

STUDY OF FUNCTIONAL STATUS OF INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED (ID) STUDENTS OF INCLUSIVE AND SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. Jitendra Pratap Singh¹, Prof. Yash Pal Singh², Ph. D. &
Prof. Anju Agarwal³, Ph. D.

¹Research Scholar, IASE, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh

²Professor, IASE, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh

³Professor, IASE, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh

Paper Received On: 25 DECEMBER 2022

Peer Reviewed On: 31 DECEMBER 2022

Published On: 01 JANUARY 2023

Abstract

Present study focuses on studying the functional ability/status of intellectually disabled (ID) students in inclusive and special schools. The objectives of the study were - (i) to study the functional status of ID students in special schools on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender (ii) to study the functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender and (iii) to study the functional status of ID students on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their school category. A total sample of 91 ID students from inclusive schools and 61 ID students from special schools of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India was selected using purposive sampling method. The findings of the study are – (i) ID students in special schools were not differing significantly on functional status of 'learning and applying knowledge' and 'general task and demands' dimensions with reference to their gender (ii) though, ID students in special schools were significant different on functional status of 'communication' dimension with reference to their gender (iii) No significant difference was found in functional status between ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge', 'general task and demands' and 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender (iv) Similarly, there was no significant difference was found between functional status of ID boys and ID girls on 'learning and applying knowledge', 'general task and demands' dimensions over their school category and (v) Though, the significant difference was found between functional status of ID boys and ID girls on 'communication' dimension over their school category. It can be concluded in the light of study that ID students should be provided adequate support services and system to minimize the barriers.

Key words: Intellectual disability (ID), functional status, barriers, facilitators, inclusive education



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

Introduction

Disability affects the functioning of any person who has disability. Children with intellectual disabilities (ID) face many difficulties in learning, social activities, problems in motor skill activities and it adversely affects the ability to perform successfully in everyday activities. This negatively impacts a child's ability to learn in a regular educational setting. In special schools ID students receive the instruction according to their need because of availability of adequate support services, availability of resources and trained special educators and other rehabilitation professionals. Though, it is reported by many researches that there is lack of special educators and adequate support services and resources as per the need of ID students in inclusive schools in our country. It becomes important to improve the functional status of children with disabilities including ID students. In different legislations and policies it is recommended that children with disabilities have right to access of quality education and adequate services for their appropriate development. RPWD Act-2016 and NEP-2020 also made provisions for the education for children with disabilities to enhance their skills and participation in every aspect of life.

Many research studies reported the barriers and facilitators for ID students. Some studies reported that most of barriers are related to the ID students, their family and the community. In education of the child intrapersonal and interpersonal factors have the ability to influence the direction and state of attainment of his/her educational goals/skills. Boucher, T.Q., McIntyre, C.L. & Iarocci, G. (2022) indentified major two categories of barriers i.e. (i) intrapersonal barriers (factors that are within the person which hold back physical activity involvement) (ii) interpersonal barriers (factors external to the person, such as lack of community support) and two categories of facilitators (iii) intrapersonal facilitators (factors within the person that enhance physical activity involvement) and (iv) interpersonal facilitators (external factors such as supports from caregivers). Yu, Wang, Zhong, Qian, and Qi, (2022) identified low self-efficacy, lack of parental support, inadequate facilities as most prominent barriers for ID students. Though, the presence of facilitators in an educational setting may increase the level of participation of ID students in physical activities. Facilitators like self-efficacy, enjoyment of physical activity, sufficient parental support, social interaction with peers, attending school physical education classes, and adapted physical

activity programmes among children and adolescents with intellectually disabilities may improve their functional ability in educational setting (Yu, Wang, Zhong, Qian, and Qi, 2022).

Review of Related Literature

Lauri M.O. Rätty, Elina K. Kontu & Raija A. Pirttimaa (2016) conducted a qualitative study ‘teaching children with intellectual disabilities: analysis of research-based recommendations’ and they draw conclusions that instruction should be based on students’ ID strengths and an appropriate method for assessment the correct level of ID students. Teachers should use standardised assessment methods which are extremely important in communication and social skills instruction. Researchers suggested that preventing problems is typically better and more positive than treating the problem. Research also drawn a conclusion that teachers should ensure that their standards are not too low.

In same line of time Limaye (2016) studied the ‘factors influencing the accessibility of education for children with disabilities in India’ and explored the broader challenges in the current education system with respect to issues of quality of education and drop-out rates of primary students with disabilities. A number of factors that influence the accessibility of education for children with disabilities are presented including: perceptions of parents of children with disabilities and their difficulties in helping their children with disabilities, the general attitude of society, government officials, school staff and infrastructure, inadequate levels of training of key stakeholders, invisibility of disability in community, poverty, lack of acceptance, lack of interest, gender discrimination, lack of awareness, poor physical access, availability of various support systems, and government policies focusing on the education of children with disabilities in specific.

One year later, Bhat (2017) also argued about issues, challenges and prospects in inclusive education in India. Author revealed that there are several issues and challenges in inclusive education i.e., less students’ enrolment, lack of competencies among teachers, lack of competencies among teachers, large class sizes, rigid curriculum, inadequate pre-service training and professional development, negative attitude of parents and teachers, inadequate infrastructure, lack of assistive devices, and social attitude towards disability in the country.

Similarly, Taneja-Johansson, Singal, and Samson (2021) examined the perceptions and practices of mainstream teachers in rural government schools of Haryana. Study focused on how teachers understand and respond to the needs of students with disabilities. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with teachers and classroom observations, in six

primary schools, in three districts of Haryana. The findings suggested that deficit-oriented views dominate teachers' thinking, but they were ready to engage with disability issues. Teachers in these schools struggled in the classroom practices to meeting diverse learner needs and exclusionary practices were further amplified for children with disabilities. Teachers were unwilling to take responsibility for the learning of children with disabilities, expressing significant concerns about their own preparedness, while highlighting the lack of effective and appropriate support structures.

Recently, Yu S, Wang T, Zhong T, Qian Y, Qi J. (2022) carried out a survey 'barriers and facilitators of physical activity participation among children and adolescents with intellectual disabilities: a scoping review' and they identified most commonly reported barriers included disability-specific factors, low self-efficacy, lack of parental support, inadequate or inaccessible facilities, and lack of appropriate programs. Similarly, researchers identified most commonly reported facilitators included high self-efficacy, enjoyment of physical activity, sufficient parental support, social interaction with peers, attending school physical education classes, and adapted physical activity programmes among children and adolescents with intellectually disabilities.

Similarly, McDermott, G., Brick, N. E., Shannon, S., Fitzpatrick, B., & Taggart, L. (2022) studied the 'barriers and facilitators of physical activity in adolescents with intellectual disabilities: An analysis informed by the COM-B model'. The major aim of the study was to explore the factors influencing adolescent physical activity within schools through application of the COM-B model. Researchers employed a qualitative methodology, using focus groups with students, who have mild/moderate intellectual disabilities, their parents'/carers' and teachers'. The COM-B model provided the lens through which the data were collected and analysed. Researchers identified of a range of individual, interpersonal, and environmental factors influencing physical activity, across all six COM-B constructs, within the context of the 'school-system'. Identification of such physical activity behavioural determinants can support the development of effective and sustainable interventions.

Further, Shady, K., Phillips, S. & Newman, S. (2022) conducted a review to examine the 'barriers and facilitators to healthcare access in adults with intellectual and developmental disorders and communication difficulties: an integrative review'. The purpose of this review was to explore the barriers to and facilitators of healthcare access in adults with intellectual and developmental disorders (IDDs) and communication difficulties (CD) using Levesque et

al.'s conceptual framework of access to health. Researchers identified the barriers to access for adults with IDD and CDs i.e. health literacy, understanding health information, screening, fear, patient's negative expectations, time, accommodation needs, insurance coverage and financial difficulty, communication, coordination and continuity of care, and supporter presence and inclusion. Researchers concluded that communication between service providers, patients, and supporters is a significant barrier for persons with IDD and CD.

In continuation of such research studies Boucher, T.Q., McIntyre, C.L. & Iarocci, G. (2022) explored the 'facilitators and barriers to physical activity involvement as described by autistic youth with mild intellectual disability'. Major focus of this study was to examine the barriers and facilitators to physical activity in autistic youth with mild intellectual disability using semi-structured interviews with youth and through caregiver reports. Researchers selected fourteen caregivers and their children ages 8 to 16 years old for this study to collect the relevant information. Selected caregivers were given a questionnaire about their thoughts on their child's physical activity while their children interviewed using semi-structured interview. Researchers four themes related to barriers were identified inductively i.e. (i) intrapersonal barriers (factors that are within the person which hold back physical activity involvement) (ii) interpersonal barriers (factors external to the person, such as lack of community support) (iii) intrapersonal facilitators (factors within the person that enhance physical activity involvement) and (iv) interpersonal facilitators (external factors such as supports from caregivers).

Need and Significance of study

Present study has emphasis on the comparison of functional status of ID students in special and inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge', 'general task and demands' and 'communication dimensions' of ICF-FAS. This study explored the functional ability of ID students The results of present study will be useful to special educators, general teachers in inclusive setting and other rehabilitation professionals in planning and creating suitable learning environment for ID students. The findings of the study will give a clear frame about the functional status of ID boys and ID girls in inclusive and special schools.

Objectives of the study

Researcher wrote following objectives of the study to compare the functional status ID students in special and inclusive schools on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions of ICF-FAS.

1. To study the functional status of ID students in special schools on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender.
2. To study the functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender.
3. To study the functional status of ID students on (a) 'learning and applying knowledge', (b) 'general task & demands' and (c) 'communication' dimensions with reference to their school category.

Hypotheses of the study

Researcher has formulated the following null hypotheses-

1. There is no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender.
2. No significant difference exists between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'general task & demands' with reference to their gender.
3. There exists no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender.
4. No significant difference exists between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender.
5. The difference between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools does not exist significant on 'general task and demands' with reference to their gender.
6. There is no significant difference between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender.
7. No significant difference exists between functional status of ID boys on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category.
8. The significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID girls on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category.
9. There is no significant difference between functional status of ID boys on 'general task and demands' with reference to their school category.
10. No significant difference exists between functional status of ID girls on 'general task and demands' with reference to their school category.
11. The significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID boys on 'communication' with reference to their school category.

12. There is no significant difference between functional status of ID girls on 'communication' with reference to their school category.

Research Design of the study

Method

The main objective of the study was to examine the facilitators and barriers those influencing the functioning of ID students in inclusive and special schools. The study was based on descriptive research approach therefore Survey method is being adopted to collect the data for present study.

Population

The population of the present study was constructed by the students with intellectual disability who were studying in I-V classes in inclusive and special schools located in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh state.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Researcher used multi-stage random sampling method to draw the sample for present study. Firstly, four *tehsils* were selected randomly using lottery method; and secondly, researcher selected seven blocks randomly also using lottery method to draw the regular schools. Thirdly, ten inclusive schools (I-V classes) were selected from each block using lottery method. Finally, 70 inclusive schools were chosen using lottery method. A total sample of 97 intellectually disabled (ID) students in inclusive schools was selected purposive sampling method for the present study. Researcher also selected a sample of 61 intellectually disabled (ID) students who were studying in special schools of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, using purposive sampling method.

Tool used

The International Classifications of Functioning, Disability and Health- ICF a functional assessment scale (ICF-FAS) is based on the indicators and qualifiers of ICF for children with disabilities who were attending regular schools. Further, researcher used ICF based Functional Assessment Scale tool for rational assessment of functioning of students with disabilities developed, modified and standardised by Mishra, A. and Rangasayee, R. (2006, 2010). This tool contains 82 items covering all domains of 'Activity' and 'Participation' at second level classification system of ICF-FAS. Three dimensions i.e. 'learning and applying knowledge' (16 items), 'general task and demands' (4 items) and 'communication' (12 items) dimensions of this tool were selected to collected the data on functioning of ID students in inclusive and special schools.

The reliability of ICF-FAS full scale was found to be 0.72 (Based on Rasch Analysis), similarly a test-retest reliability coefficient was found 0.71 and an inter-rater reliability was calculated 0.78. The reliability of different dimensions was calculated using test-retest method and it was found 0.78 for ‘learning and applying knowledge’, 0.59 for ‘general task and demands’ and 0.77 for ‘communication’ dimensions. In comparing the use of teacher's report against parent as proxy to the administration of ICF-FAS, a high degree of correlation was observed in majority of items under domains ‘Learning and Applying Knowledge’, ‘Communication’ and ‘Self-Care’. A moderate to low degree of correlation was found with rest of the domains of the scale.

Delimitations of the study

1. Present study was delimited to ID students who were studying in special and inclusive schools of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh state.
2. In this study ID students of classes I-V were included who were studying in special and inclusive schools of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh state.
3. Researcher selected only three dimensions i.e. ‘learning and applying knowledge’, ‘general task and demands’ and ‘communication’ of ICF-FAS tool.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Researcher received 91 and 61 filled up tools from ID students in inclusive and special schools respectively. The data received from the selected sample of ID students from both the schools was analysed using SPSS package according to the objectives of the study and interpretation of data is given below accordingly.

H₀₁ There is no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on ‘learning and applying knowledge’ with reference to their gender.

Table-1: Comparison of functional status of ID students in special schools on ‘learning and applying knowledge’ with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	34	26.97	5.84	59	0.80	0.425 Not significant
Girls	27	25.74	6.04			

* Level of significance .05

Table-1 indicates the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in special schools on ‘learning and applying knowledge’ dimension of ICF-

FAS. The mean score of boys ($M=26.97$, $SD=5.84$) is slightly bigger than their counterparts ($M=25.74$, $SD=6.04$), which reflects that the functional status of boys on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, these mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the difference between two mean scores of intellectually disabled boys and girls is not found significant, because $t(59)=0.80$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.425, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender is accepted.

H_{02} No significant difference exists between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'general task & demands' with reference to their gender.

Table-2: Comparison of functional status of ID students in special schools on 'general task and demands' with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	34	11.23	1.54	59	-1.04	0.302 Not Significant
Girls	27	11.67	1.68			

* Level of significance .05

Table-2 shows the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in special schools on 'general task and demands' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls ($M=11.67$, $SD=1.68$) is marginally larger than their counterparts ($M=11.23$, $SD=1.54$), which reflects that the functional status of girls on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, the mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and results revealed that the mean difference between intellectually disabled boys and girls of special schools is not significant, because $t(59)= -1.04$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.302, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists between the functional status of ID students in special schools on 'general task & demands' with reference to their gender is accepted.

H_{03} There exists no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender.

Table-3: Comparison of functional status of ID students in special schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	34	18.47	5.45	59	-3.04	0.003* Significant
Girls	27	22.48	4.64			

* Level of significance .05

Table-3 gives the details of the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in special schools on 'general task and demands' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls (M=22.48, SD=4.64) is quite larger than their counterparts (M=18.47, SD=5.45), which reflects that the functional status of girls of special schools on the said dimension is better than their counterparts. Further, the mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and results revealed that the mean difference between ID boys and ID girls of special schools is found to be significant, because $t(59) = -3.04$ is significant as the p-value is 0.003, which is less than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between functional status of ID students in special schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender is rejected.

H₀₄ No significant difference exists between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender.

Table-4: Comparison of functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	56	26.48	6.51	89	1.05	0.295 Not Significant
Girls	35	25.14	4.77			

* Level of significance .05

Table-4 gives the details of mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of boys (M=26.48, SD=6.51) is quite larger than their counterparts (M=25.14, SD=4.77), which reflects that the functional status of ID boys of inclusive schools on the said dimension is better than their counterparts. Further, the mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and results revealed the mean difference between intellectually disabled boys and girls of inclusive schools is not

found to be significant, because $t(89) = 1.05$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.295, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their gender is accepted.

H₀₅ The difference between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools does not exist significant on 'general task and demands' with reference to their gender.

Table-5: Comparison of functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'general task and demands' with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	56	11.46	1.72	89	-0.987	0.326
Girls	35	11.83	1.71			Not Significant

* Level of significance .05

Table-5 describes about the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in inclusive schools on 'general task and demands' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls (M=11.83, SD=1.71) is marginally larger than their counterparts (M=11.46, SD=1.72), which reflects that the functional status of ID girls of inclusive schools on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, these mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the difference between ID boys and girls of inclusive schools is not found to be significant, because $t(89) = -0.987$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.326, which is greater than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the difference between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools does not exist significant on 'general task and demands' with reference to their gender is accepted.

H₀₆ There is no significant difference between functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender.

Table-6: Comparison of functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'communication' with reference to their gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Boys	56	29.34	3.90	89	-0.524	0.602
Girls	35	29.74	2.97			Not Significant

* Level of significance .05

Table-6 indicates the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID students (boys and girls) in inclusive schools on 'communication' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls (M=29.74, SD=2.97) is marginally larger than their counterparts (M=26.34, SD=3.90), which indicates that the functional status of ID girls of inclusive schools on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, the mean difference was calculated and the results revealed that the difference between intellectually disabled boys and girls of inclusive schools is not found to be significant, because $t(89) = -0.524$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.602, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in functional status of communication among ID students of inclusive schools with reference to their gender is accepted.

H₀₇ No significant difference exists between functional status of ID boys on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category.

Table-7 Comparison of functional status of ID boys on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	56	26.48	6.51	88	0.358	0.721 Not Significant
Special Schools	34	26.97	5.84			

* Level of significance .05

Table-7 shows the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID boys in inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of boys in special schools (M=26.97, SD=5.84) is marginally larger than boys in inclusive school (M=26.48, SD=6.51), which reflects that the functional status of special school boys on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, the means difference was calculated using independent t-test (2-tailed) and results revealed that intellectually disabled boys of inclusive schools and special schools do not differ significantly, because $t(88) = -0.358$ is not found to be significant as the p-value is 0.721, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference exists between functional status of ID boys on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category is accepted.

H₀₈ The significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID girls on 'learning and applying knowledge' with reference to their school category.

Table-8: Comparison of functional status of ID girls on ‘learning and applying knowledge’ with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	35	25.14	4.77	60	0.435	0.665 Not Significant
Special Schools	27	25.74	6.05			

* Level of significance .05

Table-8 reflects the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID girls of inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on ‘communication’ dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls in special school (M=25.74, SD=6.05) is marginally larger than girls in inclusive school (M=25.14, SD=4.77), which reflects that the functional status of girls in special school on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, these mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the difference between ID girls in inclusive schools and special schools is not significant, because $t(60)=0.435$ is not found significant as the p-value is 0.665, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID girls on ‘learning and applying knowledge’ with reference to their school category is accepted.

H₀₉ There is no significant difference between functional status of ID boys on ‘general task and demands’ with reference to their school category.

Table-9: Comparison of functional status of ID boys on ‘general task and demands’ with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	56	11.46	1.72	88	-0.638	0.525 Not Significant
Special Schools	34	11.24	1.54			

* Level of significance .05

Table-9 shows the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID boys in inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on ‘general task and demands’ dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of boys in inclusive school (M=11.46, SD=1.72) is marginally larger than boys in special school (M=11.24, SD=1.54), which reflects that the functional status of boys in inclusive school on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, these mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-

test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the difference between ID boys in inclusive schools and special schools is not significant, because $t(88) = -0.638$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.525, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference exists in functional status of 'general task and demands' of ID Boys in inclusive and special schools with reference to their school category is accepted.

H₁₀ No significant difference exists between functional status of ID girls on 'general task and demands' with reference to their school category.

Table-10: Comparison of functional status of ID girls on 'general task and demands' with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	35	11.83	1.71	60	-0.372	0.711 Not Significant
Special Schools	27	11.67	1.69			

* Level of significance .05

Table-10 describes about the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID boys in inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on 'general task and demands' dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls in inclusive school (M=11.83, SD=1.71) is marginally larger than girls in special school (M=11.67, SD=1.69), which reflects that the functional status of girls in inclusive school on the said dimension is marginally better than their counterparts. Further, these mean scores of two groups were compared using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the difference between ID girls in inclusive schools and special schools is not significant, because $t(60) = -0.372$ is not significant as the p-value is 0.711, which is more than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists between functional status of ID girls on 'general task and demands' with reference to their school category is accepted.

H₁₁ The significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID boys on 'communication' with reference to their school category.

Table-11: Comparison of functional status of ID boys on ‘communication’ with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	56	29.34	3.90	88	11.001	.001* Significant
Special Schools	34	18.47	5.45			

* Level of significance .05

Table-11 explains about the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID boys in inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on ‘communication’ dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of boys in inclusive school (M=29.34, SD=3.90) is quite larger than boys in special school (M=18.47, SD=5.45), which reflects that the functional status of boys in inclusive school on the said dimension is much better than their counterparts. Further, these two means were compared and mean difference was calculated using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the difference between ID boys in inclusive schools and special schools is significant, because $t(88)=11.00$ is significant as the p-value is 0.001, which is less than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the significant difference does not exist between functional status of ID boys on ‘communication’ with reference to their school category is rejected.

H₁₂ There is no significant difference between functional status of ID girls on ‘communication’ with reference to their school category.

Table-12: Comparison of functional status of ID girls on ‘communication’ with reference to their school category

Schools	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value
Inclusive Schools	35	29.74	2.97	60	-7.149	.001* Significant
Special Schools	27	24.15	3.16			

* Level of significance .05

Table-12 indicates about the mean, standard deviation, t-value and p-value of ID girls in inclusive and special schools inclusive schools on ‘communication’ dimension of ICF-FAS. The mean score of girls in inclusive school (M=2974, SD=2.97) is quite larger than girls in special school (M=24.15, SD=3.16), which reflects that the functional status of girls in inclusive school on the said dimension is quite better than their counterparts. Further, the

means difference was calculated using independent t-test (2-tailed) and the results revealed that the mean difference between ID girls in inclusive schools and special schools is significant, because $t(60) = -7.14$ is significant as the p-value is 0.001, which is less than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in functional status of Communication of ID Girls in inclusive and special schools with reference to their school category is rejected.

Major Findings

1. ID students in special schools were not differing significantly on the functional status of 'learning and applying knowledge' and 'general task and demands' dimensions with reference to their gender.
2. Though, ID students in special schools were significant different on the functional status of 'communication' dimension with reference to their gender.
3. Further, no significant difference was found between the functional status of ID students in inclusive schools on 'learning and applying knowledge', 'general task and demands' and 'communication' dimensions with reference to their gender.
4. There was no significant difference between functional status of ID boys and ID girls on 'learning and applying knowledge', 'general task and demands' dimensions over their school category.
5. Though, the significant difference was found between functional status of ID boys and ID girls on 'communication' dimension over their school category.

Conclusion

It is reported by many research studies that barriers for ID students influence their functional ability in educational and social settings. The results of the study indicate that adequate support services, resources and positive attitudes should be increased, which will enhance the level of participation and educational outcome of ID students.

References

- Boucher, T.Q., McIntyre, C.L. & Iarocci, G. (2022). *Facilitators and Barriers to Physical Activity Involvement as Described by Autistic Youth with Mild Intellectual Disability*. *Advances in Neurodevelopmental Disorders*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41252-022-00310-5>
- Lauri M.O. Rätty, Elina K. Kontu & Raija A. Pirttimaa (2016). *Teaching Children with Intellectual Disabilities: Analysis of Research-Based Recommendations*. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(2), 318-336. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n2p318>
- McDermott, G., Brick, N. E., Shannon, S., Fitzpatrick, B., & Taggart, L. (2022). *Barriers and facilitators of physical activity in adolescents with intellectual disabilities: An analysis informed by the COM-B model*. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual*

Disabilities, 35(3), 800–825. 10.1111/jar.12985

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9305883/#jar12985-sec-0019title>

MoE (2020). *National Education Policy-2020*, GOI.

DEPWD (2016). *The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act-2016*. MSJE, GOI.

Shady, K., Phillips, S. & Newman, S. (2022). *Barriers and Facilitators to Healthcare Access in Adults with Intellectual and Developmental Disorders and Communication Difficulties: an Integrative Review*. *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-022-00324-8>

Yu S, Wang T, Zhong T, Qian Y, Qi J. (2022). *Barriers and Facilitators of Physical Activity Participation among Children and Adolescents with Intellectual Disabilities: A Scoping Review*. *Healthcare*, 10(2):233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10020233>