

Impact of Special Olympic Program for Children with Intellectual Disabilities in the Light of Social Skills Development among Special Educators

Krishna Kumar Srivastava
Research Scholar, Department of Education,
Annamalai University,
Tamilnadu

Dr. K. Saileela
Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Annamalai University, Chidambaram,
Tamilnadu

Abstract:- The study investigated the Impact of a Special Olympics Program on Social Skill development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities. The samples were the 60 Special Educators of Children with Intellectual Disabilities who attended Special Olympic Program. About 60 Special Educators from Mumbai of the country answered when the Google form was circulated. Perception of the Special Educators on Social Skill Development (PSESSD) constructed by Krishna Kumar Srivastava and Dr K Saileela was used to collect the data. The questionnaire consists of 25 statements and was designed with dichotomous answering options: 'Yes' or 'No'. Scoring Procedure for statements, for Yes is one and for No is Zero. The data were analysed using the statistical techniques like Percentage analysis, Mean, median, Standard deviation and t-test. Results confirm that involvement in Special Olympics is positively correlated with Social Skill development, communication, and problems with competence and understanding.

I. INTRODUCTION

For the last 60 years, the Special Olympics have been a worldwide leader in providing year-round sport training and competition opportunities to athletes with intellectual disabilities. In 1968, the First International Special Olympics Games were held at Soldier's Field in Chicago with 1000 athletes from 26 states and Canada competing in three sports. Today, Special Olympics has grown to serve over 2.9 million people with intellectual disabilities in over 180 countries, through 30 summer and winter sports. Since 2000, global program growth has been one of the primary objectives of the Special Olympics. In fact, a strategic goal was set by Special Olympics to reach two million athletes worldwide by the end of 2005, a goal which as of 2008 is on the brink of three million athletes.

In addition to this goal for growth and documenting the quantity of athletes participating in the movement, Special Olympics, Inc. has also been committed to a line of research documenting the quality and impact of Special Olympics athletes' experiences.

The U.S. Special Olympics Impact Study (Harada & Siperstein, 2008; Siperstein, Harada, Parker, Hardman, & McGuire, 2005), was not only the first of its kind to address athletes' experiences in Special Olympics, but also their lives outside of sport. More specifically, the Impact Study provided U.S. programs with a wealth of information about

athletes, families, and coaches, with specific attention to athletes' experiences in Special Olympics over time.

This information is beneficial to programs in a manner that it can be used to ensure that athletes' interests continue to be met and to improve programs' outreach in the community to people with intellectual disabilities of all ages, particularly those who are not currently involved in Special Olympics.

One of the most notable findings from the U.S. study was that most athletes with intellectual disabilities participate in Special Olympics through school programs, and that they participate at a significant stage of their lives (an average age of 11 years). Another interesting finding was that Special Olympics athletes share the same motives for participating in and leaving sport as athletes without disabilities.

II. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

There are 40 Special schools, for children with Intellectual Disabilities and classes are running (from pre-primary to Vocational) in BMC Mumbai District, Maharashtra. Among these a significant number of Special schools are located in the urban and suburban areas. In recent years, with technological boom and global internet connectivity, the suburban and urban areas of Mumbai have also benefited to a large extent in terms of social development. Though the involvement of special Olympics program with support of GOV and NGO has become widespread, little research has been conducted on the impact of these events on the minimum endorsed 8-year-olds as well as the adolescent population of Mumbai. This study attempts to partially address this gap by examining the Effectiveness of Special Olympic Program for Children with Intellectual Disabilities on Social Skill Development. Effectiveness of Special Olympic Program was found by the Parents Perception on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities. Every age group of students with ID at all levels has not been officially involved and recorded so far. Therefore, there is an urgent need to study the effectiveness of Special Olympic Program on Social skill development of the Children with Intellectual Disabilities. A priori studies on such topics are not much available therefore this study would be the first of its kind for this region.

- **Research Questions**

- 1) Is there is any significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities (CWID) in their Home Environment with respect to the following variables
 - a) Gender
 - b) Age
 - c) Location
 - d) Income
- 2) Is there is any significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities (CWID) in their School Environment with respect to the following variables
 - a) Gender
 - b) Age
 - c) Location
 - d) Income

III. METHODS

This descriptive-survey study was conducted to find out the effectiveness of Perception of the Special Educators on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities (CWID) in their Home Environment and School Environment. The population of the study comprised Samples of Special Educators whose Children with Intellectual Disabilities are attending Special Olympic Program. They are selected from various parts of the Mumbai. A sample of 60 Special Educators participated in the survey from Mumbai, Maharashtra. They were selected by Purposive sampling technique when the Google form was sent to the Special Educators through digital mode.

The data were collected using (i) Personal data form and (ii) Social Skill Development. The

A. Personal Data :

Collection form was used to collect the demographic information such as Gender, Age, Location and Income status of Special Educators.

- Based on gender, the respondents were categorized as male and female
- Based on Age the respondents were categorized as Below 35 and Above 35
- Based on Location the respondents were categorized as Rural and Urban
- Based on Income status the respondents were categorized as Less than 10000 and Above 10000

B. Perception of Special Educators on Social Skill Development :

The questionnaire consists of 25 statements and was designed with dichotomous answering options: 'Yes' or 'No'. Scoring Procedure was for positive statements, Yes is one and for No is Zero. And for negative statements the vice-versa. Questions of this Perception of the Special

Educators on Social Skill Development (PSESSD) are given in the Table 1.

Question numbers for Home environment- q1, q2, q4, q5, q15, q20, q22, q23, q24 and q25

Question numbers for School environment – q3, q5, q6, q7, q8, q9, q10, q11, q12, q13, q14, q15, q21, q16, q17, q18 and q19

IV. PROCEDURES

The investigators adopted online survey method for collecting data for this study. For the present study, questionnaire was imported to Google Forms with Personal Data Form and PSESSD. The link was shared among social media like what's up App, and email, the collected data was exposed as spread sheet in the Google Forms. The scored master data were analysed with the help of IBM-SPSS version 23. The data were analysed using the statistical techniques Percentile analysis, Descriptive and Differential analysis. For comparing a demographic variables Gender, Age, Location and Income Status t-test was used; Hypotheses were tested uniformly at 5% level of significance for table value.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

From the Table-1 we could see that

For the statement, 1. Does your student greet the guests when they visit your School, 87.5% have responded yes. For the statement, 2. Does your student obey your commands in Classroom? 92.33% have responded yes. For the statement, 3. Does your student feel happy when you praise him for good academic, 95.67% have responded yes. For the statement 4. Does your student feel guilty when you angry him? 75.67% have responded yes. For the statement 5. Does he/she feel sorry after a mistake is realized by you? 78.5% have responded yes. For the statement, 6. Does he/she thank others after receiving help? 74.67% have responded yes. For the statement, 7. Does he/she use polite words like 'excuse me', 'kindly' or 'please with their friends'? 65.67% have responded yes. For the statement, 8. Is he/she capable of taking care of personal belongings in the school like school bag, lunch box, pencil box and others? 88% have responded yes. For the statement, 9. Does he/she share his/her food with his peers while eating? 80.83%, have responded yes. For the statement, 10. Do you encourage your student to Participate in the school annual function? 93.20% have responded yes. For the statement, 11. Does your student perform the activities as per teacher's instructions? 92.33% have responded yes. For the statement, 12. Does he/she assist the teachers on request? 86.33% have responded yes. For the statement, 13. Does he/she seek the permission of the teacher when he wants to go out of the class for any activity? 78.17% have responded yes. For the statement, 14. Do you encourage your student to take up the respect of parents in home? 76.83% have responded yes. For the statement, 15. Does he/she dress appropriately as per the requirement? 81% have responded yes. For the statement, 16. Does he/she exhibit appropriate manners in gatherings like social functions, school assembly, birthday parties etc.?

91% have responded yes. For the statement, 17. Does he/she behave appropriately with the opposite gender? 87% have responded yes. For the statement, 18. Does he/she share lunch/snacks with his/her classmates during the break? 68.17% have responded yes. For the statement, 19. Does he/she identify other individuals by their names? 92% have responded yes. For the statement, 20. Does he/she have a proper self-awareness? 65.67%, have responded yes. For the statement, 21 Does he /she identify his self-interest and abilities? 68.17% have responded yes. For the

statement, 22. Does your student identify your happy when you giving reward? 65.67 % have responded yes. For the statement, 23 Does he/she express when angry? 96.33%, have responded yes. For the statement, 24. Does your student show patience when you take some time to give answer of their question? 86 % have responded yes. For the statement, 25. Does your student acquire self-confidence on completing an activity successfully and independently? 87.33% have responded yes.

| S.No | Perception on Social Skill Development for Special Educator | Yes | No |
|------|--|--------|--------|
| 1 | Does your student greet the guests when they visit your School? | 87.5% | 12.5% |
| 2 | Does your student obey your commands in classroom? | 92.33% | 7.67% |
| 3 | Does your student feel happy when you praise him for good academic | 95.67% | 4.33% |
| 4 | Does your student feel guilty when you angry him? | 75.67% | 43.33% |
| 5 | Does he/she feel sorry after a mistake is realized by you? | 78.5% | 21.5% |
| 6 | Does he/she thank others after receiving help from their friend? | 74.67% | 25.33% |
| 7 | Does he/she use polite words like 'excuse me', 'kindly' or 'please with their friend'? | 65.67 | 34.33 |
| 8 | Is he/she capable of taking care of personal belongings in the school like school bag, lunch box, pencil box and others? | 88% | 12% |
| 9 | Does he/she share his/her food with his peers while eating? | 80.83% | 19.17% |
| 10 | Do you encourage your student to participate in the school annual function? | 93.2% | 6.80% |
| 11 | Does your student perform the activities as per your instructions? | 92.33% | 7.67% |
| 12 | Does he/she assist the friends on request? | 86.33% | 13.67% |
| 13 | Does he/she seek the permission of the teacher when he wants to go out of the class for personal activity? | 78.17% | 21.83% |
| 14 | Do you encourage your student to take up the respect of parents in home? | 76.83% | 13.17% |
| 15 | Does he/she dress appropriately as per the requirement? | 81% | 19% |
| 16 | Does he/she exhibit appropriate manners in gatherings like social functions, school assembly, birthday parties etc.? | 91% | 11% |
| 17 | Does he/she behave appropriately with the opposite gender? | 87% | 13% |
| 18 | Does he/she share lunch/snacks with his/her classmates during the break? | 68.17% | 31.83% |
| 19 | Does he/she identify other individuals by their names? | 92% | 8% |
| 20 | Does he/she have a proper self-awareness? | 65.67% | 34.33% |
| 21 | Does he /she identify his self-interest and abilities? | 68.17% | 31.83% |
| 22 | Does your student identify your happy when you are giving reward? | 65.67% | 34.33% |
| 23 | Does he/she express when angry? | 96.83% | 3.17% |
| 24 | Does your student show patience when you take some time to give answer of their question? | 86% | 14% |
| 25 | Does your student acquire self-confidence on completing an activity successfully and independently? | 87.33% | 12.67% |

Table 1:- Perception on Social Skill Development for Special Educator

| Home Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Gender of Special Educators | Male | 09 | 9.11 | 1.54 | 1.044 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 51 | 8.41 | 1.90 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 8.52 | 1.85 | | |

Table 2 : Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Gender on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities (CWID) in Home Environment.

It is seen from the table- 2 the average Home environment score with respect to social skill development is 9.11 for Male and 8.41 for Female. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Male and Female the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 1. There are no significant differences in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Gender on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 1.044 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Male and Female in their mean Home environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| School Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|--------------------------|----------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Age of Special Educators | Above 35 | 37 | 15.19 | 3.08 | 0.021 | Not Significant |
| | Below 35 | 23 | 15.17 | 2.04 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 15.18 | 2.71 | | |

Table 3: Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Age on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

It is seen from the **table 3 above** that the average School environment score with respect to social skill development is 15.19 for Above 35 and 15.17 for Below 35. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Above 35 and below 35 the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 2. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educator with respect to their Age on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 0.021 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Above 35 and Below 35 in their mean School environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| Home Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Location of Special Educators | Rural | 20 | 9.00 | 1.49 | 1.440 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 40 | 8.28 | 1.99 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 8.52 | 1.85 | | |

Table 4 : Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Location on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

It is seen from the **table 4 above** that the average Home environment score with respect to social skill development is 9.00 for Rural and 8.28 for Urban . In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Rural and Urban the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 3. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Location on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 1.440 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Rural and Urban in their mean Home environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| Home Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | T | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----|------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Income of Special Educators | Less than 10000 | 15 | 8.53 | 1.81 | 0.040 | Not Significant |
| | Above 10000 | 45 | 8.51 | 1.89 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 8.52 | 1.85 | | |

Table 5 : Perception of the Educators with respect to their Income status on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

It is seen from the **table 5 above** that the average Home environment score with respect to social skill development is 8.53 for Less than 10000 and 8.51 for Above 10000. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Less than 10000 and Above 10000 the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 4. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Income status on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 0.040 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Less than 10000 and Above 10000 in their mean Home environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| School Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Gender of Special Educators | Male | 09 | 15.56 | 2.60 | 0.444 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 51 | 15.12 | 2.75 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 15.18 | 2.71 | | |

Table 6 : Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Gender on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

It is seen from the table 6 above that the average School environment score with respect to social skill development is 15.56 for Male and 15.12 for Female. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Male and Female the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 5. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Gender on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 0.444 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Male and Female in their mean School environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| School Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|--------------------------|----------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Age of Special Educators | Above 35 | 37 | 15.19 | 3.08 | 0.021 | Not Significant |
| | Below 35 | 23 | 15.17 | 2.04 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 15.18 | 2.71 | | |

Table 7 : Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Age on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

It is seen from the table 7 above that the average School environment score with respect to social skill development is 15.19 for Above 35 and 15.17 for Below 35. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Above 35 and below 35 the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 6. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educator with respect to their Age on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 0.021 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Above 35 and Below 35 in their mean School environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| School Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Location of Special Educators | Rural | 20 | 16.10 | 1.48 | 1.894 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 40 | 14.73 | 3.06 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 15.18 | 2.71 | | |

Table 8: Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Location on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

It is seen from the table 8 above that the average School environment score with respect to social skill development is 16.10 for Rural and 14.73 for Urban. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among Rural and Urban the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 7. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Location on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 1.894 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Rural and Urban in their mean School environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

| School Environment Score | | No. | Mean | S.D | t | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Income of Special Educators | Less than 10000 | 15 | 15.13 | 2.39 | 0.082 | Not Significant |
| | Above 10000 | 45 | 15.20 | 2.83 | | |
| Total | | 60 | 15.18 | 2.71 | | |

Table 9 : Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Income status on Social Skill Development of Children in School Environment.

It is seen from the table 9 above that the average School environment score with respect to social skill development is 15.13 for Less than 10000 and 15.20 for Above 10000. In order to find whether the mean scores differ among School Level and College Level the following hypothesis was framed and tested.

Ho 8. There is no significant difference in the Perception of the Special Educators with respect to their Income status on Social Skill Development of Children in Home Environment.

Result: t-test for equality of means was applied to verify the above hypothesis. The calculated t-test value is 0.082 which is lesser than the critical value of 2.002 at 5% level. The calculated t-value is lower than the critical value and hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among Less than 10000 and Above 10000 in their mean School environment scores with respect to social skill development. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

VI. DISCUSSION

Approximately 1 – 3 percent of the global population has an intellectual disability—as many as 200 million people. Intellectual disability is significantly more common in low-income countries—16.41 in every 1,000 people. Disabilities overall are more common in low-income countries. The United Nations Development Program estimates that 80 percent of all people with disabilities live in low-income countries. While people with disabilities represent approximately one in 10 people worldwide, they are one in every five of the world's poorest people. Intellectual disabilities represent the most common developmental disability. Intellectual disability involves problems with general mental abilities that affect functioning in two areas: intellectual functioning (such as learning, problem solving, judgment) adaptive functioning (activities of daily life such as communication and independent living). Intellectual disability affects about one percent of the population, and of those about 85 percent have mild intellectual disability. Males are more likely than females to be diagnosed with intellectual disability. The policy of inclusion (mainstreaming) of children with an intellectual disability in regular schools has raised questions about the extent to which 'true' integration is possible (Townsend MA et.al.,). One important aspect of integration is social acceptance by the regular class children. The students presented positive attitudes towards peers with disabilities. Students in schools that included students with intellectual disabilities had more positive attitudes than other students, in a study conducted by Alnahdi GH. (2019).

Siperstein,et.al., (2009) examined the social acceptance of children with and without intellectual disabilities in a

summer recreational program. Results showed that children with and without intellectual disabilities were equally accepted by their peers. Specifically, 95% of children without intellectual disabilities indicated that they liked to “hang out with” at least 1 child with an intellectual disability. As Special Olympics an international organization, is dedicated to empower individuals with intellectual disabilities to become physically fit, productive and respected members of society through sports training and competition. It is important to determine how programmes serving the individual with intellectual disability may also give support to develop by Special Educators of adult children with intellectual disabilities. Special Educators who frequently observe their children compete in Special Olympics have a more positive Special Educators–child experience than those who do not attend with the same frequency. In this study for all the statements of the tool, Perception of the Special Educators on Social Skill Development of Children with Intellectual Disabilities (CWID) Special Educators have responded with maximum yes. Children may be more motivated, increases socialism and improve more social development in their day to day life, most of the time children are attentive and develop social skills in their day to day life etc. may be the reasons. Social skills are essential to form and sustain positive relationships with others and cope up well in the environment. Usually, children learn social skills as they grow, but children with Intellectual disability learn slowly. The reasons for social skills deficits in children with Intellectual disabilities are deficits in cognitive skills, lack of opportunities and training. Special Educators, family members and Parents need to provide guidance and exposure for children with Intellectual disabilities to practice social skills. This will enhance their social participation and interaction which makes him/her well-adjusted individual of the society

REFERENCES

- [1] <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.508.9140&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [2] <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2005.00234.x>
- [3] <https://niepid.nic.in/NIMH%20E-%20learning/social%20skills%20ppt.pdf>
- [4] <https://www.specialolympics.org/about/intellectual-disabilities/what-is-intellectual-disability>
- [5] <https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/intellectual-disability/what-is-intellectual-disability>
- [6] Alnahdi GH. (2019) The positive impact of including students with intellectual disabilities in schools: Children's attitudes towards peers with disabilities in Saudi Arabia. *Res Dev Disabil.* 2019 Feb;85:1-7. doi:

10.1016/j.ridd.2018.10.004. Epub 2018 Oct 30. PMID: 30388506.

- [7.] Siperstein, G. N., Glick, G. C., & Parker, R. C. (2009). Social Inclusion of Children With Intellectual Disabilities in a Recreational Setting. *Intellect Dev Disabil*, 47 (2): 97–107.
- [8.] Townsend MA, Wilton KM, Vakilirad T. Children's attitudes toward peers with intellectual disability. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 1993 Aug;37 (Pt 4):405-11. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.1993.tb00883.x. PMID: