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The planning and implementation of any research should always be preceded by review of the literature in the associated field as it helps the investigator to get vision into the work done and provides the background and context for the research problem. A review of the related literature is an essential part of research work. It is the base on which the structure of further studies is held and time spent in such survey is a productive phase of research programme. Researcher must know what sources are available, which are likely to be useful and where and how to find them. It enable the researcher to gain acquaintance with the past performance and development in the concerned area. It ensures the investigator to avoid many pitfalls and contribution in broadening his vision with regards to present problems. It also enhance researcher’s ability to make his own contribution towards increasing the previous stock of knowledge either by adding something altogether new or developing the old one with new perspective.

In the present chapter, an attempt has been made to present a brief review of those studies which have some connection with present investigation.

2.1 Review of studies related with peer victimization

Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) investigated whether peer victimization is a cause or consequence of school maladjustment. Participants of the study were 200 kindergarten children of school in Midwestern US. Out of which 105 children were males and 95 female children. Data was calculated from them by administering questionnaire on Perception of Peer Support during individual interview. The study showed that peer victimization is the cause of children school maladjustment, loneliness and school avoidance. Whereas feeling of loneliness is noticeable in children only at the time of victimization was happening, in the end it affects school avoidance by children.

Schwartz, McFadyen-Ketchum, Dodge, Pettit and Bates (1999) conducted longitudinal study to investigate association of child’s early behaviour and later peer victimization. Behaviour checklist was administered to measure behavioural
adjustment of 389 kindergarten and 1st class children. This check list consist subscales on internalizing, externalizing, hyperactivity–impulsiveness, immaturity–dependency behaviour. Results of the study showed that behaviour problems found in the first year of the study were associated with victimization of child in fourth year. The association of peer victimization and behaviour problem was mediated by social preference (acceptance –rejection by peers) and friendships.

Rigby (2000) recommended that the mental health of school children can be undermined by frequent bullying at school and further by having insufficient social support. To assess this claim, the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) was applied to 845 adolescent schoolchildren of South Australia, and to measures the extent of each who reported being bullied at school and the social support available to them. Multiple regression analyses showed that for both genders frequent peer victimization and low social support added significantly and insignificantly to relatively poor mental health.

Hawker and Boulton (2000) presented a meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies, available between 1978 and 1997, of the relationship of peer victimization with psychosocial maladjustment. Effects of mean sizes were calculated for the relationship between peer victimization and each form of maladjustment (depression, loneliness and social anxiety, and universal and social self-worth). The results of the study suggested that victimization is most intensely related to depression, and weakly related to anxiety. There was no proof that victimization is more strongly related to social than to psychological forms of maladjustment. When the same informants were used effect sizes were stronger to assess both victimization and maladjustment as compared to when informants were different. There were some limitations to the studies reviewed, but all together their outcomes provide a strong background for more complex research into the course and cure of victims' distress.

Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton and Scheidt (2001) measured the existence of bullying behaviours among US youth and determined the association of bullying and being bullied with signs of psychosocial adjustment, that includes problematic behaviour, school adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and parenting. Sample of the study consists of 15686 students in grades 6 from 10 private and public school of US who completed WHO’s Behaviour in
School-aged Children survey during the spring of 1998. Self-report of involvement in bullying and being bullied by others. Out of the total sample 29.9% of the sample reported reasonable or frequent involvement in bullying, as a bully (13.0%), one who was bullied (10.6%), or both (6.3%). Males were more involved than females to be both as committers and targets of bullying. Committing and facing bullying were related with poorer psychosocial adjustment; but, different designs of relationship occurred among bullies, those who bullied, and those who involved in both bullied others and were bullied themselves. The behavioural and emotional difficulties related with bullying, as well as the potential abiding undesirable outcomes for these children.

Berntson (2003) researched on peer victimization experiences of two high schools students. The study was conducted on total sample of 115 students from school A and 713 students from school B. These student completed student profile which consist information regarding victimization, loneliness, feeling of safety, classroom climate. Results of the study indicated that both the school children experience low levels of victimization. There were no significant gender difference exists in school A, but boys of school B experienced high peer victimization as compared to girls. Boys from both the school were encounter overt forms of victimization whereas girls were experience relational forms of victimization. Correlational analysis showed similar results for both the school children. Any form of peer victimization physical, verbal and relational victimization were correlated with negative feeling of classroom climate, depressive experiences and feels less safe in school.

Storch, Nock, Warner, and Barlas (2003) investigated the relationship of peer victimization with social-psychological adjustment of Hispanic and African-American children. Participants of the study were 190 children studying in 5th and 6th grade of urban elementary school. To examine victimization, prosocial behaviour, social-psychological adjustment were measured by administering depression, social anxiety, and loneliness standardized questionnaire. Results of the study found that overt and relational victimization were positively related to depression, social avoidance, loneliness and fear of negative evaluation. Boys reported high experiences of overt victimization as compared to girls whereas no gender difference exists in case of relational victimization. Prosocial support from peers had limited association with
depression or social anxiety. No other social psychological variables other than prosocial behaviour moderate the effect of relational victimization.

Asher and Paquette (2003) conducted study to find out association of loneliness and peer relations in childhood. Findings of the study conclude that loneliness in children associated with peer relation. It suggested that loneliness is influenced on whether the children are victimized by their peers, number of friends, quality and durability of the friendships. Children’s peer experience influences their emotional wellbeing. Children who have good quality friendships experience less loneliness.

Nowick (2003) conducted a meta-analysis research to measure the social competence of children with learning disabilities and compare them with low and average to high achievement peers. Sample of the study consists 1659 children with learning disabilities and 5293 children in the comparing group. Further latter group was divided into low achieving group contains 527 Participants and rest of them were children without learning disabilities of average to high achievement. All children from both the groups were from kindergarten to grade 12. Results of the study concluded that according to teacher perception about children with learning disabilities were low in academic achievement and greater risk of social competences as compared to their counterpart. Children with learning disabilities receive negative peer nomination as compared to their comparison group. But when children with learning disabilities were compared with low achieving children on self-perception of social acceptance no significant difference exists between them. However teacher’s perception about social skills for low achieving children was slightly on higher side as compared to children with learning disabilities.

Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, Ruan and the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Bullying Analyses Working Group (2004) determined relationship and bullying behaviour and psychosocial adjustment. They conducted international collaborative study in which cross-sectional survey data were collected from 113200 students on health-related behaviours in 25 countries. Measure of this study was obtained by administering self-report questionnaire on participants. Psychosocial adjustment was evaluated by assessing its dimensions namely emotional adjustment, school adjustment, heath problems, relations with classmates, drug use, and weapon
carrying. Involvement in bullying as bullies, victims, bully-victim ranged 9% to 54% of children. In all the countries bullying was positively correlated with poor psychosocial adjustment for bullies, victims or both. They reported greater health problems and poorer emotional and social adjustment then non-involved children. Victims and bully-victims experienced poorer relationships with peers, whereas bullies and bully-victims reported frequent alcohol use and weapon carrying.

Schreck and Fisher (2004) conducted a study to investigate the fact that family and peer are important factors responsible for individual difference in violent victimization. This study has used data from National Longitudinal study of Adolescent Health to study the influence of family and peers on violent victimization. The study uses routine activities and lifestyle frameworks to show the role played by family in making children less vulnerable to motivated offenders. The results of the study showed that delinquent peers will enhance the risk of falling prey to violent victimization. Overall results of the study showed that certain family and peer context variables play a significant role in predicting violent victimization.

Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, and Kernic (2005) examined the occurrence of bullying during elementary school and its association with school attendance, academic attainment, disciplinary actions, and self-reported emotional state of sadness, safety, and belonging. Sample of the study consists of 30530 third, fourth, and fifth grade students of US. Result of the study shows that 22% of children surveyed were involved in bullying either as a victim, bully, or both and children who involved as victims and bully-victims were more likely to have low achievement. All 3 groups were significantly more likely to feel unsafe at school and victims and bully-victims were significantly report that they feel they don't belong at school.

Graham (2006) conducted a study on peer victimization in school by exploring the ethnic context in—specifically, classrooms' and schools' ethnic composition’. Two important findings arise from the study. First, more ethnic diversity in classrooms and schools diminishes students' feelings of victimization and vulnerability, as there is more balance of power among different ethnic groups. Second, in non-dissimilar classrooms where one ethnic group enjoys a numerical majority, victimized students who are members of the ethnic group that is in the majority may be particularly susceptible to self-blaming ascriptions.
Sullivan, Farrell, and Kliewer (2006) conducted a study “Peer victimization in early adolescence: association between physical and relational victimization and drug use, aggression, and delinquent behaviours among urban middle school students”. Participants of the study consist of 276 eighth grader students attending schools from African American. They were assessed using Problem Behaviour Frequency Scales which includes subscales on physical and relational aggression, use of drug, and delinquent behaviour. Both the gender reported physical and relational victimization. Physical victimization was found to be strongly related to delinquent behaviours and source of stress in both the gender. But boys reported high victimization as compared to girls in all the items except in hair pulling and being kicked. All types of peer victimization significantly correlated with physical and relational aggression but in case of boys physical victimization more significantly correlated to physical aggression as compared to girls. It indicated that physical victimization was significantly associated to cigarette and alcohol use but not to advanced drug use whereas relational victimization was associated to all categories of drug use.

Lapidot-Lefler and Reiter (2007) conducted study on student with intellectual disabilities studying in special education. The sample consists of 186 special education students. Further sample were categorize into three sub groups viz. victims, bully and bully-victim and examined the difference among them in terms of social adjustment and social skills. Result of the study found that no significant difference exists in terms of social skills but bullies and bully-victim showed higher level of bad temperament, hyperactivity, nature to lie and steal and quarrelsome behaviour whereas victims exhibited significantly correlated with emotional and interpersonal behaviour.

Baumeister, Storch and Geffken (2008) examined peer victimization in children with learning disabilities and its correlation with psychosocial variables. Out of the total sample of 303 children searched in psychiatry clinic 77 were children with learning disabilities. Results of the study indicated that peer victimization was related to comorbidity. Children with learning disabilities who had experience comorbidity reported higher peer victimization as compared to children without comorbidity. Parents reported that peer victimization was positively correlated with depressive symptoms, social problems, delinquent behaviour, withdrawal, anxiety, attention problems, and disruptive behaviour.
Wiener and Mak (2009) examined peer victimization in children with and without Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Participants of the study were 104 children out of which 52 were children with ADHD of age 9 to 14 years. According to self-reported children with ADHD experience higher level of victimization as compared to their counterpart. Girls reported higher rates of victimization as compared to boys. But results according to parents teachers, reported that children with ADHD bullied other children mainly children without ADHD. Boys with ADHD bullied more as compared to girls.

Rose, Espelage, and Monda-Amaya, (2009) compared bullying and victimization rates among children of special and general schools. Study was conducted on sample of 7331 children studying in middle school and 14315 children in high school from a Midwestern county registered in general and special education programmes. Sample is further divided into three group namely general education, students with disabilities in self-contained settings, students with disabilities in inclusive settings. The study examined the victimization, perpetration, and fighting rates of students and compared the rate in all the three groups. Result of the study confirmed that children studying in special education showed higher rates of victimization, aggression, and bullying perpetration as compared to children in general class room. Further children in self-contained settings experienced more victimization as compared to children in inclusive settings. They are at greater risk of victimization. Younger and older children studying in special education reported similar rates for fighting perpetration whereas it was lower for older children in general education.

Didden, Scholte, Korzilius, De Moor, Vermeulen, Lancioni, O'Reilly and Lang (2009) examined cyber bullying among children having development and intellectual disabilities studying in special educational settings. Sample of the study consists of 114 students of age 12-19 years with development and intellectual disabilities were taken. Data was collected from the sample with the help of questionnaire containing question concerned with bullying and victimization by electronic media (internet and cell phones), it also contained question related socio-demographic characteristics (IQ, age, gender, diagnosis), self-esteem and depressive feelings. The study reported that students face bullying or victimization at least once in a week. There were no significant difference exist between cyber bullying and age
and gender. Cyber bullying found to be significantly associated with intellectual and development disability of student in special education programme.

Dempsey, Sulkowski, Nichols, Storch, (2009) conducted the study to found the relationship between cyber victimization and psychosocial adjustment using traditional indicators of depressive and social anxiety symptoms. They found only fourteen percent students of the total sample showed that they had been victims of cyber aggression at least one time in the last one month. Cyber victimization was only related with symptoms of social anxiety, not with depression, after regulating for relational and overt victimization.

Wang, Iannotti, Luk, and Nansel (2010) examined co-existence of subtypes of peer victimization (physical, verbal, social exclusion, spreading rumours and cyber). Participants of the study consist of 7475 US students of grade 6th to 10th. Data was collected from the student with the help of self-report. The analysis of the study showed that if one was bullied by at least one type of traditional bullying, 17.8% from them reported experience with cyber victimization i.e. co-existence of traditional and cyber victimization among victims of traditional bullying, in the reverse manner among cyber victims, 95.1% were also traditional victims. Male were more likely to victimized as compared to female whereas no racial/ethnic differences were found with the only exception that Hispanic adolescents.

Griese (2011) investigated prosocial behaviour as protective factor for children’s peer victimization and its subsequent loneliness. Findings of the study suggested that effects of peer victimization might be moderated with prosocial behaviour of children. Study indicated that children who were highly victimized and also prosocial experienced lower levels of loneliness. Children who were engaged in prosocial behaviour use prosocial behaviour for coping strategy as rather than rely on peer social support. Interaction between relational victimization and loneliness were moderated with prosocial behaviour but it was not possible in case of overt victimization. In case of gender interaction of boys prosocial behaviour with relational victimization was more stronger as compared to girls whereas girls perceived social support was significant than boys.

Farmer, Petrin, Brooks, Hamm, Lambert, and Gravelle (2012) conducted study on bullying involvement and the school adjustment of rural students with and without
disabilities. On the sample of 1,389 students of 5th class (745 female, 644 male) containing 145 special education students who were served in general education classrooms for at least 50% of the day were compared bullying involvement status (i.e., bully, victim, bully–victim) and school adjustment. The sample was drawn from all the all geographic areas of the United States. Overall findings of the study found that the relationship between bullying involvement and school adjustment is similar for nondisabled children and students who receive special education. However, students with disabilities have elevated levels of being identified as a victim or as a bully–victim but not as a bully. This resembles with a social interactional view of aggressive behaviour in the classroom.

Frerichs, Maag, Siebecker, Swearer and Wang (2012) conducted study namely “Understanding the bullying dynamic among students in special and general education”. Sample of the study consists of 816 children in total of age 9 to 16 years. Out of the total sample 130 children were divided as (a) specific learning disability (n=51), (b) speech language impairment (n=25), (c) behavioural disorder(n=14), (d) other health impaired(n=21), (e) mild mentally handicapped (n=9) (f) hearing impaired(n=3) receiving special education and 686 children as ‘no disabilities’ studying in general education. Further these children were categorizes in four groups as i.e., ‘observable’, ‘non-observable’, ‘behavioural disorder’, and ‘no disability’ to examined the difference in bullying, victimization and prosocial behaviour. ANOVA was used for analysis of the data in the study. Results of the study indicated that no gender difference was found on bullying and victimization. However grade difference exists in student in general education and no grade difference exists in students in special education. Students with disabilities showed poor pro social behaviour than peers in general education.

Lindsay and Mcperson (2012) conducted study on children and youth with cerebral palsy and explored exclusion and bullying at school among these children. The sample of the study was 15 children with disabilities. They use qualitative in-depth interviews for the selection of sample. Results of the study showed that these children experience social exclusion from both teachers and peers. Socio-contextual environment and teachers’ attitudes toward children with disabilities influenced the social exclusion by peers. Results also showed that bullies use both form of social
exclusion may be implicit or explicit which leads them to use verbal and physical victimization.

Kouwenberg, Rieffe, Theunissen, and Rooij (2012) examined the role of parents in reducing the social problems, peer victimization in children who were deaf hearing or hard to hearing. Participants of the study consisted of total of 188 children out of which 94 were deaf and 94 with hearing. Findings of the study showed that deaf or hard to hearing children reported more victimization as compared to their hearing peers. They experienced feeling of more ignored, received more mean comments, and reported fewer invitations to parties than their counterpart. No gender difference existed on peer victimization in both the groups. Peer victimization in children according to child reports, found to be negatively associated with parental sensitivity in both the groups it was and positively correlated with sadness and anger. Parental sensitivity and parents who challenge their children disability to hear, motivate them to become competent in the practical, emotional, cognitive and social factors of life being less victimized. Moreover children who are deaf or hard hearing studying in special school were at high risk of victimization as compared to deaf or hard hearing children studying in regular school.

Ates, Rasinski, Yildirim, and Yildiz (2012) examined the perception of Turkish parents with dyslexic children and the problems faced by them and their children in school. By the method of purposeful sampling seven parents were selected for the study with dyslexic children. The qualitative case study technique was used for the observation. Results of the study point out that learning disabled students were observed more negatively by parents, teachers, and peers. They faced exclusion, ignored, rejected and various bullying behaviour from their peers and teachers. Dyslexic girl students face more problems as compared to boys. Parents mentioned another problems that attitudes of teacher towards their children, time taken by the school in identification of dyslexia and wrong practices used by the teacher in the class room.

Dhillon and Babu (2013) investigated about peer conflicts of Indian children. Sample of the study consists of 40 children both boys and girls from class 1 to 5. The purpose of the study was to measure children perception about their peer conflicts. Interviewed technique was used for investigation. Results of the study found that
younger children experienced lower frequencies of peer conflicts and these too for short interval, whereas older girls experienced it for more frequent duration of conflicts depended on their intensity. To windup the conflicts elder boys felt that controlling anger was important and girls used sadness and guilt to resolve the conflicts. Both felt that anger and impulsivity motivate them to fight.

Shekhar, Senha, and Bhagat (2014) investigated peer victimization and its psychosocial correlation. The study was conducted on sample of 200 school children of age 10 to 14 years studying in Govt. and private schools of Jammu region. Finding of the study indicated that children from govt. and private school differ significantly on variable peer victimization. Govt. school children victimized more as compared to private school children. Both the group differs significantly on loneliness and depression. Whereas no gender difference exists in any of the variable

Marjorie and Mcgee (2014) examined the relationship between disability status and psycho social distress was mediated by exposure to peer victimization. Sample of the study consists of 6664 students of 11th grade. Results of the study provided support for peer victimization as a partial facilitator of the association between disability status and psychosocial distress. However results did not provide support for gender as a moderator of the effects of peer victimization on psychosocial distress.

Kavnak, Lepore, Kliewer, and Jaggi (2015) conducted a study on peer victimization and succeeding disruptive behaviour in school and investigated whether youth’s anger regulation coping might decrease the positive association between peer victimization and following aggressive behaviour. Sample of the study consists of 485 students of 7th-grade (55% female, average age = 12.8 years) and their teachers. Results of the study showed significant interactive effects of baseline anger regulation and peer victimization on teacher-rated aggressive behaviours. Findings of the study suggested that improving students’ ability to regulate their anger may be protective in the face of peer victimization and reduce aggressive behaviour.

**Summary of the Reviews**

The review of literature related to peer victimization has shown that peer victimization is a cause or consequence of school maladjustment, loneliness and
school avoidance (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996; Storch, Nock, Warner & Barlas 2003), social physique anxiety, loneliness, and internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems (Storch, Milsom, Braganza, Lewin, Geffken, & Silverstein, 2006), delinquent behaviour, withdrawal, anxiety, attention problems and disruptive behaviour (Baumeister, Eric & Gary, 2008). Peer victimization is most intensely related to depression, and weakly related to anxiety (Hawker & Boulton, 2000). Behaviour problems of child found in the early year of the study are associated with peer victimization in the later life of child. The association of peer victimization and behaviour problem is mediated by social preference (acceptance – rejection by peers) and friendships. Committing and facing bullying are related with poorer psychosocial adjustment; but, different designs of relationship occurred among bullies, those who bullied, and those who involved in both bullied others and are bullied themselves (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton & Scheidt, 2001; Schwartz, McFadyen-Ketchum, Dodge, Pettit & Bates, 1999). Frequent bullying at school and having insufficient social support can damage mental health of the children (Rigby, 2000). Boys encounter overt forms of victimization whereas girls experiences relational forms of victimization (Berntson, 2003). No significant difference was reported by (Shekhar Senha, & Bhagat (2014). In another study boys reported high experience of overt victimization as compared to girls whereas no gender difference exists in case of relational victimization (Storch, Nock, Warner & Barlas 2003). Whereas another study shown that both girls and boys reported physical and relational victimization (Sullivan, Farrell & Kliwer, 2006).

Any form of peer victimization i.e. physical, verbal and relational victimization is correlated with negative feeling of classroom climate, depressive experiences and feels less safe in school (Berntson, 2003). Physical victimization has found to be strongly related to delinquent behaviours, substance use and source of stress (Sullivan, Farrell, and Kliewer, 2006)

Children with some disabilities are at greater risk of victimization. Children with learning disabilities receive negative peer nomination as compared to their comparison group. But when children with learning disabilities compared with low achieving children on self-perception of social acceptance no significant difference exists between them (Nowick, 2003). Children with learning disabilities experience more victimization as compared to children without learning disabilities (Baumeister,
Eric & Gary, 2008). They are at greater risk of victimization (Rose, Espelage & Monda-Amaya 2009). Similarly children with ADHD experience higher level of victimization as compared to their counterpart (Wiener & Mak, 2009). Children with cerebral palsy experience social exclusion from their peers (Lindsay & Mcperson, 2012). Peer victimization may act as a partial facilitator of the association between disability status and psychosocial distress (Marjorie & Mcgee, 2014). Dyslexic children may face exclusion, ignored, rejected and various bullying behaviour from their peers and teachers (Ates, Rasinski, Yildirim,& Yildiz, 2012). Grade difference exists in student in general education and no grade difference exists in students in special education (Frerichs, Maag, Siebecker, Swearer and Wang, 2012). Also Cyber bullying found to be significantly associated intellectual and development disability (Didden, Scholte, Korzilius, De Moor, Vermeulen, Lancioni, O'Reilly & Lang, 2009) and it is significantly associate with psychosocial adjustment ( Dempsey, Sulkowski, Nichols & Storch, 2009).

Involvement in bullying not only effects the adjustment of victims but also it affects bullies, victims or bully-victim. They reported greater health problems and poorer emotional and social adjustment as compared to non involved children. (Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, Ruan & the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Bullying Analyses Working Group, 2004). Due to involvement in bullying make the child feel unsafe in school. Peer victimization has positive association with lower the level of academic attainment, low school attendance, increase disciplinary actions, and self-reported emotional state of sadness (Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara & Kernic (2005).

Peer victimization and psychosocial adjustment variables are not related to age or BMI. Whereas inverse relation exists between the reports of peer victimization and the levels of physical activity and negative relation exists between physical activity and both loneliness and depressed mood (Storch, Milsom, Braganza, Lewin, Geffken & Silverstein (2006). In non-diverse classroom, ethnic group victimized those children who are at risk of self-blaming (Graham, 2006). In terms of social skills no significant difference exists between bullies, bully- victims. But bullies and bully-victim showed higher level of bad temperament, hyperactivity, nature to lie and steal and quarrelsome behaviour where as victims exhibited significantly correlated with emotional and interpersonal behaviour (Lapidot-Lefler & Reiter, 2007).
Pro social behaviour acts as protective factor for children’s peer victimization and its subsequent loneliness (Griese, 2011). Students with disabilities showed poor pro social behaviour than peers in general education (Frerichs, Maag, Siebecker, Swearer and Wang, 2012). Parental sensitivity and parents who challenge their children disability to hear motivate them to become competent in the practical, emotional, cognitive and social factors of life being less victimized (Kouwenberg, Rieffe, Theunissen & de Rooij, 2012). Govt. school children victimized more as compared to private school children. Both the group differs significantly on loneliness and depression (Shekhar Senha, & Bhagat (2014). By improving students’ ability to regulate their anger may be protective in the face of peer victimization and reduce aggressive behaviour (Kavnak, Lepore, Kliewer, & Jaggi, (2015).

2.2 Review of studies related with parental involvement

Young and Roopnarine (1994) conducted study on father’s childcare involvement and functioning styles, and support for childcare in the children with and without disabilities. Result of the study found that there were no significant differences in paternal involvement as a function of the child's disability.

Paulson (1994) examined the relationship of parenting style and parental involvement on children’s school achievement. Sample of the study consists of 247 children’s of 9th grade of different communities. To explore the relationship of parenting with child’s achievement perception of both children as well as parents on maternal and paternal demandingness, responsiveness, and parental involvement were measured. Results showed that according to children’s reports of parenting along with parent involvement was significantly predicted children’s achievement outcome but this was not according to parent’s perception.

Sui-Chu and Willms (1996) investigated the effect of parental involvement on achievement of eighth grader. Data for the study was drawn from the NELS, which contained sample of 1,052 eighth grader students, their parents and teachers from public and private schools in the United States. The findings of the study showed that SES had a significant positive relationship with parental involvement. It showed positive effects on achievement and negative effects linked with learning and behavioural problems. Significant gender difference exists in the involvement of parents. Male students reported more parental communication with school as
compared to female, whereas female reported more discussion by parents with them at home. However home supervision was higher for male and there exists no gender difference in levels of school participation. Children with learning and behaviour problems had fewer discussions and less supervision by their parents at home, also parents showed less participation in their children’s schools. Further findings of the study showed that parent’s participation as volunteers or attending PTO meetings had uncertain effect on child’s reading achievement and insignificant effect on mathematics achievement but parental home involvement has the strongest relationship to educational achievement.

Davis (1999) conducted study to measure parent involvement and its association with parent and child adjustment. Sample of the study consists of 355 parents, on them Parent Involvement in Education Scale was administered. Also for the analysis other factors like family enumerations, parent adjustment, child adjustment (i.e., learning behaviours), and environmental adjustment were administered. Findings indicated that according to teacher rating, out of four factors of parental involvement home monitoring, school engagement, school presence, and educational preparation only home monitoring was found to be influence learning behaviour of children positively. Home monitoring positively influenced child’s learning and motivation for competence. Also parents were found to be lower in all types of parental involvement if they scored low self-esteem.

Sacker, Schoon, and Bartley (2002) examined role of social inequalities in children’s developmental resources and its influence in children’s educational achievement and psychosocial adjustment. Data of the study was taken from the National Child Development Study consisted of total sample 15468 individual which were followed at the age of 7, 11 and 16 years. The study applied two models on them. Both gave evidence that child’s environment in which he was raised get affected from social class of the family and it influenced educational achievement and psychosocial adjustment. First model ‘A class inequalities’ determined social class inequalities at three transition stages of ages 7, 11 and 16 years. Second model was contextual-systems model which explained pathways from family social class to student’s scholastic achievement and psychosocial adjustment with the help of factors: material deprivation, school composition, parental involvement and aspirations. Social class inequalities in psychosocial adjustment found to be less as compared to scholastic
achievement. The contextual-systems models showed that parental involvement found to be a working link between social class and pupil achievement and adjustment. Parental involvement is influenced by material conditions and parental aspiration.

Morrison, Rimm-Kauffman and Pianta (2003) conducted a longitudinal study to measure the relation of mother–child interaction at entry level and social and academic success of children in middle school. Examination of relation was measured after controlling variables like mother’s education, family background, child’s IQ, and gender. Children's social and academic success in school was assessed by teacher report. Findings of the study reported that positive mother-child interaction at the time of kindergarten was associated to less probability of behaviour problems and greater academic performance in middle school, even when controlling for demographic factors.

Barnard (2004) investigated parental involvement in elementary school and its relation with educational attainment to children through high school. Participants of the study were taken from the Chicago Longitudinal Study (CLS), out of the original sample 1539 only 1165 participants were taken for the present study. Ratings of parent’s school involvement and teacher school involvement were significantly correlated. Further teacher rating indicated that significant relation exists between parent’s school involvement and school dropout. Higher the parent’s school involvement lowers the school dropout rates. Similarly parent’s school involvement was significantly linked with high school completion of their children. Thus teacher ratings of parent’s home or school involvement were significantly related with all educational outcomes. Whereas parent’s rating of home involvement or school involvement were not associated with student’s high school completion, highest grade completed and school dropout of children.

Ahuja (2006) in a study of parental involvement and academic achievement across various SES levels revealed that academic achievement of high, average and low parental involvement groups were not significantly different. A sample of 100 students of ninth class was selected from Govt. Model schools of Chandigarh. SES scale of Dev Mohan, Parent-child interaction by Tritha, Rao and cumulative achievement scores from school records were used to collect the data. The findings indicated that SES of the family and parental involvement were associated with each
other and there significant interaction effect of SES and parental involvement on academic achievement of students.

Carlson (2006) examined the role of father involvement and family structure on behavioural outcomes of children. This study used data from survey of National Longitudinal Youth consists of sample size N=2,733. Findings of the study showed that children whose fathers were more involved in their lives and converse essential decisions with them, reported lower levels of aggression, anxiety, depression, had high self-esteem and less behaviour problems than children who got less paternal involvement. No significant gender difference exists in father’s involvement.

Hickman (2007) investigated the barriers that hamper parental involvement. Data was collected from 25 Participants of urban high school located in Tennessee with the help of in depth interview. Families of the sample belonged to disadvantaged, urban backgrounds. Findings of the interview reported the barriers that obstruct parental involvement in child’s education according to parent’s perception were comprise of time constraint, family responsibilities, the parents own educational experience, lack of teacher co-operation, lack of communication, and the relationships concerning community and school.

Al-Yagon (2007) investigated the role of maternal personal resources in restraining the effects of learning disabilities (LD) on children’s socio emotional and behavioural adjustment. Data was collected from the sample of 110 mother-children which consists of 59 mothers having children with learning disabilities of age 8 to 11 years and 51 mothers have children without learning disabilities. Questionnaires on Loneliness and Social Dissatisfaction, Sense of Coherence, Attachment Style, and Hope scales were administered to both the groups of children with and without disabilities and scales on three maternal resources namely mother’s coping strategies, affect, and mother’s attachment style in moderating the effect of LD were administered on mother. Initial analysis of the study by MANOVA indicated that significant difference exists on all children’s measured variable. Children with learning disabilities reported higher loneliness, a lower sense of coherence, lower agency (goal-directed energy), lower pathways (planning to meet goals), and less attachment security compared to children without disability. Also according to mother’s rating, children with LD were rated high in emotional, social, and behaviour.
problems as compared to their peers. Finding of the study also indicated that significant relationship exists between children’s disabilities and some of the personal maternal resources. Mother’s personal resources moderate the effect of learning disabilities on children’s social and emotional adjustment problems.

Ingram, Wolfe and Lieberman (2007) investigated the role of parental involvement which would at-risk populations in achieving high in schools from low-income families. Data was collected from a sample of 200 parents whose children attend three Chicago public elementary schools and also of the high achieving students belongs to low-income families. Results of the study indicated that out of six Epstein’s framework of parent involvement (Parenting, Learning at Home, Communicating, Volunteering, Decision Making, and Collaborating with the Community) only two namely ‘parenting’ and ‘learning at home’ had a substantial positive effect on student’s achievement. This study suggested that parents, teachers, schools and administrators should join together to enhance those aspects of parental involvement which assist in high achievement of students.

Mo and Singh (2008) measured the effect of parent-child relationships and involvement in children’s academic achievement and attainment. The sample of the study was taken from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health of Wave I data. For the study three types of parental relation and involvement were assessed namely parental involvement in school, parent-child relationship, and parents’ educational aspiration for the child. Three types of engagement of students’ namely behavioural, emotional, and cognitive engagement and school performance were assessed in the given study. Findings of the study reported that parents’ involvement had significant effects on students’ school engagement. There were no significant gender-based differences in either parent’s involvement or students’ engagement, only academic performance was significantly different between male and female students. Parent’s relationship, involvement and student’s school engagement had direct effect on children’s academic performance. Thus findings suggested that highly involved parents would encourage their children for higher school engagement, and this will lead to higher school achievement.

Barkauskiene (2009) examined the role of parenting for the adjustment of children with and without learning disabilities. Participants of the study consist of 204
children from 8 to 11 years old, out of which 102 children were students with learning disabilities and equal number of children without learning disabilities. Further learning disabilities group was subdivided into two groups according to the types of disabilities (63 children with multiple LD and 39 children with single LD). ‘Child Behaviour Checklist’ was used to measure child’s adjustment difficulty problem and to assess parenting ‘Involvement in Child’s Learning Scale’ was used. Correlation exists between parent’s rating and teacher rating about child’s behaviour. After examination of the relationship between parenting patterns (in learning situations at home and affection toward the child) and children’s LD group, results of the study showed that exercising a high control by mother in learning situations along with negative expression feelings toward a child was incident for mothers of children with multiple LD. No such relationship was found between single LD and parenting pattern. Children with multiple LD was related with more difficulties in emotional and behavioural domain and parenting can moderated relationship between multiple LD and high internal, external problem behaviour, attention difficulties; and association between single LD and attention difficulties. No significant relation were found between multiple or single learning disabilities and adjustment problems.

Rogers, Wiener, Marton and Tannock (2009) compared two groups of parents having children with and without ADHD on variable parent’s involvement in child’s learning. Data was collected from the parents of 101 children of age 8 to 11 years, out of the total 53 children were with ADHD and 48 children were without ADHD. Findings of the study reported that if level of education of parents were controlled even then parents with ADHD children showed low self-efficacy in their ability to help their children. Parents of ADHD children reported that they feel less greeted in school, teacher of their children sent frequent request for more involvement and they had less time and energy for involvement in school as compared to parents of children without ADHD.

Azabdaftari and Azabdaftari (2009) conducted a five year longitudinal study to examine the relationship of parental involvement and child’s satisfaction with schooling in children with specific learning disabilities. The sample of the study consisted of 200 parents of children studying in elementary and guidance school in Tehran, Iran. Out of the total 200 children 17 children were found to be diagnosed with specific learning disability. These children were compared with other children
Without disabilities. The nature of parental involvement of children with specific learning disabilities was significantly different from the involvement of parents without learning disabilities. Parents of children with specific learning disabilities were reported to more concern with children’s immediate learning environment (like their school, homework, their teacher, parent-teacher meetings). They were less satisfied with the school and the amount of homework their children receive as compared to parents of children without disabilities. Whereas parents of children without learning disabilities involved more in school by fundraising, joining general meetings, and volunteering.

Tan and Goldberg (2009) conducted study to measure relation between parental involvement and children's grades and adaptation to school. Sample of the study consists of ninety-one families (91 mothers, 91 fathers) with a child in grades K-5. School Attitude Scale was administered on parents to measure child’s attitude towards school and child’s grades were obtained from parent and teacher reports. Analysis of the study showed that children of high family income enjoyed more in school and got higher grades. Significant correlation exists between children’s school anxiety and their grades. Significant association exists between parental involvement and children’s school anxiety as well as children’s school enjoyment. If mothers were more involved in school homework children reported to have lower anxiety. Results indicated that mother’s involvement was not differentiated according to gender of the child whereas father’s involvement was tended to engage in more interpersonal involvement with their daughters as compared to sons. Fathers were found to influence their child's school adaptation, child's adjustment to school and achievement in school over maternal involvement.

Adams (2010) examined the association between parent involvement and a child's transferal into kindergarten. Analysis of the study reported that parental involvement had influence on all the outcomes (like reading, and self-control) but association was very weak. Even parental involvement was not able to predict child’s school adjustment. Implication of the study suggested that other factors of parental involvement should be assessed to find out relationships between parental involvement and self-control and between parental involvement and reading.
Vellymalay (2012) conducted a study to examine the relation between school-parents cooperation and parental involvement in enhancement of child’s education. Data was collected from the 150 Indian children studying in National Type Tamil Schools from Malaysia. Structured interview and questionnaires were used for collection of data related to the school-parents partnership and the parents’ involvement strategies. Results of the study indicated that mothers spend more time in helping their children’s education. Mothers were more involved with their children. The attention and support given by school to parents enhance parental involvement in school. More the efforts taken by school authority for involving parents and hold activities which were suitable according to time constraint of parents, more the parents show parental involvement in child’s education. Thus study suggested that more the cooperation and support given by the school to the parents greater would be the parental involvement.

Shashi and Mishra (2012) investigated parent’s involvement in their children’s activities. Data was collected from 60 parents from Lucknow city. The study concluded that parent’s want betterment for their child but lack of implementation of effective parental involvement leads to poor understanding of home and school activity. Results showed that no significant difference exists between parental involvements in children’s activity.

Chowa, Masa, and Tucker (2013) conducted a study to measure the effects of parental involvement on academic performance of Ghanaian youth. Study used baseline data of the Youth Save experiment. In which 6252 youth were Participants of the experiment, out of which only 3083 youth whose parents or guardian was also interviewed during experiment were selected. Analysis of the study showed that both types of parental involvement viz. home and school involvement were predictor of children’s academic achievement but the direction of prediction was different. Parental home involvement showed significant and positive relation with scholastic achievement and school involvement was negatively related with scholastic achievement. Findings of the study reported that parent’s monitoring and encouragement at home showed positive impact on scholastic achievement. Whereas role of negative finding of parental school involvement was not clear.
Vukovic, Roberts and Wright (2013) examined the role of parental involvement in reducing mathematical anxiety and enhancing mathematical achievement. Data reported in the study consists of 78 parents and their children of second-grade with mean age 7 years. Questionnaires on mathematics anxiety, whole number arithmetic, word problems, and algebraic reasoning were administered on children and survey of parental involvement was assessed from their parents. Results of the study indicated that influence of parental involvement in children’ mathematical achievement by decreasing their mathematics anxiety depends on the nature of parental involvement and the kind of mathematics. The mediation analyses established that the parental home support and expectations factor reduced mathematics anxiety in children and influenced children’s performance on word problems.

Fite, Cooley, Williford, Frazer and Pierro (2014) conducted a study to find out the link of peer victimization and parental involvement associated with academic performance. Sample of the study consists of 704 elementary school-children (51% female) of 5th grade. Results of the study indicated that high levels of peer victimization, mainly relational victimization, were related with lower levels of academic performance at both high and low levels of parental involvement for both boys and girls. But, the highest levels of academic performance were obvious when parental involvement was high and relational victimization were low, and the lowest levels of academic achievement happened when parental involvement was low and levels of relational victimization were high.

Badri, Qubaisi, Rashedi and Yang (2014) examined the relationship between parental involvement and child’s behaviour adjustment. It also measured the effect of the parental involvement on the three behaviour constructs. Sample of the study consists of 59 KG school teacher of Abu Dhabi. The analysis of the study identified that the relationships exists between the three constructs of behaviours viz. externalizing, internalizing and hyperactive and the teacher perceptions of parent involvement and class performance. Negative and significant correlation were exists between parental involvement and the three behaviour constructs. Significant results were found when parent’s talks with school teacher on regular basis. Parental involvement enhanced children's behavioural adjustments to school. But no such significant influence was found due to student gender.
Yap and Jorm (2015) investigated the parental factors associated with childhood anxiety, depression and internalizing behaviour problems. PRISMA method was used for review and meta-analysis. Sample of the study consists of children of age 5-11 years range and 141 articles matched with condition of the present study. Analysis of the study showed that no parental factor had association with anxiety outcome in children whereas those parental factors having sound evidence base reported more risk of depression and internalizing behaviour problems in children. These factors include over involvement, less parents warmth for child, and more abusive parenting.

Kumari and Chmundesweri (2015) examined the relationship of parental involvement, self-regulated learning of the children, scholastic achievement. Participants of the study consist of 300 children of high school student studying in different system viz. state, matriculation and central board school. Results of the study showed that significant correlation exists between parental involvement, self-regulated learning of the children, scholastic achievement. Significant differences were reported by different categories of schools in relation of parental involvement, self-regulated learning of the children, scholastic achievement. Children of central board school reported better parental involvement, self-regulated learning and academic achievement as compared to other categories. Girls were found to be better in all the three variables.

**Summary of the Reviews**

Above review of studies related to parental involvement has shown that parent involvement is significantly associated with children’s achievement outcome (Paulson, 1994; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996), lower children’ school anxiety as well as children’s school enjoyment (Tan & Goldberg, 2009). Whereas no significant difference was found in parental involvement due to child's disability (Young & Roopnarine, 1994). Significant gender difference exists in the involvement of parents (Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996).

Parental home monitoring positively influenced child learning and motivation for competence (Davis, 1999). Moreover Parental home involvement was significantly linked with high school completion of their children (Barnard, 2004). Parenting and learning at home had a substantial positive effect on student’s
achievement (Ingram, Wolfe & Lieberman, 2007), but another study reported negative relation between parental school involvement and scholastic achievement (Chowa, Masa & Tucker, 2013). Parental home support and expectations factor reduced mathematics anxiety in children and influenced children’s performance on word problems (Vukovic, Roberts & Wright, 2013). Parent’s relationship, involvement and student’s school engagement had direct effect on children’s academic performance. Highly involved parents would encourage their children for higher school engagement, and this will leads to, higher school achievement (Mo & Singh, 2008). Parental involvement enhanced children’s behavioural adjustments to school (Badri, Qubaisi, Rashedi & Yang, 2014) and self-regulated learning of the children (Kumari and Chmundesweri, 2015). Some study found that parental involvement was not able to predict child’s school adjustment (Adams, 2010).

Parental involvement is found to be a working link between social class and pupil achievement and adjustment. Parental involvement is influenced by material conditions and parental aspiration (Sacker, Schoon & Bartley, 2002). Positive mother-child interaction at the time of kindergarten was associated to less probability of behaviour problems and greater academic performance (Morrison, Rimm-Kauffman, & Pianta, 2003). Parental involvement in early childhood is positively associated with success in later life (Barnard, 2004). Socioeconomic status of family and parental involvement were associated with each other and together there is significant effect on academic achievement of students (Ahuja, 2006). Children whose fathers were more involved in their lives and converse essential decisions with them, reported lower levels of aggression, anxiety, depression, had high self-esteem and less behaviour problems than children who got less paternal involvement (Carlson, 2006).

Barrier that obstruct parental involvement are time constraint, family responsibilities, the parents own educational experience, lack of teacher co-operation, lack of communication, and the relationships concerning community and school (Hickman, 2007). Mother’s personal resources moderate the effect of learning disabilities on children’s social and emotional adjustment problems (Al-Yagon, 2007). Parental involvement and parenting can moderate relationship between multiple LD and high internal, external behaviour problem, attention difficulties; and association between single LD and attention difficulties (Barkauskiene, 2009). For more parental involvement teacher sent frequent request to the parents of children
with ADHD and they had less time and energy for involvement in school as compared to parent’s of children without ADHD (Rogers, Wiener, Marton & Tannock, 2009). Parents of children with specific learning disabilities were reported to more concern with children’s immediate learning environment (Azabdaftari & Azabdaftari, 2009). Father’s involvement was found to influence their child's school adaptation, child's adjustment to school and achievement in school over maternal involvement (Tan & Goldberg, 2009). But another study reported that mothers were more involved with their children as compared to father (Vellymalay, 2012).

High levels of peer victimization were related with lower levels of academic performance at both high and low levels of parental involvement. But, the highest levels of academic performance were obvious when parental involvement was high and relational victimization were low (Fite, Cooley, Williford, Frazer & Pierro, 2014). Over involvement, less parental warmth for child, and more abusive parenting had association with anxiety outcome in children (Yap & Jorm (2015).

2.3 Review of studies related with adjustment

Lewandowski and Arcangelo (1994) examined the social adjustment and self-concept of children with and without learning disabilities. Sample of the study consists of 81 adults out of which 40 were designated as with “learning disabilities” and received special education services whereas 41 had regular education programming. Data was collected from the sample by administering questionnaire on Social Adjustment Scale-Self Report and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale together with data on IQ and achievement test scores. Findings of the study indicated that significant difference exists between both the group on the social adjustment and self-concept. Children with learning disabilities reported low in self-concept. Study indicated that scores of achievement and IQ measures together were good predictors of social adjustment in children.

Ladd, Kochenderfer and Coleman (1997) examined the influence of various types peer relation (friendship, peer acceptance, and peer victimization) on children’s adjustment. Children adjustment was assessed with measures of “(1) school affect (loneliness and social dissatisfaction), (2) school liking and avoidance, and (3) school performance (academic readiness and classroom involvement)”. Participants of the study consist of sample of 200 children of age 5 to 6 years. Results of the study
suggested that not all rejected children were victimized and not all victimized children were rejected. Also it indicated that the relative relation of each form of peer relationship to adjustment of children provided confirmation of both unshared (i.e., unique) and shared (i.e., redundant) associations, depending on the type of adjustment (or maladjustment) inspected. The child’s adjustment will possibly influenced with experience that children face in different forms of peer relationship. Children's experience to peer victimization leads to the development of negative perceptions about school (i.e., expressed school avoidance and start feelings of loneliness in school).

Ketsetzisb, Ryan and Adams (1998) examined the relationship family processes, family relations, school-focused parent-child interactions, personal characteristics of child and school based social adjustment. The study was conducted on sample of 161 fourth-grade and 151 seventh-grade children of Roman Catholic school district in Southern Ontario. Significant consistent and direct association was found between child characteristics and social adjustment. Internalizing behaviour problems of children were significantly and negatively related with assertiveness and tolerance of frustration. Whereas assertiveness and tolerance of frustration were related to support from the mother and it is negatively associated with family conflict. Finding support that personal characteristics of Child make important contributions to the child's own school adjustment. Also greater frustration tolerance and academic success were predictive of good school social adjustment. No significant association was found between self-esteem and school adjustment. Parent’s pressure reduced intellectual effectiveness which leads to more internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems.

Woodward and Fergusson (1999) examined relationship of peer relation problems in childhood and psychosocial adjustment in adolescence. The relationship of peer relationship and psychosocial adjustment was explained with the effect of family background (Maternal age, maternal education, family socio economic status, family type and ethnicity), child functioning (intelligence, conduct problem and attention problem) and parenting factors (maternal avoidance of punishment, maternal emotional responsiveness and change of parents). Participants of the study were part of Christchurch Health and Development longitudinal Study. Data was gathered from 964 children using different techniques by parent interviews, teacher assessments,
child interviews, standardized psychometric tests, and medical and official records. Firstly at the age of 9 years information regarding peer relationship of the sample was collected by the comprehensive interview of their teachers and in the second part of the study at the age 18 years sample members were interview to assess the psychosocial outcome. Results of the study indicated that majority of the sample as rated by the teacher had good peer relationship, only few were reported as peer relationship problems. These children whose peer relationship placed them in most problematic position had a tendency to be associated with psychosocial adjustment problems in adolescence. No significant interaction were found in child gender and peer relationship problems. Further finding of the study showed that peer relation problems were associated with many factors of their childhood social situations, behavioural adjustment, and parenting factors, rather than a simple direct effect of childhood peer relationship on later psychosocial adjustment.

Shaw (2000) compared college adjustment, social skills, and self-esteem in students with ADHD and without ADHD. Participants of the study consist of 21 undergraduate students with ADHD to 20 students without ADHD. Both the groups were matched on age, gender, and GPA. Findings of the study showed that ADHD students reported lower levels of college adjustment, social skills and self-esteem as compared to students without ADHD. Lastly social skills and self-esteem partially mediated the impact of ADHD on college adjustment.

Murray and Greenberg (2001) investigated the students’ ratings of “student–teacher relationships and school bonds related to indicators of social, emotional, and school-related adjustment among students with and without disabilities”. Participants of the study comprise of 289 students who were enrolled in regular or special education classrooms of elementary schools in Washington State. Measures related to children's social and emotional adjustment were completed by children and teacher. Analyses of data measured showed that students with disabilities reported greater disappointment with their relation with teachers, had poorer school bonds, and supposed to be higher school danger than children without disabilities. Children with disabilities were divided into subgroups namely receiving services for emotional disturbance (ED), mild mental retardation (MMR), learning disabilities (LD) and other health impairments (OHI). These were compared with each other and with children having no disabilities. Findings indicated that children with ED and children
with MMR had poorer relationship with teachers, had greater disappointment with their relation with teachers and had poorer school bonds than children without disabilities. Children with LD and with MMR reported significantly higher school danger in comparison to students without disabilities.

Wiener (2002) examined friendship patterns and adjustment of children with learning disabilities. The study investigated the relationship between friendship, self-concept, loneliness and depression in children with and without learning disabilities. Sample of the study were 232 children out of which 117 were children with learning disabilities and 115 were children without learning disabilities. Results of the study showed that friendships of children with LD were less stable as compared to children without LD. Whereas both the groups of children with and without LD were not different in nominated friends which means number of friends they thought they had. Children with LD had problems in relation repair with their peers. Children with learning disabilities were found to be less accepted by their peer, reported more loneliness, experienced higher level of depression, had poor social skills and lower academic self-concepts as compared to children without learning disabilities. However both children with and without learning disabilities were not differ in self-esteem. Social and emotional adjustment of children was predicted by peer relationship, which includes peer acceptance, peer nomination and quality of friendship.

Al-Yagon, and Mikulincer (2004) conducted a study “Patterns of close relationships and socio emotional and academic adjustment among school-age children with learning disabilities.” The study was conducted on 196 children out of which 98 children were with learning disabilities and 98 were without learning disabilities of age 8 to 11 years. Data was collected from children as well as from teacher. On children self-reported questionnaire on loneliness, coherence and their attachment style were administered and teacher rated their academic function at school. Findings of the study indicated that significant association exists between children with learning disabilities and attachment style. Children with LD reported less attachment security and more attachment avoidance and high anxiety as compared to children without disabilities in close relation. Relationship of children with disabilities and socio emotional and academic adjustment in sense of loneliness, coherence and attachment style found to be higher as compared to their normal peers.
Whereas correlation between attachment style and measure of adjustment in both the group was similar. In both the groups higher level of attachment security was related to lower level of loneliness and high sense of coherence and correlation between attachment avoidance and higher level of loneliness exists for both the group.

Martinez and Semrud-Clikeman (2004) compared three groups namely children with multiple learning disabilities (LD; reading and math), with single LD (reading or math) and typically achieving (TA) peers studying in grades 6 to 8 in inclusive settings regarding their emotional adjustment and school functioning. Participants of the study consist of 120 students divided equally in each group. Findings confirmed that all three groups differ significantly from typically achieving (TA) on school maladjustment, clinical maladjustment, emotional symptoms index, attitude towards school and depression but not from each other. Multiple learning disabilities children reported inferior on emotional adjustment and school functioning as compared to TA peers, but no significant difference exists between multiple LD children and single LD. Significant gender difference exists irrespective of disability status. Girls reported high on emotional problems, social stress, and depression, whereas boys reported higher in school maladjustment.

Arseneault, Walsh, Trzesniewski, Newcombe, Caspi, and Moffitt (2006) investigated the role of bullying victimization in contribution of adjustment problem in children. Study was conducted on cohort of 2232 children. Out of the whole sample, those children were identified who experienced bullying victimization at the age of 5 to 7 years. Then reports about behaviour problem and school adjustment of children was collected from the mother and teacher of these identified children. Findings of the study indicated that pure victims exhibited more internalizing problems and sadness at school as compared to the control group. Pure victims, bully-victims reported more internalizing-externalizing problems, and lesser pro social behaviours as compared to control group.

Raju and Rahamtulla (2007) investigated adjustment problems among school students and individual factor influencing adjustment of children. The sample of the study comprised of 461 students (197 boys, 264 girls) studying in various government and private schools situated in urban and rural areas of Visakhapatnam district, Andhra Pradesh. Findings of the study showed that age of the Participants had no
significant influence on adjustment. Significant influence was reported due to gender on adjustment. Boys and girls differ significantly on the financial and emotional factors of adjustment. English medium school children reported better emotional adjustment as compared to rural school children. Grade in which children were studying, significantly influence family adjustment. Parental education and parental occupation of the children also effect adjustment.

Storch, Milsom, Braganza, Lewin, Geffken, and Silverstein (2006) examined peer victimization, psychosocial adjustment, and physical activity in at-risk-for-overweight and overweight adolescence. Sample comprised of 92 children and adolescents. Children’s body mass index to age was considered as index for overweight or risk at overweight. Findings of the study were strong, positive correlations exists between reports of peer victimization and depressive symptoms, general anxiety, social physique anxiety, loneliness, and internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems. Peer victimization and psychosocial adjustment variables were not related to age or BMI. No significant gender difference exists for study measures except on social physique anxiety. Inverse relation was identified between the reports of peer victimization and the levels of physical activity and negative relation between physical activity and both loneliness and depressed mood.

Hussain, Kumar and Husain (2008) investigated level of academic stress and overall adjustment of public and government high school students of Delhi. Sample of total of 100 students were selected and out of which 50 were from public and 50 were from government school students. Findings of the study indicated that significant difference exists in terms of academic stress and adjustment between both public and government school children. But public school student reported high in academic stress, whereas government school students were better in level of adjustment. As far as relationship between academic stress and adjustment was concerned, negative relation exists between them among both public and government school students.

Amalor, Suresh and Govind (2009) investigated the influence of parental variables like occupational and educational levels of parents on children’s adjustment. Participants of the study were 594 students of higher secondary school. Analysis of the study reported that children with less educated mother were better adjusted as compared to children having more educated mother. During crisis period, children
who take help from parents found to be more adjusted as compared to children who try to find help from other. Study concluded that warm and supporting family atmosphere strongest influencing factor for child’s adjustment.

Patil, Saraswathi and Padakannaya (2009) compared self-esteem and adjustment among children having reading and writing difficulties with their normal peers. Sample of the study was selected based on previous academic performance of the class-tests and teacher’s rating. A total sample was of 418 children out of which 203 were academically poor and 215 were high achieving children. From these two groups children with reading and writing difficulties were screened out. Results of the study indicated that self-esteem was found to be significantly low for children with reading difficulties as compared to children with good reading. Similarly children with writing difficulty were found to be significantly poor self-esteem than children with good readers. Further adjustment scores of children with reading difficulty were significantly lower as compared to good readers. Same trends of results were found in children with writing difficulties and adjustment. Lastly it was concluded that children with reading and writing difficulties were significantly lower in self-esteem and adjustment as compared to good readers.

Sharma and Joshi (2010) examined the relation of family environment with adjustment. The study suggested that family play important role in cognitive and emotional development of every individual. Sample of the study consists of 102 female students of XI & XII class from two districts of Haryana. Data was collected by administering Bell Adjustment Inventory and Family Environment Scale to the participants of the study. Findings of the study indicated that overall adjustment is negatively associated with family environment. Family adjustment has positive association with conflict and negative correlation with achievement orientation, intellectual cultural orientation, active recreational orientation and with organization. Health adjustment is negatively associated with Active Recreational Orientation, Intellectual cultural Orientation and organization. Out of ten components of family environment three like intellectual cultural orientation, active recreational orientation and organization had negative relation with overall adjustment. Further regression analysis of the study indicated that predictors of adjustment were Organization and Active Recreational Orientation.
Rohner, Parmar and Ibrahim (2010) investigated the relationship of perceptions of teacher’s and parent’s (mothers’ and fathers’) acceptance with behavioural control, students’ conduct in school, and psychological adjustment on sample of 205 middle school students in Kuwait. Findings of the study indicated that neither perceptions of teacher’s and parent’s acceptance or behavioural control associated significantly with girls’ school conduct. But both had marginally tendency to be correlated with boys’ school conduct. However both perceived teacher and parental acceptance was correlated with the psychological adjustment of both boys and girls. Moreover teachers’ reported their students to be generally well behaved in school, but boys likely to misbehave more as compared to the girls. Lastly study reported both the gender as psychologically well adjusted.

Betsur and Mahmoudi (2010) investigated the relationship of self-esteem and adjustment. Sample of the study consists of 100 students selected randomly from Mysore city studying in 9th class. Different adjustment (Home, health, social and emotional) of students were measured by using Bell adjustment Inventory and self-esteem in 5 areas-general self, social self, home parents, lie scale and school academic were assessed using Self-esteem inventory. Findings revealed that general self-esteem, social adjustment did not have significant influence on different areas of self-esteem as well as total scores of adjustment. Whereas Home parents self-esteem had positive influence over emotional adjustment and School academic self-esteem had positive effect on health adjustment of the students. In other areas of self-esteem, no significant influence over adjustment was found.

Mills (2010) examined the ‘effect of parenting style, influence on locus of control, self-efficacy on academic adjustment of student’. Sample of the study consists of 2116 undergraduate first year students (763 females and 1353 males) from Ethiopia. Results of MANOVA showed significant and positive sex difference in relation of self-efficacy and academic adjustment (favouring male students. Similarly positive and direct effect was reported for student self-efficacy on achievement motivation. However no gender difference was reported between academic self-efficacy and achievement motivation. Authoritative parenting style was used by parents for female children whereas for male children parents adopted neglectful parenting. Irrespective of gender of child authoritative parenting style reported
positive and direct effect on academic self-efficacy of students as compared to non-authoritative parenting style.

Sharma and Saini (2013) investigated adjustment problems of both the sexes i.e. Boys and Girls. Three dimensions of adjustment health, social and emotional were taken for study. Data was collected from 100 students (50 boys and 50 girls) from rural and urban areas. Findings of the study indicated that there was no gender difference on health, social and emotional adjustment. Also girls were average in the areas of health and social adjustment and reported unsatisfied in emotional dimensions and boys were unsatisfied in health and emotional areas and reported average in dimension of social adjustment. Lastly no significant difference exists between urban and rural students in social adjustment and differs significantly on health and emotional adjustment.

Neeraja and Anuradha (2014) examined adjustment problems faced by children with learning disabilities. Study concluded that children with learning disabilities reported emotional difficulties due to adjustment problems resulting from failure in academic. They faced difficulties in class room, not able to express them easily and reading nonverbal cues, which leads them to problems with peers and difficulties’ in adjustment. They might feel irritated, miserable, isolated, frustrated, or hopeless because of focusing on their problems. Further study concluded that learning disabled children might face problems in academics, social, home and emotional aspects and these problems may be overcome by providing special education classes and parental attention.

Tamannaeifar and Nezhad (2014) compared social, affective, educational adjustment and academic performance among children with learning disabilities and normal children. Data was collected from all the children with learning disability and normal students studying in Qom Province in the elementary school of 3rd to 6th grades during session 2012 to 2013, out of which a sample of 120 was screened out with the help of ease sampling and matched method. Study concluded that children with learning disability score lower on overall adjustment as well as social and educational adjustment as compared to normal students. No significant difference exists on the affective adjustment between children with learning disabilities and
normal students. In addition normal students score significantly higher on academic achievement as compared to children with learning disabilities.

Rajkonwar, Soni and Dutta, (2014) examined “adjustment, level of aspiration, self-concept and academic achievement of visually handicapped school children”. The sample of the study was taken from 400 visually handicapped children of age 12 to 16 years studying in VI to X class of Assam. Findings of the study indicated that no significant gender difference exists on overall adjustment, academic achievement and level of educational aspiration of visually handicapped children. But boys had better self-concept than girls. Results also revealed that there exists no relationship between adjustment, level of educational aspirations, self-concept and academic achievement of visually handicapped children.

Aldarabah, Atyat, and Hamaden (2014) compared parent’s raring styles of gifted and normal children and their relation with child’s academic adjustment. Data was collected from the sample of 345 children of fifth grade studying in Jordan. Findings of the study showed that out of four types of parental rearing style (Rejective, Authorative, Democratic and Autonomic), autonomic style parenting was mostly used by the parents of both gifted and normal children. There were significant differences exist with prevailing style for the gifted and normal children. By results of the study it suggested the importance of parental rearing style in handling of the gifted children and treating them with the style of autonomy and democracy that will positively reflect on children’s social and personal adjustment. Significant difference exists between gifted and normal children on over all scholastic adjustment and its sub dimensions (child's relation with his peers, child's relation with the school's system & child's relation with the scholastic activities). These differences were more in favour of gifted children than their normal peers.

Yunus, Baba, and Wai, (2014) examined the effects of family environment on student academic achievement and adjustment problems in school. Study was conducted on a sample of 168 students of age of 16 – 20 years of school of health Technology Keffi, Nasarawa State. Findings of the study indicated that family environment had no effect on Academic performance of the student; however family environment had significant effect on school adjustment. No gender difference was
reported in school adjustment and academic achievement. Study suggested that parents have to pay attention for their relation with children.

Menaga and Chandrasekaran (2015) examined adjustment of college students and find out differences if exists in terms of gender, types of locality, types of family, type of educational degree, and socioeconomic status of family. Data was collected from the samples of 300 college students studying in Thiruvannamalai District. For the present study descriptive survey method was used. There was significant difference in the adjustment of students in relation to their gender, types of degree, socioeconomic status of family. No significant difference exists in the adjustment of students in relation to their type of locality and type of family. There was no significant difference in adjustment of urban and rural students.

Summary of the Reviews

The review of literature related with adjustment has shown that children with and without learning disabilities differ significantly on the social adjustment and self-concept. Children with learning disabilities reported low in self-concept and social adjustment (Lewandowski & Arcangelo, 1994). Also ADHD students reported lower levels of adjustment, social skills and self-esteem as compared to students without ADHD (Shaw, 2000).

The child’s adjustment has been influenced by many factors one of the factors is peer relationship (Ladd, Kochenderfer & Coleman, 1997). Children whose peer relationship placed them in most problematic position had a tendency to be associated with psychosocial adjustment problems in adolescence (Woodward & Fergusson, 1999). Friendships of children with LD are less stable as compared to children without LD. Social and emotional adjustments of children are predicted by peer relationship, which includes peer acceptance, peer nomination and quality of friendship (Wiener, 2002). Peer victimization is positively related with psychosocial adjustment and negatively related with physical activity (Storch, Milsom, Braganza, Lewin, Geffken & Silverstein, 2006). Bullying victimization can create adjustment problem in children (Arseneault, Walsh, Trzesniewski, Newcombe, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2006).
Another factor that influences child’s adjustment is child’s own characteristics. Significant consistent and direct association was found between child characteristics and social adjustment (Ketsetzisb, Ryan & Adams, 1998). No significant association was found between self-esteem and school adjustment. Age of the Participants had no significant influence on adjustment. Boys and girls differ significantly on the financial and emotional factors of adjustment (Raju & Rahamtulla 2007). Children with reading and writing difficulties are found to be significantly lower in self-esteem and adjustment as compared to good readers (Patil, Saraswathi & Padakannaya, 2009). Positive sex difference exists in relation of self-efficacy and academic adjustment (favouring male students) (Mills, 2010). Whereas no gender difference exists was found by Sharma and Saini (2013) on health, social and emotional adjustment. Significant difference exists in the adjustment of students in relation to their gender, types of degree, socio-economic status of family (Menaga & Chandrasekaran, 2015).

In child’s adjustment role of parents is also significant. Family environment had no effect on academic performance of the student; however family environment had significant effect on school adjustment (Yunus, Baba & Wai, 2014). Parent’s pressure reduces intellectual effectiveness which leads to more internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems (Ketsetzisb, Ryan & Adams, 1998). In schools, adjustment of children are effected by student–teacher relationships and school bonds, which are the indicators of social, emotional, and school-related adjustment among students with and without disabilities (Murray& Greenberg, 2001). Parental occupations and educational levels significantly influence children’s adjustment (Amalor, Suresh & Govind, 2009). Family environment plays important role in cognitive and emotional development of children (Sharma & Joshi, 2010). Parent’s acceptance with behavioural control, has significant relationship with students’ conduct in school, and psychological adjustment (Rohner, Parmar & Ibrahim, 2010). Autonomic style of parenting rearing positively reflects on children’s social and personal adjustment (Aldarabah, Atyat, & Hamaden, 2014).

Children with learning disability are found to score lower on overall adjustment as well as social and educational adjustment as compared to normal students (Tamannaefar & Nezhad, 2014). Relationship of Children with disabilities and socio emotional and academic adjustment in sense of loneliness, coherence and
attachment style found to be higher as compared to their normal peers (Al-Yagon&
Mikulincer, 2004). Children with multiple learning disabilities reported inferior on
emotional adjustment and school functioning as compared to typically achieving
peers, but no significant difference exists between multiple LD children and single
LD (Martinez & Semrud-Clikeman, 2004). Children with learning disabilities
reported emotional difficulties due to adjustment problems resulting from failure in
academic (Neeraja & Anuradha, 2014). When academic stress and adjustment are
concerned, negative relation exists between them (Hussain, Kumar & Husain, 2008).
Self-esteem did not have significant influence on social adjustment. However home
parents’ self-esteem had positive influence over emotional adjustment of children
(Betsur & Mahmoudi, 2010). However no significant gender difference exists on
overall adjustment, academic achievement and level of educational aspiration of
visually handicapped children (Rajkonwar, Soni and Dutta, 2014).

2.4 HYPOTHESES

In the light of objectives stated in chapter I and after reviewing the literature
related to variables of the study, following null hypotheses were formulated by the
investigator.

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between students with learning disabilities
(LD) and students without learning disabilities on variable of peer victimization
and its dimension viz.:

H₀₁.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀₁.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀₁.3 Social Manipulation (SM)
H₀₁.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between students with learning disabilities
(LD) and students without learning disabilities (i.e. Normal children, NLD) on
variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimension viz.:

H₀₂.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀₂.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀₂.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)
H₀₃: There is no significant difference between students with learning disabilities (LD) and students without learning disabilities (i.e. Normal students, NLD) on variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₃.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀₃.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀₃.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀₄: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐI) and average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₄.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀₄.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀₄.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀₄.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀₅: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐI) and average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₅.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀₅.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀₅.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀₆: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐI) and average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₆.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀₆.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀₆.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)
H₀7: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐl) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐₐl) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

- H₀7.1 Verbal victimization (VV).
- H₀7.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V).
- H₀7.3 Social manipulation (SM).
- H₀7.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀8: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐl) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐₐl) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

- H₀8.1 School Involvement (SI)
- H₀8.2 Home Involvement (HI)
- H₀8.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀9: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐl) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐₐl) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

- H₀9.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
- H₀9.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
- H₀9.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀10: There is no significant difference between high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₕₕ) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₕₕ) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

- H₀10.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀10.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)

H₀10.3 Social manipulation (SM)

H₀10.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀11: There is no significant difference between high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD_HI) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_HI) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.: 

H₀11.1 School Involvement (SI)

H₀11.2 Home Involvement (HI)

H₀11.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀12: There is no significant difference between high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD_HI) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_HI) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.: 

H₀12.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)

H₀12.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)

H₀12.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀13: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD_AI) and above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD_AAI) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.: 

H₀13.1 Verbal victimization (VV)

H₀13.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)

H₀13.3 Social manipulation (SM)

H₀13.4 Attack on property (AP)
$H_014$: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AI}$) and above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AAI}$) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

$H_014.1$ School Involvement (SI)
$H_014.2$ Home Involvement (HI)
$H_014.3$ Parent teacher association (PTA)

$H_015$: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AI}$) and above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AAI}$) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

$H_015.1$ Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
$H_015.2$ Social Adjustment (SAD)
$H_015.3$ Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

$H_016$: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AI}$) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{HI}$) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

$H_016.1$ Verbal victimization (VV)
$H_016.2$ Physical victimization (Ph.V)
$H_016.3$ Social manipulation (SM)
$H_016.4$ Attack on property (AP)

$H_017$: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{AI}$) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LD$_{HI}$) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

$H_017.1$ School Involvement (SI)
$H_017.2$ Home Involvement (HI)
$H_017.3$ Parent teacher association (PTA).
H₀₁₈: There is no significant difference between average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐ) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₕᵢ) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₁₈.₁ Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀₁₈.₂ Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀₁₈.₃ Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀₁₉: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐₐ) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₕᵢ) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₁₉.₁ Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀₁₉.₂ Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀₁₉.₃ Social manipulation (SM)
H₀₁₉.₄ Attack on property (AP)

H₀₂₀: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐₐ) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₕᵢ) on the variable of parental involvement and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₂₀.₁ School Involvement (SI)
H₀₂₀.₂ Home Involvement (HI)
H₀₂₀.₃ Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀₂₁: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₐₐₐ) and high intelligence with learning disabilities students (LDₕᵢ) on the variable of adjustment and its dimensions viz.:

H₀₂₁.₁ Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀₂₁.₂ Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀₂₁.₃ Educational Adjustment (EdAD)
H₀22: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐAI) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀22.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀22.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀22.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀22.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀23: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐAI) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀23.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀23.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀23.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀24: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) and above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐAI) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀24.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀24.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀24.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀25: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₐI) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLDₕI) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀25.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀25.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀25.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀25.4 Attack on property (AP)
H₀26: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{AI}) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{HI}) on the variable of parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀26.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀26.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀26.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀27: There is no significant difference between average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{AI}) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{HI}) on the variable of adjustment (AD) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀27.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀27.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀27.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀28: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{AAI}) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{HI}) on the variable of peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀28.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀28.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀28.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀28.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀29: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{AAI}) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD_{HI}) on the variable of parental involvement and its dimensions viz.:

H₀29.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀29.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀29.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)
H₀30: There is no significant difference between above average intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD<sub>AAI</sub>) and high intelligence without learning disabilities students (NLD<sub>HI</sub>) on the variable of adjustment and its dimensions viz.:

H₀30.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀30.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀30.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀31: There is no significant difference between entire sample of male and female students on peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀31.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀31.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀31.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀31.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀32: There is no significant difference between entire sample of male and female students on parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀32.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀32.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀32.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀33: There is no significant difference between entire sample of male and female students on adjustment and its dimensions viz.:

H₀33.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀33.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀33.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀34: There is no significant difference between male and female students with learning disabilities on peer victimization and its dimensions viz.:

H₀34.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀34.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀34.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀34.4 Attack on property (AP)
H₀35: There is no significant difference between male and female students with learning disabilities on parental involvement and its dimensions viz.:

H₀35.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀35.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀35.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀36: There is no significant difference between male and female students with learning disabilities on adjustment and its dimensions viz.:

H₀36.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀36.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀36.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)

H₀37: There is no significant difference between male and female students without learning disabilities on peer victimization (PV) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀37.1 Verbal victimization (VV)
H₀37.2 Physical victimization (Ph.V)
H₀37.3 Social manipulation (SM)
H₀37.4 Attack on property (AP)

H₀38: There is no significant difference between male and female students without learning disabilities on parental involvement (PI) and its dimensions viz.:

H₀38.1 School Involvement (SI)
H₀38.2 Home Involvement (HI)
H₀38.3 Parent teacher association (PTA)

H₀39: There is no significant difference between male and female students without learning disabilities on adjustment and its dimensions viz.:

H₀39.1 Emotional Adjustment (EAD)
H₀39.2 Social Adjustment (SAD)
H₀39.3 Educational Adjustment (EdAD)
$H_0^{40}$: There is no significant relationship between adjustment and peer victimization of students with learning disabilities and its dimensions viz.

$H_0^{40.1}$ Verbal victimization (VV)
$H_0^{40.2}$ Physical victimization (Ph.V)
$H_0^{40.3}$ Social manipulation (SM)
$H_0^{40.4}$ Attack on property (AP)

$H_0^{41}$: There is no significant relationship between adjustment and peer victimization of students without learning disabilities and its dimensions viz.

$H_0^{41.1}$ Verbal victimization (VV)
$H_0^{41.2}$ Physical victimization (Ph.V)
$H_0^{41.3}$ Social manipulation (SM)
$H_0^{41.4}$ Attack on property (AP)

$H_0^{42}$: There is no significant relationship between adjustment and parental involvement of students with learning disabilities and its dimensions viz.

$H_0^{42.1}$ School Involvement (SI)
$H_0^{42.2}$ Home Involvement (HI)
$H_0^{42.3}$ Parent teacher association (PTA)

$H_0^{43}$: There is no significant relationship between adjustment and parental involvement of students without learning disabilities and its dimensions viz.

$H_0^{43.1}$ School Involvement (SI)
$H_0^{43.2}$ Home Involvement (HI)
$H_0^{43.3}$ Parent teacher association (PTA)