

The Impact of Socio-Economic Facts of Deaf Students on Their Academic Achievement

Mubashar Ahmed

PhD Scholar, ISE, Punjab University, Lahore,

Muhammad Asif Faiz

PhD Scholar, ISE, Punjab University, Lahore,

Hafiz Muhammad Fasial

PhD Scholar, ISE, Punjab University, Lahore.

Abstract

This article considers the impact of socio-economic facts of deaf students on their academic achievement. It is based on study deaf students in secondary school at Punjab. Statistical techniques were used to explore the impact of family and social background on academic achievement of students with hearing impairment. The research was conducted through in-depth structured interview of parents. The academic achievement of the students the researcher use final result of Mathematic and English subject. For analysis the researcher use linear regression test to examine the impact of different socio economic factors on student performance.

Keywords: Socio Economic Factors, Academic Achievement, Parents' Involvement, Students with Hearing Impairment.

Introduction

The factors of socio-economics have significant impact on how long and how well we live such as education, sources of income, employment status, community networking and social supports. Teachers, parents, administrators as well as public assume that family background and the involvement of parents in children's education is an important element that can optimize the learning outcomes (Björklund & Salvanes, 2011).

National Research Council, 2001 reported that educational assessment that is aimed at measuring the learning outcomes is a fundamental part of better education. Parents, teachers as well as policy makers get the feedback about the effectiveness of learning process through assessment. Through this process the families, administrators and teachers of deaf students learn about the strengths and weakness of special students and by doing so they are able to design services and programs that may be beneficial in improving the educational performance of such students (Mitchell, 2004).

According to the Qi & Mitchel, 2012 said that the special children remains delayed developmental as comparative to other learners in the institutes of special education and these students unable reach to their full potential. According to Epstein et. al, (2011), parental involvement in the educational system can improve the performance of children in education, promote healthy behaviors and encourage the positivity of children in living. The strong consciences and character of parents play a vital role in development of children

A review of the literature on family influences in general, Benner et. al, (2016) said that two of the most important features related with success are expectations of parents, family background, and communication style and nature at home.

According to the Das, 2021 he conduct the study which is based on interviews with parents of children with deafness to identify parents factors of socio-psychological related with good success. He said that two factors were significantly related with his success. Firstly he said that "adaptation to deafness" (includes acceptance of deaf child and a positive attitude regarding the deaf community) and the other factors which affect the children "press for success" (including higher education and Professional expectations included).

The characteristics of the family environment and practically all studies of the school education have emphasized the families of the children in general. Although parents and professionals testify to the impact of a disabled child on the family system and parental behavior. (Boothroyd. 1982; Featherstone, 1980; Meadow & Trybus. 1979), Relatively little research has focused more than a mythical way (Di Marino, et. al, 2018) on how the family environment is affected or important factors related to the educational performance of a child with a disability. The present study examines the family socio-psychological environment of deaf students and examines the differences in the family environment between students who are more proficient in math and reading (English) and those who have less success. Identification of family characteristics associated with high and low academic performance.

Research shows that academic achievement of deaf and hard of hearing students (DHH) is the result of a complex interaction of many factors. These factors include the characteristics of students, the characteristics of their family environment (e.g., parents' level of education, socioeconomic status) and experiences inside and outside the school. The present study was designed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of DHH student achievement than ever before. Specifically, the study focused on the question of which individual, family,

communication, and educational factors are associated with variations in academic achievement among DHH secondary students. It is based on the study of academic results of deaf students in DG Khan Secondary School

METHODOLOGY

The aim of research is to explore the impact of family and social background on academic achievement of students with hearing impairment at secondary level. We used the quantitative techniques for execution of this research.

The population of the study constituted on the 32 male and female students with hearing impairment of class 9th and 10th (18 boys, 14 girls) of Govt. Higher Secondary School of Special Education for H.I, D. G. Khan.

We collected the data through in-depth structured interview from parents of students of interest. The interview question consists of demographic and socio economic factors of family (e.g. area of residence, parents' qualification, family income, sibling status etc). The marks of math and English subject in annual examination taken by B.I.S.E D. G. Khan have been used as measured of academic achievement.

The methodology of research has two phases, in the 1st phase frequency distribution has been used to explore the data then multiple regressions has been used to measure the impact of socio economic facts on the academic achievement of our students.

$$Y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_nx_n$$

Where Y is response in our research represents the academic achievement

X₁x₂.....x_n are covariates

B₁b₂....b_n are measurable co. efficient

DATA

Gender wise frequency distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	14	43.8	43.8
Male	18	56.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table provides information about the number of participants and their gender wise ratio. The data reveals that there were total 32 students who participated in the research, out of the total of 32, 18 were male and 14 were the female students. Hence, the ratio of male students is 56.3% while female students comprised of 43.8% of the sample. Hence, it can be asserted that the ratio of male students is greater than that of female learners.

Frequency distribution of Area of Residence

Area of Residence	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rural	08	25.0	25.0
Urban	24	75.0	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows that 75% of the students belonged to the urban areas whereas 25% of the students were from rural areas. This indicates that there is a lack of awareness about education in the rural areas. The outcome reveals that the people of rural areas are not interested to educate their disabled children.

House Ownership

House ownership	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rented	08	25.0	25.0
Own	24	75.0	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows the house ownership of the parents of students with H.I , this indicates that 75% students live in their own home whereas 25% of the students were living the rented home.

Father employment status

Father Employment	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Labour	06	18.8	18.8
G. job	07	21.9	40.6
Foreign	04	12.5	53.1
Artisan	08	25.0	78.1
Former	01	03.1	81.3
Shopkeeper	01	03.1	84.4
Others	05	15.6	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

The table above shows the employment status of the parents of disabled children, 25% of the fathers of student were artisans and 22% of the parents of students had good Job. This indicates that the persons who are Artisans (skilled men) and the persons who have good Job have much awareness and know the importance of education. They are more interested to educate their children than the others.

Mother employment status

Mother Employment	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
H. Wife	29	90.6	90.6
Working	03	09.4	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows the employment status of the mothers of the disabled children, the data reveals that 90% of the mothers were house wives and 09.4% of the mothers were working ladies. This indicates that the literacy rate of the mothers of disabled children is less than the fathers. People are not interested to educate the women and women are not allowed to go outside for work.

Family Income

Income	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 10.000	02	06.3	06.3
Above 10.000 below 20.000	09	28.1	34.4
Above 20.000	21	65.6	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows the income status of the parents, it is evident from the obtained data that 65.6% of the parents have income above 20,000. Hence, it can be asserted that there is a strong relation between parents' income and their desire to educate their children. The financially strong parents provide better education to their children as compared to the parents with low income low income.

Father Education	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Illiterate	16	50.0	50.0
Matric	10	31.3	81.3
Above	06	18.8	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows that the literacy rate of parents, it is evident that 50% of the parents are illiterate, while 31.3% have Matric qualification and only 18.8% of the parents possess higher qualification. This indicates that majority of the guardians is illiterate.

Mother Education

Mother Education	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Illiterate	22	68.8	68.8
Matric	08	25.0	93.8
Above	02	06.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows the data about the literacy rate of mothers of such students, it is clear that 69% of the mothers are illiterate, on the other hand 25% have matriculation and only 06% of the mothers have qualification above matric level. This is an eye opening revelation as it is evident that the literacy rate of female is low as majority of the mothers illiterate.

Sibling Status

Siblings Status	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Normal	12	37.5	37.5
Special	20	62.5	100.0
Total	32	100.0	

This table shows data about the mental condition of siblings of the special children and the information reveals that 62.5% of the students have siblings with disabilities and 37.5% have siblings without disabilities. This is a startling revelation as the results indicate that majority of the special students have disabled siblings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error
(Constant)	292.955	15.933
Gender	-13.313	7.237
Area of residence	-3.322	2.793
House ownership	-12.557	7.385
Income	-9.816	6.424
Father Edu	-.725	6.842
Mother Edu	7.142	3.118
Employment status father	1.177	1.773
Employment status mother	-5.073	5.514
Sibling status	-3.428	2.673

A girl student is 13 time more likely to perform better than her counterpart. The data provide strong evidence that gender has significant role in performance in might be the reason that girls students in our society are more sensitive about the career. They work hard and perform better additionally being special child make them more sensitive than boys.

The covariate area of residence has two categories 0 indicating rural area whereas 1 indicating urban area of residence. The data has shown interesting and unexpected result normally it is believe that urban area provide more strength to students to perform in their academic career but our results show the opposite the residence of rural area have shown better grades as compare to those students living in urban areas. One understandable explanation of the phenomena might be that the difficult and tough environment of the rural area give more fighting spirit and motivate the student to work hard. Our data have sufficient evidence to believe in this explanation.

We have included house ownership 0 indicating rented house and 1 indicating and income as categorical variant 0 indicating per month income less than 10,000 and other categories indicate higher income groups. House ownership and income are likely to be correlated. Therefore might be as spurious effect on standard error these both covariates have again shown consistency with the variable area of residence. The parents living in own house and have high income consider their income and house as security of their special children. Consequently special children have not much concern about their future as compare to those children whose parents reside in rented house and low income. These children are likely to work hard and consider education as their social and economic security so data provide sufficient evidence in our explanation.

Father educations though have negative sign but are statistically insignificant. Mother education was included as variable indicating 0 as no education and other categories indicate subsequently higher education. This variable has shown the expected result the positive sign indicate that the higher education of mother will be better the performance of special children. Socially mother has more concern about her special child. So educated mother will channelize ability of her child towards education and child will perform better.

Father employment status indicate that father involved in regular economic activity can support his special child in better way resultantly child will perform better and our results have concluded this argument. Whereas mother employment status though statistically insignificant but its negative sign indicate that if mother leave her home for economic activity has not shown good effect on performance of her special child and it can be explained as if mother is indulge in economic activity she has less time to supervise her special child. Our result have provided evidence to suggest that educated mother without any involvement in economic activity can prove herself better in supporting her special child.

The sibling status was included as categorical variable 0 as normal and 1 as special a family having more than 1 special child is likely to negatively effect the academic performance of special children and it is understandable keeping in view the setup and economic status of our sample data which include specific rural and urban area of D. G. Khan.

CONCLUSION

The results have provided insight about the impact of different socio economic factors. Some factors have shown unexpected impact for example father income has negative impact on academic achievement. In general it is imperative to sensitize the family of special children through session with them. Furthermore social media and print media on also be used. The parents counseling must be included in education system developing for special children.

REFERENCES

- Benner, A. D., Boyle, A. E., & Sadler, S. (2016). Parental involvement and adolescents' educational success: The roles of prior achievement and socioeconomic status. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 45, 1053-1064.
- Björklund, A., & Salvanes, K. G. (2011). Education and family background: Mechanisms and policies. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 201-247). Elsevier.
- Boothroyd, A. (1982). Hearing impairments in young children. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Das, K. (2021). *Psycho-Social Determinants Quality of Life among Mothers of Intellectually Disabled and Hearing-Impaired Children* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Di Marino, E., Tremblay, S., Khetani, M., & Anaby, D. (2018). The effect of child, family and environmental factors on the participation of young children with disabilities. *Disability and health journal*, 11(1), 36-42.
- Epstein, J., Micheal, S., & Dittus, P. (2011). Family and community involvement in schools, results from the school policies & programs. *Journal of School Health* 88(3) 78-86.
- Featherstone, H. (1980). A difference in the family. New York: Basic Books.
- Meadow, K., & Trybus, R. (1979). Behavioral and emotional problems of deaf children: An Overview. In L. Bradford & W. Hardy (Eds.). *Hearing and hearing impairment* (pp. 395-403). New York:
- Mitchell, R. E. (2004). National profile of deaf and hard of hearing students in special education from weighted survey results. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 149 (4), 336–349.
- National Research Council. (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Committee on the Foundations of Assessment, J. Pellegrino, N. Chudowsky, & R. Glaser (Eds.), Board on Testing and Assessment, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.