VOLUME-8, ISSUE-1, JANUARY-2019 • PRINT ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Original Research Paper



COMPARITIVE STUDY OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERS OF SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH AND WITHOUT LEARNING DISABILITY

P.Meenakshi

Clinical Psychologist, VIMHANS Hospital, Vijayawada.

ABSTRACT The study focuses on the personality characteristics among Learning disabled Children and non learning disabled peers age between 8to 12 from various schools in Krishna district, Andhra Pradesh.

Participants from both the groups were given Children Personality Questionnaire, Standard Progressive matrices. The scores were compared and it shows that there is significant difference in three factors. Learning disabled children seems to have low frustration tolerance, highly emotional, more neurotic tendencies, and poor self image. Remediating learning disabled children helps us to prevent school dropout and class retention.

KEYWORDS: Learning disability, Personality, Intelligence, Emotional Problem.

INTRODUCTION

Samuel Kirk coined the term Learning Disability and put it in use around 1962.Learning disorder are diagnosed when the individuals achievement on individually administered, standardized tests in reading,matheematics or written expression is substantially below that expected for age, schooling and level of intelligence. The problem interferes with academic achievement in daily living.

Recognition of individual differences in every aspect of human life has to led to the development of various special education measures to address the needs of pupils with disabilities (e.g., visual, auditory, physical disabilities) Scholastic achievement is based on many factors like encouragement to the poor performance, re inforcement .Instead grade retention, dropping out of school can have negative effects on the child.

In all standards of education there are students who achieve low due to academic difficulty, learning disability, learning disorders. Teacher may un notice due to many factors. These children may have normal intelligence but may have emotional disturbances, socially and culturally disadvantaged. These children must be given attention to overcome their difficulty. Children academic problem go un- notice until seventh grade because promotion is based on attendance.

There are 2 ways of explaining learning disability.

- 1. Cause oriented
- 2. Effect oriented

(Frierson&Barbe, 1967) clinicians generally prefer etiological description. Children with learning disabilities have "minimal brain dysfunction syndrome" Clements (1966). Children with average or above average intelligence with learning or behavioral disabilities, ranging from mild to severe, that are associated with a deviation in the functioning of the central nervous system. Such children have difficulty in perception, conceptualization, language, and memory, control of attention, impulse and motor function.

Bateman's (1965) Learning disabled children have a sharp discrepancy between intelligence and learning process. It should not be secondary to intellectual delay, emotional disturbances or sensory loss.

National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children(1968), which states that learning disabled children may have dysgraphia, dyslexia, dyscalculia, problems in reading, writing, calculation,

listening, language.

There is a need to conduct research on learning disability due to lack of awareness, lack of estimation on prevalence and incidence of learning disability.

Psychology

AIM

To study the personality difference between learning and non learning disabled children.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The sample was drawn randomly from various schools of Vijayawada (both rural and urban schools).180 children with learning disability and 180 children without learning disability have been selected for the study from ages8-12 (class V to V111)

INCLUSION CRITERIA

Age of child 8-12 years Children who gave consent to participate in the study

EXCLUSION CRITERIA

Children who have below average Intellectual capacity Children who have sensory loss.

TOOLS

1. Socio Demographic Data Sheet

It contains information like religion, education, marital status.

2. Standard Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1952)

The SPM was designed to measure a person's ability to form perceptual relations and to reason by analogy independent of language and formal schooling. The age range is between 6 yrs to adult. It has 60 items arranged in 5 sets (A, B, C, and D &E) 12 items each. Factor analysis is >0.75. Concurrent validity between 0.54 and 0.88.

3. The Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ)

It was developed by Porter and Cattell (1972). It measures about 14 dimensions of personality. It gives a quantity evaluation about performance of the child in school and social adjustment, tendency towards delinquency, leadership potential, and excessive emotional disturbance.

CPQ adapted version (Siddamma, 1977) was selected for use with the children. Independent scores were obtained. Out of 14 factors 8 were found to have dependability co-efficient 0.7.

| FACTORS | Α | | В | | С | | D | | E | | F | | G | |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| GROUPS N=180 | М | SD |
| LD | 1.42 | 0.66 | 1.72 | 0.81 | 1.58 | 0.61 | 1.58 | 0.61 | 1.81 | 0.68 | 3.15 | 0.36 | 1.93 | 1 |
| NLD | 2.2 | 0.84 | 1.73 | 1.13 | 2.17 | 0.6 | 2.17 | 0.6 | 1.81 | 0.68 | 1.73 | 0.54 | 1.8 | 0.88 |
| t | 9.78 | | 0.09 | | 1.57 | | 1.57 | | 0.14 | | 1.86 | | 0.09 | |

VOLUME-8, ISSUE-1, JANUARY-2019 • PRINT ISSN No 2277 - 8160

| FACTORS | н | | I | | J | | N | | 0 | | Q3 | | Q4 | |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| GROUPS N=180 | М | SD |
| LD | 1.45 | 0.76 | 1.81 | 0.68 | 1.93 | 1 | 2 | 0.6 | 2 | 0.6 | 1.58 | 0.68 | 1.36 | 0.52 |
| NLD | 1.46 | 0.87 | 1.81 | 0.68 | 1.8 | 0.88 | 2.1 | 0.63 | 2.1 | 0.63 | 2.17 | 0.83 | 1.36 | 0.52 |
| t | 0.77 | | 0.14 | | 0.09 | | 1.54 | | 1.54 | | 7.38 | | 0.18 | |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data were analyzed using t tests. The results indicate there is significant difference between Learning disabled and Non-learning disabled children in factors A,C and Q3.The mean value in factor A for learning disabled children is 1.42 and non learning disabled 2.20 and significant difference is found to be 9.78**.It shows learning disabled children seems to introvert, not easily get along or mingle with others children. Similarly less scores on factor C indicates that highly emotional, low frustration tolerance, easily changeable, have neurotic tendencies. Low scores on Q3 indicate less will power, poor self image, introvert, socially receptive have external locus of control.

CONCLUSION

Findings of this study indicate that learning disabled children shows differences in personality factors. They have maladaptive tendencies in the personality disposition. It may have a greater impact in the later part of life. Therefore urgent need to identify the problems of learning disabled children in needed.

IMPLICATIONS

A Nation Wide Survey is needed to know the incidence and prevalence of learning disability in India. Identifying and remediating Learning disabled Children helps to solve the problem of School dropout and rectifying the emotional and behavior problems of the learning disabled children.

REFERENCES

- 1. Bateman, B. (1965). An educator's view of a diagnostic approach to learning disorders. In J.Hellmuth (Ed.), Learning disorders (Vol. 1). Seattle, WA: Special Child Publication.
- Clements, S.D.(1996).Minimal brain dysfunction in children.Washington,DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Frierson, E.C., and Barbe, W.B. (1967).Educating Children with learning disabilities: Selected readings. New York: Appleton Century Crafts.
- National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children (1968). First annual report: U.S department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washilgton, DC: Author.
- Raven J.C. (1952) .Human nature, its development, and variation and assessment .London:H.K.Lewis&Co.
- Siddamma, T. (1977). Reliability of Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ). Child Psychiatry Quarterly, 2, 13-17.