Asian Social Studies and
Applied Research (ASSAR)
Published by ASAR Council

Volume 2 Issue 4
November, 2021
ISSN (E): 2709-9229

A Comparative Study on the Quality of Education for Students with Visual Impairment in Public and Private Institutions

TAHIRA ZAFARULLAH
Department of Education,
University of Management and Technology, Lahore.
Email: tahirazafarullah555n@gmail.com

Dr. FAISAL ANIS
Assistant professor, Department of Education,
University of Management and Technology, Lahore.
Email: faisal.anis@umt.edu.pk

FARAH FIDA
Ph.D Scholar, Education Department Islamia University Bahawalpur.

Abstract

Quality of education is the main key to achieve sustainable development goals (SDGs). The Aim of the present study was to compare the quality of education in public and private schools of Students with visual impairment in Punjab. Descriptive research design of quantitative approach adopted to conduct this study. A cross-sectional survey method used to collect data. The population of this study comprised of students with visual impairment from all public and private schools of grade 6 to 10. The sample of the study was comprised of 270 enrolled students with visual impairment of public and private schools. Sample collected from 12 schools of four cities of Punjab like Lahore, Gujranwala, Faisalabad and Rawalpindi. Sample selected through convenient sampling technique, which is a particular type of non-probability Sampling. A Self-developed questionnaire was used which comprised of 35 closed-ended items. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques used for analyzing the collected data. Results indicated that the overall quality of education in private schools was better than in public Schools. The findings of this study highlight the importance of guidance and counseling as a part of quality education. Guidance and counseling services were better in private schools as compared to public schools for students with visual impairment. Furthermore, findings also show that the environmental accessibility, assessment and evaluation methods, instructional curriculum and instructional methods are lack in public schools of students with visual impairment which are a very important part of quality education. It recommended that the environmental accessibility and guidance and counselling services in public schools are not good for students with visual impairment. Govt. should renovate and adapt the building infrastructure and should provide guidance and counselling services according to the needs of students with visual impairment. Teachers of public schools should improve their assessment and evaluation methods. Moreover, teachers of students with visual impairment should adapt the methods of teaching, instructional curriculum.

Key Words: *Quality of Education, Enrolled Middle and Secondary Visually Impaired Students, Public and Private Special Education Institutes.*

Introduction

Instruction generally perceived as a type of interest in human resources advancement that produces financial advantages and participating in to a nation's future progress by expanding the capabilities of its persons (Gideon, 2014). It is noted that education in a country is one of the key indicators of its level of development. Globally, the basic human rights of any society or country is education and training. The charter of human rights took education and training as the essential right of every country. It appears to be almost certain, in any case, that the accomplishment and involvement of all society in education and training is depends upon the quality of basic education. (Barrett, Chawla-Duggan, Lowe, Nikel, & Ukpo, 2006).

According to Smith (2010), Quality training is characterized as improving all parts of the nature of instruction and guaranteeing greatness of all particularly in education and learning, numeracy and fundamental abilities, accomplishments, skills, abilities and quantifiable educational results.

Quality is denote as the level of magnitude as estimated against settled upon guidelines. Additionally, the different school-based variables directly affect the nature of instructing, learning, and instructive achievements: Physical services, educating, school assets and number of learners each class**.** The emphasis of quality in education found in the students admitted, the learning adopted and the academic staff in the institution. The main objective of the schools is to provide quality education with information, training and skills, which are very important for the economic and social development of all nations. Institutes can provide learning opportunities which a student may not get at house, particularly when they living in a disadvantage society. A huge number of students do not get basic education and trainings that is very dangerous for their own future and development of their nation (Gideon, 2014).

Hussain (2015), said that a number of efforts and commitments, which have made by Pakistan for educating and supporting the students with disability. In Pakistan through national policy for disables, national plan of action and some commitments at international level like MDGs and SDGs that promote education and literacy in the country. It was very necessary to study about the quality of education for VI learners in Pakistani context, and towards know about the difference of quality education in both government and non-government special education sectors. The goal of this research is to compare the quality of education for VI students in government and non-government institutions of province Punjab and check the environmental accessibility, curriculum, guidance & counselling, assessment & evaluation methods, and instructional accessibility in both schools.

Literature Review

“Visual impairment is any visual disorder which effects a person’s capability to effectively fulfill the actions of their routine life. Pupils with visual disorder are children, who face or pass through weaknesses in their visual mechanism that effect their aptitude to learn” (Hagargund, Shaik, Beru, & Thota, 2017)”.

According to Ahmed, Khan, and Nasem (2011), in Pakistan, there is no satisfactory attention is given on providing quality education to the learners with visual deficiency, due to bad behavior of community, poor education system, and low income of parents so that they will not be able to support their disabled child. The present education procedure, curriculum, teaching methods, instructional method, and assessment techniques are effective for non-disable students and not reliable for learners with disability. The disability rate in Pakistan is 2.49% from which 8.7 percent are visually impaired. Likewise, in Pakistan, 11.6 million

individuals are with visual deficiencies. Out of this collection, 2.3 million are partially sighted. Every year 130000 persons got blind from cataract. (Yelamarthi, Haas, Nielsen, & Mothersell, 2010).

For teaching the learners with visual deficiency, a basic role is play by Government and Non-Government institutions through providing various training programs in Pakistan through which they assist to learners with visual deficiency to become an effective part to society. There is no effective innovation. The old education system is providing in country. For educating the students with visual deficiency, public sectors have proper system and structure as compared to private sectors. Therefore, the quality of education might be different in both sectors. Though, efforts have done on the way to an overall system to care people with impairments (Mohsin, Khan, Doger, & Awan, 2011).

According to Omotayo and Tiamiyu (2017), today parents are very conscious about the selection of school for their child because they want to provide effective environment and education to their child which is very necessary for their child future. Parents also express their feelings about issues and challenges they face in school selection it is either public or private. Hence, they are taking essential steps to teach themselves on the problems, which are affecting today's education.

As indicated by Mödi, M. L. (2015), the idea of quality education generally relies upon the educating learning process. This procedure is identified with showing techniques, evaluation and criticism, learning condition, study hall the executives, showing helps and educator training.

Quality education is the fundamental right of all students with visual impairment. There are many indicators that contribute in enhancing and providing quality education to students with visual impairment. Nonetheless, there are some essential prescribed procedures that can control the advancement of the best quality education. The educator ought to energize all students with visual impairment to spend an independent life (Simon, et al, 2010). Urge the learners to move freely through the study classroom, and maintain your classroom as needs be. It also maintain the physical equipment in the school for providing quality education to students with visual impairment. (Nasiforo, B. M. 2015).

Research Design

This research was descriptive in nature and quantitative research technique was used to compare the quality of Education for students with visual impairment in Public and Private Institutions. Cross-sectional survey method was used to collect the data.

Sampling

The research sample consisted of 270 enrolled students with visual impairment of public and private schools from four cities of Punjab that was Lahore, Gujranwala, Faisalabad and Rawalpindi. The researcher selected these cities because they were easily accessible for the researcher and have both public and private institutions. Among the sample 153 students were studying in public and 117 students in private institutions.

Data collection

The researcher contacted the schools and requested data collection after developing and validating the questionnaire. The heads of institutions/schools have given their formal authorization. The researcher

went to all of the government and private institutions in the area and collected data from students with vision impairment.

Instrument

The self-made questionnaire developed for the collection of data from the respondents after the intensive review of literature about quality of education. The instrument developed for this study was consisted on two portions. The first portion consisted on demographical information and the second portion of questionnaire divided into eight components\indicators. These components based on the quality of education. There were 35 items developed to know about these components of quality education briefly. The researcher developed a self-made questionnaire and validated it from different field experts against settled upon validation criteria while Reliability of the pilot testing determined by Cronbach's alpha. The value of Cronbach's alpha was .843. The researcher visited all selected government and private institutes of VI students and collected data from students. The researcher delimited this study to 4 cities of Punjab. Collected data was precisely calculated and thoroughly organized to enable it for analysis. The SPSS version 21 used for analysis. The demographic variables analyzed by using frequency distribution. Inferential statistic also applied on data. For comparing the difference in quality of education of government and non-government schools. Independent sample *t* test used. Furthermore, one sample *t* test was used to determine whether the mean of a population different from given criteria of 75%.

Results of the Study

Results showed that the majority of respondents were male and were from public institutions. Quality education is very important for all students with visual impairment for making them a productive part of society.

Table 1: Frequency distribution

Sr. No	Variable	Categories	F	%
1	Gender	Male	174	64.4
2		Female	98	35.6
1	Classes	6^{th}	39	14.4
2		7^{th}	56	20.7
3		8^{th}	69	25.6
4		9^{th}	56	20.7
5		10^{th}	50	18.5
1	Age Groups	10-13	82	30.4
2		13-16	63	23.3
3		16-19	67	24.8
4		19-22	58	21.5
1	Type of School	Public	153	56.7
2		Private	117	43.3
1	Level of Disability	Low vision	71	26.3
2		Blind	199	73.7
1	District	Lahore	131	48.5
2		Faisalabad	66	24.4
3		(GRW)	43	15.9
4		Rawalpindi	30	11.1

Majority of the students responded that the environmental accessibility, guidance and counselling, instructional methods, instructional material, assessment and evaluation was better in private schools as compared to Public. But majority of the students responded that the free services like white cane, availability of psychologist, mobility and orientation service was better in public schools as compared to private school. The results of the study showed that in some indicators of quality education there is no difference in the perception of students with visual impairment like learning resources and stimulating learning environment. Overall the results of study showed that the quality of education in private sectors was better as compared to public schools for students with visual impairment.

Table 1 shows that out of 270 respondents, 174 (64.4%) enrolled students were male while 98 (35.6%) enrolled were female students with visual impairment and among 270 students with visual impairment, 39 (14.4%) students were studying in 6th class, 56 (20.7%) were in 7th class, 69 (25.6%) were in 8th class, 56 (20.7%) were in 9th class, and 50 (18.5%) were in 10th class. From 270 students with visual impairment, 82 (30.4%) students were 10-13 years old, 63 (23.3%) were of 13-16 years' age, 67 (24.8%) were of 16-19 years' age and 58 (21.5%) were 19-22 years old. out of 270 visually impaired respondents, 153 (56.7%) students were enrolled in public school, while 117 (43.3%) students were enrolled in private school and out of 270 visually impaired respondents, 71 (26.3%) students were with low vision, while 199 (73.7%) students were blind and among 240 students with visual impairment, 131 (48.5%) students with visual impairment were enrolled in schools of Lahore, 66 (24.4%) were enrolled in schools of Faisalabad, 43 (15.9%) were enrolled in schools of Gujranwala and 30 (11.1%) were enrolled in schools of Rawalpindi.

Table 2: Independent sample *t* test Comparison

Sr. No	Test variable	School type	N	M	S.D	t	Sig.
1	Environmental accessibility	Public	153	17.314	4.222	-6.085	.005
		Private	117	20.051	3.170		
2	Guidance and counseling	Public	153	5.3203	1.90102	-4.779	.000
		Private	117	6.2564	1.31407		
3	Stimulating learning environment.	Public	153	14.2288	2.55337	.134	.247
		Private	117	14.1880	2.38144		
4	Services for Students	Public	153	31.0915	5.06713	5.566	.037
		Private	117	27.9487	4.20354		
5	Learning resources for students	Public	153	8.2810	1.71854	-.462	.000
		Private	117	8.3932	2.15341		
6	Appropriateness of Learning Methods	Public	153	5.4902	1.6785	-6.516	.000
		Private	117	6.5556	.9865		
7	Appropriateness of Curriculum	Public	153	5.5033	1.569	-6.254	.000
		Private	117	6.5128	1.079		
8	Assessment and Evaluation	Public	153	10.915	2.145	-6.644	.393
		Private	117	12.623	2.024		

Table 2 shows the result of Independent sample t-test was applied to find out the difference between quality of education in public and private institutions for students with visual impairment through eight indicators. The first indicator was environmental accessibility which showed that (t = -6.085 Sig = .005, Mean $_{public}$ = 17.31, Mean $_{private}$ =20.05), the environmental accessibility in private schools was better as compared to public schools. And the second indicator was guidance and counselling which also showed that (t= -4.779, Sig= .000, Mean $_{public}$=5.32, Mean $_{private}$= 6.26), the guidance and counselling was better in private school as compared to public institutions. According to the results of third indicator stimulating

learning environment (t =.134, Sig =.247, Mean $_{public}$=14.27, Mean $_{private}$= 14.19), the perception of both public and private school students were same. And perception of both school students about fourth indicator services (t =5.566 Sig = .037, Mean $_{public}$= 31.09, Mean $_{private}$= 27.95), for students was different to each other. The perception of public school students was better as compared to private. The fifth indicator was learning resources for students. Results of this indicator showed the (t =-.462 Sig = .000, Mean $_{public}$=8.28, Mean $_{private}$= 8.39), perception of private school students were better as compared to public. The sixth indicator of this study was Appropriateness of Learning Methods. Results demonstrate that (t = -6.516, Sig = .000, Mean $_{public}$= 5.49, Mean $_{private}$= 6.56), the perception of private school student was also better as compared public. And seventh indicator was Appropriateness of Curriculum about which (t = -6.254, Sig = .000, Mean $_{public}$= 5.50, Mean $_{private}$= 6.51), the perception of private school students was also better. The results of eighth indicator Assessment and Evaluation showed (t = -6.644, Sig = .393, Mean $_{public}$= 10.92, Mean $_{private}$= 12.62) that there is no significant different about the perception of public and private school students because its sig. value was below than alpha 0.05.

Table 3: One sample t test

Sr. No	Components	Type of school	N	M	S.D	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Test value
1	Environmental accessibility	Public	153	17.31	4.221	-2.01	152	.046	18
		Private	117	20.05	3.170	6.999	116	.000	
2	Guidance & counseling	Public	153	5.32	1.901	-4.42	152	.000	6
		Private	117	6.26	1.314	2.111	116	.037	
3	Stimulating learning environment	Public	153	14.23	2.553	-3.74	152	.000	15
		Private	117	14.19	2.188	-3.69	116	.000	
4	Services for students	Public	153	31.09	5.067	2.664	152	.009	30
		Private	117	27.95	4.203	-5.29	116	.000	
5	Learning resources for students	Public	153	8.28	1.716	-5.18	152	.000	9
		Private	117	8.39	2.153	-3.09	116	.003	
6	Appropriateness of Learning Methods	Public	153	5.490	1.678	3.955	152	.000	6
		Private	117	6.556	.9865	6.350	116	.000	
7	Appropriateness of the Curriculum	Public	153	5.503	1.569	-3.92	152	.000	6
		Private	117	6.513	1.079	5.137	116	.000	
8	Assessment and Evaluation	Public	153	10.92	2.146	-6.25	152	.000	12
		Private	117	12.52	2.025	3.334	116	.001	

Table 3 shows the results of one sample t test to conclude whether the mean of a population is different from any test value. There are eight indicators used like environmental accessibility, guidance and counselling, appropriateness of learning methods, services for students, learning resources for students, appropriateness of learning methods, appropriateness of curriculum and assessment and emulation. The results demonstrated that the mean values of Environmental Accessibility public (Mean=17.31, test value= 18, t=-2.01, df= 152, sig = .046) and private (Mean=20.05, test value= 18, t=6.999, df=116, sig = .000), Guidance & Counseling public (Mean=5.32, test value= 6, t=-4.42, df= 152, sig = .000) and private (Mean=6.26, test value= 6, t= 2.111, df= 116, sig= .037), Appropriateness of Learning Methods public (Mean=5.490, test value= 6, t=3.955, df= 152, sig = .000) and private (Mean=6.556, test value= 6, t=6.350, df= 116, sig = .000), public (Mean=5.503, test value= 6, t=-3.92, df= 152, sig = .000) and private (Mean=6.513, test value=5.137 6, t=, df= 116, sig = .000) was better in private schools as compared to

public schools and 75% bench mark value. Furthermore, results showed that there is no statistical significant difference in mean value of Stimulating learning Environment the public (Mean=14.23, test value= 15, *t*=-3.74, df= 152, sig = .000) and private (Mean=14.19, test value= 15, *t*=-3.69, df= 116, sig = .000) and Learning resources for students the public (Mean=7.8854, test value= 9, *t*= -5.916, df= 95, sig = .000) and private (Mean=8.4327, test value= 9, *t*= -2.698, df= 103, sig = .008). In one indicator services for students with visual impairment showed that the public (Mean=31.09, test value= 30, *t*=2.664, DF=152, sig = .009) and private (Mean=27.95, test value= 30, *t*=-5.29, df= 116, sig = .000). Perception of public students about services for students was better than given criteria in public schools and below than given criteria in private schools. The bench mark value given for all these indicators was 75%.

Findings and Conclusions

The finding of independent sample *t* test showed that the perception of both public and private school students with visual impairment is different from each other about environmental accessibility, guidance and counselling, instructional material, appropriateness of curriculum and instructional methods. Perception of private school students is better than public about these indicators. And the perception of public schools students is better about provision of free services in school as compared to private schools. Furthermore, there is no difference in perception of students about stimulating learning environment and assessment & evaluation methods in both schools.

The finding of one-sample *t* test showed that the perception of both public and private school students with visual impairment is different from each other about environmental accessibility, guidance and counselling, instructional material, appropriateness of curriculum and instructional methods and assessment and evaluation methods. Perception of private school students is better than public about these indicators. And the perception of public schools students is better about provision of free services in school as compared to private schools. Furthermore, there is no difference in perception of students about stimulating learning environment and learning resources.

Overall the results of study on the basis of these eight indicators showed that the perception of private school students about quality of education is better private schools students as compared to public school students. So the quality of education is better in private schools for students with visual impairment as compared to public school students.

Discussion

The results of present study show that in non-government schools the environmental accessibility and guidance & counselling services and methods of instructions are better as compare to government schools. According to Kuivalainen (2017), it is indicate that the non- government institutions have central value in accessibility of physical offices, when contrasted with government schools and this is very important for every student to guide them about their impairment, interest, abilities, opportunities and hurdles and the students of private school are happier to their teachers as compared public schools. They are satisfied about their methods of teaching and presenting the material, about their guidance and polite behaves. In the present study, it has seen that in government and non-government institutions of Pakistan the stimulating leaning environment is same. According to Nichols. (2010), the learner of both government and non-government institutions have equal opportunities. They learn in similar environment of learning inside the school.

This present research reveals that the free services are better in public schools. According to the study of Statistics and Sciences (2008), they always have a competition to each other about the all-educational factors. The government runs public schools. Many funds have provided by the government to VI students that are not provide in private schools. So that the culture of both institutions is very different to each other about the services. According to the views of progressive countries. The non-public schools are more beneficial for provision of quality education (Guzavicius, Gižienė, & Žalgirytė, 2015). Result of this study show that curriculum of private schools is better in private schools. A strongest study of Andrabi et al. (2010), concluded that the non-government' quality of curriculum was better than public schools.

Recommendations

1. In public schools, the environmental accessibility was not satisfactory for the students with visual impairment. Government must renovate as well as adapt the building infrastructure according to the student's needs.
2. Students of private schools were not satisfied about free services. So Proper and satisfactory services should be provide to students with visual impairment by the non-government school. School administration should organize proper set up for provision of services to students.
3. In government schools, there was deficiency of satisfactory guidance and counselling services. For the provision of proper guidance and counselling services according to needs of students, government should hire well-trained counselor in schools who can solve the hurdles of students and guide them.
4. There was lack of proper stimulating learning environment in government and non- government schools of students with visual deficiencies. Because education and training of internet and computer is the need of time. So proper computer labs, Jaws and special equipment need to be available in all schools.
5. Proper learning resources like, optical and non- optical aids should be provide to learners with visual deficiency so that they can learn effectively.
6. Assessment and evaluation process need to improve in public schools. Supervision should be active for placement, summative, formative and diagnostic assessment. They should hold meetings with teachers for making effective changes in assessment and evaluation methods.
7. There was lack of proper teaching methods in public schools. Teacher should adapt the methods of teaching and instructional material in public schools, which is necessary for better learning. Government should hold trainings of teachers, and teach them innovative methods of teaching. So that they can learn innovative and effective methods of teaching.

References

Ahmed, M., Khan, A. B., & Nasem, F. (2011). policies for special persons in Pakistan. *deBerkeley Journal of Social Sciences, 1*(2), 1-11.

Barrett, A. M., Chawla-Duggan, R., Lowe, J., Nikel, J., & Ukpo, E. (2006). The Vocational Training Facilities in Pakistan and Job Adjustment Problems of Special People. *Pakistan Journal of Special Education 44*(2), 11-43.

Gideon, L. M. (2014). School based factors influencing quality of education in public secondary schools in Kitui Country, Kenya. *(Unpublished Masters Thesis),* University of Nairobi.

Guzavicius, A., Gižienė, V., & Žalgirytė, L. (2015). Education as public good and Behavioral economics approach. *Journal of Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191*, 884-889.

Hagargund, A. G., Shaik, E. F., Beru, M., & Thota, S. V. (2017). Image to speech conversion for visually impaired. *International Journal of Latest Research Engineering and Technology (IJLRET), 3*, 09-15.

Hussain, A., & Awan, A. G. (2017). Comparison of the achievements of Public and Private secondary

schools in District Khanewal-Pakistan *(Doctoral* dissertation*).*

Kuivalainen, T. (2017). Comparative education systems: student performance & private and public funding, management and schools*:* A case study of Finland and Sweden *(Master's thesis).*

Mödi, M. L. (2015). Factors Affecting the Provision of Quality Education in Public and Private Secondary Schools in Central Equatoria State, Juba County South Sudan *(Doctoral dissertation).*

Mohsin, M. N., Khan, T. M., Doger, A. H., & Awan, A. S. (2011). Role of parents in training of children with intellectual disability. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(9), 78-84.

Nasiforo, B. M. (2015). Academic impediments students with visual impairments encounter in the colleges of University of Rwanda. *Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Kenyatta University, Kenyatta*

Nichols, M. K. (2010). Parents perceptions of private Christian schools and why parents pay when public education is free. *International Journal of Capella University,* 121–147-121–157.

Omotayo, F. O., & Tiamiyu, W. A. (2017). Influence of socio-environmental forces on use of e-learning by teachers in selected tertiary institutions in Oyo state, Nigeria. *The African Journal of Information Systems*, *9*(1), 1.

Simon, C., Echeita, G., Sandoval, M. & Lopez, M. (2010). The Inclusive Education process of students with visual impairment in Spain: An analysis from the perspective of organization.

Smith, A. (2010). *The influence of education on conflict and peace building, Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011*. The Hidden Crisis: Armed conflict and education, Paris: UNESCO.

Yelamarthi, K., Haas, D., Nielsen, D., & Mothersell, S. (2010). RFID and GPS integrated navigation system for the visually impaired: *Paper presented at the 2010 53rd IEEE International Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems,* 11-475-919 *doi: 10.1109/2010.5548863*