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5.1 INTRODUCTION

Analysis and interpretation of data is a necessary step in the research process as it aims to find meaning of the raw data. Its basic purpose is to summarise observation and search their broader meaning by linking them to the existing knowledge.

According to Dictionary of Education, “Statistical analysis is the application of Statistical processes and theory to the compilation, presentation, discussion and interpretation of numerical data” (Good et.al., 1959).

In fact analysis means the categorizing, ordering, manipulating and summarising of data to obtain answers to research questions. The purpose of analysis is to reduce data to intelligible and interpretable form, so that the relation of research problems can be studied and tested. Further, interpretation takes the results of analysis, makes inferences pertinent to the research relation studied, and draws conclusions about these relations.

The analysis and interpretation of data with necessary statistical treatment on the basis of related objectives and hypotheses have been presented in this chapter. The following chapter will describes the major findings, necessary suggestions and recommendations for further investigation.

5.2 COMPARISON BETWEEN NORMAL AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED ADOLESCENT STUDENTS WITH RESPECT TO EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

H01: Mean emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent students do not differ significantly.
Table 5.1
Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students with respect to Emotional Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Emotional adjustment</th>
<th>Total (N= 100)</th>
<th>Boys (N=50)</th>
<th>Girls (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>‘t’ ratio</td>
<td>Level of sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td><strong>3.66</strong></td>
<td>45.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIAS</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= *  
P< 0.01= **  
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.1 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent students.

The respective Mean and SD for N.A.S. are (N=100, M=46.85, SD= 4.87) and for V.I.A.S. are (N=100, M=43.26, SD=4.95). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 3.66).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 3.66) is more than the table value (2.58 at 0.01 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students differ...
significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent students. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

The results of the present study support the findings of other studies. Pandey (1995) conducted a study on affectional deprivation, ego-strength and adjustment among visually impaired children and it was found that blind children had poor ego-strength and poor adjustment. In a study Singh and Raghubha (1992) also found that physically handicapped boys and girls are inferior than normal boys and girls in adjustment. In this way Bauman (1950), Bala (1985), Pandit (1985), Rai (1988), Phoola (1990) and Rudraman (2007) also found same result.

The finding of this objective also contradict the findings of other works. In a study Kaur, Singh and Jain (1984) found that there is no significant difference among the sighted and blind adolescents in relation to adjustment. Likely, Singha (1982), Srivastava and Singha (1974) and Haider (1991) also found same result.

5.2.1 Comparison between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Emotional Adjustment

**H02**: Mean emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys do not differ significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= *  
NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.

P<0.01=**  
VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.

NS= Not Significant.
The Table 5.2 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys. The respective Mean and SD for N.A.B. are (N=50, M=45.78, SD= 5.20) and for V.I.A.B. are ( N=50, M=44.00, SD=4.70). The ‘t’ ratio is ( ‘t’ = 2.61).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 2.61) is more than the table value (2.58 at 0.01 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that emotional adjustment of normal adolescent boys differ significantly from the visually impaired adolescent boys. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

5.2.ii Comparison between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Emotional Adjustment

H03: Mean emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls do not differ significantly.

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= *  
NAG= Normal Adolescent Girls.

P<0.01=**  
VIAG= Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls.

NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.3 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the emotional adjustment scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls. The respective Mean and SD for N.A.G. are (N=50, M=47.48, SD= 4.98) and for V.I.A.G. are ( N=50, M=43.00, SD=4.79). The ‘t’ ratio is ( ‘t’ = 4.91).
From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 4.91) is more than the table value (2.58 at 0.01 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that emotional adjustment of normal adolescent girls differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

5.3 COMPARISON OF SELF-CONCEPT BETWEEN NORMAL AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED ADOLESCENT STUDENTS.

H04: Mean Self-Concept score do not differ significantly between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students.

Table 5.4

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students with respect to Self-Concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total (N= 100)</th>
<th>Boys (N=50)</th>
<th>Girls (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>‘t’ ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIAS</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05 = *  
NAS= Normal Adolescent Students.

P< 0.01=**  
VIAS= Visually Impaired Adolescent Students.

NS= Not Significant

The Table 5.4 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent students.
The respective Mean and SD for NAS are (N=100, M=56.20, SD= 6.92) and for VIAS are ( N=100, M=55.25, SD=6.05). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 0.73).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 0.73) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent students do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent students. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The findings of this objective support the findings of other studies. In a study Lifshitz, et al. (2007) found similar self-concept profile for sighted adolescents and adolescents with visual impairments. Griffin-Shirley and Nes (2005), Folk and Fung (2004), Bernaras et al. (2009) also found similar result that there is no difference among normal and visually impaired adolescents in relation to self concept.

However, the findings also contradict the results of other works done with adolescents. In their studies, Mieghan (1971), Beaty(1991,1992) found that the self-concept of normal and visually impaired adolescents are not same.
5.3.i: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.

H05: Mean self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent Boys do not differ significantly.

Table 5.5

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Self-Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= * NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.
P<0.01= ** VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.5 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys. The respective Mean and SD for N.A.B. are (N=50, M=56.28, SD= 6.08) and for V.I.A.B. are ( N=50, M=55.88, SD=5.75). The ‘t’ ratio is ( ‘t’ = 0.39).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 0.39) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.3.ii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls.

H0g: Mean self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired girls do not differ significantly.
Table 5.6

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Self-Concept:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= *  
NAG= Normal Adolescent Girls  
P<0.01=**  
VIAG= Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls  
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.6 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls. The respective Mean and SD for N.A.G. are (N=50, M=56.06, SD= 6.92) and for V.I.A.G. are ( N=50, M=54.00, SD=6.14). The ‘t’ ratio is ( ‘t’ = 1.54).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 1.54) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN NORMAL AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED ADOLESCENT STUDENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF SELF-CONCEPT

H0: Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students do not differ significantly with respect to different dimensions of Self-Concept:
Table 5.7
Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students with respect to Different Dimensions of Self-Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NAS</th>
<th>VIAS</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Intellectual and School Status</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Physical Appearance and Attributes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Happiness and Satisfaction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05 = *  
P< 0.01 = **  
NS = Not Significant

The Table 5.7 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the normal and visually impaired adolescent students with respect to different dimensions of self-concept scores.
The respective Mean and SD for N.A.S. are (N=100, Behaviour-M=10.78, SD=1.47, Intellectual and School Status- M=11.63, SD=1.63, Physical Appearance and Attributes – M=9.80, SD=2.39, Anxiety-M=10.40, SD=1.17, Popularity-M=9.70, SD=0.82, Happiness and satisfaction – M=5.68, SD=1.17) and for V.I.A.S are (N=100, Behaviour- M=10.16, SD=1.36; Intellectual and School Status- M=11.48, SD=2.36; Physical Appearance and Attributes- M=10.60, SD=2.01; Anxiety – M =10.10, SD=0.99; Popularity – M=8.90, SD=1.20; Happiness and satisfaction-M=5.92, SD=1.07). The ‘t’ ratio for different dimensions among NAS and VIAS are I= 2.19, II= 0.35, III=1.82, IV=1.39, V=3.96 and VI=1.07 respectively.

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ values (I=2.19, V=3.96) are more than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance) with respect to Behaviour and Popularity. So, it is significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent students differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent students with respect to Behaviour and Popularity.

Thus, the null hypothesis that Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students do not differ significantly with respect to different dimensions of Self-Concept is partially rejected.

From the Table-5.7 it is also found that the calculated ‘t’ values (II=0.35, III=1.82, IV=1.39 and VI=1.07) are less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance) with respect to Intellectual and School Status, Physical Appearance and Attributes, Anxiety, and Happiness and satisfaction. So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent students do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent students with respect to Intellectual and
School Status, Physical Appearance and Attributes, Anxiety, and Happiness and satisfaction.

Thus, the null hypothesis that Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Students do not differ significantly with respect to different dimensions of Self-Concept is partially accepted.

5.4.1 Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Behaviour

H0: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to Behaviour

Table 5.8

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= * NAB = Normal Adolescent Boys.
P< 0.01=** VIAB = Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.
NS = Not Significant.

The Table 5.8 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to behaviour. The respective Mean and SD for NAB are (N=50, M=10.76, SD= 1.41) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=9.94, SD=1.17). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ =2.92).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ =2.92) is more than the table value (2.58 at 0.01 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys differs significantly from that
of the visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to behaviour. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

5.4.ii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Behaviour

**H0**: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to Behaviour

**Table 5.9**

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= *  
NAG= Normal Adolescent Girls.
P< 0.01=**  
VIAG= Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls.
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.9 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls with respect to behaviour. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=10.82, SD= 1.42) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=10.14, SD=1.25). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 2.64).
From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 2.64) is more than the table value (2.58 at 0.01 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls with respect to behaviour differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

5.4.iii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Intellectual and School Status

\[H_0\]: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to intellectual and School Status.

Table 5.10

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Intellectual and School Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= * \hspace{1cm} \text{NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.}
P< 0.01= ** \hspace{1cm} \text{VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.}
NS= Not Significant.
The Table 5.10 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to intellectual and School Status. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=11.64, SD=1.51) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=11.68, SD=2.07). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 0.11).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 0.11) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to intellectual and School Status do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4.iv: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to intellectual and School Status

H011: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to intellectual and school status.

### Table 5.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= *

P< 0.01=**

NS= Not Significant.
The Table 5.11 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls with respect to intellectual and School Status. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=11.50, SD=1.68) and for VIAG are (N=50, M=11.44, SD=2.40). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 0.13).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ value (‘t’ = 0.13) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls with respect to intellectual and School Status do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4.v: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Physical appearance and attributes.

H012: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to Physical appearance and attributes.
Table 5.12
Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, 't' Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Physical appearance and attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>'t' value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= * NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.
P< 0.01= ** VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.12 represent the Mean, SD and 't' ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes. The respective Mean and SD for NAB are (N=50, M=9.42, SD= 1.94) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=9.78, SD=1.97). The 't' ratio is ('t' = 1.10).

From the table it is observed that the calculated 't' value ('t' = 1.10) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to Physical appearance and attributes do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4.vi: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes.

H013: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes.
Fig. 5.6: Mean scores of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys and Girls with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes

Table 5.13
Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= *  
NAG= Normal Adolescent Girls.

P<0.01=**  
VIAG= Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls.

NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.13 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to Physical Appearance and Attributes. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=9.06, SD= 2.55) and for VIAG are (N=50, M=9.72, SD=1.91). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 1.39).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 1.39) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to Physical
appearance and attributes do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4.vii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Anxiety.

H0_{14}: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to Anxiety.

Table 5.14

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= * NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.
P<0.01=** VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.14 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to Anxiety. The respective Mean and SD for NAB are (N=50, M=9.70, SD= 1.69) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=9.34, SD=1.61). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 1.02).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 1.02) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to Anxiety do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. So the null hypothesis is accepted.
5.4.viii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Anxiety.

H015: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to Anxiety.

Table 5.15
Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05 = * NAG= Normal Adolescent Girls.

P< 0.01 = ** VIAG= Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls.

NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.15 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls with respect to Anxiety. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=9.46, SD= 2.24) and for VIAG are (N=50, M=8.98, SD=2.08). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 1.19).
From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 1.19) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls with respect to Anxiety do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.4.ix: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Popularity.

**H₀₁₆**: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to Popularity.

**Table 5.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ Ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.05= *  NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.

P<0.01= ** VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.

NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.16 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to Popularity. The respective Mean and SD for NAB are (N=50, M=9.20, SD=1.39) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=8.78, SD=1.34). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 1.43).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 1.43) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to Popularity do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. So the null hypothesis is accepted.
5.4.x: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Popularity.

H017: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to Popularity.

Table 5.17

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05 = *  
P< 0.01 = **  
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.17 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls with respect to Popularity. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=9.38, SD=1.51) and for VIAG are (N=50, M=8.60, SD=1.60). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 2.58).
From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 2.58) is more than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls with respect to Popularity differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

5.4.xi: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction.

H018: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys do not differ significantly with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction.

Table 5.18

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05= * NAB= Normal Adolescent Boys.
P< 0.01= ** VIAB= Visually Impaired Adolescent Boys.
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.18 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction. The respective Mean and SD for NAB are (N=50, M=5.58, SD= 0.73) and for VIAB are (N=50, M=5.80, SD=0.97). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 1.14).

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 1.14) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent boys with respect to Happiness and
Satisfaction do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent boys. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted here.

5.4.xii: Comparison of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction.

H0: Mean self-concept score between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls do not differ significantly with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction.

Table 5.19

Table shows Mean, Standard Deviation, ‘t’ Ratio and Significance Level of self-concept between Normal and Visually Impaired Adolescent Girls with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Girls</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ ratio</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VIAG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< 0.05 = *  
P< 0.01 = **  
NS= Not Significant.

The Table 5.19 represent the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio of the self-concept scores of normal and visually impaired adolescent girls with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction. The respective Mean and SD for NAG are (N=50, M=5.76, SD= 1.14) and for VIAG are (N=50, M=5.80, SD=0.80). The ‘t’ ratio is (‘t’ = 0.22).
From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘t’ ratio (‘t’ = 0.22) is less than the table value (1.96 at 0.05 level of significance). So, it is not significant and it may be inferred that self-concept of normal adolescent girls with respect to Happiness and Satisfaction do not differ significantly from that of the visually impaired adolescent girls. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

5.5 TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT OF NORMAL ADOLESCENT STUDENTS

(i) Having high self-concept and having high emotional adjustment.
(ii) Having average self-concept and having average emotional adjustment.
(iii) Having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment

H0_20: There is no significant relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students –

(i) Having high self-concept and having high emotional adjustment.
(ii) Having average self-concept and having average emotional adjustment.
(iii) Having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment.

Percentile point and Pearson Product Moment Correlation method was used to find out the relationship. The percentile point of P_{67} and P_{33} has taken into consideration to divide the self-concept and emotional adjustment of the normal and visually impaired adolescent students into high, average and low group.

Table 5.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>High Group</th>
<th>Average Group</th>
<th>Low Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N  df  'r'  sig.</td>
<td>N  df  'r'  sig.</td>
<td>N  df  'r'  sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal adolescents students</td>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>30  28  -0.14 NS</td>
<td>35  33  0.11 NS</td>
<td>26  24  -0.04 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.20 represents N, df, 'r' value and level of significance between self-concept and emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students. The normal adolescent students having high self-concept and high emotional adjustment shows negative (-0.14) relationship. The average self-concept and average emotional adjustment shows positive relationship but it is negligible (0.11). The low self-concept and emotional adjustment scores (-0.04) shows negative relationship.

From the table it is observed that calculated 'r' value for having high self-concept and high emotional adjustment is ('r' = -0.14), which is negative and less than the table value (at 0.05 level 0.36 for 28 df). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between having high self-concept and high emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students is accepted.

The result of this objective contradict the findings of other studies. Baumrind (1991) suggested that development of self-concept of children and adolescents requires an environment that provides the freedom to explore and experiment and protection from danger.

![Fig. 5.10: Relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students](image-url)
Individuals with high self esteem tend to have confidence in their own abilities, to make decisions, expectation for successful outcomes, and relationships that are characterized by respect and dignity (Tuttlt & Tuttle, 2004).

It is observed that calculated ‘r’ value for having average self-concept and average emotional adjustment is (‘r’ = 0.11), which is positive and very low but less than the table value (at 0.05 level 0.35 for 33 df). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between having average self-concept and average emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students is accepted.

Again it is observed that calculated ‘r’ value for having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment is (‘r’ = -0.04), which is negative and negligible and also less than the table value (at 0.05 level 0.39 for 24 df). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students found to be true. So the hypothesis is accepted here

5.6 TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED ADOLESCENT STUDENTS

(i) Having high self-concept and having high emotional adjustment.
(ii) Having average self-concept and having average emotional adjustment.
(iii) Having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment.

H021: There is no significant relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students –

(ii) Having high self-concept and having high emotional adjustment.
(iii) Having average self-concept and having average emotional adjustment.
(iv) Having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment.
The table 5.21 represents N, df, ‘r’ value and level of significance between self-concept and emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students. The ‘r’ value of having high self-concept and having high emotional adjustment is (0.24). It is positive but very low relationship. The self-concept score and emotional adjustment having average relationship of visually impaired adolescent students show relationship (0.30). It is positive but also low relationship. Similarly the relationship between low self-concept and emotional adjustment scores of visually impaired adolescent students is (0.33). It is positive and barely average relationship.

From the table it is observed that the calculated ‘r’ value for having high self-concept and high emotional adjustment is (‘r’ = 0.24), which is positive and very low relationship and less than the table value (at 0.05 level for 25 df is 0.38). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between having high self-concept and high emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students is accepted.

It is observed that calculated ‘r’ value for having average self-concept and average emotional adjustment is (‘r’ = 0.30), which is positive and low but less than the table value (at 0.05 level 0.35 for 32 df). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between having average self-
concept and average emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students is accepted.

Again it is observed that calculated 'r' value for having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment is ('r' = 0.33), which is positive and barely average, but it also less than the table value (at 0.05 level 0.36 for 28 df). It is not significant and the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between having low self-concept and low emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students. So the hypothesis is accepted.

5.7 A GENERAL DISCUSSION

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of data presented the discussion of the findings in the context of theoretical background and reviewed literature has been presented here. The sequence of the variables in discussion is similar to that of that analysis and interpretation of data.
Emotional adjustment and adolescent

In the present study, one of the objectives was to compare the normal and visually impaired adolescent students with respect to emotional adjustment the result of the study indicated that while there was difference between normal and visually impaired adolescent students with respect to emotional adjustment. In the same way the normal and visually impaired boys, and normal and visually impaired girls also differ from each other with respect to emotional adjustment. It is general in the line with the results obtained by other investigators – Cutsforth, 1933; Sommers, 1944; Hastings, 1947; Brieland, 1950; Barker, 1953; Bauman, 1950; Louttil, 1957; Norris et al., 1957; Vasudeva et al., 1979; Bhargava and Lavina, 1981; Dash and Mohanty, 1981; William, 1983; Bala, 1985; Goel and Sen, 1985; Lata, 1985; Mathur, 1985; Pandit, 1985; Sarita, 1985; Phoola, 1990; Pandey, 1995; Bhaskar and Rudraman, 2007 and others.

The result of the present study also differ with the results obtained by different investigators, Brown, 1938; Hubbard, 1945; Lowenfeld, 1955; Srivastava and Sinha, 1974; Sinha, 1982; Kaur, Singh and Saha 1983; Jain, 1984; Rai, 1988; Haider, 1991; Singh and Raghubha 1992 and others.

Self-concept and Adolescent

Another objective of the present study was to compare the self-concept of normal and visually impaired adolescent students. From the result of the study it is observed that the self-concept of normal and visually impaired (total = Boys + Girls) do not differ from each other. Likely the self-concept of normal and visually impaired adolescent boys and normal and visually impaired girls are same. These results confirm the findings of other studies that have found no differences when comparing

The differences in the results of the studies may be due to factors of self-concept investigated, the way the groups were selected, and the method of gathering data. The differences may be related to the instruments employed because some of them assess global self-concept, whereas others explore the differentiate dimensions of the self-concept. In general, a clear tendency was observed in the direction of absence of differences in the global self-concept between the adolescents with and without impairment. Another explanatory factor of the discrepancies may be related to the differences in the samples of the studies because they have different percentages of men and women, as well as the number of adolescents with psychological problems. Moreover, another explanation of the fact that, in an increasing number of students, no differences in self-concept is observed between impaired and unimpaired individuals may be due to the social campaigns carried out to achieve a higher acceptance of the difference. In general, people in our society live together with impaired people with more normality than a few years ago. The integration and inclusion policies may be positively affecting the factors of interest involved in this type of population.
Normal and visually impaired adolescent students and different dimensions of self-concept

In the present study, the investigator compared the normal and visually impaired adolescent students with respect to various dimensions of self-concept. The result indicates that normal and visually impaired adolescent students differ significantly from each other with respect to dimension – behaviour (I) and popularity (V). This means that the behaviour of NAS and VIAS are not same and they are also not equally popular.

The results get support from the studies of Bernaras et al., 2009; Zyoudi, 2007; Lefshitz et al., 2007; Pandit, 1985; Singh and Raghubha, 1992; Beaty, 1991; Meighan 1971).

But the result also indicates that NAS and VIAS do not differ from each other with respect to dimensions – intellectual and school status (II), physical appearance and attributes (III), anxiety (IV) and happiness & satisfaction (VI). This means both the group shows similar self-concept regarding II, III, IV and VI dimensions.

These results also confirm the findings of other studies – Griffin-Shirley and Nes, 2005; Huurre et al., 1999; Kumar and Meena, 1997; Lopez-Justicia et al., 2000, 2001, 2005 & Lifshitz et al., 2007; Fok and Fung, 2004; Bernaras et al., 2009. However the result contradict the findings of other works – Bala, 1985; Mathur, 1985; Bhatnagar, 1985; Ghai and Sen, 1985; Sharma, 1990.

Relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students

The result shows that there is negative relationship between having high and having low self-concept and emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students. This means that to be highly emotionally adjusted high level of self-concept is not
necessary. The result also shows that there is a positive but negligible relationship between average self-concept and average emotional adjustment of normal adolescent students. This also means that average self-concept is not necessary for average emotional adjustment.

Relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students

The result showed that there is positive relationship between having high, average and low self-concept and emotional adjustment of visually impaired adolescent students. Though it is positive, but not significant at 0.05 level. This shows that high, average and low self-concept is not the condition for high, average and low emotional adjustment. It varies in different condition and situations.

The findings of the study contradict the findings of other studies. In some studies (Beaty, 1991, 1992; Meighan, 1971) have found that visual impairment could be the cause of the feeling of incapacity and inferiority, which may be reflected in a lack of social acceptance, low academic results, physical incapacity, and poor social and emotional adjustment. Thus, circumstances such as the presence of visual impairment have been noted to affect the formation and development of the self-concept negatively.