

Faculty of Education

Quality of Life and Self-Concept for a Sample of Gifted Deaf Students

Dr. Mona Tawakul Elsayed

Assistant Prof. of Special Education

ElZulfy College of Education - Majmaah University

Participants description according to gender, age and type of gift (n)=54

Table 1: Participants description according

to gender, age and type of gift (n = 54)

	Gifted Deaf									
Gender	N	Age Type of Gift								
Male	3	15-18 Sport (football)								
Male	3	14-17 Sports (volley and basket ball)	Sports (volley and basket ball)							
Male	4	6-22 Sports (athletics)								
Male	2	16-18 computer (programming)								
Male	3	16-18 Art (formative)								
Male	3	4-18 Art (acting and mimicry)								
Female	4	12-16 Art(theatrical performance-music playing-acting)								
Female	5	17-22 Art (embroidery-drawing on glass-hand crafts-carving wor	ſk)							
Total	27									
		Non – Gifted Deaf								
Gender	N	Age								
Male	18	14-22								
Female	9	12-22								
Total	27									

Table 2: (U) value and its statistical significance between the means of deaf students (gifted-non-gifted) on the quality of life scale

Scale Dimensions	Sample	N	Means	Total score	(u) value	(z) Value	Significance level	
Overall Satisfaction	Gifted deaf	27	33.80	912.50	104 50	2.978	0.01	
Overall Satisfaction	Non-gifted deaf	27	21.20	572.50	194.50			
Social Interaction	Gifted deaf	27	34.48	931.00	176.00	3.287	0.01	
Social interaction	Non-gifted deaf	27	29.52	554.00	176.00			
School Life	Gifted deaf	27	35.26	952.00	155.000	3.755	0.01	
School Life	Non-gifted deaf	27	19.74	533.00	155.000			
Camily Lifa	Gifted deaf	27	36.67	990.00	117.000	4.334	0.01	
Family Life	Non-gifted deaf	27	18.33	495.00	117.000			
Calf Assautance	Gifted deaf	27	30.57	825.500	101 500	2.468	0.01	
Self Acceptance	Non-gifted deaf	27	24.43	559.50	181.500			
Total Dograd	Gifted deaf	27	35.63	962.00	145.00	2 902	0.01	
Total Degree	Non-gifted deaf	27	19.37	523.00	145.00	3.802	0.01	

Table 3: (U) value and its statistical significance between means score of deaf students (gifted-non-gifted) on the self concept scale

Scale Dimensions	Sample	N	Means	Total score	(u) value	(Z) value	Significance level
A 1:16	Gifted deaf	27	38.67	1044.00	63.00	5.280	0.01
Academic self concept	Non-gifted deaf	27	16.33	441.00			
Coolal salf assessed	Gifted deaf	27	38.65	1043.50	63.50	5.345	0.01
Social self concept	Non-gifted deaf	27	16.35	441.50			
Dhygiaal salf aanaant	Gifted deaf	27	38.31	1034.50	72.50	5.134	0.01
Physical self concept	Non-gifted deaf	27	16.69	450.50			
Total Dagraa	Gifted deaf	27	39.15	1057.00	50.00	5.488	0.01
Total Degree	Non-gifted deaf	27	15.85	428.00			

References

- ➤ Rushdie, S. M. (2007).

 Self concept and its relationship to some variables for the deaf and hard of hearing students in special education programs, Riyadh, *Journal of the Faculty of Education University of BaniSuef*, 2(8), 137-167. Egypt.
- ➤ Obaid, M. S. (2010). "Problems that threaten the security and safety of audio-impaired students and developing a proposed program to enhance safety opportunities for them", *Journal of Islamic University*, series of humanitarian studies, 18(2), 479-519.
- ➤ Patrick, D. L. (2010). Quality of Life of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth, Seattle Quality of Life Group, Department of Health Services at the University of Washington.

Recommendations:

In the light of research results, the researcher recommends by :

- Increasing attention to the gifted deaf, especially females, and providing them opportunities to discover, highlight, and make the optimum use of their gifts.
- Design the appropriate measurement tools for early detection of gifted disabled to foster and develop their abilities.
- 3. Establishment of equipped and specialized educational and training institutes are; for qualifying and rehabilitation and of gifted deaf, depending on their gifts, after the academic stage and throughout work via continuous training.

Egyptian Journal of psychological studies, 74(22), 2012: 1-31.

Introduction:

Recently, the concern for the gifted students with disabilities, who are often called "twice exceptional "or" dual exceptionalities" has emerged, which has led to the endeavor to identify the dimensions of strength, innovation and talent in the students with disabilities, particularly as the focus was previously- on dimensions of deficiency and inability in them

Research Problem & Motivations

The research problem, can be summed up in the following question:

• Is there a statistically significant effect of being gifted on quality of life, and self concept at the sample of gifted deaf students?

This question branches into several sub questions as following:

- 1- Are there statistically significant differences between the gifted deaf students and their non- gifted deaf peers in quality of life?
- 2- Are there statistically significant differences between the gifted deaf students and their non- gifted deaf peers in self concept?
- 3. Are there statistically significant differences between male and female gifted deaf students in quality of life?
- 4. Are there statistically significant differences between male and female gifted deaf students in self concept?
- 5. Is there a relationship between the quality of life, and self concept for the gifted deaf students?

Purpose

This research aims at identifying the impact of giftedness on the quality of life and self concept of deaf students, illustrated through:

- 1. Identifying differences between the sample of gifted deaf students and their non-gifted peers in the quality of life, and self concept.
- 2. Identifying differences between gifted deaf male and female in quality of life and self concept.
- 3. Identification of the nature of the relationship between quality of life, and self concept.

Research Hypothesis

H1: there are statistically significant differences between means of gifted deaf, and non-gifted deaf on quality of life scale in favor of gifted deaf.

H2: there are statistically significant differences between means of the gifted deaf, and non-gifted deaf on the self concept scale in favor of gifted deaf.

H3: there are statistically significant differences between means of the male and female gifted deaf on the life quality scale.

H4: there are statistically significant differences between means of the male and female gifted deaf on the self concept scale.

H5: there is a positive significant correlation between gifted deaf degrees on self concept scale and their degrees on quality of life scale.

Method & Instrument

- > Methodology: Descriptive method was used for it fits the research nature and goals.
- > Population: Population is Al Amal School for deaf and Hard of hearing, Mansoura, Dakahlia Governorate, Arab Republic of Egypt.
- ➤ Participants: Participants were (54) male and female students who are enrolled in preparatory (vocational) and secondary (technical) stages, for the second semester, academic year (2010/2011)(Table1)
- > Instruments: 1: Gifted Deaf Life Quality Scale: Developed by the researcher
- ➤ II: Self Concept Scale for Gifted Deaf: Developed by the researcher

Results: The results indicated that: 1- There are significant differences between gifted, deaf students and their nongifted, deaf peers in self-concept in favor to gifted, deaf students due to gift variable. (Table2)

- There are significant differences between gifted- deaf students and their nongifted, deaf peers in quality of life in favor to gifted deaf students, due to gift variable. (Table3)
- There are significant differences between male and female gifted-deaf students in all quality of life scale dimensions in favor to males; except the self acceptance there was no significant differences.
- There are significant differences between male and female gifted-deaf students in self concept in favor to males.
- -There is a significant correlation between quality of life and self concept for gifted-deaf students.