regard being close/friendly, majority of (.296) was cooperate education, majority of (.232) was school call discuss your children academic progress , majority of (.000) was easy to go to children school , majority of (.318) discussed disability or individual disabilities child, majority of (.106) family member other friends home , majority of (.113) classmate help work, majority of (.000) was happy that visually impaired child learning school with community , majority of (.027) was

visual impaired pupils included class, majority of (.000) was visual impaired pupils include school.

The data reported highly significant relationship between ($p < .000$) interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across parents education. The data reported significant relationship between (.001) bedroom accessible for disabled children. The data reported highly significant relationship between easy to go to children school any time feel like. Data reported significant relationship between (.000) visually impaired child learning school with community. Data reported highly significant relationship between (.000) visually impaired pupils include in school. Thus null hypothesis was rejected.




Fig no.3-Distribution of the respondent on the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across parents education

Conclusion:-

Majority of parent's age among the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across the social domain of children. Difference between age of the parents and social domain. Data shown that as the p value

were more than 0.05 in all parameter like adopted curriculum students special needs (.000). The result reveled f test was found significant between parent’s age and social domain. Which mean null hypothesis was rejected. Majority Parents education among the interaction of family member in visually

handicapped children the across social domain difference between gender of the parents social domain. Data shown that as the p value was more than 0.05 in all parameter like majority of difficulty that limits activities at home (.678) was visually handicapped children. Majority of p value (.026) was enhancement technologies, majority of p value (.055) was difficulties /problem find getting into school the first time, majority of p value (.249) was child difficulty or disability they are sometimes absent from school, majority of p value (.511) was helpful/useful to help people like school, majority of p value (.566) was school community give special service for students with visual handicapped children, majority of (.355) was teaching methodology of teacher's comfortable for students with special needs, majority of p value (.232) was adapted curriculum for students special needs, majority of (.169) was disability interact with students during break and entry time, majority of (.002) was bed room accessible for disabled children, majority of (.711) students with disabilities stigmatized students without disabilities , majority of (.511) students with disabilities participate in different activities of the school, majority of (.710) home place ,toilet rooms .class room gets ,and there accessible students with disabilities, majority of (.244) was sport field of the school comfortable children with disabilities , majority of (.441) was brother and sister with the same condition, majority of (.817) was family regard being close/friendly, majority of (.201) was cooperate education, majority of (.710) was school call discuss your children academic progress , majority of (.752) was easy to go to children school , majority of (.394) discussed disability or individual disabilities child, majority of

(.177) family member other friends home , majority of (.710) classmate help work, majority of (.312) was happy that visually impaired child learning school with community , majority of (.000) was visual impaired pupils included class, majority of (.083) was visual impaired pupils include school.

The data reported highly significant relationship between ($p < .000$) interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across parents gender. The data reported highly significant relationship between (.000) was visually impaired pupils included in class. Thus null hypothesis alternative was rejected. Majority of parents education among the interaction of family member in visually handicapped children the across social domain difference between education of the parents social domain. Data shown that as the p value was more than 0.05 in all parameter like majority of difficulty that limits activities at home (.221) was visually handicapped children. Majority of p value (.326) was enhancement technologies, majority of p value (.051) was difficulties /problem find getting into school the first time, majority of p value (.078) was child difficulty or disability they are sometimes absent from school, majority of p value (.093) was helpful/useful to help people like school, majority of p value (.564) was school community give special service for students with visual handicapped children, majority of (.085) was teaching methodology of teacher's comfortable for students with special needs, majority of p value (.024) was adapted curriculum for students special needs, majority of (.995) was disability interact with students during break and entry time, majority of (.001) was bed room accessible for disabled children,

majority of (.945) students with disabilities stigmatized students without disabilities , majority of (.868) students with disabilities participate in different activities of the school, majority of (.018) home place ,toilet rooms .class room gets ,and there accessible students with disabilities, majority of (.003) was sport field of the school comfortable children with disabilities , majority of (.096) was brother and sister with the same condition, majority of ((.193) was family regard being close/friendly, majority of (.296) was cooperate education, majority of (.232) was school call discuss your children academic progress , majority of (.000) was easy to go to children school , majority of (.318) discussed disability or individual disabilities child, majority of (.106) family member other friends home , majority of (.113) classmate help work, majority of (.000) was happy that visually impaired child learning school with community , majority of (.027) was visual impaired pupils included class, majority of (.000) was visual impaired pupils include school.

The data reported highly significant relationship between ($p < .000$) interaction of family member in visually handicapped children across parents education. The data reported significant relationship between (.001) bedroom accessible for disabled children. The data reported highly significant relationship between easy to go to children school any time feel like. Data reported significant relationship

between (.000) visually impaired child learning school with community. Data reported highly significant relationship between (.000) visually impaired pupils include in school. Thus null hypothesis was rejected.

References:-

- [1.] John,E.et.al (2003).Parents attitudes to inclusion of their children with special need, Journal of research in special education need,vol-3,pp 122-129.
- [2.] Khurshid,F.et.al. (2010).Perception of visually impaired youth about familial,academic and caregivers support, Global Journal of human social science,vol-11; 0975-587.
- [3.] Kef,S.Maja,D.(2004).The role of parental and peer support in adolescents well-being a comparison of adolescents with and without a visually impairment, Journal of adolescence,vol-27; 453-466.
- [4.] Lifeshitz,H,et.al (2007).Self-concept, adjustment to blindness, and quality of friendship among adolescents with visual impairments,vol-101(2);pp 1-20
- [5.] Mishra,S.(2011).Contemporary approach in family community studies,Shree publishers & distribution; 978-81-8329-387-7.