IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)
ISSN (P): 2347-4564; ISSN (E): 2321-8878
Vol. 7, Issue 6, Jun 2019, 263-278

INCLUSIVE STRATEGIES TO EMPOWER THE PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED

Hanumanthu Lakshmana Rao

Department of Social Work, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andra Pradesh, India

Received: 01 Jun 2019 **Accepted: 10 Jun 2019** **Published: 28 Jun 2019**

ABSTRACT

Inclusion of people with disabilities into everyday activities involves practices and policies designed to identify and remove barriers such as physical, communication and attitudinal that hamper individuals' ability to empower in society, the same as people without disabilities. In this context, this study has clearly brought out the strong linkages between poverty and disability. The study was undertaken by the author also corroborates the same. Thus, increasing the poverty line criteria for the disabled persons also needs consideration by the planners. The problem of mobility and physical barriers are the roadblocks for the disabled in accessing facilities, accessing people and accessing information. Mitigating the problem requires resources and attention. The study, based on perceptual responses, corroborates the general feeling that the majority of disabled feel socially excluded and discriminated. The attitudinal barriers are, therefore, the real barriers that need to be crossed over in the first place. Higher inflow of resources to the sector to the schemes and programmes run in the social welfare sector as also through the tenth plan committed component plan approach coupled with capacity building of NGOs for working in the remote rural areas are required to be ensured in order to materialize the commitment of an inclusive, barrier-free and rights-based society.

KEYWORDS: *Inclusive Strategies, Empowerment, Physically Challenged*

INTRODUCTION

The physically challenged persons of our country suffer from the social, economic and psychological burden that needs to be understood by the policy-makers, Implements and the society in general in the right perspective. This disadvantaged section of our society has to bear additional costs of disability some of which are difficult to compensate. The physical and attitudinal barriers they face and the additional expenditure they have to incur for management of their disability are few dimensions of their hardship. When a disabled person is poor, the problems get added to the challenges and costs they face becomes magnified more often than not, to an unmanageable degree. Make an attempt to look at various inclusive strategies to empowerment and physically challenge linkage, more particularly, in this context. To substantiate the linkage, which is often discussed in general terms, the researcher gives a brief summary of the research work conducted on the basis of primary data collected from the physically challenged persons who, for accessing rehabilitation services, working in public and private sectors, studying in colleges in different parts of the selected three north coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh.

According to the World Health Organization (2011), many PWDs do not have equal access to health care, education, and employment opportunities, do not receive the disability-related services that they require, and experience

exclusion from everyday life activities. The World Bank (2017) points out that one-fifth of the estimated global total, or between 110 million and 190 million people, experience significant disabilities and they are more vulnerable to negative social and economic factors than non-disabled persons. Specifically, the factors include less education, poorer health outcomes, low staffing levels, and high poverty rates.

Nurazzura Mohamad Diah (2017) Information and Communication Technology (ICT) skills have become basic requirements to compete in the labor market. However, persons with disabilities face financial, social and environmental difficulties which form barriers to acquiring these skills. Thus, it contributes to the weakening of their competitiveness in the labor market.

Education is a powerful tool for economic empowerment of people with disabilities. Rifkin and Pridmore (2001)[1], support this fact when they stated that information (education) is power; people who lack information lack power and lack choices about how to improve their lives or to control what happens to them. Through educational programs (either formal or informal), people with disabilities can gain knowledge and skills needed to perform functions, tasks or carry out some socio-economic activities for personal and community development.

Need and Significance of the Study

Empowerment of persons with disabilities or physically challenged, therefore, refers to giving them a variety of opportunities to discover themselves, understand their environment, be aware of their rights and take control of their lives and partake in important decisions that lead to their destiny. Experience of earlier studies and publications suggests that the majority of persons with physically challenged are unemployed and often denied employment opportunities even when they have met the necessary requirements for jobs. The aim is to explore the possibilities of employment in wide-ranging fields, which are hither to not encouraging for the physically challenged in the era of globalization. Therefore, the proposed study is entitled as “Inclusive strategies to empower the physically challenged: a study in north coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh”

Objectives

- To study the demographic profile of the physically challenged people in the study area.
- To analyze the differences among various demographic group physically challenged persons in timing, scheduling, setting, presentation and response of inclusive strategies.

Hypothesis

- There is no significant difference among various demographic group physically challenged persons in the timing of inclusive strategy.
- There is no significant difference among various demographic group physically challenged persons in the scheduling of inclusive strategy.
- There is no significant difference among various demographic group physically challenged persons in the setting of inclusive strategies.

[1] Rifkin, & Pridmore (2001), “Partners in Planning: Information, Participation and Empowerment”. Macmillan Education Ltd, London. pp.11.

- There is no significant difference among various demographic group physically challenged persons in the presentation of the inclusive strategy.
- There is no significant difference among various demographic group physically challenged persons in the response to inclusive strategy.

METHODOLOGY

The investigator has studies 150 samples of physically challenged persons from the selected three districts of North Coastal Andhra Pradesh. These sample respondents are physically challenged persons who are employees in public and private organizations, students, business persons, self-employed, professionals, etc. who are selected on the random sampling method. The opinions of physically challenged respondents on the inclusive strategies to empowerment have been measured with their response to opinion based statement through a pre-designed questionnaire. In the questionnaire, there is 5 dimensions of inclusive strategies of physically challenged empowerment with opinion based questions and statements along with student demographic characteristics like sex, age, education, caste, occupational status, type of disability and limitations of the disability. The inclusive strategies of physically challenged empowerment dimensions are timing, scheduling, setting, presentation, and response, and each dimension is carrying a number of statements. The frequency table was designed to the distribution of respondents by demographic profile and ANOVA test was carried out by SPSS statistical package for analyze the data and test the hypotheses.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic variables	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	102	68.0
	Female	48	32.0
Age	10-15 years	25	16.7
	16-18 years	64	42.7
	19-21 years	42	28.0
	Above 21 years	19	12.7
Caste	SC	39	26.0
	ST	40	26.6
	OBC	32	21.3
	OC	39	26.0
Education	Secondary	34	22.7
	Higher Secondary	36	24.0
	Graduation	41	27.3
	P G and Above	39	26.0
Occupation	Student	30	20.0
	Govt. Employee	30	20.0
	Private Employee	30	20.0
	Business	30	20.0
	Others	30	20.0
Type of disability	Physical	81	54.0
	Visual	43	28.6
	Hearing	26	17.3

Table 2

Demographic variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	T-value	P-value
Gender	Male	102	11.30	2.320	0.230	1.685	0.095
	Female	48	10.65	2.188	0.316		
Age group	10-15 years	25	10.72	1.768	0.354	2.855	0.039
	16-18 years	64	11.56	2.203	0.275		
	19-21 years	42	10.38	2.273	0.351		
	Above 21 years	19	11.58	2.854	0.655		
Caste	SC	39	11.51	2.126	0.340	0.928	0.429
	ST	40	10.70	2.301	0.364		
	OBC	32	11.25	2.436	0.431		
	OC	39	10.95	2.328	0.373		
Education	Secondary	34	11.18	2.153	0.369	0.661	0.578
	Higher Secondary	36	10.64	2.543	0.424		
	Graduation	41	11.34	2.069	0.323		
	P G and Above	39	11.18	2.416	0.387		
Occupation	Student	30	11.37	2.282	0.417	1.030	0.394
	Govt. Employee	30	10.90	1.954	0.357		
	Private Employee	30	11.33	2.440	0.445		
	Business	30	10.43	2.431	0.444		
	Others	30	11.43	2.315	0.423		
Type of Disability	Physical	81	11.06	2.436	0.271	0.427	0.653
	Visual	43	11.33	2.078	0.317		
	Hearing	26	10.81	2.209	0.433		
	Total	150	11.09	2.292	0.187		

Significant at 5% level.

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards timing shows that male respondents' performance (11.30) is more than female (10.65) but is not at the significant level because the tested t-value 1.685 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance based on timing.

The difference among different age-group respondents towards timing shows that the performance of above 21 years age group respondents (11.58) are significantly higher than the respondents who are between 16-18 years of age (11.56), between 10-15 years (10.72) and between 19-21 years of age (10.38).The calculated f-value is 2.855 found significant at 5% level because the p-value is 0.039.It shows that there is a significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards timing were above 21 years age-group respondents performing better in timing.

The significant difference among different castes physically challenged respondents towards timing shows that the performance of schedule caste respondents (11.51) is significantly higher than the respondents who are other backward caste respondents (11.25), open category (10.95) and schedule tribe respondents (10.70).The calculated f-value is 0.928 found not significant because the p-value is 0.429.It shows that there is no significant difference among different castes physically challenged respondents in their performance towards timing where schedule castes respondents performing better in timing.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards timing shows that the performance of graduate respondents (11.34) is found higher than the respondents who are qualified secondary education and post graduation and above (11.18) and higher secondary (10.64).The calculated f-value is 0.661 found not significant because the p-value is 0.578.It shows that there is no significant difference among different education qualification respondents in their performance towards timing.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards timing shows that the performance of students and other occupation respondents (11.43) is found higher than students (11.37), private employee (11.33), government employees (10.90) and business people (10.43).The tested f-value 1.030 is not a significant value because the p-value is 0.394.It infers that there is no significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards timing

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards timing shows that the performance of visually disabled respondents (11.33) is found higher than the physically disabled respondents (11.06) and hearing disabled respondents (10.81).The calculated f-value is 0.427 found not significant because the p-value is 0.653.It shows that there is no significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards timing.

Table 3: Perceptive Analysis of Various Demographic Group Respondents on the Scheduling Strategy of Physically Challenged

Demographic Variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	T-value	P-value
Gender	Male	102	12.42	3.094	0.306	1.848	0.068
	Female	48	11.44	3.017	0.435		
Age	10-15 Years	25	9.84	1.930	0.386	6.552	0.000
	16-18 Years	64	12.30	3.100	0.387		
	19-21 Years	42	13.05	3.200	0.494		
	Above 21 Years	19	12.37	2.813	0.645		
Caste	SC	39	10.26	2.048	0.328	8.293	0.000
	ST	40	12.50	3.274	0.518		
	OBC	32	13.53	3.601	0.637		
	OC	39	12.38	2.509	0.402		
Education	Secondary	34	12.15	3.421	0.587	0.017	0.997
	Higher Secondary	36	12.08	2.792	0.465		
	Graduation	41	12.17	3.065	0.479		
	P G and Above	39	12.03	3.208	0.514		
Occupation	Student	30	10.53	2.488	0.454	8.816	0.000
	Govt. Employee	30	10.57	3.530	0.644		
	Private Employee	30	12.27	2.840	0.518		
	Business	30	13.40	2.811	0.513		
	Others	30	13.77	2.223	0.406		
Type of Disability	Physical	81	11.85	2.838	0.315	0.601	0.550
	Visual	43	12.37	3.478	0.530		
	Hearing	26	12.46	3.240	0.635		
	Total	150	12.11	3.094	0.253		

Significant at 1% level.

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards scheduling shows that male respondents' performance (12.42) is more than female (11.44) but is not at the significant level because the tested t-value

1.848 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance towards scheduling.

The difference among different age-group physically challenged respondents towards schedule shows that the performance of between 19-21 years age group respondents (13.05) is significantly higher than the respondents who are above 21 years of age (12.37), between 16-18 years (12.30) and 10-15 years of age (9.84).The calculated f-value is 6.552 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.000.It shows that there is no significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards scheduling where between 19-21 years age-group respondents performing better in scheduling.

The significant difference among different caste group physically challenged respondents towards schedule shows that the performance of other backward caste respondents (13.53) is significantly higher than the respondents who are schedule tribe respondents (12.50), open category (12.38) and schedule caste respondents (10.26).The calculated f-value is 8.293 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.000.It shows that there is a significant difference among different caste physically challenged respondents in their performance towards scheduling where other backward caste respondents performing better in scheduling.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards schedule shows that the performance of graduate respondents (12.17) is found higher than the respondents who qualified secondary education qualified (12.15), higher secondary (12.08) and post graduation and above (12.03).The calculated f-value is 0.017 found not significant because the p-value is 0.997.It shows that there is no significant difference among different education qualification respondents in their performance towards scheduling.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards schedule shows that the performance of other occupation holders (13.77) is found higher than business people (13.40), private employees (12.27), government employees (10.57) and students (10.53).The tested f-value 8.816 is significant value because the p-value is 0.000.It infers that there is a significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards scheduling.

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards schedule shows that the performance of hearing disabled respondents (12.46) is found higher than the visually disabled respondents (12.37) and physically disabled respondents (11.85).The calculated f-value is 0.601 found not significant because the p-value is 0.601.It shows that there is no significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards scheduling.

Table 4: Perceptive Analysis of Various Demographic Group Respondents on Setting Strategy of Physically Challenged

Demographic variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	T-value	P-value
Gender	Male	102	8.80	2.274	0.225	0.750	0.455
	Female	48	8.50	2.334	0.337		
Age	10-15 Years	25	7.64	2.289	0.458	2.808	0.042
	16-18 Years	64	9.17	2.135	0.267		
	19-21 Years	42	8.69	2.363	0.365		
	Above 21 Years	19	8.58	2.317	0.532		
Caste	SC	39	7.77	2.367	0.379	4.834	0.003
	ST	40	9.03	2.348	0.371		
	OBC	32	9.69	2.055	0.363		
	OC	39	8.51	1.998	0.320		
Education	Secondary	34	9.09	2.151	0.369	2.285	0.081
	Higher Secondary	36	8.56	2.535	0.422		
	Graduation	41	9.20	2.272	0.355		
	P G and Above	39	8.00	2.065	0.331		
Occupation	Student	30	9.60	1.993	0.364	2.909	0.024
	Govt. Employee	30	8.57	2.128	0.389		
	Private Employee	30	9.23	2.344	0.428		
	Business	30	8.17	2.394	0.437		
	Others	30	7.97	2.282	0.417		
Type of Disability	Physical	81	8.73	2.490	0.277	0.017	0.983
	Visual	43	8.65	2.034	0.310		
	Hearing	26	8.73	2.108	0.413		
	Total	150	8.71	2.290	0.187		

Significant at 1% level, Significant at 5% level.

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards setting shows that male respondents' performance (8.80) is more than female (8.50) but is not at the significant level because the tested t-value 0.750 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance towards the setting.

The difference among different age-group physically challenged respondents towards setting shows that the performance of between 16-18 years age group respondents (9.17) is significantly higher than the respondents who are between 19-21 years of age (8.69), above 21 years (8.58) and 10-15 years of age (7.64).The calculated f-value is 2.808 found significant at 5% level because the p-value is 0.042.It shows that there is a significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards setting were between 16-18 years age-group respondents performing better in the setting.

The significant difference among different caste group physically challenged respondents towards setting shows that the performance of other backward caste respondents (9.69) is significantly higher than the respondents who are schedule tribe respondents (9.03), open category (8.51) and schedule caste respondents (7.77).The calculated f-value is 4.834 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.003.It shows that there is a significant difference among different castes physically challenged respondents in their performance towards setting where other backward caste respondents performing better in the setting.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards setting shows that the performance of graduate respondents (9.20) is found higher than the respondents who qualified secondary education qualified respondents (9.09), higher secondary (8.56) and post graduation and above (8.00).The calculated f-value is 2.285 found not significant because the p-value is 0.081.It shows that there is no significant difference among different education qualification respondents in their performance towards the setting.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards setting shows that the performance of students (9.60) is found higher than private employees (9.23), government employees (8.57) and business people (8.17) and other occupation respondents (7.97).The tested f-value 2.909 found significant at 5% level because the p-value is 0.024.It infers that there is a significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards the setting.

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards setting shows that the performance of physical and hearing disabled respondents (8.73) is found higher than the visually disabled respondents (8.65).The calculated f-value is 0.017 found not significant because the p-value is 0.983.It shows that there is no significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards the setting.

Table 5: Perceptive Analysis of Various Demographic Group Respondents on Presentation Strategy of Physically Challenged

Demographic variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	T-value	P-value
Gender	Male	102	18.83	4.889	0.484	0.703	0.484
	Female	48	18.27	4.413	0.637		
Age	10-15 Years	25	13.16	5.907	1.181	18.577	0.000
	16-18 Years	64	20.06	3.486	0.436		
	19-21 Years	42	19.24	3.944	0.609		
	Above 21 Years	19	19.84	3.132	0.718		
Caste	SC	39	15.90	6.210	0.994	7.103	0.000
	ST	40	19.75	3.600	0.569		
	OBC	32	18.91	3.719	0.657		
	OC	39	20.08	3.681	0.589		
Education	Secondary	34	18.76	4.439	0.761	0.373	0.773
	Higher Secondary	36	18.03	4.450	0.742		
	Graduation	41	18.61	4.964	0.775		
	P G and Above	39	19.18	5.093	0.816		
Occupation	Student	30	19.67	4.381	0.800	1.977	0.101
	Govt. Employee	30	18.30	4.647	0.848		
	Private Employee	30	20.13	4.289	0.783		
	Business	30	17.83	4.713	0.860		
	Others	30	17.33	5.274	0.963		
Type of Disability	Physical	81	17.93	4.909	0.545	5.601	0.005
	Visual	43	20.63	3.266	0.498		
	Hearing	26	17.65	5.396	1.058		
	Total	150	18.65	4.735	0.387		

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards presentation shows that male respondents' performance (18.83) is more than male (18.27) but it is not at the significant level because the tested t-value 0.703 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance towards presentation.

The difference among different age-group physically challenged respondents towards presentation shows that the performance of between 16-18 years age group respondents (20.06) is significantly higher than the respondents who are above 21 years of age (19.84), between 19-21 years (19.24) and 10-15 years of age (13.16).The calculated f-value is 18.577 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.000.It shows that there is a significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards presentation were above 21 years age-group respondents performing better in the presentation.

The significant difference among different caste group physically challenged respondents towards presentation shows that the performance of open category respondents (20.08) is significantly higher than the respondents who are schedule tribe respondents (19.75), other backward castes (18.91) and schedule caste respondents (15.90).The calculated f-value is 7.103 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.000.It shows that there is a significant difference among different caste physically challenged respondents in their performance towards presentation where open category respondents performing better in the presentation.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards presentation shows that the performance of post graduation and above qualified respondents (19.18) is found higher than the respondents who qualified secondary education (18.76), graduation (18.61) and higher secondary qualified (18.03).The calculated f-value is 0.373 found not significant because the p-value is 0.773.It shows that there is no significant difference among different education qualification respondents in their performance towards presentation.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards presentation shows that the performance of students and private employees (20.13) is found higher than students (19.67), government employees (18.30), business people (17.83) and other occupation respondents (17.33).The tested f-value 1.977 is not a significant value because the p-value is 0.101.It infers that there is no significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards presentation.

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards presentation shows that the performance of visually disabled respondents (20.63) is found higher than the physically disabled respondents (17.93) and hearing disabled respondents (17.65).The calculated f-value is 5.601 found significant at 1% level because the p-value is 0.005.It shows that there is a significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards presentation.

Table 6: Perceptive Analysis of Various Demographic Group Respondents on Response Strategy of Physically Challenged

Demographic variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	T-value	P-value
Gender	Male	102	18.30	3.807	0.377	1.388	0.168
	Female	48	17.42	3.578	0.516		
Age	10-15 Years	25	17.24	2.697	0.539	2.602	0.054
	16-18 Years	64	18.33	3.809	0.476		
	19-21 Years	42	18.81	3.846	0.593		
	Above 21 Years	19	16.26	4.012	0.920		
Caste	SC	39	16.82	3.913	0.627	2.006	0.116
	ST	40	18.77	3.309	0.523		
	OBC	32	18.25	3.672	0.649		
	OC	39	18.26	3.912	0.626		
Education	Secondary	34	17.74	3.776	0.648	0.315	0.815
	Higher Secondary	36	18.47	3.917	0.653		
	Graduation	41	17.76	3.936	0.615		
	P G and Above	39	18.13	3.443	0.551		
Occupation	Student	30	18.37	3.157	0.576	1.174	0.325
	Govt. Employee	30	17.60	4.391	0.802		
	Private Employee	30	19.13	4.377	0.799		
	Business	30	17.73	3.162	0.577		
	Others	30	17.27	3.383	0.618		
Type of Disability	Physical	81	18.16	4.048	0.450	0.153	0.858
	Visual	43	17.77	3.442	0.525		
	Hearing	26	18.00	3.335	0.654		
	Total	150	18.02	3.746	0.306		

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards response shows that male respondents' performance (18.30) is more than female (17.42) but is not at the significant level because the tested t-value 1.388 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance towards response.

The difference among different age-group physically challenged respondents towards response shows that the performance of between 19-21 years age group respondents (18.81) is significantly higher than the respondents who are between 16-18 years of age (18.33), 10-15 years of age (17.24) and above 21 years (16.26).The calculated f-value is 2.602 found significant at 5% level because the p-value is 0.054.It shows that there is no significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards response where between 19-21 years age-group respondents performing better in response.

The significant difference among different caste group physically challenged respondents towards response shows that the performance of schedule tribe respondents (18.77) is significantly higher than the respondents who are open category respondents (18.26), other backward castes (18.25) and schedule caste respondents (16.82).The calculated f-value is 2.006 found not significant because the p-value is 0.116.It shows that there is no significant difference among different caste physically challenged respondents in their performance towards response where schedule tribe respondents performing better in response.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards response shows that the performance of higher secondary qualified respondents (18.47) is found higher than the respondents who qualified post graduation and

above (18.13), graduation (17.76) and secondary education qualified (17.74).The calculated f-value is 0.315 found not significant because the p-value is 0.815.It shows that there is no significant difference among different education qualification respondents in their performance towards response.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards response shows that the performance of students and government employees (19.13) is found higher than the student (18.37), business people (17.73), government employees (17.60) and others (17.27).The tested f-value 1.174 is not a significant value because the p-value is 0.325.It infers that there is no significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards response.

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards response shows that the performance of physically disabled respondents (18.16) is found higher than the hearing disabled respondents (18.00) and visually disabled respondents (17.77).The calculated f-value is 0.153 found not significant because the p-value is 0.858.It shows that there is no significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards response.

Table 7: Perceptive Analysis of Various Demographic Group Respondents on Career Aspirations of Physically Challenged

Demographic Variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	T-Value	P-Value
Gender	Male	102	19.12	3.978	0.394	0.559	0.577
	Female	48	19.48	3.555	0.513		
Age	10-15 years	25	19.96	2.653	0.531	1.426	0.238
	16-18 years	64	19.14	3.960	0.495		
	19-21 years	42	19.62	4.132	0.638		
	Above 21 years	19	17.74	3.928	0.901		
Caste	SC	39	19.41	3.851	0.617	0.608	0.611
	ST	40	19.73	3.916	0.619		
	OBC	32	19.19	3.771	0.667		
	OC	39	18.59	3.864	0.619		
Education	Secondary	34	18.85	3.727	0.639	0.233	0.873
	Higher Secondary	36	19.58	4.232	0.705		
	Graduation	41	19.12	3.148	0.492		
	P G and Above	39	19.36	4.307	0.690		
Occupation	Student	30	19.97	3.690	0.674	1.748	0.143
	Govt. Employee	30	19.97	4.098	0.748		
	Private Employee	30	19.50	4.321	0.789		
	Business	30	18.97	3.567	0.651		
	Others	30	17.77	3.234	0.591		
Type of disability	Physical	81	19.48	3.889	0.432	0.453	0.637
	Visual	43	19.09	3.797	0.579		
	Hearing	26	18.69	3.834	0.752		
	Total	150	19.23	3.840	0.314		

The difference between male and female physically challenged respondents towards career aspirations shows that female respondents' performance (19.48) is more than male (19.12) but is not at the significant level because the tested t-value 0.559 is not a significant value. It infers that there is no significant difference between male and female physically challenged persons in their performance towards career aspirations.

The difference among different age-group physically challenged respondents towards career aspirations shows that the performance of between 10-15 years age group respondents (19.96) is significantly higher than the respondents who are between 19-21 years of age (19.62), between 16-18 years (19.14) and above 21 years of age (17.74).The calculated f-value is 1.426 found not significant because the p-value is 0.238.It shows that there is no significant difference among different age group physically challenged respondents in their performance towards career aspirations whereas between 10-15 years age-group respondents performing better in career aspirations.

The significant difference among different caste group physically challenged respondents towards career aspirations shows that the performance of schedule tribe respondents (19.73) is significantly higher than the respondents who are schedule caste respondents (19.41), other backward castes (19.19) and open category respondents (18.59).The calculated f-value is 0.608 found not significant because the p-value is 0.611.It shows that there is no significant difference among different caste physically challenged respondents in their performance towards career aspirations where schedule tribe respondents performing better in career aspirations.

The difference among different education qualification respondents towards career aspirations shows that the performance of higher secondary qualification respondents (19.58) is found higher than the respondents who qualified post graduation and above (19.36), graduation (19.12) and secondary education qualified (18.85).The calculated f-value is 0.233 found not significant because the p-value is 0.873.It shows that there is a significant difference among different education qualifications of respondents in their performance towards career aspirations.

The significant difference among different occupation levels of physically challenged respondents towards career aspirations shows that the performance of students and government employees (19.97) is found higher than private employees (19.50), business people (18.97) and others (17.77).The tested f-value 1.748 is not a significant value because the p-value is 0.143.It infers that there is no significant difference among different occupation levels of respondents in their performance towards career aspirations.

The significant difference among different types of disability respondents towards career aspirations shows that the performance of physically disabled respondents (19.48) is found higher than the visually disabled respondents (19.09) and hearing disabled respondents (18.69).The calculated f-value is 0.453 found not significant because the p-value is 0.637.It shows that there is no significant difference among different types of disability respondents in their performance towards career aspirations.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- The demographic profile of the respondents from the data denotes that more than sixty percent of the sample physically challenged persons are male where the majority are between 21-30 years in the age group. It is also noticed that more than sixty percent of physically challenged respondents have qualified graduation and above graduation.
- It is noticed that more than fifty percent of the respondents are having a disability by birth and they need extra time to read or write a text because of their disability. However, a major group of respondents need extra time to use specialized equipment or technology, they need sufficient time to complete an assessment.

- According to the response of physically challenged persons it can be concluded that the majority group enables multiple or frequent breaks in finishing the task, so they need an extension of time to complete any assessment.
- The data revealed that most of the physically challenged persons opined that the total assessment can be completed in smaller sections with additional time and they felt additional time allows them for other adjustments in the work.
- The data infers that forty percent of overall physically challenges persons said always true with the additional time allows the physically challenged to compete for assignment with perfection.
- While the data reveals the physically challenged fatigues easily by the others, nearly fifty percent of respondents agreed for their anxiety may impact on the quality of work.
- It can be concluded from the data that the majority group of physically challenged persons does not need more time to complete any task unless sometimes felt difficulty in maintaining concentration during a length of activity. So they require more time for ongoing feedback which will be possible with medication and other health procedures for their performance of activities
- It is observed from the responses of the physically challenged persons that they need an adjustment to overcome distractions, reduce anxiety and frustration for better results.
- The majority group of physically challenged need multiple steps or stages to finish a complex problem even though they attend regular to school/ college. Still, majority group of respondents felt that with the anxiety levels may impact on the quality of the response to the assignment which starting an assessment with a section that engages the physically challenged.
- A dominated group of physically challenged agreed that they find easier to complete an assignment with a section but they complete any work when choosing a time of the day.
- It is noticed from the response of the physically challenged persons that they need regular medical treatment for their health condition as well as strong areas of interest that need to be capitalized upon.
- Most of the physically challenged overcome distraction by using adjustment at sensory issues to complete the assignments and enable explicit individual scaffolding to be provided in performing their duties.
- There is a need to reduce anxiety and frustration among physically challenged to complete the assignment.
- It can be concluded from the data that most of the respondents opined that always true that sensory or physical needs are impacting on the ability of physically challenged to complete the work because they may engage in behaviors which may distract other individuals.
- A predominant group of respondents said reduce distractions may be possible with physically challenged and they should select a particular location to minimize the concentration of others on their work.
- It is observed from the opinions of the respondents that at everywhere management provides wheelchair access to physically challenged and also proper guidance is needed at the school level to reduce anxiety.

- The data shows that the majority group of respondents are very much positively with support sensory needed by the physically challenged to present an assessment and they should provide support of others to finish the assignment.
- Most of the respondents felt that sometimes there is a need to minimizing anxiety and frustration among physically challenged to present or deliver the assessment. Whereas, it is always true that there is less encouragement from others to assign any work to physically challenged persons.
- The response of the physically challenged shows that scaffold memory, sequencing, directionality, and organizational skills are less in them so highlighting keywords or phrases in directions cannot be done by them.
- More than sixty percent of the physically challenged respondents accepted that they using symbols like arrows or stop signs to remind the student to do something is a difficult task at physically challenged persons. So they need help from others to remain focused on their performance.
- Refocus on physically challenged is needed when there are distractions more explanation is necessary to understand.
- A dominated group of respondents felt more than onetime reading will not give clarity to the physically challenged students, so presented in the format of pictures, symbols or signed can make them understand easily.
- As per the responses it is noticed that using colored highlighting for key words are particular to physically challenged students.
- It is observed that most of the physically challenged students have difficulties in seeing and/ or reading the text which fatigue easily at them as a result of physical, sensory or emotional issues.
- The majority group of respondents agreed that physically challenged face difficult in hearing instructions and follow directions so they need to use alternative communication systems for physically challenged to make them more clear in performing their duties.
- A significant number of respondents opined always true that large print and/ or changes to letter and sentence spacing is needed for challenged persons. They are also felt less text on the page is compulsory.
- Most of the respondents accepted that in order to meet student needs related to physical and sensory barriers that prevent the demonstration of achievement. It is expressed by many respondents that they need proper guidance and encouragement to complete any assignment.
- It can be concluded from the responses of physically challenged that their scribes need word-for-word answer including punctuations, even though they can answer through a translator who translates the verbal response.
- Most of the respondents felt that tools with adaptations, such as pencil grips or hand grips badly need by a physically challenged but they did not accept specialized writing tools which are badly needed by them to write.
- Above fifty percent of the respondents expressed that they need special paper which is used by physically challenged students to present their response and they need special keyboards to type on a typewriter or a computer.

- It is indicated from the data that a dominated group of respondents in all the selected three districts agreed with the statement that a scribe must be provided to each and every physically challenged student and they also need mandatory of speech-to-text software.
- A dominated group of respondents in all the selected three districts agreed that assistive technology is necessary for physically challenged to express their response to an assignment when there are distractions. Forty percent of physically challenged respondents opined that a symbol bank technology is needed to assist them and also expressed that they cannot respond to the assessment without a word bank.
- A predominated group of respondents in all the selected three districts agreed that finger or eye pointing may help the physically challenged to locate the spot. So majority group of respondents felt that a computer or word processor cannot be used by every physically challenged.
- The majority group of respondents in all the selected three districts agreed that communication devices can be utilized by the physically challenged and they felt symbol systems are the part and parcel of the education system to physically challenged student.
- Most of the respondents felt that it is always difficult to understand the response of physically challenged but a talking calculator and Braille machine are very much necessary tools for them.
- It can be noted from the responses of the physically challenged persons that facilities provided by the government to them are good and special care taken by the normal people towards them found average.
- The majority group of respondents has a poor opinion about the cooperation and encouragement given by the surrounding people towards physically challenged.
- A dominated group of respondents opined that grasping the power of physically challenged is poor but their performance of work is good
- Most of the respondents have good opinion about their working skills and performance in relation to educational activities. But they who less interest in learning new things. Still, they have good determination in their carrier aspirations.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has clearly brought out the strong linkages between poverty and disability. The study was undertaken by the author also corroborates the same. The three per cent reservation provisions in jobs, in education and in all poverty alleviation schemes are to be implemented in right earnest to ameliorate the conditions of the poor physically and mentally challenged population. Private sector initiatives in the organized sector coupled with an effective delivery system for making the concessional facilities available to the poor and disabled persons will help to break the vicious cycle of poverty and disability. Increasing the poverty line criteria for the disabled persons also needs consideration by the planners. The problem of mobility and physical barriers are the roadblocks for the disabled in accessing facilities, accessing people and accessing information. Mitigating the problem requires resources and attention. Equally important is the social exclusion and discrimination that a disabled person faces in life which makes it miserable for him to live in society, not to talk of getting equal opportunity and full participation in mainstream activities which is far from real, even today. The study,

based on perceptual responses, corroborates the general feeling that the majority of disabled feel socially excluded and discriminated. The attitudinal barriers are, therefore, the real barriers that need to be crossed over in the first place. Higher inflow of resources to the sector to the schemes and programs run in the social welfare sector as also through the tenth plan committed component plan approach coupled with capacity building of NGOs for working in the remote rural areas are required to be ensured in order to materialize the commitment of an inclusive, barrier-free and rights-based society.

REFERENCES

1. *Akintaro, M.(2004), "Discrimination in Employment of People with Disabilities". A paper presented at workshop by Ministry of Labour and Productivity, Abuja.*
2. *Boorse, C., (2010), "Disability and Medical Theory," in Philosophical Reflections on Disability, D.C. Ralston and J.Ho (eds.), Dordrecht: Springer, pp.55–90.*
3. *Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment, Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.*
4. *Nurazzura Mohamad Diah* ***(2017),*** *Empowering people with disabilities (PWDS) via information communication technology (ICT): The case of Malaysia, International Journal for Studies on Children, Women, Elderly and Disabled, Vol.2 June, ISSN, 0128-309X.*
5. *Persons with Disabilities Act (1995).(Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment.*
6. *Thornton and Lunt (1999), "Employment Polices for Disabled People in Eighteen Countries", 305.*
7. *WHO.(2011).World Report on Disability. Malta. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report.pdf*
8. *World Health Organization, Report on Disability Prevalence (Geneva, 1993). See Annex E for descriptions of the human ability deficits experienced by "special needs users."*