

## A STUDY OF MOTIVATION AND SELF-CONCEPT AMONG DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED PEOPLE

Arti Bakhshi  
Professor\*

Karuna Gupta  
Research Scholar\*

\* PG Department of Psychology, University of Jammu, J&K, India

Received : 09/07/2017

1st BPR : 11/07/2017

2nd BPR : 12/07/2017

Accepted : 13/07/2017

### ABSTRACT

The present study has been undertaken to examine the differences in motivation and self-concept among 75 disabled and 75 non-disabled people with age ranging from 20 to 60 years. Basic psychological needs scale (BPNS) by Deci and Ryan (2000) and Self-concept checklist cum rating scale by Saraswat (2004) were used. Mean, SD and t-test were applied. The results of motivation showed significant differences among disabled and non-disabled people in competence only as a psychological need. Significant difference was found in total self-concept and in all the dimensions of self-concept except for power self-concept.

**Keywords :** Motivation, Self-concept, Disabled, Non-disabled

### INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (2001) defines disability as an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. An impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action; while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations.

Disability is not only a health problem, but it is a complex phenomenon, reflecting the interaction between features of a person's body and features of the society in which he or she lives. Overcoming the difficulties faced by people with disabilities requires interventions to remove environmental and social barriers (WHO, 2017).

More than one billion people in the world live with some form of disability, of whom nearly 200 million experience considerable difficulties in functioning (WHO, 2011). Whereas, In India, nearly 2.21 % of the population is suffering from one or the other kind of disability, Disability in movement at 20.3% emerges as the top category among the eight types of disabilities. Others in sequence are: hearing (18.9%), seeing (18.8%), any other (18.4%), Multiple disability (7.9) speech (7.5%), mental retardation (5.6%) and mental illness (2.7%) (Census of India, 2011). The present study has included people with disability in movement as disabled subjects.

### MOTIVATION

Motivation is the process by which activities are started, directed, and continued so that physical or psychological needs or wants are met (Ciccarelli and Meyer, 2008). Self-determination theory (SDT) is an empirically based theory of human motivation, development, and wellness (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT) is one of the five mini-theories of macro self-determination theory. It elaborates the concept of evolved psychological needs and their relations to psychological health and well-being.

BPNT argues that psychological well-being and optimal functioning is predicted on and Autonomy Relatedness, Competence. SDT supports three basic psychological needs (Autonomy Relatedness, Competence) that must be satisfied to foster well-being and health; these needs can be universally applied. However, some may be more salient than others at certain times and will be expressed differently based on time, culture or experience.

*Autonomy:* The need to feel that one's behavior and resulting outcomes are self-determined, or self-caused, as opposed to being influenced or controlled by outside forces.

*Relatedness:* The need to feel connected to, supported by, or cared for by other people.

*Competence:* The need to feel effective and capable of performing tasks at varying levels of difficulty.

Disabled people have psychological needs that should be satisfied for their psychological well being, growth, satisfaction and adjustment in life. The disabled fulfill their motivational needs to be accepted in the society, and this enables them to show the right behavior and encourage the right drive in themselves. Omolayo (2009) found no significant differences in the self-motivational needs of disabled and non-disabled participants.

### SELF-CONCEPT

Self-concept is an individual's awareness of her/his own identity. There are three aspects of this concept: self-image (of what the person is), ideal self (what the person wants to be) and self-esteem (what the person feels about the discrepancy between what s/he is and what s/he would like to be) (Lawrence, 1996). Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) stated that self concept can be broadly defined as a person's perception of him/herself. Self-concept is the perception of ourselves involving our attitudes, feelings, and knowledge about our skills, abilities, appearance, and social acceptability (Byrne, 1984).

Self-concept is the perception that individuals have of their own worth. This includes a composite of their feelings, a generalized view of their social acceptance, and their personal feelings about themselves (Bellmore & Cillessen, 2006).

According to Saraswat (2004). There are five dimensions of self-concept i.e. physical, power, ability, social and psychological self-concept.

Airat (2003) and Hussain (2006) reported that self-concept of physically disabled people was lower than normal people.

Russo, Goodwin, Miller, Haan, Connell and Crotty (2008) found that children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy had reduced quality of life and self-concept compared with typically developing peers.

Narimani and Mousazadeh (2010) studied self-concept of handicapped and normal students and reported significant differences in self-concept among handicapped and normal students.

Goel (2013) concluded that there was significant difference in self-concept among normal and physically handicapped children.

### HYPOTHESES

- H1 There will be significant differences in motivation among disabled and non-disabled people.
- H2 There will be significant differences in self-concept among disabled and non-disabled people.

### METHOD

#### Participants

The sample was comprised of 150 people (75 disabled and 75 non-disabled) with age ranging from 20 to 60 years. Purposive sampling technique was used for data collection.

#### Measures

**Basic psychological needs scale (BPNS)** by Deci and Ryan (2000). The basic psychological needs scale is a family of scales i.e. Basic need satisfaction in general (21 items), Basic need satisfaction at

work (21 items), Basic need satisfaction in relationships(9 items).In the study , only basic need satisfaction in general(21 items ) was used. The scale has 3 sub-scales – autonomy, relatedness, competence.

**Self-concept checklist cum rating scale** by Saraswat (2004).The checklist contains 58 personality traits based on dimensions, such as physical, power, ability, social and psychological characteristics.

### Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics, i.e., Mean, Standard deviation were used. t-test was computed to compare the disabled and non-disabled people on motivation and self-concept.

## RESULTS & DISCUSSION

**Table 1**  
Mean, standard deviations and t-ratios of motivation among disabled and non-disabled people

Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t- ratio	Significance
Autonomy	Disabled	75	29.26	5.47	1.33	Non-significant
	Non-disabled	75	30.46	5.53		
Relatedness	Disabled	75	35.70	5.81	.87	Non-significant
	Non-disabled	75	36.62	6.97		
Competence	Disabled	75	24.37	4.16	3.39**	Signifi
	Non-disabled	75	27.09	4.63		

\*\*p<.01

Table -1 indicates the Mean, SD and t-ratios of autonomy, relatedness and competence in disabled and non-disabled people. Mean values show that the autonomy, relatedness and competence needs are lower in disabled people as compared to non- disabled people. But t-ratio shows significant differences in disabled and non-disabled people in competence need only. Therefore, Hypothesis is accepted only in case of competence need.

**Table 2**  
Mean, standard deviations and t-ratios of self-concept among disabled and non-disabled people

Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t- ratio	Significance
Power self-concept	Disabled	75	22.21	4.47	1.07	Non-significant
	Non-disabled	75	22.92	3.52		
Social self-concept	Disabled	75	22.18	3.33	2.68**	Significant
	Non-disabled	75	23.50	2.64		
Ability self-concept	Disabled	75	21.81	4.48	2.57*	Significant
	Non-disabled	75	23.46	3.28		
Physical self-concept	Disabled	75	22.69	4.05	3.50**	Significant
	Non-disabled	75	24.74	3.05		
Psychological self-concept	Disabled	75	55.21	8.68	2.24*	Significant
	Non-disabled	75	57.97	6.14		
Total self-concept	Disabled	75	144.12	22.79	2.63**	Significant
	Non-disabled	75	152.61	16.16		

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

Table 2 shows the Mean, SD and t-ratios of self-concept in disabled people and non-disabled people. There is significant difference in disabled and non-disabled people in social, ability, physical, psychological and total self-concept. The self-concept of disabled people is lower in all the dimensions of

self-concept and total self-concept as compared to non-disabled people except for power self-concept in which there is no significant difference. Therefore, Hypothesis is accepted in total self-concept and all the dimensions of self-concept except power self-concept

## CONCLUSION

It is concluded that disabled people have lower level of competence need as compared to non-disabled people. It shows that disabled people do not feel effective and capable of performing various types of tasks. Lower level of satisfaction of basic psychological needs leads to lower levels of well-being in disabled people.

Significant differences are found in disabled and non-disabled people in all the dimensions of self-concept except power self-concept. Disabled people have lower level of self-concept as compared to non-disabled people. It implies that there was adverse effect of disability on the development of self-concept among disabled people.

## REFERENCES

- Airat, S.A. (2003). Self-concept of the physically disabled in inclusive secondary schools. Retrieved from <http://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/handle/10413/1757>
- Bellmore, A. D., & Cillessen, A. R. N. (2006). Reciprocal influences of victimization, perceived social preferences, and self-concept in adolescence. *Self and Identity*, 5, 209-229.
- Byrne, B. (1984). The general/academic self-concept nomological network: A review of construct validation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 427-456.
- Census of India (2011). Disabled population by type of disability, C- series, Table C -20. Retrieved from [http://wadhwanifoundation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/12/Disability2011\\_Data\\_Release\\_Dec\\_2013\\_PPT\\_\(27.12.13\).ppt](http://wadhwanifoundation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/12/Disability2011_Data_Release_Dec_2013_PPT_(27.12.13).ppt).
- Ciccarelli, S.K. & Meyer, G.E. (2008). *Psychology*. Delhi: Person education, Inc.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). Self Determination Theory. Retrieved from <http://www.selfdeterminationtheory.org/theory>
- Goel, U. (2013). Comparative Study of Achievement Motivation and Self Concept of Physically Handicapped (Hearing Impaired and Speech Impaired) and Normal Children. *Advanced International Research Journal of Teacher Education*, 1 (2), 65-69.
- Lawrence, D. (1996). *Enhancing Self-esteem in the Classroom*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Narimani, M., & Mousazadeha, T. (2010). Comparing self-esteem and self-concept of handicapped and normal students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 1554-1557.
- Omolayo, B. (2009). Self-esteem and self-motivational needs of disabled and non-disabled: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 1 (2), 449-458.
- Russo, R. N., Goodwin, E. J., Miller, M.D., Haan, E.A. Connell, T.M., & Crotty, M. (2008). Self-esteem, self-concept and quality of life in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 153 (4), 473-477. Retrieved from [http://www.jpeds.com/article/S0022-3476\(08\)00421-6/abstract](http://www.jpeds.com/article/S0022-3476(08)00421-6/abstract)
- Saraswat, R.K. (2004). *Manual of self-concept checklist cum rating scale*. Varanasi: Prasad Psycho Corporation.
- Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46 (3), 407-441.
- World Health Organization (2001). Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/topics/disabilities/en/>
- World Health Organization (2017). Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/topics/disabilities/en/>.

