Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Every citizen of a nation has the right to enjoy all the possible opportunities and facilities during the span of his or her life in a meaningful manner. The physically challenged persons like visually impaired, hearing impaired etc. are no exception from that. All the possible opportunities should be provided to them so that they may obtain proper education, proper training etc. as normal human beings. Their strong and weak points should be identified as early as possible and alternative ways should be devised quickly as their requirements. They should be offered the opportunities to develop through physically, mentally, emotionally, socially etc. with the highest degree of possibility within their limits through the media of Physical Education and Sports.

Generally, it is observed that limited research works have been done about the problems and status handicapped persons till now. These areas demands more attention to the investigation to reveal unknown dimensions about them.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate about the comparative effect of sensory deficiency on functional response in relation to sensory ability, motor ability and kinesthetic perception.
To conduct the present study, Snellen’s chart was used to measure the visual response, Pure – Tone Audiometry test was used to measure the hearing response respectively. Again Barrow Motor Ability Test was used to measure the motor performance and the kinesthetic perception was measured by Distance Perception Jump Test. All the tests were taken under proper improvisations.

For this study, thirty male and thirty female students of each categories namely normal, hearing impaired and visually impaired (total one hundred eighty students) within the age group of thirteen to seventeen years old were selected randomly from the different schools of Purba Medinipur, Paschim Medinipur, Howrah and Kolkata. The collected data were analyzed statistically on the basis of age, sex and degree of sensory loss through the process of percentage, ‘t’ test, ‘z’ test and Analysis of Variance. Better than normal efficiency in visual response as well as in hearing response were computed through percentage. The mean differences among variables were computed by ‘t’ testing case of small sample. In case of large sample, the data were analyzed by ‘z’ test. Analysis of Variance was computed for comparison among all groups (normal, visually impaired and hearing impaired). For analysis of the result, the level of significance was set at 0.05 level of confidence.

The statistical analysis of the collected data revealed that the sensory response, motor performance and kinesthetic perception of the subjects were different according to their age, sex and degree of sensory loss.
Conclusions

After analyzing the data, the research scholar derived the following conclusions:-

1. Due to loss of hearing, no significant increase in visual response was observed.
2. Hearing Impaired boys were slightly better than girls.
3. Due to loss of vision, no significant increase in hearing response was noticed.
4. No significant differences were found among hearing impaired boys and girls in relation to visual response.
5. Normal students were significantly superior to hearing impaired and visually impaired students in relation to motor ability.
6. Again normal boys and girls were significantly superior to visually impaired boys and girls respectively in relation to motor ability.
7. Further more, normal boys were significantly superior hearing impaired boys and girls in relation to motor ability. But hearing impaired boys significantly superior to normal girls.
8. Both hearing impaired boys and girls were significantly superior to visually impaired boys and girls in relation to motor ability.
9. Normal students were significantly superior to hearing impaired and visually impaired subjects in relation to kinesthetic perception. Again
normal boys and girls were significantly superior to hearing impaired and visually impaired boys and girls in relation to kinesthetic perception.

10. In relation to kinesthetic perception, hearing impaired subjects were significantly superior to visually impaired subjects. It was also observed that hearing impaired boys and girls were significantly superior to visually impaired boys and girls.

11. Due to loss of hearing, no significant increase in visual response was observed among greater and lesser degree of hearing loss students.

12. Due to loss of vision, no significant increase in hearing response was noticed among greater and lesser degree of visual loss students.

13. Normal students were superior to lesser and greater degree of both hearing impaired and visually impaired students in relation to motor ability.

14. Both greater and lesser degree of hearing impaired boys were superior to normal girls in relation to motor ability.

15. Lesser degree of visually impaired students were superior to greater degree of visually impaired students in relation to motor ability.

16. There was no significant difference among subjects of lesser and greater degree of hearing loss in relation to motor ability.

17. In relation to kinesthetic perception, there was no significant difference among hearing impaired subjects of lesser and greater degree of hearing loss.
18. In relation to motor ability, partially visual impaired subjects were also distinctly superior to totally visual impaired subjects.

19. Normal students were distinctly superior to lesser and greater degree of hearing and visually impaired students in relation to kinesthetic perception.

20. Again normal boys and girls were distinctly superior to lesser and greater degree of both hearing and visually impaired boys and girls students in relation to kinesthetic perception.

21. Hearing impaired students were distinctly superior to partially and totally visual impaired students in relation to kinesthetic perception.

22. Again hearing impaired boys and girls were distinctly superior to partially and totally visual impaired boys and girls in relation to kinesthetic perception.

23. Partially visual impaired boys were significantly superior to totally visual impaired boys and girls in relation to motor ability. But totally visual impaired boys were distinctly superior to partially visual impaired girls.

24. Partially visual impaired boys and girls were significantly superior to totally visual impaired boys and girls in relation to kinesthetic perception.

25. Due to loss of hearing, no significant increase in visual was observed as well as no significant increase in visual was observed due to loss of vision during both early and late adolescence period.

26. In respect to motor ability and kinesthetic perception, both early adolescents and late adolescents among normal group were significantly
superior to hearing impaired early and late adolescents students respectively.

27. Hearing impaired students of early and late adolescents were significantly superior to visually impaired early and late adolescents students in relation to motor ability and kinesthetic perception.

28. No significant difference was observed during early and late adolescence period among hearing impaired and visually impaired students.

29. Hearing impaired students having better than normal efficiency were significantly superior to the students having normal and below normal efficiency in relation to motor ability and kinesthetic perception.

30. Again visually impaired students having better than normal efficiency were significantly superior to the students having normal and below normal efficiency in relation to motor ability as well as kinesthetic perception.
**Recommendations**

1. This study was conducted only on hearing impaired and visually impaired students. Such study may extend to the other type of physically challenged students.

2. Such study may be conducted on primary school children, college students etc.

3. The present study was confined to the age, sex and degree of sensory loss only. To get better results and idea, cause and state of handicapped including congenital as well acquired possibilities may be considered for future studies.

4. Similar study may be conducted by involving psychological, sociological and anthropometric variables.

5. In the present study, only a small number of subjects were studied. Future investigations may attempt on a large number of samples among physically challenged students.

6. Other comparative study including physical fitness, motor fitness etc. may also be conducted among different groups.

7. In selection of Adopted Physical Education programme for physically challenged students, the ability of motor performance should be considered as one of the criterion measures.