CHAPTER VII

INTERPRETATION OF DATA AND CONCLUSION

7.1(a)- Main Hypotheses and their Verification:

Hypothesis No. 1- There is no relationship between Self-concept and Socio-economic Status.

There is no correlation between Self-concept and S.E.S. in Physically Disabled children but the correlation does exist by a very small margin in the case of Normal Children which is found significant at 0.05 probability level. Therefore the hypothesis is accepted in the case of Physically Disabled Children but rejected at 0.05 level of significance in the case of Normal Children.

Hypothesis No. 2- There is no relationship between Self-concept and Intelligence.

Self-concept and Intelligence were highly and positively correlated in both the Normal and Physically Disabled groups of children significant at 0.001 level of significance. This shows that higher the Intelligence of a child higher the Self-concept. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis No. 3- There is no relationship between Self-concept and Academic Achievement.

Self-concept and Academic Achievement were found to be positively correlated in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups, significant at 0.001 level of significance. The hypothesis is therefore rejected.
Hypothesis No. 4 - There is no relationship between S.E.S. and Intelligence.

The Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence was observed to be significant only at 0.05 level of significance in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis No. 5 - There is no relationship between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement.

The S.E.S. and Academic Achievement were found to be positively correlated and significant in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups at 0.01 level of significance. This indicates higher the S.E.S. the better Academic Achievement. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at 0.01 level of significance.

Hypothesis No. 6 - There is no relationship between Intelligence and Academic Achievement.

The Total Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic Achievement were highly significant at 0.001 probability level which indicates that higher Academic Achievement was associated with higher Intelligence. The hypothesis is therefore rejected at 0.001 level of significance.

Hypothesis No. 7 - There is no relationship between Self-concept and S.E.S. when the effects of Intelligence and Academic Achievement are held constant at a time.
There is no correlation between Self-concept and S.E.S. either in Normal or Physically Disabled children when Intelligence and Academic Achievement were held constant at a time. Therefore the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No. 8—There is no relationship between Self-concept and Intelligence when the effects of S.E.S. and Academic Achievement are partialled out.

Self-concept and Intelligence were highly and positively correlated in both the groups of Normal and Physically Disabled children at 0.001 level and 0.01 level of significance respectively when the S.E.S. and Academic Achievement were held constant at a time. This fact is clear from the significant Total and Partial Correlation Coefficient in the different groups. This indicates that the higher the Intelligence of a child higher the Self-concept. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at 0.001 level of significance in the case of Normal group and at 0.01 level of significance in the case of Physically Disabled group.

Hypothesis No. 9—There is no relationship between Self-concept and Academic Achievement when the effects of S.E.S. and Intelligence are held constant at a time.

The Partial Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Academic Achievement when the effects of S.E.S. and Intelligence were held constant came out to be non-significant in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups. Therefore the hypothesis is accepted.
Hypothesis No. 10—There is no relationship between S.E.S. and Intelligence when the effects of Self-concept and Academic Achievement are held constant at a time.

The Partial Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence were negatively non-significant and almost zero in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups when Self-concept and Academic Achievement were partialled out. The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Hypothesis No. 11—There is no relationship between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement when the effects of Self-concept and Intelligence are partialled out.

S.E.S. and Academic Achievement were found to be positively correlated in the case of Normal and Physically Disabled groups at 0.01 level of significance when Self-concept and Intelligence were held constant and also allowed to vary. This shows that better Academic Achievement was associated with higher S.E.S. The hypothesis is therefore rejected at 0.01 level of significance in the case of both Normal and Physically Disabled groups.

Hypothesis No. 12—There is no relationship between Intelligence and Academic Achievement when the effects of Self-concept and S.E.S. are held constant at a time.

The Partial Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic
Achievement when the effects of Self-concept and S.E.S. were held constant was highly significant at 0.001 level of significance in both Normal and Physically Disabled Groups of children. The positive and significant relationship indicates that the higher the Intelligence, the higher the Academic Achievement. The Academic Achievement of the children with low Intelligence was poor. The hypothesis is therefore rejected at 0.001 level of significance in the case of both Normal and Physically Disabled groups.

**Hypothesis No.13** - No difference exists among the two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Self-concept.

Reference Table No.6.1(e) the Normal Children were found to have Self-concept (187.89) significantly better than that of Physically Disabled Children (183.29). Similarly Boys (187.49) were found to have Self-concept better than girls (183.69). Further Urban Children (188.88) had significantly higher Self-concept than the Rural Children (182.30). Therefore the hypothesis of no difference among two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Self-concept is rejected.

Reference Table No.6.1(c) the above null hypothesis No.13 stands rejected while taking into account the different groups of Normal and Physically Disabled Children as below:

Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Normal Rural Boys (G1), Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Normal Urban Girls (G4) and Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Urban Girls (G8) positively significantly
differ at 0.01 level of significance whereas Normal Urban Boys versus Normal Rural Girls (G3), Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Rural Boys (G5), Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Urban Boys (G6) and Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Rural Girls (G7) positively significantly differ at 0.001 level of significance. But no difference exists between Normal Rural Boys (G1) and Disabled Urban Girls (G8) and in this case only the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No. 14: No difference exists among the two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to S.E.S.

Reference Table No. 6.2(e) no difference was found between Normal (23.11) and Physically Disabled children (23.04) with regard to S.E.S. as the mean values were statistically at par. Therefore the hypothesis of no difference among two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled children) with regard to S.E.S. is accepted.

Reference Table No. 6.2(c) while comparing each of the two groups on the basis of S.E.S. Normal Urban Boys (G2) Versus Normal Urban Girls (G4), Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Urban Girls (G8) and Normal Urban Girls (G4) versus Disabled Urban Girls (G8), the t-value indicates no difference between these groups. Hence in all these cases the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No. 15: No difference exists among the two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Intelligence.

Reference Table No. 6.3(e) Normal children were found to have
Intelligence (66.37) which is significantly better than Physically Disabled children (61.21). Hence the hypothesis of no difference among two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Intelligence is rejected.

Reference Table No. 6.3(c) Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Urban Boys (G6) differ positively significant at 0.05 level of significance, Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Normal Rural Boys (G1), the t-value comes out to be -3.11 which is negatively significant at 0.01 level of significance. Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Normal Rural Girls (G3) and Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Disabled Urban Girls (G8) positively highly significant at 0.001 level of significance. In all the above cases the hypothesis stands rejected but in the following combination of groups the hypothesis is accepted, namely Normal Urban Boys (G2) versus Normal Urban Girls (G4), Normal Urban Girls (G4) versus Disabled Urban Boys (G6), Normal Urban Girls (G4) versus Normal Rural Boys (G1) and Normal Urban Girls (G4) versus Normal Rural Girls (G3).

Hypothesis No. 16: No difference exists among the two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Academic Achievement.

Reference Table No. 6.4(e) Normal children were found to have Academic Achievement (57.14) significantly better than those of Physically Disabled children (51.99). Hence the hypothesis of
no difference among two groups (Normal and Physically Disabled) with regard to Academic Achievement is rejected.

Reference Table No. 6.4(c) the comparison of groups shows that the t-value in all the cases comes out to be negatively low and insignificant. The hypothesis therefore, in the case of Disabled Urban Boys (G6) versus Normal Urban Girls (G4), Disabled Urban Boys (G6) versus Normal Urban Boys (G2) and Normal Urban Girls (G4) versus Normal Urban Boys (G2) were found to have no significant difference, is accepted.

7.1(b) Subsidiary Hypotheses and their Verification:

Hypothesis No. 1: Sex creates no difference between the relationship of Self-concept and S.E.S.

Reference Table No. 6.6(a) in the case of High S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and S.E.S. was negative and significant at 0.01 level of significance in the Normal Rural Boys and was positive and significant at 0.05 level of significance only in the Disabled Rural Girls. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.

Reference Table No. 6.6(b) in the case of Low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and S.E.S. was observed to be negatively correlated at 0.05 level of significance (−0.541) in the group of Normal Urban Girls and positively correlated at 0.01 level of significance (0.683) in the
group of Disabled Rural Boys. Therefore in these groups only
the hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis No. 2:** Sex does not produce difference between the
relationship of Self-concept and Intelligence.

Reference Table No. 6.6(a) in the case of High S.E.S. group of
children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept
and Intelligence was positive and significant in the group of Normal
Urban Girls, Disabled Rural Boys and Disabled Urban Girls.
Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level in the first
two combination of groups and at 0.01 level (0.681) in the group
of Disabled Urban Girls.

Reference Table No. 6.6(b) in the case of Low S.E.S. group of
children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept
and Intelligence was positive and significant in all the groups
except the group of Disabled Rural Boys and Disabled Urban Boys.
Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level in the case
of Normal Urban Boys, Normal Rural Girls, Normal Urban Girls
and Disabled Urban Girls and rejected at 0.01 level of significance
in Normal Rural Boys and Disabled Rural Girls.

**Hypothesis No. 3:** Sex creates no difference between the relation­
ship of Self-concept and Academic Achievement.

Reference Table No. 6.6(a) in the case of High S.E.S. of children
the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Academic
Achievement was negatively significant at 0.05 level of significance in the group of Normal Rural Girls, positively significant at 0.01 level of significance with groups of Normal Urban Girls, Disabled Rural Girls and Disabled Urban Girls. Hence the hypothesis is rejected at these levels.

Reference Table No. 6.6(b) in the case of Low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Academic Achievement was positively significant at least at 0.05 level of significance in all the groups except the group of Disabled Urban Boys. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected at least at 0.05 level of significance.

**Hypothesis No. 4:** Sex creates no difference between the relationship of S.E.S. and Intelligence.

Reference Table No. 6.6(a) in the case of High S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence was positively significant at 0.01 level of significance in the group of Disabled Rural Boys and at 0.05 level of significance in the group of Disabled Rural Girls. Hence the hypothesis is rejected at these two levels.

In the case of Low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence was non-significant in all the eight groups. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis No. 5:** Sex does not create difference between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement.
In the case of High S.E.S. of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement was positive and significant at 0.01 level of significance in the group of Disabled Rural Boys. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.

In the case of Low S.E.S. of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement was significant only at 0.05 level of significance in the group of Normal Urban Boys. Hence it is rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

**Hypothesis No. 6**: Sex creates no difference between the relationship of Intelligence and Academic Achievement.

Reference Table No. 6.6(a) in the case of High S.E.S. of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic Achievement was positively significant at least at 0.05 level of significance in all the eight groups. Hence the hypothesis is rejected at least at 0.05 level of significance.

In case of Low S.E.S. of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic Achievement was positively significant at 0.01 level of significance in all the groups except in the group of Disabled Urban Boys. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.

### 7.2 Achievement of objectives

The objectives framed at the beginning of the present investigation given on page 21 in chapter I have all been achieved namely:
1. The first objective of finding out the relationship between Self-concept and S.E.S. has been fulfilled by calculating Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and S.E.S. in Physically Disabled Children as well as in Normal Children. The conclusions have been drawn accordingly.

2. The objective of determining the relationship between Self-concept and Intelligence that exists between the two has been achieved as correlations have been worked out in the case of both Normal and Physically Disabled groups of children and conclusions drawn accordingly.

3. The objective of ascertaining the extent of relationship that exists between Self-concept and Academic Achievement has been fulfilled by working out the correlations between the two variables in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups and drawing conclusions accordingly.

4. The objective of determining the extent of relationship that exists between S.E.S. and Intelligence has been achieved as Coefficient of Correlations have been calculated in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups on the two variables and conclusions drawn accordingly.

5. The objective of studying the extent of relationship between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement has been achieved when it was found out to be positively correlated and significant in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups.

6. The objective of determining the extent of relationship between
Intelligence and Academic Achievement has been achieved as correlations between the two variables have been worked out for Normal and Physically Disabled groups and conclusions drawn accordingly.

7. The objective of determining the extent of relationship between Self-concept and S.E.S. when the effects of Intelligence and Academic Achievement are held constant at a time has been achieved by working out Partial Correlations between the two variables for both Normal and Physically Disabled children.

8. The Partial Correlations have been calculated to achieve the objective of studying the extent of relationship between Self-concept and Intelligence when the effects of S.E.S. and Academic Achievement were held constant at a time. The conclusions have been drawn accordingly for both Normal and Physically Disabled groups of children.

9. The objective of determining the extent of relationship between Self-concept and Academic Achievement when the effects of S.E.S. and Intelligence are held constant at a time has been achieved by computing Partial Correlation Coefficients between the two variables in the case of both Normal and Physically Disabled groups and conclusions drawn accordingly.

10. The objective of finding out the extent of relationship between S.E.S. and Intelligence when the effects of Self-concept and Academic Achievement are partialled out has been achieved by calculating Partial Correlation Coefficients between the
two variables for both Normal and Physically Disabled groups and conclusions were drawn accordingly.

11. The objective of determining the extent of relationship between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement when the effects of Self-concept and Intelligence are held constant at a time has been achieved when it was found out that the two variables are positively correlated in the case of both Normal and Physically Disabled groups.

12. The objective of ascertaining the extent of relationship between Intelligence and Academic Achievement when the effects of Self-concept and S.E.S. are held constant at a time by calculating Partial Correlation Coefficients for both Normal and Physically Disabled groups and conclusions were drawn accordingly.

7.3 Conclusions based on the study

1. S.E.S. does not effect Self-concept in the case of Physically Disabled children but the relationship does exist though by a small margin in the case of Normal children.

   In the case of High S.E.S. the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and S.E.S. is negative and significant in Normal Rural Boys and positively significant in Disabled Rural Girls.

   In the case of low S.E.S. the Total Correlation
Coefficient between Self-concept and S.E.S. is negative in Normal Urban Girls and positive in Disabled Rural Boys.

2. Self-concept and Intelligence are positively correlated and highly significant in the case of Normal as well as Physically Disabled groups of children when the effects of S.E.S. and Academic Achievement are partialled out.

In the case of high S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Intelligence is positively significant in the group of Normal Urban Girls, Disabled Rural Boys and Disabled Urban Girls.

In the case of low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Intelligence is positive and significant in all the groups except the group of Disabled Rural and Urban Boys.

3. Self-concept is positive and highly correlated with Academic Achievement in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups. But when the effects of S.E.S. and Intelligence are partialled out it is non-significant.

In the case of high S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Academic Achievement is negatively significant in the group of Normal Rural Girls, positively significant in the groups of Normal Urban Girls and Disabled Rural as well as Urban Girls.
In the case of low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Self-concept and Academic Achievement is positively significant in all the groups except the group of Disabled Urban Boys.

4. Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence has been found to be positively significant in both Normal and Physically Disabled Groups, but when Self-concept and Academic Achievement are partialled out the partial correlation is non-existent.

In the case of high S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence is positively significant in the groups of Disabled Rural Boys and Disabled Rural Girls.

In the case of low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Intelligence is non-significant in all the groups.

5. The relationship between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement is positive and significant in both Normal and Physically Disabled groups. The same result holds good when the effects of Self-concept and Intelligence are held constant at a time.

In the case of high S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement is positive and significant in Disabled Rural Boys.
In the case of low S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between S.E.S. and Academic Achievement is positive and significant in the case of Normal Urban Boys.

6. Intelligence and Academic Achievement are highly and positively correlated. The same conclusion is true when the effects of Self-concept and S.E.S. are partialled out.

In the case of high S.E.S. group of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic Achievement is positive and significant in all the groups.

In the case of low S.E.S. groups of children the Total Correlation Coefficient between Intelligence and Academic Achievement is positive and significant in all the groups except in the Disabled Urban Boys.

7. Normal children have on the whole better Self-concept, higher Intelligence and Superior Academic Achievement than Physically Disabled children.

Also total boys (both Normal and Disabled) have better Self-concept, higher intelligence and good Academic Achievement than total girls.

Urban children (boys and girls) have higher Self-concept, better Intelligence and Academic Achievement than Rural children (boys and girls).
7.4 General Conclusions and Suggestions

On the basis of the present study it can be safely concluded that:

1. Self-concept is significant and positively correlated with Intelligence as well as Academic Achievement in the case of Normal and Disabled groups of children.

2. Higher the S.E.S. better the Intelligence and superior the Academic Achievement.

3. Higher Academic Achievement is positively associated with higher Intelligence.

4. Normal children on the whole have better Self-concept higher Intelligence and superior Academic Achievement as compared to Physically Disabled children.

5. Boys are better in Self-concept, Intelligence and Academic Achievement than girls. Further Urban children are better in the three variables i.e. Self-concept, Intelligence and Academic Achievement when compared to Rural children.
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