DOI: 10.71317/jgst.2.11.2026.1136
Journal of Global Social Transformation
Journal homepage: https://rjsaonline.org/index.php/JGST

Beyond Admission: Educational Accessibility and Student Agency among University Students with Visual Impairments in Pakistan

Hina Tariq[1], Aamna Asad[2], Quratulain Sarwat[3]
[1] Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
[2] Westminster International School.
[3] Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
Email: Quratulain.sarwat@fjwu.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

Submission:
October 28, 2026
Revised:
November 09, 2026
Accepted:
November 20, 2026
Available Online:
November 27, 2026

Keywords:
Visual impairment, inclusive higher education, accessibility, student agency, assistive technology, Pakistan

Corresponding author:
Quratulain Sarwat
Email: Quratulain.sarwat@fjwu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Admission to higher education does not guarantee equitable participation for students with visual impairments. This qualitative descriptive study examined how university practices shape accessibility and independence in Pakistan. Ten students with visual impairments were purposively recruited and interviewed using a semi-structured guide. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed thematically. Five themes concerned visually dependent teaching, fragmented digital accessibility, campus mobility, scribe-dependent assessment, and resilience and informal support. Participants described substantial differences in access across teachers, digital resources and examination arrangements. They reported using screen readers, document-conversion tools and generative artificial intelligence to manage inaccessible materials, while limited institutional support and inaccessible specialist software restricted some academic activities. Physical barriers and dependence on scribes further constrained independence. Interpreted through the social model of disability, these accounts suggest that students frequently had to compensate for barriers embedded in university practices. The study contributes an account of how established accessibility challenges intersect with emerging digital tools and student agency. It recommends coordinated accessibility standards for teaching, digital resources, campus design and assessment, alongside support that reduces reliance on individual negotiation.

Introduction

Higher education plays an important role in promoting personal independence, professional development, and social participation. For students with visual impairments, equitable educational opportunities depend not only on access to universities but also on their ability to participate meaningfully in academic and social activities (Höger et al., 2025). An inclusive university environment requires accessible teaching practices, appropriate learning resources, assistive technologies, and equitable assessment procedures. Understanding students' lived experiences is therefore essential for identifying educational barriers and developing institutional practices that promote accessibility, independence, and meaningful inclusion (Hussain et al., 2022).

Access to university is not equivalent to inclusion. Students with visual impairments must also be able to engage with course content, navigate campus, participate in learning and demonstrate their knowledge through equitable assessment. Research in the United Kingdom and Egypt illustrates the gap between formal inclusion and students' everyday experiences of participation (Alghurabi, 2024; Croft, 2020; Hewett, et al, 2017)

In Pakistan, studies have documented barriers to accessible instruction, digital literacy and examination accommodations (Hussain et al., 2022; Iqbal et al., 2022; Parveen et al., 2024). These findings establish that educational accessibility is an existing research concern rather than an unexplored topic. The question addressed here is how barriers across different university activities intersect, and how students respond when institutional provision is insufficient.

The present study examines academic, technological, infrastructural, social and assessment-related barriers together. It pays particular attention to students' reported use of generative AI and difficulties with specialist software, situating these experiences within broader questions of independence and institutional responsibility. Its contribution is contextual and interpretive, not a claim that these barriers have never been documented.

Research questions

- What academic, technological, infrastructural, social, and assessment-related barriers are experienced by university students with visual impairments?
- How do participants perceive these barriers as influencing their learning, participation, independence, and academic performance?
- What institutional measures do participants consider necessary for improving accessibility and inclusion?

Literature review and conceptual framework

Inclusive higher education extends beyond providing admission opportunities to students with visual impairments. It requires equitable access to academic resources, instructional practices, digital technologies, physical infrastructure, and assessment procedures (Soleimani-Sefat et al., 2016). Despite increasing attention to inclusive education, students with visual impairments continue to experience institutional, academic, technological, and social barriers that restrict their participation and independence (Bayram, 2014). This section reviews the existing literature on these barriers, the role of assistive technology, and students' adaptive strategies. It also establishes the conceptual foundation of the study through the Social Model of Disability and identifies the research gap within the context of Pakistani higher education.

Institutional barriers and the social model of disability

The social model of disability distinguishes impairment from disabling social and institutional arrangements. In higher education, this directs attention to the design of teaching, resources and assessment rather than locating educational difficulty solely within the student. Croft (2020) examined the tensions between institutional inclusion and everyday participation, while Hewett et al. (2017) emphasized the interaction between learner skills and institutional accommodations. Together, these perspectives help distinguish student agency from the responsibility of universities to provide accessible environments.

Pedagogical and digital accessibility

Access to academic content depends on how instructors communicate information and how materials are provided. Hussain et al. (2022) identified accessibility hurdles in Pakistani universities, including visually dependent teaching. Otyola et al. (2017) similarly documented limitations in instructional methods, assessment and materials in Ugandan universities. In a rural South African university, Fakoya-michael and Fakoya (2015) identified unmet information needs as a barrier to academic participation. These studies indicate that accessible resources and teaching practices must be considered together.

Assistive technology can provide alternative routes to academic information, but its usefulness depends on the availability of compatible resources and support. Iqbal et al. (2022) examined digital-literacy challenges among students with visual impairments in Pakistan. Simui et al. (2017) reported students' self-initiated use of technologies including scanners, voice recorders and screen-reading software. Such practices illustrate the importance of student initiative but also raise questions about institutional responsibility for access (Amna Shaheen, 2023; Tichauya et al., 2012). The present study extends this discussion to participants' reported uses of generative AI and specialist academic software.

Mobility, assessment and participation

Campus accessibility and assessment arrangements influence participation beyond classroom instruction. Alghurabi (2024) identified mobility and accessible materials among the difficulties experienced by students at a private university. Otyola et al. (2017) reported both examination accommodations and limitations in their implementation. In Pakistan, Parveen et al. (2024)

examined accessible examination modes and associated challenges. Together, these studies provide a basis for examining whether accommodations enable students to participate independently or require continued reliance on others.

Student agency and the research gap

Student initiative and peer support are important resources, but they do not establish that an institution is accessible. Scott (2009) identified supportive relationships and institutional connectedness as facilitators of academic success, alongside experiences of isolation and restricted accessibility. In Pakistan, previous work has addressed several of the barriers examined here. This study brings these domains together and examines how students negotiate access, including through emerging digital tools (Juma & Ntulo, 2024). The analysis therefore focuses on the relationship between institutional barriers and student agency. The findings from the study of Parween (2015) indicated that students with acquired visual impairment demonstrated higher emotional intelligence than those with congenital visual impairment.

Methodology

Research Design

The study used an interpretivist qualitative approach and a qualitative descriptive design. This design was appropriate because the purpose was to produce a clear account of participants' experiences rather than to test a hypothesis or construct a formal theory. Semi-structured interviews enabled participants to explain how institutional practices influenced their daily academic lives.

Participants and Sampling

The study involved ten students with visual impairments enrolled in public and private universities in Pakistan. Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their direct experience of the phenomenon under investigation. The inclusion criteria comprised enrolment in a university program, identification as having visual impairment, and willingness to share educational experiences.

The sample comprised eight female and two male participants aged between 21 and 28 years, with a mean age of 23.9 years. Seven participants had total blindness, two had low vision, and one reported partial blindness. Seven participants were enrolled in public universities and three in private universities. Participants represented diverse academic disciplines and were enrolled between the second and eighth semesters. This variation enabled the exploration of educational experiences across different academic disciplines, stages of study, visual-impairment profiles, and institutional settings. Participant codes (P1–P10) were assigned to protect their identities. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of participants

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (N=10)	Percentage
Gender	Female	8	80%
	Male	2	20%
Age	21–23 years	4	40%
	24–26 years	5	50%
	27–28 years	1	10%
Visual impairment	Total blindness	7	70%
	Low vision	2	20%
	Partial blindness	1	10%
University type	Public	7	70%

	Private	3	30%
Semester	2nd–4th semester	3	30%
	5th–6th semester	4	40%
	7th–8th semester	3	30%

Note. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 28 years (M = 23.9) and were enrolled in the second to eighth semesters of their respective academic programs.

The participants represented diverse academic disciplines, stages of study, visual-impairment profiles, and institutional settings. This diversity provided an opportunity to explore educational barriers across different university contexts and academic experiences.

Data Collection

Data were collected through semi-structured online interviews. The online format was selected to accommodate the researcher's mobility and accessibility needs (Table 1). All ten interviews lasted approximately 25 minutes each and were digitally recorded with participants' informed consent. English was the primary language of communication; however, participants were given the option to respond in Urdu according to their language preferences. This flexibility enabled participants to express their experiences comfortably. The recordings were subsequently transcribed for thematic analysis.

Table 2

Interview protocol

Parameter	**Details**
Interview mode	Online semi-structured interviews
Number of interviews	10
Interview duration	Approximately 25 minutes each
Interview language	English, with the option to respond in Urdu
Interview location	Remote/online
Recording method	Digital recording with informed consent
Member checking	Participant verification of interview transcripts and intended meanings
Online platform	Google Meeting
Urdu-to-English translation tool	Google Translator
Transcription tool	Turboscribe.ai

Data Analysis

The data were analysed thematically. First, the researcher read the transcripts repeatedly to become familiar with the data. Second, meaningful segments were assigned initial codes, including in vivo codes that preserved participants' own language. Third, related codes were grouped into broader categories. Fourth, categories were compared across interviews and developed into candidate themes. Finally, themes were reviewed against the transcripts, refined for coherence, and named according to their central meaning.

The initial coding process generated codes reflecting participants' educational experiences. Related codes were grouped into categories based on conceptual similarities. These categories were further organized into sub-themes and consolidated into five

overarching themes. The themes were reviewed against the original interview transcripts to ensure consistency with participants' accounts. Table 3, presents an illustrative overview of the progression from initial codes to the final themes.

Trustworthiness and Reflexivity

Trustworthiness was supported through expert review of the interview guide, audio recording, careful reading of interview transcripts, member checking, and comparison of emerging themes with the original data. Following transcription, the transcripts were shared with the respective participants to verify whether the researcher's understanding accurately reflected their intended meanings and experiences. This process strengthened credibility and reduced the potential for misinterpretation.

The researcher was herself a university student with visual impairment. This insider position facilitated rapport, contextual understanding, and open communication with participants. However, shared experiences also created a potential risk of personal assumptions influencing interpretation. To address this concern, the researcher maintained reflexive awareness, remained attentive to individual differences in participants' experiences, and grounded interpretations in participants' accounts. Emerging themes were reviewed against the original transcripts to ensure consistency between the findings and the data.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee, Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University (FJWU), Rawalpindi, Pakistan, prior to the commencement of the study. Participants were informed about the research purpose, interview procedures, confidentiality, and their right to withdraw without penalty. Informed consent was obtained before conducting and recording each interview. Participation was voluntary, and participant codes (P1–P10) were used to protect participants' identities. Interview recordings and transcripts were stored securely and used exclusively for research purposes.

Findings

The thematic analysis generated five interconnected themes reflecting participants' experiences of teaching, digital accessibility, campus mobility, assessment, and institutional support. These themes in Table 3, illustrate how institutional practices shaped students' academic participation, independence, and experiences of inclusion.

Table 3

Thematic Coding Framework

Initial codes	Categories	Sub-themes	Themes
Silent board writing; undescribed diagrams; visual gestures; inaccessible graphs and equations	Visually dependent instruction	Instructional accessibility	**Inaccessible Teaching and Academic Participation**
Recorded lectures; advance sharing of materials; audio explanations; accessible soft copies	Accessible instructional practices	Pedagogical support	
Limited teacher awareness; dependence on classmates; repeated listening; additional learning time	Unequal learning opportunities	Academic participation barriers	
Screen readers; JAWS; document conversion; ChatGPT; Gemini; audio resources	Technology-enabled learning	Assistive technology and AI-supported learning	**Digital Access and Assistive-Technology Support**
Inaccessible websites; scanned PDFs; multilingual difficulties; inaccessible SPSS; image-based content	Digital accessibility barriers	Academic software and content accessibility	

Inadequate computer training; unavailable laboratory software; self-directed learning; peer-led training	Inadequate technological provision	Institutional technical support	
Uneven pathways; stairs; open drains; inaccessible upper floors; insufficient lighting	Physical infrastructure barriers	Campus safety and accessibility	**Campus Mobility and Physical Accessibility**
Absent tactile pathways; unavailable Braille signs; limited navigation systems	Inadequate navigation facilities	Orientation and navigation	
Route memorization; reliance on friends and guides; shuttle services	Mobility adaptation strategies	Independent mobility and participation	
Unavailable scribes; spelling errors; inability to verify answers; administrative delays	Scribe-related barriers	Scribe dependency	**Assessment Inequities and Scribe Dependency**
Insufficient additional time; inconsistent grading; sudden assessment changes; teacher assumptions	Inconsistent assessment accommodations	Assessment fairness and validity	
Laptop-based examinations; Braille papers; oral examinations; audio-recorded responses	Alternative assessment formats	Accessible and independent assessment	
Determination; self-directed learning; problem-solving; persistence; self-advocacy	Personal coping strategies	Resilience and student agency	**Resilience, Peer Support, and Institutional Inclusion**
Supportive teachers; peer assistance; encouragement; informal collaboration	Interpersonal support	Social participation and belonging	
Emotional stress; reduced confidence; isolation; limited disability awareness	Psychosocial consequences of exclusion	Emotional well-being and institutional inclusion	

Note. Initial codes were condensed into categories, organized into sub-themes, and consolidated into five overarching themes.

Inaccessible Teaching and Academic Participation

Participants reported that classroom instruction frequently depended on whiteboards, slides, diagrams, graphs, and non-verbal gestures. When instructors wrote silently or pointed to visual content without describing it, participants could not access the same information as sighted classmates. Mathematics, statistics, psychology, neuropsychology, and other visually intensive subjects were described as especially difficult because equivalent non-visual explanations were not consistently provided.

“If the teacher explains the slide verbally, I can follow everything. But if they just point at the board and move on, I lose the whole topic.” (Participant 5)

Participants also described difficulties when teachers addressed students through eye contact or gestures without stating a name. This reduced opportunities to respond and sometimes created social awkwardness. Accessibility varied considerably across instructors. Some teachers shared materials in advance, verbally explained visual content, and allowed lecture recording. Others restricted recording or appeared unaware of inclusive teaching strategies.

Recorded lectures and accessible soft copies supported revision and independent study. However, classroom noise reduced recording quality, and inaccessible slides still required additional explanation. Participants therefore experienced academic access as dependent on individual teacher practice rather than a consistent institutional standard.

Digital Access and Assistive-Technology Support

Participants used JAWS, screen readers, InstaReader, InVision, iPDF, document converters, and generative artificial intelligence applications. Different tools were used for different tasks because no single application provided complete access. Students converted PDFs, translated content, generated practice questions, and requested explanations of difficult documents.

“Tools like Gemini and ChatGPT changed everything for me. I can now understand a whole PDF by just asking questions, which was never possible before.” (Participant 10)

Despite these benefits, participants reported continuing difficulty with scanned PDFs, image-based presentations, graphs, Urdu and Arabic text, multilingual switching, large files, and inaccessible websites. Some participants stated that SPSS was not usable with their available screen-reading arrangements, which restricted participation in quantitative research.

Formal university training and technical support were described as limited. Participants often learned assistive technologies independently, through earlier special education, or through peer-led sessions. Some university computer laboratories did not have the required software, forcing students to rely on personal devices and internet access.

Campus Mobility and Physical Accessibility

Campus mobility was described as a major daily challenge. Participants reported stairs, uneven pathways, crowded corridors, open drains, poor lighting, inaccessible upper floors, and the absence of tactile paths, Braille signs, room indicators, and navigation support. These barriers affected safety, punctuality, energy, and independent participation.

Students developed route-memorisation strategies and gradually learned familiar paths. However, unfamiliar buildings and changes in classroom location increased dependence on friends or guides. One participant described reaching upper-floor classrooms without lifts as exhausting and risky. Another reported stumbling on uneven surfaces and being unable to identify rooms independently because Braille indicators were absent.

Peer assistance and shuttle services reduced some difficulties, but participants preferred institutional arrangements that supported independent movement. Their accounts showed that mobility barriers consumed time and effort that could otherwise have been used for academic work.

Assessment Inequities and Scribe Dependency

The scribe system was one of the most frequently reported assessment concerns. Participants described difficulty locating reliable scribes, uncertainty about whether answers were recorded correctly, and inconsistent treatment of spelling, punctuation, handwriting, and additional time.

“We study twice as hard as other students, and then we still lose marks because of what the writer wrote, not because of what we actually knew.” (Participant 1)

Administrative procedures for securing a scribe were described as time-consuming and stressful. Some participants received additional time, while others reported that arrangements were unclear or inconsistently applied. One participant also raised discomfort when a male scribe was assigned to a female student, indicating that accommodation procedures did not always account for gender and privacy.

Participants proposed alternatives such as laptops with screen-reading software, Braille examination papers, audio-recorded answers, accessible objective tests, and planned oral assessment. These approaches were viewed as ways to improve independence and ensure that grades reflected the student’s own knowledge.

Resilience, Peer Support, and Institutional Inclusion

Participants described determination, self-advocacy, and peer support as essential to continuing their education. They learned new technologies independently, memorised campus routes, negotiated accommodations, and supported one another through informal training and guidance.

Several participants stated that repeated challenges had made them mentally stronger. At the same time, they described stress, reduced confidence, and feelings of exclusion when support was unavailable. Supportive teachers and classmates improved participation, but dependence on peers could also create a sense of obligation and reduce independence.

Resilience therefore represented both personal strength and a response to inaccessible institutional arrangements. Participants' success should not be interpreted as evidence that existing support was sufficient. Their accounts instead demonstrated the need for consistent policies, trained staff, accessible systems, and reliable institutional support.

Discussion

The findings reflect the experiences of participants from different academic disciplines and stages of university education, including students with varying degrees of visual impairment enrolled in both public and private universities. This diversity provides contextual depth to the understanding of educational accessibility. However, the study did not explicitly examine differences across demographic or institutional groups.

The findings of table 3, suggest that accessibility was experienced as uneven and often dependent on individual negotiation. Across the five themes, students described a recurring tension between their ability to adapt and the institutional arrangements that made adaptation necessary. The social model of disability provides a way to interpret this tension without treating impairment itself as the sole explanation for educational disadvantage.

Participants' accounts of silent board work, undescribed diagrams and inconsistent access to lecture materials reinforce earlier evidence of instructional barriers in Pakistan (Hussain et al., 2022) and Uganda (Otyola et al., 2017). Their contrasting experiences with teachers who described visual content or shared materials illustrate how access can vary within the same institutional environment. The implication is that inclusive teaching should be a routine expectation rather than an accommodation negotiated separately with each instructor.

Participants' reliance on several applications is consistent with earlier accounts of self-initiated technology use and digital-literacy challenges (Iqbal et al., 2022; Simui et al., 2017). The present findings add a contemporary dimension: students reported using generative AI to obtain explanations, translate content and prepare for examinations. These accounts indicate perceived usefulness, not measured improvements in achievement. The study did not assess tool accuracy, privacy or comparative effectiveness. Institutional support should therefore combine accessible source materials with training in evaluating AI-generated outputs (Agesa, 2014).

Reports of difficulty using SPSS with available screen-reading arrangements point to a possible constraint on participation in quantitative research. The finding is specific to the participants' reported configurations and does not establish that SPSS is universally inaccessible. Universities should examine accessibility of specialist software in the environments students actually use and offer suitable alternatives or support (Shahed et al., 2016).

Participants' reports of unsafe pathways, inaccessible upper floors and dependence on peers show that mobility barriers can affect academic participation as well as physical access. These findings are consistent with the mobility concerns reported by Alghurabi (2024). Route memorisation and peer assistance helped students manage daily activities but did not eliminate the underlying barriers. Accessible campus planning should therefore consider the entire journey to learning spaces, including changes in classroom location. These practices will help visually impaired students' wellbeing and access (Potočnik et al., 2025).

The accounts of scribe errors, administrative delays and inconsistent additional time complement the examination challenges identified by Parveen et al. (2024). Participants perceived that their grades could reflect the performance of a scribe rather than their own knowledge. This raises a question of assessment validity, although the study did not independently examine examination scripts or marks. Alternatives should be selected according to the intended learning outcome, the student's preference and the accessibility of available technology (Juma & Ntulo, 2024). Where scribes remain necessary, procedures should address accuracy, privacy and appropriate support.

Participants described self-directed learning, peer support and persistence alongside stress and dependence. This combination is consistent with research emphasising the importance of institutional connectedness (Scott, 2009) and the interaction between learner agency and accommodations (Hewett et al., 2017). Croft (2020) likewise identified tensions between formal inclusion and lived participation. The present study suggests that resilience can coexist with exclusion: students' ability to compensate for barriers should not be interpreted as evidence that institutional provision is adequate.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings support a coordinated institutional approach rather than isolated accommodations. Accessibility should be integrated into teaching standards, digital systems, infrastructure, assessment policy, and student support.

- Faculty development should require verbal description of visual information, accessible document design, advance sharing of materials, and inclusive participation strategies.
- Universities should provide licensed assistive software, accessible computer laboratories, document-conversion support, and structured training for students and staff.
- Institutional websites, learning-management systems, library resources, and specialist software should undergo regular accessibility audits.
- Campus planning should include tactile guidance, safe pathways, accessible room identification, appropriate lighting, and mobility-sensitive scheduling.
- Assessment policies should offer multiple accessible formats, consistent additional time, trained scribes where required, and procedures that protect accuracy, privacy, and independence.
- Students with disabilities should participate in institutional accessibility planning and review.

Limitations

The study involved a small purposive sample of ten students, limiting the transferability of findings across different higher education contexts. The findings relied on self-reported experiences without independent verification of campus accessibility, software compatibility, assessment outcomes, or institutional practices. The perspectives of teachers, administrators, and scribes were not included. Although the researcher's insider position facilitated contextual understanding, shared experiences may have influenced interpretation. The predominance of female participants and students enrolled in public universities may limit the diversity of perspectives represented in the findings, particularly regarding gender-related experiences and differences across institutional settings.

Conclusion

Students with visual impairments described accessibility as dependent on how universities organise teaching, digital resources, campus movement and assessment. Although participants developed strategies to manage these barriers, their accounts suggest that independence requires more than individual adaptation. The contribution of this study lies in connecting established accessibility challenges with students' reported use of emerging digital tools and their negotiations for equitable participation. Universities should make accessibility a coordinated responsibility across academic and administrative systems, with students involved in decisions about support.

Declarations

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee, Department of Education, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, before the commencement of the study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality was maintained throughout the research process.

Consent for Publication

Participant quotations were anonymized, and no directly identifying information is reported in the manuscript.

Data Availability

Although The interview data are not publicly available to protect participant confidentiality. data-availability statement consistent with the approved consent and institutional policy.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions

Hina Tariq: Conceptualization, investigation, data collection, and formal analysis.

Amna Asad: Writing original article draft and helped in data analysis.

Quratulain Sarwat: Supervision, methodology, writing –review and editing.

All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript before submission.

References

1. Agesa, L. (2014). Challenges Faced by Learners with Visual Impairments in Inclusive Setting in Trans-Nzoia County. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*(29), 185–193.
2. Alghurabi, G. (2024). *Educational Experiences of Students with Visual Impairments in Higher Education : A Case Study of a Private University Educational Experiences of Students with Visual Impairments in Higher Education : A Case Study of a Private In partial fulfillment of th*. https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/2322
3. Amna Shaheen, S. N. (2023). CHALLENGES FACED BY VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION. *8th Multidisciplinary International Conference (MDSRIC 2023)*, 6–7.
4. Bayram, G. İ. (2014). *Exploring the academic and social challenges of visually impaired students in learning high school mathematics* (Issue June).
5. Croft, E. (2020). Experiences of Visually Impaired and Blind Students in UK Higher Education : An Exploration of Access and Participation. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, *22*, 382–392. https://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.721 RESEARCH
6. Fakoya-michael, S. A., & Fakoya, M. B. (2015). *Visually Impaired University Students Quest for Information and the Challenges Faced in a Rural University Context*. *42*(3), 223–228.
7. Hewett, R., Douglas, G., McLinden, M., & Keil, S. (2017). Developing an inclusive learning environment for students with visual impairment in higher education : *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *32*(1), 89–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254971
8. Höger, B., Meier, S., & Giese, M. (2025). " Actually , it ' s pretty much like normal PE ": reconstructing social hierarchies from the perspective of visually impaired students and their teachers in segregated PE. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Learning*, *November*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1582648
9. Hussain, F., Hameed, A., & 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. https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022(6-II)39
10. Iqbal, K., Majeed, Z., & Ashraf, S. (2022). Exploring the Challenges of Digital Literacy among Students with Visual Impairment Studying at Higher Education Level. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 199–208. https://doi.org/https://journals.internationalrasd.org/index.php/pjhss Exploring
11. Juma, R. K., & Ntulo, G. R. (2024). The Availability and Use of Assistive Technologies among Pupils with Hearing and Visual Impairments in Zanzibar Rukia Khamis Juma The State University of Zanzibar (SUZA), Tanzania Getrude Robert Ntulo Tumaini University , Dar es Salaam College , Tanzani. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, *20*(1), 63–77.
12. Otyola, W. R., Kibanja, G. M., & Mugagga, A. M. (2017). Challenges Faced by Visually Impaired Students at Makerere and Kyambogo Universities. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(1), 75–86. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/majohe.v9i1.6
13. Parveen, Z., Mukhtar, S., & Jameel, M. (2024). Exploring the Accessible Modes used by students with Visual Impairment in University Examination System : Challenges and Prospects. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, *8*(2), 248–258. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024(8-II-S)28

14. Parween, S. (2015). Variables Influencing Emotional Intelligence of Visually Impaired Students in Higher Education. *Disability, CBR & Inclusive Development*, *26*(1), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.5463/DCID.v26i1.342

15. Potočnik, R., Zavšek, K., & Vidrih, A. (2025). Visual Art Activities as a Means of Realizing Aspects of Empowerment for Blind and Visually Impaired Young People. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.1.41

16. Scott, R. (2009). *Undergraduate Educational Experiences: The Academic Success of College Students with Blindness and Visual Impairments*.

17. Shahed, S., Ilyas, Z., & Hashmi, A. M. (2016). *Academic Performance , Self Efficacy and Perceived Social Support of Visually Impaired Students*. *2*(1), 72–77.

18. Simui, F., Kasonade-Ngandu, S., & Nyaruwata, L. T. (2017). ICT as an enabler to academic success of students with Visually impaired at Sim University: Hermeneutics approach. *Zambia Information Communication Technology (ICT) Journal*, *1*(1), 5–9.

19. Soleimani-Sefat, E., Rostami, M., Amani, S., & Movallali, G. (2016). Needs and problems of students with visual Impairment. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, *2*(2), 8–16.

20. Tichauya, C. H., Alexander, C. R., Paul, M., Campus, M. R., Campus, M. R., & Campus, M. R. (2012). The Forgotten Tribe in ODL Systems : Challenges Faced by Visually Impaired Students in Institutions of Higher Learning. *Huria: Journal of the Open University of Tanzania*, *13*(2), 410–421.

Appendix

Interview Guide

Section A: Participant Information

- Participant code: _____
- Age range: _____
- Gender: _____
- Current program/qualification: _____
- Academic discipline: _____
- Type of institution: _____
- Visual-impairment category: Blind / Low vision / Other

Direct identifiers such as names and email addresses should be collected separately from interview data only when operationally necessary.

Section B: Interview Questions

How would you describe your experience of accessing lectures, textbooks, notes, and other core learning materials?

Which teaching practices support your learning, and which practices create barriers?

What challenges do you experience when participating in classroom discussion and interacting with teachers and peers?

Which assistive technologies are important to your studies, and what technical or financial barriers affect their use?

What training or technical support does your university provide for digital platforms and assistive technologies?

What physical or infrastructural barriers do you experience when moving between classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and common areas?

How well do campus facilities, tactile paths, signs, lifts, and navigation arrangements meet your needs?

What difficulties do you experience during examinations and other assessments, including formats, scribes, and time accommodations?

How fair and inclusive are grading and feedback procedures, and what changes would improve them?

How do these academic, technological, physical, social, and assessment-related barriers influence your independence, participation, academic performance, and future plans?

What actions should universities take to improve accessibility and inclusion?

Table

Participants Information

Participant	Gender	Age	Academic program	Semester/study level	Visual impairment	University type
P1	F	24	Urdu	5	Low vision	Public
P2	F	22	Behavioral Science	3	Full blind	Public
P3	F	22	Sociology	4	Full blind	Private
P4	F	21	Education	2	Full blind	Public
P5	F	22	Sociology	6	Partially blind	Public
P6	M	26	Islamic Studies	8	Full blind	Private
P7	F	28	Urdu	8	Full blind	Public
P8	F	24	Political Science	6	Full blind	Public
P9	F	24	Psychology	6	Low vision	Public
P10	M	26	China studies	8	Full blind	Private

Note. Participant codes are used to maintain confidentiality.

2026 by the authors; Journal of Global Social Transformation (JGST). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).