VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences
http://vfast.org/journals/index.php/VTESS@ 2022, ISSN(e): 2309-3951, ISSN(p): 2411-0221
Volume 10, Number 2, April-June, 2022 *pp:357-366*

Analyzing the Implementation of the Special Education Program for Students with Hearing Impairment at Primary School Level in Punjab

Asma Kanwal[1,2], Dr. Rukhsana Bashir[2], Aasma[1], and Komal Shahzadi[3]

[1]Department of Special Edcation, University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
[2]Institute of Special Education, Unversity of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
[3] Govt. Training College for the Teachers of Blind, Lahore, Pakistan
*Corresponding author email: rukhsana.dse@pu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to analyze the implementation of the special education program for students with hearing impairment (SWHI) at primary school level in Punjab. The nature of the research was descriptive. Teachers of SWHI working at special education primary schools were selected as population. Multi-stage random sampling technique was used to select the sample which was comprised of 209 teachers of SWHI (M=43 & F=166). Data was collected by survey method through self-developed and validated questionnaire having reliability of α= 0.92. Independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA were run to draw the results of the study. Findings of the study indicated that there are very few constructive activities are being practiced such as daily lesson planning, assigning homework, taking weekly & monthly test, activity based instructions, formative assessment, providing immediate feedback on performance. But many contributing practices were found to be employed in a passive manner like knowledgeable classroom management and instructional strategies, training to deal assistive technological devices, parent-teacher collaboration, teachers' education program, and use of audio-visual aids. Workload, extra duties, lack of technological resources, use of local sign language, neglected teacher-professional collaboration, higher student-teacher ratio, dealing more than one class at same time were the flaws affecting the quality of process of primary special education program in Punjab. It was recommended that the role of related stakeholders such as government, head teachers, teachers, non-teaching staff, parents and community should be reaffirmed in true sense.

KEYWORDS

Implementation Phase, Process Evaluation, Special Education Program, Students with Hearing Impairment, Primary School Level

JOURNAL INFO

HISTORY: Received: March 17, 2022 Accepted: June 27, 2022 Published: June 30, 2022

INTRODUCTION

Basic primary education works like a stepping stone to reach the higher levels of education and allow students to become a groomed member of the society with confidence and esteem having core values and social emotional stability (Ministry of Education, 2012; Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2014). It works as corner stone for national development also (Okpala, 2007). The Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004), there is crucial need of playing valuable roles by different stakeholders to strengthen basic education which fundamental to sustainable development. The focused goals of primary school level are to instill permanent literacy and numeracy skills, communication skills, strong foundation for scientific and reflective thinking, contributing role towards society as a responsible citizen, sound personality development incorporating moral values, adapting skills in transforming environment, developing manipulative skills within the child potentials, and incorporating the basic instruments approaching higher levels of education and meeting marketing values.

Primary education works like structural framework to represent the quality of secondary and tertiary levels of education. It was generally observed in Nigeria that students at higher education level are not equipped with the tools necessary to become quality students. Therefore, its dire need to reorient the primary education system to provide a solid foundation to prosperous the whole system of education in concern with scientifically and technologically equipped outputs (Etor et al., 2013).

There are different ingredients to the recipe of quality education such as the institutions' repute, resources and input, process, content, output and outcomes and value added, which should be reformed to encourage integrated education system (Adams, 1993).

Major challenges at primary school level are divided into four concerns as institutional, financial, curricular and security where critical changes are crucial to ensure quality education (Bessingpas, 2009). The product of schools is our students which are treated by the desires of the system but not appropriate to their needs, strengths, potentials and capacities (Kaila, 2005). Multiple factors are missing but crucial for nurturing the quality of primary education program especially process phase such as friendly environment in concern of psycho-social and emotional development, compatible workload, collaboration among colleagues, updated teaching and instructional strategies, assimilation of 21st century skills in curriculum and examination, positive feedback, parental involvement, and parent-teachers' collaboration (Niwaz et al., 2014).

In Pakistan primary school level is most ignored and affected due to different factors such as lack of financial resources, depraved management, political influences, pathetic supervision, lack of teacher education programs for their professional

development, parental dissatisfaction, poor accountability system, improper wages for teachers, low motivation, pitiable implementation of educational policies, obsolete curriculum and traditional assessment procedures. That's why primary education does not sufficient and efficient to meet the needs of the child, national and international standards of education. Students do not progress towards the higher levels of cognitive domain (Ahmad et al., 2013).

According to The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), providing quality primary education is the right of all people and Pakistan is the member state who was in favor of declaration. Many countries have reached the target of universal primary education and now focusing on improving quality of education following standards of quality assurance.

Pakistan is a signatory member of Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 1995, according to the article 27 of this declaration Pakistan is responsible to provide basic education for sustainable development of individualized basis. According to article 30, without any gender discrimination it would be equally accessible for anyone. Pakistan agreed to achieve millennium development goals by 2015 and made commitment to world declaration on education for all (EFA, 2000) and Dakar Framework for Action 2000, by acknowledging free and compulsory quality primary education to all children without any discrimination (Hunzai, 2007; Ali & Tahir, 2009; Ahmad, 2011; Tahirkheli & Khan, 2013; Malik, 2015; Farooq, 2015; Farooq, 2018; Ahmed & Khan, 2020; Zakar et al., 2020).

In the light of all international commitments, Pakistan's constitution has made18th amendment in article 25-A to provide free, compulsory education to children from age 5 to 16 years as a fundamental right (Malik, 2011; Musarrat et al., 2012; Islam, 2013; Bibi, 2015; Hussain, 2019; Ullah, 2020; Zadi, Ch & Hameed, 2021; Parvez et al., 2021; Qayyum).

To acknowledge the international promises, Pakistan primed National Plan of Action on the agenda of EFA (2001-2015) ensuring discrimination free equal access to education for disadvantaged groups of people, community participation for owning basic education and improving quality of education (Niwaz et al., 2014; Shami et al., 2014).

Despite of all national and international commitments, Pakistan is still far away in the race of universalization of basic quality education. Increasing enrollment is still the agenda to pursue due to the factors such as poverty, physical punishment, lack of awareness, parents' preferences, unavailability of teachers, shortage of resources, and cultural concerns (Khan, 2010).

A look on the history of special education depicts that very few institutions were working on the education of students with special needs. These bodies were started on charity basis, society's own efforts especially parents of students with special needs and some non-governmental organizations (Hameed, 2003).

Miserable picture of special education programs was found when we see previous decades, because there is outrageous inappropriateness in all the dynamics such as intervention programs, assessment techniques, process of curriculum planning to enactment, teachers' training for professional development, instructional approaches and non-availability of resources (Khan, 2010), and parental involvement Farooq et al., 2011).

Teachers have the power to endorse quality of education by adopting radical teaching styles, up to the mark credibility, and commitment to the diverse needs of the students in the field of special education program (Brownell et al., 2004). Globally, to achieve excellence in special education field, the recruitment of quality special education teachers has been extended on national level (Billingsley, 2004).

Researches shows that students with hearing impairment suffer on large scale in their academics, socialization and inclusion due to excluded system of segregation. General education schools' stakeholders have stupid reasons to deny to admit these students in school and pretend that they are not responsible to cater the SWHI but special education schools. They don't have related resources and teachers' professional development to tackle the needs of deaf students (Bashir, 2005). Curriculum being provided to SWHI in special education school is same as in general education schools but mainly focus on the communication and speech & language development. Most of the subjects critical to reach higher orders of cognitive domain mainly science subjects are exempted from the curriculum by which parents and students are dissatisfied (Khatoon, 2003; Kazimi, 2007). Special education schools for SWHI are reluctant to provide up to the mark quality opportunities for students' integrated learning, personality development, participation in science, business, and ICT subjects, vocational transition plans and programs (Bashir et al., 2021).

Instructional approaches are being used for SWHI in schools have pathetic situation. Teachers mostly use the combination of oral-aural methods and sign language. But prospective and in-service teachers don't learn and practice standard sign language of Pakistan. Instead of Pakistan language, they use local signs with immense variations. Teachers don't have the strength to use PSL in all subjects. Teachers are untrained to use different approaches like finger spelling, speech reading and cued speech (Khatoon, 2003; Ali, 2021). So special education schools are failed to provide updated teaching methodologies and instructional approaches to make SWHI independent and competent in comparison to their hearing counterparts. Persons with HI are labeled as economic stress, social burden, and depression giver even by their parents and criticized, mistreated and misunderstood in their potentials and capacities by hearing community. (Hussain, 2003; Batool & Shehbaz, 2008; Iftikhar & Yasmeen, 2009).

The opinion of people in Pakistan regarding SWHI have to change in progressive manner by employing technology, provision of teachers' education programs on regular basis, creating awareness platforms at both governmental and non-governmental levels, strengthening Pakistan's standard Sign Language, using team based approaches and most importantly

reorienting the learner-centered curriculum and instructional approaches, and advocating their rights on national and international levels (Akram & Bashir, 2012).

The quality of education can be retained by improving teaching-learning process which would be more cost effective than focusing on the improved provision of input. Effective teaching-learning process owns rationalized learner-centered teaching approaches and instructional strategies appropriate to the needs of the students of modern era, technology stimulation, flexible-friendly environment promising active learning and the development of critical thinking and problem solving skills (Serbessa, 2006).

Measurement, assessment and evaluation are mostly considered sometimes overlapping terms but having interrelatedness while performing different functions. Collection of data in numbers is measurement, whereas assessment is the interpretation of results based on the collected data but evaluation is a judgmental process to make decision derived from results based on data (Griffin & Peter, 1991).

Stufflebeam's CIPP model for evaluation has four components; Context, Input, Process, and Product. Context evaluation is carried out on the purpose of investigating the readiness of overall environment, compatibility of goals, policies and preferences towards gauged needs. Input evaluation is helpful for stakeholders to identify resources and relevant approaches for planning an amenable program to implement. Process evaluation is meant to monitor how well the related stakeholders play their roles in the execution of planned activities and to review which kind of necessary improvements are needed to revise the plan. Outcomes are assessed whether these are desirable or unexpected through product evaluation in terms of impact, effectiveness, sustainability and transportability (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007; Zhang et al., 2011; Guili et al., 2011; Warju, 2016; Aziz, Mahmood & Rehman, 2018).

Situational analysis depicts that despite of existence of plenty of documentation devising the voice for the rights of students with hearing impairment, intensive input resources, services and facilities, the position of SWHI is found miserable, the gradual drop of enrollment noticed while reaching higher levels of education than primary level, lesser academic achievements than their hearing counterparts, and succeeding lower standard lifestyle in society. The existing body of knowledge indicates many challenges affecting the quality of primary education programs but a gap is found related to primary special education program for students with hearing impairment especially in the context of province Punjab of Pakistan. There is imperative need to evaluate the process of primary special education program to find out the reasons and challenges influencing the manufacture of SWHI as a quality product who live independent, healthy and meaningful life in society.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify the opinion of the teachers about the instructional methods and activities used to teach SWHI at primary level.
2. Find out the opinion of the teachers about the instructional materials used to teach SWHI at primary level.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of implementation phase of the special education program at primary school level through the perception of teachers of students with hearing impairment.
4. Compare the responses of teachers on the basis of their demographic information.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to evaluate the process or implementation phase of special education program for students with hearing impairment at primary school level in Punjab through the perception of the teachers of students with hearing impairment working in schools. Descriptive type of research was used achieve the objectives of the study. Survey method was used to collect the data by using self-developed Likert type questionnaire as a research tool.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

Population of the study was teachers of SWHI teaching in special education schools at primary level in Punjab. Multi- stage random sampling technique was used to select the sample from special education schools of public sector. Firstly, 4 zones were made by dividing the province Punjab containing 36 districts with 46 special education schools for SWHI. Zone I had 7 schools, zone II had16 schools, zone III had 12 schools, and zone III had 11 schools for deaf students. At second stage, about 50% districts were selected from each zone where schools for hearing impairment were working at primary level. Total 19 districts (52%) were selected of Punjab. At third stage, 1 school from each district was selected. Total 19 schools (41%) were selected from 46 schools of Punjab. At fourth stage, 209 teachers (41%) out of 504 were selected.

INSTRUMENTATION AND & PROCEDURE OF DATA COLLECTION

Close-ended questionnaire consisted of five-point Likert scale was developed by the researchers to collect data through survey method. Reliability of the instrument was estimated after pilot testing (Cronbach alpha=0.92). Validity of the instrument was determined by 5 field experts having area of specialization of children with hearing impairment. Instrument was administered by the researchers via personal visits, post office registry, google form, and WhatsApp. The researchers followed ethical considerations and protocols during data collection process.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Table 1. Demographic variables of teachers of students with hearing impairment

Variable	Description	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	43	20.6
	Female	166	79.4
Zone	Zone I	54	25.8
	Zone II	55	26.3
	Zone III	54	25.8
	Zone IV	46	22.0
Class	One	8	3.8
	Two	13	6.2
	Three	16	7.7
	Four	14	6.7
	Five	21	10.0
	More than One	137	65.6
Age	(26-30)	49	23.4
	(31-35)	77	36.8
	(36-40)	57	27.3
	Above 40 Years	26	12.5
Designation	JSET	82	39.2
	SSET	80	38.3
	Others	47	22.5
Experience	(0-5)	85	40.7
	(06-10)	65	31.1
	(11-15)	39	18.7
	(16-20)	12	5.7
	Above 20 Years	8	3.8
Qualification	M.Phil/PhD	51	24.4
	M.A (Special Education)	104	49.8
	M.Ed (Special Education)	43	20.6
	B.Ed (Special Education)	3	1.4
	Others	8	3.8

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of indicating perception of teachers of SWHI about process of special education program at primary school level

Statements	Mean	SD
Use lecture method.	3.8852	.91789
Use question & answer.	3.7177	1.05234
Use demonstration method.	3.2297	1.21880
Arrange classroom discussion.	2.1244	1.09800
Arrange field visits.	2.5837	1.15356
Perform experiments for conceptual clarity.	3.1627	1.22174
Give individual and group assignments.	3.9378	1.02421
Teachers use differentiated strategies in the classroom for better learning.	3.6794	1.05958
Plan activity-based instructions.	4.1100	.94683
Plan lessons on daily basis.	4.2201	.96046
Prepare the diary to report the instructional planning on weekly basis.	3.6938	1.04790
Engage students in role play.	3.5407	1.12212
Use original objects as audio-visual during instructions.	3.6172	1.14644
Use models and diagrams for instructional delivery.	3.2871	1.47214
Projected media is easy to arrange for teachers in the school.	2.9713	1.17225
Use videos to clarify the concepts.	3.5789	1.06281
Plan and implement effective classroom management practices.	3.9330	1.06306
Decorate classroom in an attractive way to appeal students' learning.	2.9282	1.42425
Deal students with different class levels at same time in same classroom.	3.4928	1.08805
Use different formative assessment techniques during lesson execution.	4.1100	.99631
Reinforce students by providing immediate feedback on their performance.	4.0287	.97030
Take weekly test.	4.0861	.89456
Take monthly test.	4.4067	.82167

Assign homework to students on daily basis.	4.1818	1.03099
Maintain performance record of every student.	3.5120	1.27139
Ensure daily communication with parents/guardian about the students' performance through diary.	3.0478	1.22773
Parents discuss their child's performance.	3.1579	2.43550
School arranges guidance and counseling sessions for parents.	3.8278	1.14312
Teachers send written material to parents for teaching to the child at home.	3.5215	1.18920
Teachers use their own technology gadgets for students learning.	2.7703	1.44611
Required training to deal with assistive listening devices being used by SWHI.	3.7703	1.29529
Use total communication method while teaching SWHI.	2.2967	1.20816
Feel difficulty to use Pakistan sign language.	3.2967	1.18810
Remain busy in doing extra duties assigned by administration.	2.7273	1.22760
Take help from non-teaching staff/senior students while busy in other duties.	2.8900	1.28315
Principal arranges such forums where teachers and other professionals can interact with each other.	3.3397	1.39518
Teachers are being encouraged to discuss their class issues with administration without any hesitation.	3.0335	1.28371
Parent-teacher meetings are organized once in each term.	3.3876	1.26264

Table 2 depicts the mean score and standard deviation of perception of teachers of SWHI regarding the process of primary special education program. The most practicing factors reported by teachers was monthly test (4.40), daily lesson planning (4.22), assigning home work to students on daily basis (4.18), activity based instructions and formative assessment (4.11), weekly test (4.08), and providing immediate feedback (4.02). The moderately practicing factors were individual and group activities (3.937), planning and implementing classroom management (3.933), lecture method (3.88), guidance and counselling sessions for parents (3.82), training to deal assistive listening devices (3.77), question answer (3.71), preparing diary for instructional planning on weekly basis (3.69), differentiated strategies in the classroom (3.67), audio-visual aids (3.61), video use (3.57), role play (3.54), providing written material to parents (3.52), record maintenance (3.51), dealing different class levels at same time (3.49), parent-teacher meetings (3.38), arrangement of forums for teachers and professionals interaction (3.33), difficulty to use PSL (3.29), use of models and diagrams (3.28), demonstration method (3.22), and performing experiments (3.16). The less practicing factors were child's performance discussion by parents (3.15), daily communication with parents and guardian (3.04), teachers discuss class issues with administration (3.03), arrangement of projected media (2.97), classroom decoration (2.92), non-teaching staff help for class (2.89), teachers use technology gadgets on their own basis (2.77), extra duties of teachers (2.72), field visits (2.58), use of total communication method (2.29), and classroom discussions (2.12).

Table 3. Independent sample t-test comparing perception of teachers of SWHI on the basis of their gender about the process of special education program at primary school level

Gender	N	Mean	SD	*t*-value	Sig.
Male	43	130.86	21.71	-0.074	0.751
Female	166	131.14	22.62		

Independent sample t-test was run to compare the responses of respondents on the basis of their gender about the quality of process of primary special education program for students with hearing impairment based on total score. Table shows that there was no significant difference (t=-0.074, p= 0.751) between the perception of male and female teachers regarding teaching-learning process for students with hearing impairment.

Table 4. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by designation of teachers of SWHI

Designation	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
JSET	82	134.2195	20.11818	2.22168	129.7991	138.6400
SSET	80	129.7500	22.38190	2.50237	124.7692	134.7308
Others	47	127.8936	25.72871	3.75292	120.3394	135.4479
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Designation Scores	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Scores	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1426.933	2	713.466	1.430	.242
Within Groups	102809.517	206	499.075		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of their designation about the process of primary special education program. Results shows that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI having different designation: F (2, 206) = 1.43, p = 0.24).

Table 5. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by zone of teachers of SWHI

Zones	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Zone 1	54	130.9444	21.31827	2.90105	125.1257	136.7632
Zone 2	55	127.6727	21.89880	2.95283	121.7527	133.5928
Zone 3	54	130.3333	20.01132	2.72320	124.8713	135.7954
Zone 4	46	136.2174	26.30835	3.87896	128.4048	144.0300
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Zone Scores	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1883.681	3	627.894	1.258	.290
Within Groups	102352.769	205	499.282		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of zones of Punjab province about the process of primary special education program. Results shows that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI teaching in different zones of Punjab: F (3, 208) = 1.25, p = 0.290).

Table 6. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by qualification of teachers of SWHI

Qualification	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
M.Phil/PhD	51	127.4706	23.95275	3.35406	120.7338	134.2074
M.A Special Education	104	133.5962	21.76196	2.13394	129.3640	137.8283
M.Ed Special Education	43	129.5581	22.34929	3.40823	122.6800	136.4362
B.Ed Special Education	3	134.0000	4.58258	2.64575	122.6163	145.3837
Other	8	128.6250	24.65150	8.71562	108.0158	149.2342
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Qualification Scores	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1496.226	4	374.056	.743	.564
Within Groups	102740.224	204	503.629		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of their qualification about the process of primary special education program. Results shows that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI having different qualification level: F (4, 204) = 0.743, p = 0.564).

Table 7. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by experience of teachers of SWHI

Experience	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(0-5)	85	128.7647	24.43439	3.35406	120.7338	134.2074
(6-10)	65	132.3538	20.61055	2.13394	129.3640	137.8283
(11-15)	39	133.6667	18.59164	3.40823	122.6800	136.4362
(21-25)	12	136.7500	21.81795	2.64575	122.6163	145.3837
Above 25	8	124.3750	31.53201	8.71562	108.0158	149.2342
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Experience Scores	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1567.502	4	391.876	.779	.540
Within Groups	102668.947	204	503.279		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of their experience in the field about the process of primary special education program. Results shows

that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI having experience: F (4, 204) = 0.779, p = 0.540).

Table 8. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by class of teachers of SWHI

Class	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
One Class	8	132.7500	15.82719	5.59576	119.5181	145.9819
Two Class	13	135.5385	25.99236	7.20898	119.8314	151.2455
Three Class	16	127.5000	26.62831	6.65708	113.3108	141.6892
Four Class	14	132.3571	21.60700	5.77471	119.8816	144.8327
Five Class	21	130.7143	22.73135	4.96039	120.3671	141.0615
More than one	137	130.9124	22.16598	1.89377	127.1674	134.6574
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Class Scores	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	515.270	5	103.054	.202	.961
Within Groups	103721.180	203	510.942		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of class in which teachers were teaching about the process of primary special education program. Results shows that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI having different class level: F (5, 203) = 0.202, p = 0.961).

Table 9. One-way Analysis of Variance of scores by age of teachers of SWHI

Age	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(21-25)	1	125.0000	.	.	.	.
(26-30)	48	136.1042	23.80170	3.43548	129.1929	143.0155
(31-35)	77	128.0909	23.76595	2.70838	122.6967	133.4851
(36-40)	58	130.7241	18.63386	2.44675	125.8246	135.6237
Above 40 Years	25	131.7600	23.21688	4.64338	122.1765	141.3435
Total	209	131.0861	22.38608	1.54848	128.0334	134.1388

Age Scores	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1955.461	4	488.865	.975	.422
Within Groups	102280.989	204	501.377		
Total	104236.450	208			

Table shows that one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the opinion of teachers of SWHI on the basis of their age about the process of primary special education program. Results shows that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI having different class level: F (4, 204) = 0.975, p = 0.422).

CONCLUSION

Perception of teachers of SWHI was determined regarding process phase of special education program for SWHI at primary school level in Punjab. Process means the implementation phase of planned activities that is consisted of teaching learning process to produce desired product. This study was conducted to determine the process evaluation trough the opinion of teachers of SWHI teaching in special education schools of Punjab, whether implementation of planning and resources are being applied effectively or not.

The results of the study reflect that teachers of SWHI practice such activities which strengthening the teaching learning process of primary special education program to produce quality product. These practices are monthly test, daily lesson planning, assigning home work to students on daily basis, activity based instructions, formative assessment, weekly test, and providing immediate feedback.

There are many aspects which are being implemented but in a passive manner such as individual and group activities, planning and implementing classroom management strategies, guidance and counselling sessions for parents, training to deal assistive listening devices, demonstration method, preparing diary for instructional planning on weekly basis, differentiated strategies in the classroom, proper usage of audio-visual aids, video use , role play, providing written material to parents, record maintenance, parent-teacher meetings, arrangement of forums for teachers and professionals interaction, , use of models and diagrams, demonstration method, and performing experiments.

Respondents reported about less practicing things which were discussion by parents about the child's performance, daily communication with parents and guardians by school trough student diary, discussion by teachers about class issues with administration, arrangement of projected media, classroom decoration enhancing learning of SWHI, teachers use technology gadgets on their own basis, field visits, proper use of total communication method, and arrangements of classroom discussions.

The results reflected that there are some outdated and saddling practices hamper teaching-learning process such as using lecture method most of the time at primary level, teachers have to deal more than one class at same time in the same room, the use of standard sign langue is missing widely, non-teaching staff attend classes in the absence of teachers or when busy in other additional duties, and extra workload.

Independent sample t-test on the basis of gender and one-way between groups analysis of variance was used zones, qualification, experience, designation, age and, class level. The results of both which indicated that there was no statistically significant difference was found in the responses of teachers of SWHI.

The results of the study show that there are many aspects of planned policies, goals and objectives are missing in teaching-learning process which may affect badly the product of primary special education program. The role was being played by administration, teachers, non-teaching staff, parents and community is not clear, submissive and miserable that may need to redefine replay in true sense for quality process in order to produce quality product.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made on the basis of results of the study by the researchers:

1. Teachers' education programs should be organized to equip them with all the crucial tools to perform their instructional role and responsibilities dynamically.
2. Pakistan standard sign language soul be strictly implemented in institutions to maintain uniformity of mother language of students with hearing impairment that is necessary for their learning process.
3. Parental involvement and parent teacher interaction should be encouraged by providing meaningful opportunities on regular basis.
4. Teachers should adopt up-to-date and adapt instructional approaches according to the needs of SWI.
5. Formative accountability system should be established to monitor the progress and quality of teaching-learning process.

CREDIT AUTHOR STATEMENT

Asma Kanwal: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Data curation, Writing- Original draft preparation. **Dr. Rukhsana Bashir**: Visualization, Investigation, Supervision. **Aasma**: Software, Validation. **Komal Shahzadi:** Writing- Reviewing and Editing

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS:

It is declare that all authors don't have any conflict of interest. It is also declare that this article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors. Furthermore, informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

REFRENCES

Adams, D. (1993). Defining educational quality. *Improving Educational Quality Project Publication*, *1*.

Adeney, K. (2012). A step towards inclusive federalism in Pakistan? The politics of the 18th amendment. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, *42*(4), 539-565.

Ahmad, I., Rauf, M., Rashid, A., ur Rehman, S., & Salam, M. (2013). Analysis of the problems of primary education system in Pakistan: Critical review of literature. *Academic Research International*, *4*(2), 324.

Ahmad, M. (2011, November). EFA in Pakistan: Struggle for Upgrading Literacy. In *Seminar. net* (Vol. 7, No. 2).

Ahmed, M., & Khan, A. M. (2020). Analysis of national educational initiatives (2000-2019) for promoting primary education in Pakistan. *Journal of Educational Research*, *23*(1), 131.

Akram, B., & Bashir, R. (2012). Special education and deaf children in Pakistan: an overview. *Journal of Elementary Education*, *22*(2), 33-44.

Ali, S., & Tahir, M. S. (2009). Reforming education in Pakistan–tracing global links. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, *3*(15), 1.

Ali, Z. R. (2021). Factors Affecting the Uniformity of Sign Language: Perception of Teachers of Students with Hearing Impairment: Unpublished B.Ed (Hons) Special Education Thesis; Department of special education; University of Education, Lahore.

Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Rehman, Z. (2018). Implementation of CIPP Model for Quality Evaluation at School Level: A Case Study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *5*(1), 189-206.

Bashir, R. (2005). Students with hearing impairment in inclusive classrooms. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Inclusive Education: Innovations in Inclusive School Development: Hong Kong.

Bashir, R., Wajihullah, A., Kanwal, A., Akram, B., & Haider, S. (2021). Teachers' Perspectives on the Education for Deaf Students: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Schools. *LINGUISTICA ANTVERPIENSIA*, 1059-1065.

Batool, B., S., & Shehbaz, S., F. (2008). A study of the perceptions of the teachers of HIC about the capabilities of HIC: Unpublished Masters Thesis; Department of Special Education; University of Punjab, Lahore.

Bessingpas, M. T. (2009). *Reforming primary education in Pakistan in the interest of US national security* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University).

Bibi, T. (2015). Article 25th A: Implications of free and compulsory secondary education. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, *6*(1).

Billingsley, B. (2004). Special Education Teacher Retention and attrition: A Critical Analysis of Research Literature. *The Journal of Special Education, 38(1), 39-55.*

Brownell, M., Hirsch, E., &Seo, S. (2004). Meeting the demand for highly qualified special education teachers during severe shortages: What should policymakers consider ?*The Journal of Special Education, 38(1), 22-38*

Declaration, B. (1995). Beijing declaration and platform for action fourth world conference on women. *Paragraph*, *112*, 859-865.

Eğitim Bakanlığı, S. (2014). Primary school education: preparing your child for tomorrow.

Etor, C. R., Mbon, U. F., & Ekanem, E. E. (2013). Primary Education as a Foundation for Qualitative Higher Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *2*(2), 155-164.

Farooq, M. S. (2015). MDGs and quality education situation at primary level in Pakistan. *Social Crimonol*, *3*, 126.

Farooq, M. S. (2018). Millennium development goals (MDGs) and quality education situation in Pakistan at primary level. *International Online Journal of Primary Education*, *7*(1), 1-23.

Farooq, M. S., Chaudhry, A. H. Shafiq, M. & Berhanu, G. (2011). Factors affecting students quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level. *Journal of Quality of technology management, 7(11), 1-14.*

Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2004). National Policy on Education. Yaba: NERDC.

Griffin, P., & Peter, N. (1991). Education assessment and reporting. Sidney: Harcourt Brace Javanovich Publisher.

Guili, N. Z., Nancy, Z., Robin, G., DEBBIE, M., Jennifer, W., CHRISTINE, S., & Katherine, M. (2011). Using The Context, Imput, process and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to Guide the Planning, aimplemetation, and assessment of Service-learning Programs. *Journal of Higher Educational outreach and Engangement*, *15*(4), 57.

Hameed, A. (2003). Inclusive schools: an emerging trend in Pakistan: Proceedings of the International Conference on Inclusive Education: A framework for reform: Hong Kong.

Hunzai, Z. N. (2007). Early years education in Pakistan: trends, issues and strategies. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, *15*(3), 297-309.

Husain, Z. (2003). A study of self image of deaf community in Lahore. Unpublished Master's Thesis: Department of special education; University of Punjab, Lahore.

Hussain, G. (2019). A critical analysis of state sponsored free and compulsory education in Pakistan.

Iftikhar, S., & Yasmeen, M. (2009). A study of stress experience by the parents of HIC: Unpublished Master's Thesis; Department of special education; University of Punjab, Lahore.

Islam, F. U. (2013). The 18th amendment in the 1973 constitution. *The Dialogue*, *8*(2).

Kaila, H. L. (2005). Democratizing schools across the world to stop killing creativity in children: An Indian perspective.

Kazimi, A. B. (2007). The problems related to teacher training programs: An analysis: Special World, 12-21.0

Khan, S. B. (2010). Problems in universalization of primary education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, *4*(2), 147-155.

Khan, T. (2010*). Quality education and the need for special students.* Mingowara, Swat: Jan Publishers, New Taj Mehal.

Khatoon, A. (2003). A historical and evaluative study of special. Doctoral Thesis: Special Education Department, University of Karachi, Karachi.

Malik, A. B. (2011). Policy analysis of education in Punjab Province. *Islamabad, Pakistan: UNESCO. Retrieved January*, *4*, 2017.

Malik, S. Y. (2015). Mdgs on universalization of primary education: Analysis of gaps between commitment and implementation in pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(6 S1), 224.

Ministry of Education. (2012). Primary school education: Preparing your child for tomorrow.

Musarrat, R., Ali, G., & Azhar, M. S. (2012). 18th Amendment and its Impacts on Pakistan's Politics. *Journal of Sociological Research*, *3*(1), 1.

Niwaz, A., Khan, M. S., & Abbas, A. (2014). Managing quality education at primary level in Pakistan: current practices and future hopes. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *30*(2), 97-100.

Okpala, B. N. (2007). Maintenance Culture and the sustainability of the UBE programme in Nigeria.

Parvez, N., Rauf, A., & Faiz, J. (2021). Theory and Practice of Federalism after 18th Amendment: A Case Study of Education Sector Governance in KP. *The Discourse*, *7*(1), 99-112.

Punjab School Education Sector Plan 2013-17, (2013, June). *School Education Department*, Govt. of the Punjab.

Qayyum, S. Implementation of Article 25-A of the Constitution in Punjab: Challenges and Way Forward.

Rights, C. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights. *General Assembly Resolution 217A III) of*.

Serbessa, D. D. (2006). Tension between traditional and modern teaching-learning approaches in Ethiopian primary schools. *Journal of International cooperation in education*, *9*(1), 123-140.

Shami, P. A., Ahmad, M., & Khyizer, A. (2014). management of early childhood care and education in Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, *8*(2), 239-249.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Evaluation theory, models, & applications. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tahirkheli, S. A., & Khan, S. B. (2013). Challenges to Promotion of the Fundamental Right to Education in Pakistan. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *2*(2), 327-327.

Ullah, A. (2020). Right to free and compulsory education in Pakistan after 18th constitutional amendment. *South Asian Studies*, *28*(2).

UNESCO, (2000). World Education Forum: Dakar Framework for Action 2000. Paris: UNESCO.

Warju, W. (2016). Educational program evaluation using CIPP model. *INVOTEC*, *12*(1).

Zadi, K. I., Ch, S. N., & Hameed, U. (2021). Implementation of Article 25-A of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in Punjab and KPK: A Critical Analysis of Government's Memorandum and Shortcomings. *Al-Qamar*, *4*(2), 173-186.

Zakar, P. D. M. Z., Qureshi, D. S., Ullah, D. R., Zakar, D. R., Aqil, N., & Manawar, D. R. (2020). Universal Primary Education in Pakistan: constraints and challenges. *South Asian Studies*, *28*(2).

Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K. (2011). Using the context, input, process, and product evaluation model (CIPP) as a comprehensive framework to guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *15*(4), 57-84.