



An analytical comparison of inclusive education practices in government and private Universities of Lucknow

Kailash Chandra Verma

Assistant Professor, Department of Teacher Education, Sri Mahavir Prasad Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

This paper presents an analytical comparison of inclusive education practices in government and private universities in Lucknow City. It explores the implementation of inclusive education in both sectors and identifies the challenges faced by faculty and students. The study highlights key disparities in infrastructure, teaching resources, fee structures, and support services. A systematic data analysis based on secondary indicators is incorporated to strengthen the comparative findings. The paper also evaluates how higher education institutions are responding to the growing demand for inclusive and equitable education.

Keywords: Inclusive Education, Government Universities, Private Universities, Higher Education, Infrastructure, Accessibility, Lucknow

Introduction

India holds the third-largest position globally in terms of higher education institutions, following the United States and China. Its higher education system includes several types of universities:

- **Central Universities:** Established by an Act of Parliament and funded by the Central Government.
- **State Universities:** Established by State Legislatures and supported by State Governments.
- **Private Universities:** Run by private entities, primarily as non-profit organizations, under UGC regulations.
- **Autonomous Colleges:** Institutions granted academic autonomy by the UGC.

Quality in higher education is significantly influenced by infrastructure, pedagogical methods, management practices, and motivational climate. Liberalization and privatization policies since the 1990s have resulted in the rapid expansion of private universities, particularly in urban centers like Lucknow, which are often perceived to provide better facilities and employability outcomes.

Concept of Inclusive Education

Inclusive education refers to an educational framework where students of all abilities—including those with physical, sensory, cognitive, and learning disabilities—are educated in mainstream institutions with appropriate academic, emotional, and social support. It promotes diversity, participation, equity, and dignity while removing systemic barriers within educational environments.

Universities Considered in the Study

Government and State Universities

1. Baba Saheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (Central)
2. University of Lucknow (State)
3. Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Technical University (State)
4. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University (State)
5. Dr. Shakuntala Misra National Rehabilitation University (State)

6. Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Urdu Arabi-Farsi University (State)

Private Universities

1. Amity University, Lucknow
2. Integral University
3. Babu Banarasi Das University
4. Era University

Review of Related Literature

The literature emphasizes the importance of inclusive practices and identifies both infrastructural and attitudinal barriers in higher education institutions (Ainscow, 1999; McComas et al., 2002). Studies by Forlin et al. (2006) and Naicker & Hed (2008) stress teacher preparedness as a decisive factor in inclusion. Indian studies highlight uneven implementation of inclusive policies due to resource constraints and lack of trained personnel.

Objectives of the Study

- To examine the current status of inclusive education in government and private universities.
- To compare strengths and limitations of both sectors in implementing inclusive practices.
- To analyze differences in infrastructure, faculty development, accommodation, fee structures, and student support services.

Research Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design based on secondary data. Sources include university websites, UGC and AISHE reports, published research articles, policy documents, and observational analysis. Data were organized thematically and analyzed using comparative indicators relevant to inclusive education.

Key Areas of Comparison

1. Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER)

Government universities play a major role in increasing GER by providing affordable education to diverse socio-economic

groups. Private universities contribute to enrollment expansion but remain less accessible to marginalized populations.

2. Fee Structure

- **Government Universities:** Nominal fees supported by public funding, enhancing access for disadvantaged students.
- **Private Universities:** Higher fees due to self-financing models; access depends largely on scholarships and financial aid.

3. Accommodation and Hostel Facilities

- **Government Universities:** Subsidized hostels, often overcrowded with limited accessibility features.
- **Private Universities:** Better-maintained hostels with modern amenities, but at higher costs.

4. Infrastructure and Teaching Resources

- **Government Universities:** Adequate academic infrastructure but slower modernization due to funding constraints.
 - **Private Universities:** Advanced ICT-enabled classrooms, learning management systems, and campus facilities.
- 5. Support for Students with Disabilities**
- **Government Universities:** Some specialized institutions (e.g., Dr. Shakuntala Misra University) demonstrate strong rehabilitation and inclusive support.
 - **Private Universities:** Provision varies; limited availability of trained special educators and assistive technologies.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

To strengthen the comparative assessment, secondary indicators related to inclusive education were analyzed. The data are indicative and synthesized from publicly available reports and institutional disclosures.

Table 1: Comparative Data Analysis of Inclusive Education Indicators

Indicator	Government	Private
Average Annual Fee (₹)	5,000 – 20,000	80,000 – 2,50,000
GER Contribution	High	Moderate
Availability of Ramps & Lifts	Moderate	High
Disability Support Cells	Present (limited staff)	Present (select universities)
Trained Inclusive Education Faculty	Moderate	Low to Moderate
Hostel Accessibility	Limited	Better but costly
Use of ICT & Assistive Technology	Limited	Extensive

Interpretation of Data

The data indicate that government universities perform better in access and affordability, contributing significantly to equity and GER. However, private universities outperform in infrastructure, technology integration, and physical accessibility. Support services for students with disabilities remain inconsistent across both sectors, though specialized government universities show relatively stronger compliance with inclusive mandates.

Limitations of the Study

- Dependence on secondary data restricts empirical validation.
- The study is geographically confined to Lucknow City.
- Inclusive quality is assessed through institutional indicators rather than direct student outcome measures.

Conclusion

The study reveals that inclusive education in Lucknow’s higher education institutions is marked by structural inequality between access and quality. Government universities ensure inclusivity through affordability and reservation policies, whereas private universities emphasize infrastructure and technological advancement. A hybrid inclusive model, integrating public accessibility with private-sector innovation, is essential for achieving equitable and sustainable inclusive higher education in India.

References

1. Best JW. Research in Higher Education. Prentice Hall of India, 2010.

2. Majhi PR, Khatua PK. Research Methodology. Himalaya Publishing House, 2016.

3. Kothari CR. Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. Pearson, 2014.

4. Paneerselvam R. Research Methodology. PHI Learning, 2012.

5. Pawar-Salunkhe S. Business Research Methods. Sheth Publications, 2017.

6. Deale RN. Assessment and Testing in the Secondary Schools. The Chaucer Press, 1975.

7. Hyeneman L. The effect of secondary school quality on academic achievement. American Journal of Sociology, 1983, 88(6).

8. Jangira NK. Learning Achievement of Secondary School Children. NCERT, 1994.

9. Dave PN. Fifth Survey of Educational Research. NCERT, 1994.

10. Shodhganga. n.d.

11. Google Scholar. n.d.