

**ACADEMIC STRATEGIES USED BY TEACHERS OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED
PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS STUDYING AT PUBLIC SECTOR SPECIAL
EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN PUNJAB**

**Muhammad Jahanzaib¹ Ghulam Fatima²
and Arooj Amanat²**

¹ University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: m.zaib92@gmail.com

² Institute of Special Education,
University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
Email: fatima.dse@pu.edu.pk
aroojamanat44@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this inquiry aims to examine how special school instructors educate the learners suffering from eye problems at public special education organizations in Punjab. By nature, it was a descriptive quantitative research. 132 special educators (JSETs and SSETs), consisted of 54 males and 78 females coaching the blind and low vision students in public sectors special education institutions found in four zones of the province, used the survey method to complete the self-developed validated likert type questionnaire. Chronbach alpha's reliability index for the instrument was 0.89. Relevant information and Responses of respondents were obtained by one to one meeting in most of the territories but some responses were taken online due to covid pandemic. Data were analyzed by applying SPSS (percentages and frequencies). To determine the variations in educator's data ANOVA was carried out. The present investigation exhibited that the number of leady instructors is too high than the number of gents instructors, and they have been serving in their organizations for long time. But training opportunities were limited for them. Majority of them claimed the use of best instructional practices although their many colleagues denied it. The implication of study is that the prevailing instructional practices adopted by special education teachers have significant flaws. Study recommended that training opportunities should be enhanced for special education teachers in core academic areas the promotion to next grade maybe discouraged for primary level visually impaired students without proper acquisition of reading and writing skills. Communication between school and parents should be improved.

KEYWORDS

Evaluation, Instructional practices, children with vision impairment, primary level.

INTRODUCTION

Although the importance of teacher has been proven but no teacher can guide and facilitate the students without adopting some instructional methodologies, teaching strategies, and helping aids. The effective integration of these methodologies,

strategies and educational aids represents the instructional practices of any teacher. The adequate instructional practices show the teacher's competence and expertise towards his or her subject matter and students. It can be considered the effective instructional practices which are able to achieve the pre-determined educational goals and to fulfill the learning needs of all learners. Many studies reflect the usefulness of some instructional methodologies and teaching practices than others. As Betts and Liow (1993), reported that dynamic knowledge gaining by project method or tutorials can attain essential targets to great extent than the conventional lecture method (Muema, Mulwa, & Mailu, 2018).

Moreover children with disabilities who have many unique learning needs for special arrangements, need base equipment and specific instructional strategies are still a marginalized segment of society in this modern world. As a study highlighted some kinds of problems faced by children with learning disabilities in this way kids having learning difficulties usually face challenges in educational, social, domestic and behavioral perspectives (Neeraja & Anuradha, 2014). Most of the time CWSN have limited access to existing body of knowledge and academic resources. As Awais and Ameen, (2015) depicted that they do not experience similar approach to educational stuff and various library resources as general public, they have no source of knowledge except there family members and mentors (Hussain, Hameed, & Ashraf, 2022).

Children with vision impairment face all the above-mentioned hindrances due to their handicapping condition and because of the scarcity of desired resources especially in 3rd world countries. Furthermore, the majority of children with vision impairment belong from those families which have poor financial and educational status. As Jahanzaib, Fatima & Nayab, (2020) reported that a large number of visually challenged children studying at primary level were living in cities. Their parents had low educational and financial status. So, majority of VI learners use school conveyance and they didn't have any coaching except school.

Given the discussion above, it can be concluded that the significance of special schools, special educators, and the instructional strategies which they implement to educate the special needs learners, particularly those who have eye sight related problems is un-deniable. The current inquiry aims to investigate and illustrate the teaching strategies used by teachers of special kids to instruct young students who have poor eye sight. In this way it will identify the gaps in existing instructional practices so that some practical recommendations could be proposed for academic uplift of students with vision impairment (Masood & Asim 2023).

LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the most crucial elements of any educational program is the teacher. Since students with special needs have a variety of specialized learning demands that may be met by extending the main curriculum, the need of special education instructors is higher than ever. However, a research found that even though instructors acknowledge the value of ECC for special needs children, they are unable to employ it successfully (Opie, 2018). Another research cited the lack of necessary instructional tools, weak self-reliance and dedication, low levels of teamwork, communication hurdles, and hostile learning settings as major causes (Aliasa & Salleh, 2017).

On the other side, Habiba and Ormsby, (2017) depicted her reservations about professional development facilities existing for teachers as training programs, refresher courses, and provision of assistive gadgets all were dissatisfactory. Johnson, however, refuted the idea that there aren't enough possibilities for special educators to receive training with these justifications from the literature (Johnson-Jones, 2017). On the other hand, instructors of CWVI mentioned a number of managerial and social hindrances which they face often. A study revealed that, the teaching faculty of special schools shared the insulting and discouraging behavior by heads of institutions and superordinates; similarly, they feel ambiguity about their official responsibilities. (Asamoah, Ofori, & Ebenezer, 2018).

But Lamichhane (2016), discovered a number of factors that positively encourage the effectiveness of teaching for visually impaired students in a variety of ways, such as teacher education, length of service, and use of the blackboard, all of which were positively combined with style of teaching accommodations; In addition, the negative association of the ages of instructors demonstrates that newly inducted instructors have to modify their instructional style for children with different abilities. Besides it, parents are fundamental collaborators in each academic program. Therefore, they usually feel dissatisfaction and reservations regarding prevailing instructional strategies. However, Alotabi (2017) presented us with proof of parental satisfaction with teacher practices in the United States in this way. 91.8 percent parents having young kids with special needs were happy from special education services provided to their kids. It means they acknowledged the efforts of service providers (Masood & Asim 2023).

Furthermore, some studies suggested useful strategies for better parent's teacher communication in this way regular diary, parental cooperation, and PTMs could be helpful to improve the relationship between parents and instructors of visually challenged students in Pakistan. (Shazia & Malik, 2020, Allison & Paolini, 2015). Additionally, Allinder and Rose (1994) added their views in this discussion that instructors accomplish several tuff tasks in their daily routine like separate attention to each learner, to accommodate their unique learning needs and personal preferences similarly to include them in all school and social activities. These are some admirable examples.

Scope and Significance

Humans differ widely in terms of abilities, competencies, aptitudes, attitudes, heretical features, and grooming. Despite the fact that the instructor is aware of how much he has affected the student's personality and academic accomplishment. However, because each instructor has a distinct teaching style and set of talents, pupils' academic achievement and ability to function in other aspects of life varies greatly. The purpose of the current study is to look at the instructional methodologies utilized by special education teachers to train primary level CWVI. This will allow us to discover the causes of CWVI's poor academic performance in these fundamental topics.

Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the demographic features of special education instructors working in the field of vision impairment in Punjab's government special education institutions.

2. To depict the true image of present instructional practices utilized by special education instructors in key academic areas for the coaching of blind and low-vision learners in primary schools of public sector special education, based on their own perspectives.
3. To identify opportunities for improvement in special education teachers' present instructional practices for teaching students with vision impairment at the primary level.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographics of special education instructors working in the field of visual impairment in Punjab's government special education institutions?
2. In light of their own perspectives, what is the true image of present instructional practices utilized by special education instructors to teach the CWVI at the primary level in government special education institutions?
3. What areas of present teaching practices used by special education instructors to teach students with vision impairment at the primary level should be improved?

METHODOLOGY

The present investigation was initiated to explore pedagogical manners adopted by special education lecturers to coach blind and low-vision learners studying in public sector primary special education institutions of Punjab Province. By definition, it was descriptive quantitative study. The survey approach was used to collect data from 132 randomly selected special education teachers (JESTs, SSETs) working in the field of vision impairment from four zones in Punjab. The survey approach was chosen to perform the study because, according to Creswell (2012), surveys give the most accurate data for evaluating programs and services in academic organizations. For the special education instructors working in the field of visual impairment, a self-developed validated Likert-type questionnaire was used to investigate their methods of instruction. In fact, this study was a part of the principal author's Ph.D. dissertation.

Sampling Technique

Multistage sampling technique was carried out to conduct the study. At first stage, the 36 districts of Punjab province were divided into four zones by a prescribed formula based on the principle of simple random sampling. At the second step, questionnaires about teachers' instructional practices in the field of visual impairment were distributed to 60% of the districts in each zone of Punjab using simple random sampling. In this manner, the description of selected districts from each zone is as follows: zone one has four districts, zone two has seven districts, zone three has four districts, and zone four has five districts. There is a total of 20 districts that have been chosen. Following that, 20% of special education facilities (VIC special education schools and special education centers for various disabilities) were chosen at random from each zone. The following is a zone-by-zone description of the selected institutions: six institutions were chosen from zone 1 (2 schools and four centers). Zone 2 picked fourteen special education institutions (7 schools and 7 centers), Zone 3 selected eight special education institutions (3 schools

and 5 centers), and Zone 4 selected seven special education institutions (2 schools and 5 centers). To collect teacher data, 35 special education institutions (14 schools and 21 centers) were chosen. Meanwhile, due to the substantial percentage of covid-19, a considerable number of districts in Punjab have been closed. So, based on the time constraints, the available special education instructors (JSETs and SSETs VI) from each zone were chosen. The following is a zone-by-zone description of the available sample of teachers: zone one has 7 respondents, zone two has 84 respondents, and zone three has 12 respondents and a total of 28 responders from zone four. The total available sample (SSETs and JSETs) is 131, with 54 males and 77 females.

Research Instrument

A self-developed and validated questionnaire was used in the survey to show the current methods that special education teachers use to teach primary school students with vision impairment. The two sections of the questionnaire were as follows: There were 14 questions in the first section about the demographics of special education teachers who work with VI children. Reading, writing, Braille skills, mathematics, orientation and mobility, using assistive devices, utilizing supportive lecture strategies, parental counseling, and assessment were the nine subtopics of the second section. Each part comprised of different explanations about previously mentioned 9 regions. On a total of 69 statements, a five-point Likert scale ranging from always to never will be used. A panel of five experts with extensive working experience in the field of vision impairment validated the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha (0.89) was used to determine the questionnaire's reliability, which was statistically significant.

Data Collection

The majority of the data were gathered by the principal author during his visits to various districts in Punjab. However, at the same time, due to the Corona lockdown, some districts in Punjab province were closed, so he filled out the questionnaires from special education teachers (JSETs and SSETs VI) in those districts over the phone after scheduling an appointment beforehand.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed Using SPSS, The mean scores and percentages of responses were calculated. Furthermore, frequency distribution was also performed. ANOVA was also carried out to determine variations among responses.

Findings of the Study

The findings of the study are as follows.

Table 1
Frequency Distribution of Respondents on the basis of Gender

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	54	40.9
	Female	78	59.1
	Total	132	100

A sum of 54 male special education teachers (JSETs and SSETs) answered the survey from four zones (40.9%), while 78 female special education instructors (JSETs and SSETs) working in the field of visual impairment were answering the poll (59.1%). This indicates that female special education teachers made up the majority of those who completed the questionnaires.

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Respondents on the basis of Age

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Age	20-25	11	8.3
	26-30	22	16.7
	31-35	30	22.7
	36-40	32	24.7
	41-45	17	12.9
	46-50	8	6.1
	50 plus	12	9.1
	Total	132	100

The bulk of responders were between the ages of 26 and 40. It is further described as follows. Age groups 26-30 (22, (16.7%), 31-35 (30, (22.7%), 35-40 (32, (24.7%); on the other hand, some respondents were 46 years and older. As instructors, 8 (6.1%) were between the ages of 46 and 50, while 12 (9.1%) were above the age of 50.

Table 3
Frequency Distribution of Special Education Teachers on the basis of Qualification

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Qualification	B.A	13	9.8
	M.A(SE)	83	62.9
	M.Sc (Psychology)	1	.8
	M.Phil	10	7.6
	Other	25	18.9
	Total	132	100

The majority of special education instructors (63.6%) held a master's degree, whereas just 10 (7.6%) had an M.Phil.

Table 4
Frequency Distribution of Special Education Teachers
on the basis of Braille Training

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Braille Training	0	23	17.4
	1	52	39.4
	2	20	15.2
	3	12	9.1
	4	5	3.8
	5	10	7.6
	Other	10	7.6
	Total	132	100

A large proportion of respondents 52 (39.4) had received one Braille proficiency training, 20 had received two Braille trainings (15.2%), 12 had received three Braille trainings (9.1%), and 5 had received four Braille trainings (3.8%), but 23 special education teachers working in the field of visual impairment had received no Braille training (17.4%).

Table 5
Frequency Distribution of Special Education Teachers
on the basis of Mobility and Orientation Training

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Mobility and Orientation Training	0	36	27.3
	1	57	43.2
	2	22	16.7
	3	5	3.8
	4	6	4.5
	Other	6	4.5
	Total	132	100

Similarly, 57 (43.2%) of respondents had received one training in the subject of orientation and mobility, 22 (16.7%) had received two mobility trainings, 5 (3.8%) had received three mobility trainings, but 36 (27.3%) had not received any mobility training, which is a sad reality for VIC special education teachers.

Table 6
Frequency Distribution of Special Education Teachers
on the basis of IT and Assistive Software Training

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
IT and Assistive Software Training	0	40	30.3
	1	53	40.2
	2	16	12.1
	3	16	12.1
	4	1	.8
	5	2	1.5
	Other	4	3
	Total	132	100

Furthermore, a significant number of respondents (40.2%) had attended one IT training with the reference of special software used in the VI field, 16 had received two IT trainings (12.1%), and 16 others had completed three IT trainings (12.1%), but unfortunately, 40 special education teachers working with VI children did not attend any IT training (30.3%).

Table 7
Frequency Distribution of Special Education Teachers on the basis
of Teaching of Reading, Writing and Mathematics Training

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching of Reading, Writing and Mathematics Training	0	57	43.2
	1	54	40.9
	2	13	9.8
	3	3	2.3
	4	1	.8
	5	2	1.5
	Other	2	1.5
	Total	132	100

In addition, a respectable number of respondents (40.9%) had completed one training in the subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and 13 respondents (9.8%) had completed two such trainings. It is troubling that the majority of special education instructors in the VI field (57, or 43.2%) did not get any training in the subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Findings of teachers responses about instructional practices to apply for CWVI

Table 8
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about Reading Practice

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I try to Improve Reading Fluency of Students	65.9	27.3	3.8	2.3	.8

The majority of respondents stated that they always try to improve students' reading fluency (65.9%), many respondents stated that they try to improve students' reading fluency most of the time (27.3%), and some respondents stated that they frequently try to improve students' reading fluency (3.8%).

Table 9
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the use of Braille and Large Print for Reading

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I give Reading Opportunity to every student by Braille or Large Print	51.5	21.2	9.8	2.3	15.2

The majority of special education teachers (51.5%) assert that they always provide all students in their classes with the opportunity to read using Braille or large print, while a sizeable portion (15.2%) asserts that they never provide the opportunity to read to all of their VI students in their classes.

Table 10
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the use of Work Sheets and Work Books for Writing Practice

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I use Workbooks and Worksheets for Writing Practice.	37.9	31.1	22	3.8	5.3

Workbooks and worksheets are frequently used for writing practice (37.9%), frequently used for writing practice (31.1%), rarely used for writing practice (3.8%) and flatly never used for writing practice (5.3%), according to many respondents.

Table 11
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about taking the Written Exam of Students

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I take the Written Exams/Tests of Students with Visual Impairment.	67.4	8.3	23.5	0.0	8.3

Similar to this, a large percentage of respondents showed that they frequently take written exams/tests of students with visual impairment (23.5%), but many respondents openly stated that they never take written exams/tests of students with visual impairment. The majority of special education teachers revealed that they always take written exams/tests of students with visual impairment (67.4%).

Table 12
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the Teaching of Math's

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I Teach Students Maths in Braille.	50.8	24.2	10.6	3	11.4

The majority of respondents (50.8%) reported that they always teach students maths in Braille, whereas many others (24.2%), many others (11.4%), and many others claimed that they mostly teach students maths in Braille.

Table 13
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about use of IT Devices for the Teaching of Maths

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I teach mathematical concepts using Information technology devices.	25.0	25	18.2	13.6	18.2

In addition, only a small percentage of respondents (25.0%) said they always use technology to teach math concepts, a similar percentage (25%) said they do so most of the time, and a respectable percentage (18.2%) said they never do so.

Table 14
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the Implementation of Mobility and Orientation Curriculum

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I follow Curriculum of Mobility and Orientation.	22.7	19.7	20.5	9.8	27.3

It was surprising to see that many respondents said they always followed the mobility and orientation curriculum (22.7%), while many other students said they did so frequently (19.7%). In reality, there is no curriculum for the subject of mobility and orientation being taught in special education institutions to CWVI. This is due to the fact that a sizable portion of respondents (27.3%) stated that they never adhere to the mobility and orientation curriculum.

Table 15
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the
Practical Exam of Mobility and Orientation

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I take practical exams of mobility and orientation.	22.7	18.9	22	6.8	29.5

The greatest percentage of respondents (29.5%) stated that they never take mobility and orientation practical tests, but many others (22.7% of respondents) said they always do, and still others (22% of respondents) said they frequently do practical exams of mobility and orientation.

Table 16
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about the use
of Magnification Software's for Students with Low Vision

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I Equipped Low Vision Students with Magnification Software.	16.7	16.7	17.4	15.9	33.3

A significant portion of respondents (33.3%) claimed that they never provided low vision students with magnifying software; similarly, another group of respondents asserted that they did so only occasionally (15.9%); however, a third group of respondents contended that they did so frequently (17.4%).

Table 17
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about Regular School Diary

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I Write School Diary Daily.	56.1	21.2	9.8	3	9.8

The majority of respondents (56.1%) said they always keep a daily journal for school; many special education instructors working for VI said they do so frequently (21.2%); nevertheless, another set of respondents (9.8%) said they never keep a daily journal for school.

Table 18
Frequency Distribution of Teacher's Responses about Parent Teacher Meeting

Statements	Always	Frequent	Often	Rare	Never
I Conduct the Parent Teachers Meeting.	37.9	34.1	22.2	2.3	3

A sizable portion of respondents (37.9%) stated that they always host parent-teacher conferences; a similar portion (34.1%) stated that they host conferences the majority of the time; and a small portion (3%), who stated that they never host conferences, stated that they never host conferences.

Table 19
ANOVA for Difference in Mean Scores of Instructional Practices Adopted
by Teachers of Visually Impaired Children on the basis of Zones

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3829.362	3	1276.454	1.197	.314
Within Groups	136489.183	128	1066.322		
Total	140318.545	131			

The table shows that an ANOVA was conducted to see how differently teachers of vision impaired children taught them using the four zones. The instructors were asked to comment on nine different topics, including reading, writing, math, braille competency, mobility and orientation, appropriate procedures, advice for parents, orientation and mobility, and assistive devices. In all four Zones, there was no statistically significant difference in the teaching strategies used by the teachers: $F(3, 128) = 1.19, p = .314$. It demonstrates that all teachers were employing comparable educational strategies while working with visually impaired students.

Table 20
Independent Sample t-test to Compare Mean Scores of Instructional Practices
of Teachers of Visually Impaired Children on the basis of their Gender

	Gender of the Respondents	N	Mean	Df	t-value	Sig.
Total Sum of Questions	Male	54	144.87	130	2.765	.007
	Female	78	129.24			

According to the table, there is a substantial difference in the mean scores of the instructional practices used by male and female teachers ($M = 144.8, SD = 34.82$, and $M = 129.2, S.D = 29.77$, respectively). There was a significant mean difference between the groups (mean difference = 15.62, 95% CI: 4.444 to 26.80). It demonstrates that there were differences in the methods of instruction used by male and female teachers while instructing visually impaired students.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to depict the prevailing instructional practices of special education teachers who were teaching the primary level of CWVI. The basic source of data were teachers who reflected their best teaching practices in core academic areas like reading, writing, mathematics, Braille proficiency etc but many studies denied the teacher's claims in this regard. As Maguvhe 2015, reported that special education teachers possessed insufficient skills to develop the potentialities of their pupils in math's and science.

Similarly, teachers claimed the use of multiple instructional methodologies but Chinooneka and Mupa (2015), found that instructors were not applying a range of instructional methodologies. (Klingenberg, Holkesvik, & Augestad, 2019). Moreover

teachers reflected the sufficient provision of all necessary resources in their institutions which they were using although several studies demonstrated contradictory facts about it askhan reported that the provisions and facilities in special education institutions of Pakistan are not up to the mark (Khan, Ahmad, Hamdan, & Mustafa, 2016; Vajjyanthi, & Naomi 2021).

However present study expressed limited training opportunities for special educators in the field of VI. Many studies indorsed this finding in this way less effective vocational training of special education teachers is the great barrier to enhance the vocational skills of CWVI. (Temesgen 2018; Faizan, Aziz, & Sajjad, 2017).In-spite of all challenges some studies reveal the better students' performance of CWVI than other students which depicts the effectiveness of instructional practices applied by special education teachers as Athanasia and Vasileios (2019), narrated that the visually challenged kids showed greater competence of reading comprehension than visual children.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions derived from this study are as follows, these conclusions are purely based on the responses given by special education teachers.

- The majority of special education teachers serving in the field of vision impairment were female and most of them were belonging from age group of 26-40 years.
- In the same way most of the special education teachers were SSET by designation and they were having master degree qualification. A big number of teachers had also the degree of M. Ed as professional qualification.
- Furthermore their majority had teaching experience in the field of vision impairment between 1-15 years.
- On the other side the majority of special education teachers had only 1 training in core academic areas throughout their service but it's an alarming fact that the second largest amount of special education teachers had not taken any training in core academic areas throughout their service.
- Most of the special education teachers working in the field of vision impairment were usually trying to improve the reading skills of children with vision impairment as reading fluency, word making skill and sentence making skill. Moreover they were engaging all blind and low vision students in reading activity by use of Braille and large print. On the other hand many teachers denied the engagement of all students in reading activity.
- Similarly the bulk of special education teachers working with CWVI were using worksheets and work books to improve the writing skills of students beside it they were taking their written exam however some teacher were not doing so.
- In the same way most of the special education teachers were trying to improve the Braille proficiency of students by teaching them seven line system, Arabic Braille and mathematics Braille. While the considerable number of teachers were not adopting these practices.

- Most of the teachers were using Information technology to teach the mathematics. However a prominent number of special education teachers denied to carry out the above practices.
- In the same way a great number of special education teachers expressed that they follow the mobility and orientation curriculum, similarly they take practical exam of mobility and orientation from students. While another big number of special education teachers totally negated the use of such practices. In addition it is another fact that the orientation and mobility curriculum was not included in any draft of curriculum formulate by DSE Punjab. On the other side majority of teachers were using optical and non-optical aids to teach the low vision students furthermore they were applying need based instructional strategies like exposure to real objects, unifying experiences, learning by doing etc for the teaching of blind students. But a big number of special education teachers were not using these devices and techniques in their teaching.
- The bulk of special education teachers were keeping in-touch with parents of CWVI by conducting parent teacher meetings and writing school diary. Whereas some teachers were not performing these activities. Beside it almost half of the special education teachers were managing the home visits of students for academic purposes but at the same time more than half of the teachers were not feeling it necessary.
- Finally, majority of special education teachers were sending marked papers and results cards to the parents of CWVI however many teachers were not considering it an important and permanent obligation. In addition, no statistically significant difference was found among the responses given by teachers on the behalf of different variables except gender.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations have been purposed on the behalf of this study

- The training opportunities should be enhanced for special education teachers working in the field of vision impairment in core academic areas like reading, writing, mathematics, Braille, use of IT devices, orientation and mobility etc.
- Reading and writing competitions maybe conducted by special education institutions or DSE Punjab among children with vision impairment studying at different level.
- Moreover special education teachers should be encouraged and awarded for outstanding reading, writing and mathematical ability of students.
- Similarly special education teachers should be answerable for poor reading and writing skills of their students as they are considered responsible for the completion of syllabus.

- Sufficient and in time provision of Braille books, Braille equipment, Braille work books and work sheets must be assured in all special education institutions working for CWVI.
- Promotion in next grade should be discouraged without proper acquisition of reading, writing and mathematical skills at primary level.
- Orientation and mobility training along with Effective use of residual senses should be the permanent part of curriculum.
- The use of low vision devices and supportive instructional techniques in teaching should be promoted by effective teacher's trainings and availability of gadgets.
- Regular parent teacher meetings, writing student diary and home visits of students by teachers for academic purposes must be administered by school management.
- Marked papers and result cards of children may be shown to their parents to inform them about their child's performance.
- More comprehensive studies should be conducted to explore the instructional practices of special education teachers in the field of vision impairment by taking data from different other stake holders to cross check the information provided by teachers.
- Last but not least the recommendations of various conducted research studies should be continuously gathered and analyzed by a committee of experts. Moreover their feasible and fruitful suggestions must be implemented. So that research can lead the development.

REFERENCES

1. Alias, A. and Salleh, N.M. (2017). Analysis of problems faced by special education teacher in teaching the multiple disabilities students. *Journal of ICSAR*, 1(1), 60-67.
2. Allinder, R.M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher education and special education*, 17(2), 86-95.
3. Asamoah, E., Ofori-Dua, K., Cudjoe, E., Abdullah, A. and Nyarko, J.A. (2018). Inclusive education: Perception of visually impaired students, students without disability, and teachers in Ghana. *Sage Open*, 8(4), 2158244018807791.
4. Papastergiou, A. and Pappas, V. (2019). A comparison of sighted and visually impaired children's text comprehension. *Research in developmental disabilities*, 85, 8-19.
5. Johnson, A. (2017). *The relationship between teacher practice and student performance*. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). 2235. <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2235>

6. Awais, S. and Ameen, K. (2015). Information accessibility for students with disabilities: An exploratory study of Pakistan. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information science*, 20(2), 103-115.
7. Betts, M. and Liow, S.R. (1993). The relationship between teaching methods and educational objectives in building education. *Construction Management and Economics*, 11(2), 131-141.
8. Mupa, P. and Chinooneka, T.I. (2015). Factors Contributing to Ineffective Teaching and Learning in Primary Schools: Why Are Schools in Decadence?. *Journal of education and practice*, 6(19), 125-132.
9. Fatima, G., Hussain Ch, A.H. and Malik, M. (2016). Instructional Practices Used by Special Education Teachers in Classrooms of Young Children with Deafness. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 38(1), 89-100.
10. Masood, T. and Asim, J. (2023). Exploring the Underlying Mechanism of Innovative Work Behavior and Ethical Leadership. *Journal of Islamic Countries Society of Statistical Sciences*, 9(2), 423-440.
11. Gompel, M., Van Bon, W.H. and Schreuder, R. (2004). Reading by children with low vision. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 98(2), 77-89.
12. Mugambi, M.K. (2011). *Challenges facing teachers in teaching students with visual impairment in integrated school: A study of Moi Girls" school, Nairobi*.
13. Hussain, F., Hameed, A. and Ashraf, T. (2022). Accessibility hurdles in inclusive education of the visually challenged students at university level in Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 6(2), 458-467.
14. Hussain, S., Shahzadi, U. and Khan, I. (2020). Challenges to learners with disabilities in the higher education institutions in Pakistan: A review. *Research Journal of Social Sciences and Economics Review*, 1(3), 12-19.
15. Jahanzaib, M. and Fatima, G. (2020). Demographic Characteristics of Students with Visual Impairment enrolled at Primary Level in Government Special Education Institutions in Punjab. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 30(1), 179-196.
16. Jahanzaib, M., Fatima, G. and e Nayab, D. (2019). Inclusive Education Facilities in Secondary Schools of Pakistan: A Gender Based Comparison. *Responsible Education, Learning and Teaching in Emerging Economies*, 1(2), 75-83.
17. Johnson-Jones, K.J. (2017). *Educating students with visual impairments in the general education setting* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi).
18. Khan, S., Ahmad, R., Hamdan, A.R. and Mustafa, M.S. (2016). Educational Encouragement, Parenting Styles, Gender and Ethnicity as Predictors of Academic Achievement among Special Education Students. *International Education Studies*, 7(2), 18-24.
19. Klingenberg, O.G., Holkesvik, A.H. and Augestad, L.B. (2019). Research evidence for mathematics education for students with visual impairment: A systematic review. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1626322.
20. Kelly, S.M. (2019). *Special education for young children with visual impairments*. In *Special Education for Young Learners with Disabilities* (Vol. 34, pp. 87-102). Emerald Publishing Limited.
21. Spaulding, L.S. (2009). Best Practices and Interventions in Special Education: How Do We Know What Works?. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(3), 3.

22. Malik, S. (2020). Strategies to Solve Communication Barriers between Parents and Teachers of Visually Impaired Learners in Pakistan. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 12(2), 42-62.
23. Muema, J., Mulwa, D. and Mailu, S. (2018). Relationship between teaching method and students' performance in Mathematics in public secondary schools in Dadaab Sub County, Garissa County; Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 8(5), 59-63.
24. Maguvhe, M. (2015). Teaching science and mathematics to students with visual impairments: Reflections of a visually impaired technician. *African journal of disability*, 4(1), 1-6.
25. Neeraja, P. and Anuradha, K. (2014). Adjustment problems faced by children with learning disabilities impact of special education. *Indian Journal of Scientific Research*, 5(1), 77-81.
26. Paolini, A. (2015). Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Student Learning Outcomes. *Journal of effective teaching*, 15(1), 20-33.
27. Arrah, R.O. and Swain, K.D. (2014). Teachers' Perceptions of Students with Special Education Needs in Cameroon Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Special Education*, 29(3), 101-110
28. Salami, I.A. and Egbedeyi, T.F. (2018). Inclusive lower primary education: parents' awareness of the economic and social benefits. *Journal of Positive Psychology and Counselling*, 2(1), 33-45.
29. Temesgen, Z. (2018). School Challenges of Students with Visual Disabilities. *International Journal of special education*, 33(3), 510-523.
30. Vaijyanthi, R. (2021). Learning medium for students with visual impairment. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(10), 7327-7332.
31. Habiba, U., Ormsby, G.M., Butt, Z.A., Afghani, T. and Asif, M. (2017). Knowledge and practices of teachers associated with eye health of primary school children in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *Taiwan journal of ophthalmology*, 7(1), 28-33.

