특수아동교육연구, 제28권 제2호
The Journal of Special Children Education
2026. Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 165~190
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21075/kacsn.2026.28.2.165

우간다 무코노 지역 초·중등 일반교사의 통합교육에 대한 태도, 우려 및 자기효능감 분석

유(조)은미*[1]·마가렛 남피자[2]·엘리자베스 H. 모건[3]·다이앤 숙영 이[4]·에넷 오스왈드[5]
[1]캘리포니아주립대학교, 새크라멘토, 특수교육과 교수,
[2]아프리카 인구·보건연구센터 연구원,
[3]모건주립대학교 도시교육리더십학과 교수,
[4]몬터레이 반도 칼리지 유아교육학과 교수,
[5]몬터레이 반도 칼리지 유아교육학과 교수

Inclusive Education in Uganda: Teacher Attitudes, Concerns, and Self-Efficacy in Focus

EunMi Cho[1]·Margaret Nampijja[2]·Elizabeth H. Morgan[3]·Diane Sookyoung Lee[4]·Annette Oswald[5]
[1]California State University, Sacramento, Dept. of Special Education, Professor
[2]African Population and Health Research Center, Research Associate
[3]Morgan State University, Dept. of Urban Educational Leadership, Professor
[4]Monterey Peninsula College, Dept. of Early Childhood Education, Professor
[5]Monterey Peninsula College, Dept. of Early Childhood Education, Professor

Abstract

Worldwide, countries are increasingly committed to inclusive education to ensure equitable access to learning opportunities for all students; however, persistent educational and social inequities continue to hinder effective implementation. This study examined the attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy of general education elementary and middle school teachers in Mukono, Uganda, to inform inclusive practices for children with disabilities. Using a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design, 71 teachers participated in a quantitative survey followed by qualitative open-ended responses to contextualize the findings. Results showed that teachers reported moderately positive attitudes toward inclusive education (M = 3.35, SD = 0.603) and moderately high self-efficacy (M = 4.80, SD = .608), alongside notable concerns regarding resources (M = 3.08, SD = .690) and workload (M = 2.71, SD = .667). Regression analysis indicated that workload concerns significantly influenced attitudes, while self-efficacy also contributed positively to inclusive perspectives. Although teachers expressed confidence in principle, qualitative findings revealed challenges in practical implementation, including limited instructional materials, insufficient government support,

and persistent societal stigma surrounding disability. These findings highlight a gap between perceived capability and contextual constraints, suggesting that advancing inclusive education in Uganda requires targeted efforts to reduce teacher workload, strengthen institutional support, and enhance teachers' capacities to implement inclusive practices effectively.

※ Key words : Inclusive Education, Uganda, Disabilities, Teacher Concerns, Teacher Attitudes and Self-Efficacy

Ⅰ. Introduction

According to the 2024 Uganda National Population and Housing Census, approximately 5.5 million Ugandans, about 13.2% of the population, live with a disability, including an estimated 1.7 million children aged 2–17 years with a range of functional difficulties such as physical, sensory, cognitive, and communication impairments (Uganda Bureau of Statistics [UBOS], 2025). Furthermore, research on inclusive education in Uganda highlights ongoing barriers to effective inclusion: implementation challenges related to attitudes, curriculum adaptation, and learning environments continue to limit meaningful access to schooling for children with disabilities (Okech, Yuwono, & Abdu, 2021). Despite this more recent evidence, earlier estimates noted that about 2.5 million children in Uganda experienced various disabilities, including mental, physical, and sensory conditions often presenting as comorbidities (Nardi, 2017). Moreover, only about 9% (225,000) of children with disabilities were reported to be attending primary school, a situation attributed to the lack of appropriate special needs programs, limited community understanding of disability, and the absence of individualized education plans (Nardi, 2017). Susan O'Rourke (2015) stated, "Ugandan children with disabilities are often referred to as 'hidden children' given the cultural belief that mothers who give birth to a disabled child are cursed" (Carlow University, para. 3).

Inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream education classrooms results in

* **Corresponding Author** EunMi Cho. California State University, Sacramento, Dept. of Special Education, Professor, (e-mail: eunmicho@csus.edu)

favorable outcomes (Bui, Quirk, Almazan, & Valenti, 2010; Sands, Kozleski, & French, 2000). However, this requires careful planning and preparation (King-Spears, 1997; Scott, Vitale, & Masten, 1998; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996), especially personnel preparation for mainstream education teachers (Oliver-Kerrigan, Christy, & Stahmer, 2021). While many general education teachers philosophically support inclusion, most have strong concerns about their ability to implement inclusive educational programs with success (Das, Gichuru, & Singh, 2013; Malinen et al., 2013; Savolainen et al., 2012; Mailinen et al., 2013), and others on factors such as their attributes (Sachs, 2004), the nature and severity of the disabling conditions of the learners (Elkins and Porter, 2005), their ability to manage behaviors (Savolainen et al., 2012), availability of or ability to utilize physical and human resources (Bradshaw & Mundia, 2006; Savolainen et al., 2012), their pre-service and in-service training (Chong, Forlin, & Au, 2007), and the potential consequences of inclusive practices in the class (Savolainen et al., 2012).

Inter-country differences in the types of concerns for implementing inclusive practices were also found (Mailinen et al., 2013; Savolainen et al., 2012). While Western countries, like the U.S., have legislations that date back to 1975. Countries in Africa, like Uganda, are only beginning to investigate ways to follow suit (Salend & Duhaney, 1999; Woolverton, 2021). Unlike high-income countries where inclusive education is supported by established legal systems, specialized personnel, and sufficient educational resources, Uganda continues to implement inclusion within overcrowded classrooms, limited infrastructure, and severe shortages of trained teachers and support services. While inclusive education in developed contexts increasingly focuses on improving quality and participation, Uganda is still confronting basic barriers to access, social stigma toward disability, and limited governmental capacity to support effective implementation in schools. Inclusive education conceptualized in this paper is based on all children's human rights to receive a quality education. By strengthening education systems to become inclusive, governments ensure every child receives a quality education (UNICEF, 2014). The US Department of Education (USDOE, 2022) reported that 64.8% of students (ages 5-21) with disabilities received special education services in inclusive classrooms. This was a substantial increase from 46.5% reported in 2000 (Cole et al., 2021; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2019). However, globally, including children with disabilities is still a major challenge. The Education System and Policies in Uganda for Students with Disabilities.

The structure of the education system in Uganda: Education in Uganda is provided through formal and non-formal systems and services are provided through individuals, the private sector, the government, and Non-governmental institutions, designed by the National Curriculum Development Center (NCDC). Formal education begins with pre-primary (3-5 years), primary (for 7 years), ordinary level secondary school (for 4 years), advanced secondary education (for 2 years), and then university or tertiary institutions for professional degrees or diplomas (for 2-3 years). To boost access to education, the government introduced universal primary and secondary education(Ejuu, 2012), and accordingly has laid down specific guidelines on policy, planning, and roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in the implementation of Universal Primary Education (UPE, the state-funded education program) for Districts and Urban Councils and the Strategic Plan for Universal Secondary Education (2009-2018). The principle of equitable access to conducive, quality, relevant, and affordable education is emphasized for all children irrespective of gender, race, and disability (Education Act, 2008). We focus on formal education for this study.

General education policies in Uganda: The government is committed to ensuring equitable access to quality education services for all its citizens, including persons with disabilities as required by the 1995 constitution, and it has instituted some policies and regulations to ensure well-coordinated delivery of quality education for everyone at all levels of learning (MES, July 2019). A comprehensive approach has been used, in which policies have been developed for different levels of education: the Early Childhood Development (ECD) Policy (2008) and Guidelines for Early Childhood Development Centers (2010); the Education (pre-primary, primary, and post-primary) Act; and the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (2001). Additionally, specific regulations have been developed for special groups, including the Special Needs and Inclusive Education Policy (2011), the Gender in Education Policy, and the Technical Vocational Education and Training Act (2008).

Inclusive education policies for students with disabilities in Uganda: Currently, approximately 19% (2.5 million) of the population in Uganda identify as persons with disabilities (Abimanyi-Ochom & Mannan, 2014). According to the UNICEF 2014 report, about 16% of Ugandan children have a disability, and most cannot attend school and fail to transition from one educational level to another, with only 9% of school-age children with disabilities attending primary schools (Riche & Anyimuzala, 2014). Only 5%

of children with disabilities can access education through inclusive schools while 10% access through special schools (UNICEF 2014). While Uganda is leading within sub-Saharan Africa in promoting policies for persons with disabilities, it is yet to institute practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities within mainstream/ general education classrooms. The government subscribed to international agreements/ commitments that provide learners with special needs with protections, such as the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (1994). The government also subscribed to the 2008 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to further strengthen its commitment to this cause. Local policies include The Persons with Disability Act (2006) which was instituted based on the 1995 Constitution to ensure equitable access to social services including education for people with disabilities. In 2002, the Basic Education Policy for Disadvantaged Children was passed, increasing the need for training teachers in special needs (DANIDA, 2005). The Special Needs and Inclusive Education (SN&IE) Policy (2011) was enacted to ensure increased enrollment, participation, and completion of schooling by persons with special needs.

The Ministry of Education and Sports through the Department for Special Needs and Inclusive Education is mandated to coordinate and support the provision of Special Needs and Inclusive Education in line with these policies. Over the years, the government has tried to execute most of its mandate (Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2019). However, despite several policies and regulations, this dream is far from being realized with only 9% of children with disabilities in Uganda attending school between 2009–2011, and only 6% completed primary school and went to secondary school (UNICEF Report, 2014). The COVID-19 pandemic uncovered and even widened this gap (Nampijja et al., 2022). However, inclusive education in Uganda has expanded through national policies and international commitments aimed at improving access for children with disabilities. According to the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2024), 13.2% of the population lives with a disability, including about 1.7 million children aged 2–17. Despite these efforts, many children still face barriers such as limited teacher training, inadequate resources, inaccessible school environments, and persistent social stigma. Although teachers largely support inclusive education, research shows they remain concerned about insufficient government support and heavy workloads, which hinder effective implementation (Okech, Yuwono, & Abdu, 2021).

Barriers to Inclusion in Uganda: Implementation of inclusive education policies in Uganda is hampered by non-supportive attitudes of parents and community members, distance to school, school environments that are not supportive (access, materials, equipment), and limited training for teachers on special needs education (Bannik, Idro, & Van Hove., 2016a; Bannik, Idro, & Van Hove, 2016b). Safeguarding and inclusion policies are present in schools; however, these are not enforced (Bannik, Idro, & Van Hove., 2016a). Children with significantly low physical and intellectual functioning and those from poor socio-economic status are at a higher risk of social exclusion. While teacher preparation programs may be implicated (e.g., Bannik et al. 2016), it is possible that negative teachers' attitudes towards children with disabilities could be contributing to the poor implementation of the policies, and exclusion of children with disabilities. Teacher preparation is pivotal to promoting progress toward setting inclusive learning environments (Nyende, 2012) and teachers' attitudes play an important role in their self-efficacy (an individual's belief in his/her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments) (Bandura, 1977; Fackler, Malmberg, & Sammons, 2021), as their abilities to teach students with disabilities raise challenges in both social and academic demands.

From a practical perspective, teachers in Uganda have been immersed in a cultural misconception about children with disabilities as "difficult to handle," justifying their concern with the lack of training to work with disabled children and limited resources provided to them as teachers (Carlow University, 2015, February 12, 2015; Nyende, 2012). Efficacy is redefined, as a complementary construct that determines how ready and willing teachers and the school in general are to handle the challenges and risks associated with teaching students with disabilities (Protheroe, 2008; DeWitt, 2019). Overall, and according to the UNESCO Guidelines for Inclusion, Ensuring Access to Education for All (2005, 10), "children with disabilities remain the largest group of children out of school." This is also true in Uganda, and hence the overarching purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perspectives on inclusive education in Uganda. Accordingly, this mixed-methods study was guided by the following research questions: (1) What are general education teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education, their concerns about inclusion, and their self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices in Uganda? (2) To what extent do teachers' concerns and self-efficacy predict their

attitudes toward inclusive education? and (3) How do teachers describe, through qualitative accounts, their experiences, perceived challenges, and the contextual realities of implementing inclusive education in Ugandan schools?

Ⅱ. Materials and Methods

Study Design and Population

This study utilized an explorative sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Clark, 2017; Subedi, 2016; Toyon, 2021), involving two phases of a quantitative cross-sectional survey and qualitative open-ended questions. The rationale was that qualitative data could provide more detailed, real-world perspectives to complement the quantitative findings since teachers' additional comments about inclusive education and personal experiences would help elaborate on the statistical results. The explorative sequential design enabled the first quantification of key variables related to inclusive education through surveys and statistics. The subsequent qualitative phase was implemented to help contextualize the quantitative results with narratives and personal accounts from teachers to enhance understanding of the research problem. To strengthen the credibility of the qualitative analysis, individual qualitative variables related to participants' personal and professional experiences were carefully considered during data interpretation. Teachers' perceptions of inclusive education were understood within the context of their prior experiences with disability, exposure to inclusive practices, professional training, confidence in teaching students with disabilities, and personal relationships with individuals with disabilities. These experiential and contextual factors influenced how participants described their attitudes, concerns, and perceived abilities regarding inclusive education. In addition, cultural beliefs, community perceptions of disability, and teachers' lived experiences within Ugandan school settings were considered important contextual variables that shaped participants' qualitative responses and contributed to a deeper interpretation of the findings.

Participants: 71 general education teachers from two public elementary and two

public middle schools in Mukono, Uganda, ranging from 20 to 56 years old (26 males, 42 females, 3 unreported) were surveyed. Convenience sampling based on availability and attendance at a teacher training was used to select study participants. The majority of participants (85.3%) indicated personally knowing someone with a disability. Approximately half of the sample (52.9%) received a graduate or higher degree of education, in particular, 71.8% received training in the education of students with disabilities and taught a student with a disability, while 28.2% did not. In terms of the current teaching environment, 60.7% of the participants taught at a primary school, 36.1% at a special school, and 6.56% at a secondary school. In Uganda, the special needs teacher system operates within the Special Needs and Inclusive Education (SN&IE) framework, but remains characterized by a critical shortage of formally trained personnel and limited institutional capacity. They are trained primarily through specialized programs at institutions such as Kyambogo University and selected teacher training colleges, yet their numbers are insufficient to meet national demand. In many cases, general education teachers with minimal formal training in special needs education assume primary responsibility for students with disabilities, further highlighting systemic gaps in teacher preparation(Sightsavers, 2021). Additionally, 36.6% of the sample had high to very high confidence in teaching students with disabilities, 42.3% had average, and 21.11% had low to very low confidence (see 〈Table II-1〉).

〈Table II-1〉 Demographics of Study Sample

Variable		*n*	%
Gender		68	100
	Male	26	38.2
	Female	42	63.2
Age		68	100
	20-29	27	39.7
	30-39	27	39.7
	40-49	10	14.7
	50 and above	4	5.88
Highest Education Level Completed		70	100
	Below graduate	33	47.1
	Graduate	26	37.1

Variable		*n*	%
	Postgraduate	9	12.9
	Above postgraduate	2	2.86
Known Person with Disability		68	100
	Family member	28	41.2
	Close friend	23	33.8
	Other	10	14.7
	None	10	14.7
Disability Education Training		71	100
	Yes	51	71.8
	No	20	28.2
Confidence Teaching Students with Disabilities		71	100
	Very high	9	12.7
	High	17	23.9
	Average	30	42.3
	Low	10	14.1
	Very low	5	7.01
Experience Teaching Student with Disability		71	100
	Yes	51	71.8
	No	20	28.2
Current Employment		61	100
	Primary school	37	60.7
	Secondary school	4	6.56
	Special school	22	36.1

Measures

A survey questionnaire was distributed to the elementary schools by one of the researchers and by the principals at the middle schools. After providing informed voluntary written consent, participants completed the four-part questionnaire adapted from Sharma (2012a) in English. The first scale gathered participants' background information. The remaining three scales measured teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education (Bailey, 2004), their concerns about inclusion (Sharma & Desai, 2002), and their self-efficacies in implementing inclusive practices (Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012). The teachers' attitudes towards the inclusive education scale had 23 items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree (e.g., "Students with special needs will take up too much time of classroom teachers."). The

scale demonstrated good internal consistency (α = .83), with higher scores indicating more favorable attitudes toward inclusive education. Ratings on the concerns about inclusion scale, on the other hand, varied on a scale of 1=Not at all concerned to 4=Extremely concerned (e.g., "I do not have knowledge and skills required to teach students with disabilities."). The scale included 4 subscales, including 1) Resources (α = .81; 6 items), 2) Acceptance (α = .64; 5 items), 3) Academic Standards (α = .80; 6 items), and 4) Workloads (α = .51; 4 items). Higher ratings indicated greater concern, and the scale consisted of 21 items with a global reliability coefficient of α = .90. Finally, questions on the self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices scale were rated on a Likert-type scale between 1=Strongly Disagree and 6=Strongly Agree (e.g., "I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom."). The 18-item scale had a reliability of α = .86, with higher ratings indicating greater efficacy, based on the studied data. Additionally, after participants completed the Part 3: Concerns about Inclusive Education survey, they were given an open-ended opportunity to write "other comments about inclusive education." Participants took approximately 40 minutes to 1 hour to complete the questionnaire. Surveys were completed on a voluntary basis as per their participation in the teacher training.

Procedures: During the initial phase of our research, following the explanatory sequential mixed methods design, a quantitative analysis of the surveys began. This analysis involved employing statistical techniques such as descriptive statistics, correlations, and hierarchical linear regression using SPSS. Its primary focus was to address the first research question, which pertained to teachers' attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy. The surveys were conducted and the informal conversations were done by two of these authors who worked in Uganda. All authors have experience with inclusive education and mixed-method methodological approaches in analyzing data. Differences in sample sizes across variables were due to incomplete survey responses and item-level missing data within specific sections of the questionnaire. Although 71 teachers participated in the study, not all respondents completed every item across all scales. To preserve the reliability and validity of the analyses, cases with substantial missing data within a given measure were excluded on a per-variable basis. As a result, the number of valid responses varied across constructs, including Inclusion Attitudes (N=44), Resource Concerns (N=63), and Self-Efficacy (N=54). This pattern of missingness

likely reflects respondent fatigue associated with the length of the survey, time constraints during the training session, and partial completion of questionnaire items.

Ⅲ. Research Findings

The research findings are presented through both quantitative and qualitative analyses to provide a comprehensive understanding of teachers' attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy regarding inclusive education in Uganda. The quantitative phase examined statistical relationships among inclusive attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy, while the qualitative phase explored teachers' lived experiences, perceived barriers, and recommendations for improving inclusive educational practices.

Quantitative Phase

Completed quantitative survey data were entered into IBM SPSS Statistics for analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the general education teachers' current attitudes toward inclusive education, their concerns regarding inclusion, and their efficacy in implementing inclusive practices within the classroom (i.e., the first research question). On average, participants had a moderate attitude toward inclusive education, ì = 3.35 (ó= .603). The mean score for the scale for inclusion concerns was 2.80 (ó = .574), suggesting that they were "very concerned" about issues regarding inclusive education. More specifically, the greatest concerns were about resources (ì = 3.08, ó= .690), followed by workload (ì = 2.71, ó = .667), acceptance (ì = 2.69, ó = .658), and academic standards (ì = 2.50, ó = .711). Finally, participants had a moderately high sense of self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices. The average score of 4.80 (σ = .608) indicates that they tended to agree that they were capable of successfully implementing effective strategies within the classroom (see 〈Table III-1〉).

〈Table III-1〉 Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n*	Min.	Max.	Mean	Standard Deviation
Inclusion Attitudes	44	2.22	4.52	3.35	.603
Inclusion Concerns: Resources	63	1.33	4	3.08	.690
Acceptance	68	1.4	4	2.69	.658
Workload	59	1.25	4	2.71	.667
Academic Standard	61	1.17	4	2.50	.710
Self-Efficacy for Implementing Inclusive Practices	54	3.39	6	4.80	.608

As a precursor to predictive multivariable regression analysis, bivariate correlation analysis was conducted between teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education, subscales on their concerns about inclusion (i.e., resources, acceptance, academic standards, and workloads), and teacher self-efficacies in implementing inclusive practices. This revealed that concerns about academic standard (r = -.479, p = .002), teacher workload (r = -.339, p = .035), and teachers' self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices (r = .339, p = .043) were significantly related to teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. Furthermore, because teacher workload and academic standard were highly and significantly correlated (r = .718, p 〈.0001), the academic standard was not included in the following hierarchical regression analysis to account for potential multicollinearity(see 〈Table III-2〉).

〈Table III-2〉 Correlates to Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education

Variable		Correlation
Inclusion Concerns	Resources	.000
	Acceptance	-.070
	Academic Standard	-.479**
	Workload	-.339*
Self-Efficacy in Implementing Inclusive Practices		.339*

In the table, * indicates statistical significance at the 0.05 level (p 〈 .05), and ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level (p 〈 .01). Thus, correlations marked with * are significant at the 5% level, while those with ** are more strongly significant at the 1% level.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predictors of Inclusive Education

In addressing the study's second research question of how teachers' concerns and efficacy beliefs predict their attitudes towards inclusion, a two-stage hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the significant predictors of

inclusive attitudes. The variable "workload concerns" was entered in Step 1, followed by workload concerns and self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices in Step 2. At step 1, workload concerns significantly contributed to the model, $F(1, 31) = 8.22$, $p = .007$, and accounted for 21.0% of the variation in inclusive attitudes. Upon adding self-efficacy in step 2, the change in the model was not significant ($p = .102$), although the model itself was significant, $F(2, 30) = 5.78$, $p = .008$, and accounted for an additional 6.8% of the variation in inclusive attitudes. Workload concern uniquely explained the largest percentage of the variation in inclusive attitudes at 11.8%, followed by self-efficacy at 6.9% (see 〈Table III-3〉).

〈Table III-3〉 Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Inclusion Attitudes

Variables	*B*	*β*	*t*	*sr*2	*R*	R2	△R2
Step 1					.458	.210	.210
Workload concerns	-.391	-.458	-2.87**	.210			
Step 2					.527	.278	.068
Workload concerns	-.311	-.365	-2.22*	.118			
Self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices	.312	.278	1.69	.069			

Upon obtaining significant themes from the quantitative data, we seamlessly transitioned into the qualitative phase of our analysis. In this phase, our objective was to code for dominant attitudes, concerns, and ideas about teacher self-efficacy found in the qualitative data. To delve deeper into the nuances of Ugandan teacher experiences and their thoughts on inclusion, we specifically analyzed responses to the open-ended survey question: 'Please share any other comments about inclusive education.

Qualitative Phase

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis in NVivo, following an iterative process of open coding, category development, and identification of overarching themes. Thirty-five responses to an open-ended survey question ("Please share any other comments about inclusive education") were examined. NVivo, a Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS), facilitated systematic code-and-retrieve and theory-building analysis (Azeem, Salifi, & Dogar, 2012). The analysis generated ten

themes: (1) attitudes toward inclusive education, (2) training and teacher qualifications, (3) government and resource support, (4) challenges in inclusive education, (5) recommendations for improvement, (6) inclusion of diverse disabilities, (7) time and behavior management, (8) parental and community involvement, (9) personal experience and advocacy, and (10) variability in teacher opinion.

Findings indicate generally positive teacher attitudes toward inclusion, alongside significant concerns regarding limited training, insufficient certification in special education, and inadequate government and resource support. Key challenges included stigmatization, negative peer attitudes, funding constraints, and broader political factors. Teachers proposed practical improvements, such as establishing specialized centers, enhancing professional development, improving instructional materials, adopting skill-focused curricula, and reducing student-teacher ratios. Respondents emphasized the need to address a wide range of disabilities and highlighted the importance of additional time for behavior management. Parental and community involvement was identified as critical, with recognition of parents' rights to alternative placements when appropriate. Variability in teacher perspectives was also evident, particularly regarding the inclusion of students with severe disabilities. These varied perspectives underscore the challenges and intricacies of implementing inclusive education in Uganda. Overall, these findings underscore the complexity of implementing inclusive education in Uganda and the need for strengthened professional, institutional, and community support. See examples of some teachers' sentiment (〈Table III-4〉).

〈Table III-4〉 Ugandan Teacher Sentiment

Sentiment	Range of Sentiment	Examples
Positive	Very Positive (N=7)	*"Inclusive education helps everyone to move together both in class and out"* *"Inclusive education enables students to learn/develop better skills of tolerance towards learners with disability. It's a good innovation in the education system since teachers acquire better skills and attitudes essential for maintaining disabled learners in class/school. Some disabled children perform much better than average or normal learners therefore it enables them to learn from one another. Hence, disability is not inability"*

Sentiment	Range of Sentiment	Examples
Neutral	Moderately Positive (N=11)	*"Inclusion is very much okay especially if the level of disability is not severe. Parents of children without disabilities need to be sensitized in order not to be taken by surprise"* *"Inclusive education works when all members and stakeholders of the school/community work together so all contribute, learn together and develop lifelong friendships. On the other hand, parents have the right to refuse mainstream education if they consider it to be detrimental to their child"*
Negative	Moderately Negative (N=14)	*"Inclusion education is practical in Uganda but lack of facilities and trained staff to handle severe cases in students with disabilities plus government intervention is missing"* *"Inclusive education will also depend on the student's disabilities. If the students are physically aggressive towards the staff and other students (regular) then it becomes a major concern to the community. As much as we support inclusive education we have to put other factors in place"*
Very Negative	Very Negative (N=3)	*"I would not tolerate students with severe disabilities because some children do not need education, but love and self-care skills"* *"There will be segregation of students with a disability. There is a need for ample time to cope with the behaviors of persons with disabilities in my class. There is a need for special organization of persons with disabilities in my class"*

Sequential Analysis

The analysis of these teachers' perspectives on inclusive education revealed three overarching parent themes that encapsulated their attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy regarding inclusive education. The quantitative findings served as "parent themes" generated from statistical analyses, while the qualitative findings functioned as "child themes" that contextualized and expanded the quantitative results through teachers' lived experiences and narratives (Azungah, 2018).

Quantitative Finding 1: Teachers demonstrated moderate attitudes toward inclusive education (M = 3.35 on a 5-point scale).

Qualitative Enhancement: The qualitative findings provided greater nuance regarding teachers' moderate attitudes by revealing both supportive and hesitant perspectives. Many teachers recognized the social and educational value of inclusive education, emphasizing social interaction, empathy, equal opportunities, and peer acceptance for students with disabilities. Teachers described inclusive education as promoting learning together and fostering awareness among peers. These findings are consistent with research indicating that teachers often support inclusion at a philosophical level (Savolainen et al., 2012). However, qualitative responses also revealed variability in opinions, particularly regarding students with severe disabilities and behavioral challenges. Some teachers expressed concerns about limited resources and insufficient preparedness to support students with significant needs. These mixed perspectives help explain why overall attitudes remained moderate rather than strongly positive.

Quantitative Finding 2: Teachers expressed substantial concerns regarding inclusive education, particularly related to resources and workload.

Qualitative Enhancement: The qualitative findings strongly reinforced the quantitative results by highlighting structural and environmental barriers within schools. Teachers reported inadequate instructional materials, overcrowded classrooms, lack of support personnel, and limited institutional support as major constraints. These findings align with prior research identifying resource shortages as key barriers to inclusive education in low-resource settings (Bannink et al., 2016; Nyende, 2012). Teachers also emphasized workload challenges, including large class sizes, behavior management demands, and limited time for individualized instruction. Such concerns are widely documented as negatively influencing teachers' attitudes toward inclusion (Malinen et al., 2013; Savolainen et al., 2012). In addition, qualitative findings revealed the influence of societal stigma and cultural beliefs surrounding disability, including discrimination and exclusion within communities. These issues are consistent with existing literature on disability stigma in similar contexts (Rohwerder, 2018).

Quantitative Finding 3: Teachers reported moderately high self-efficacy for implementing inclusive practices (M = 4.80 on a 6-point scale).

Qualitative Enhancement: Although teachers reported relatively high self-efficacy, qualitative findings revealed a gap between perceived confidence and actual classroom implementation. Teachers expressed commitment to inclusive education but also

described feeling underprepared due to limited training, insufficient resources, and lack of institutional support. This suggests that self-efficacy may reflect professional belief rather than practical readiness. Bandura (1977) conceptualizes self-efficacy as context-dependent, and prior research highlights the importance of institutional support in translating confidence into effective practice (Fackler et al., 2021). Teachers further emphasized the need for ongoing professional development, collaboration, and practical experience to strengthen their capacity for inclusive teaching. Overall, the sequential analysis demonstrates that teachers' attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy are interconnected and shaped by broader structural and contextual conditions influencing inclusive education.

IV. Discussion

Since self-efficacy is a person's particular set of beliefs that determines how well one can execute a plan of action in prospective situations (Bandura, 1977), the result of these teachers' rather high sense of self-efficacy toward inclusion can be a promising indicator for the country's inclusive education. However, from in-person conversations with teachers, most of them expressed their lack of confidence in including students with disabilities. Lack of knowledge and skills in teaching students with disabilities was the main reason. As workload accounted for the greatest amount of variation in predicting inclusive attitudes, interventions that promote inclusion may begin to address practices that affect teacher workload like additional paperwork, lack of incentives, and increased stress levels among other staff. Teachers are faced with having to implement a policy that does not fit into the current structure of a school. Socially, this would involve fostering practices and attitudes that embrace differences and are flexible to meet the individual needs of all students.

Results demonstrated that the awareness of inclusive practice and confidence in implementation might be related to the level of training and experience in educating students with disabilities (71.8%). However, they might have felt powerless in addressing

issues that are at the root of the uneven implementation of inclusive education. With only 9% of school-aged children with disabilities having access to schools, Ugandan educators have first-hand experience with how disparities are related to social stigma and societal attitudes that impact educational policy and practice (Nardi, 2017; Riche & Anyimuzala, 2014). Family practices of hiding children and the government's inability to enforce and fund policy may contribute to teachers feeling demotivated and ill-equipped to fully include children in the classroom setting. The macro-systemic issues, related to the stigma towards disability, also impact the teacher's ability to implement inclusive practice and therefore could impact their attitude about inclusion in general.

Whereas inclusive education teacher preparation in the form of teaching training programs is one of the key aspects that impact teacher attitude in including children with disabilities (King-Spears, 1997; Scott, Vitale, & Masten, 1998; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996), the study data suggested that these teachers do not share that aspect. First, teachers were hindered by the lack of government support particularly to develop a policy that gives them the capacity to effectively deliver teaching and maximize their skills. Secondly, societal stigma and discrimination against people with disabilities as was reported by many teachers made them feel uncomfortable with having children with disabilities in general education classrooms, especially since disability was culturally associated with curses or witchcraft. These beliefs, although they are generally fading, are still prevalent in East Africa and continue to drive perceptions and attitudes about disability in the public (Rohwerder, 2018). Teachers can leverage existing community structures and resources to support disability awareness and acceptance campaigns within their communities to demystify the myths around disability, reduce stigma, and promote inclusion in the communities and schools. It would also be useful for the government to provide additional moral and financial support to these programs.

V. Implications and Recommendation

The study examined teachers' attitudes, concerns, and self-efficacy regarding inclusive education in Mukono District, Uganda, and highlights important implications for policy and practice. While quantitative findings suggested moderately high teacher self-efficacy, qualitative evidence revealed a pronounced gap between perceived confidence and actual implementation, reflecting context-constrained efficacy shaped by overcrowded classrooms (often exceeding 80–100 students), limited instructional materials, inadequate infrastructure, and minimal access to specialized personnel. Teachers demonstrated strong professional commitment to inclusion; however, they experienced efficacy dissonance, as excessive workload, diverse learning needs, behavioral management demands, and lack of planning time constrained their ability to deliver differentiated instruction. In many cases, self-efficacy reflected aspirational beliefs tied to professional norms rather than context-sensitive capability. This gap, therefore, represents a systemic misalignment between inclusive education policies and the realities of under-resourced schools. Addressing it requires coordinated action across governance levels, including increased funding for inclusive education, clearer and more realistic implementation guidelines, strengthened monitoring systems that track classroom-level conditions, and consistent enforcement of inclusive policies. Critically, reducing teacher workload must be prioritized through the recruitment and deployment of special needs education specialists at district or cluster levels, the introduction of school-based instructional assistants or paraprofessionals, and policy efforts to improve pupil–teacher ratios or provide compensatory supports in high-density classrooms.

At the practice and community levels, the findings underscore the need for sustainable, context-responsive support mechanisms that strengthen situated teacher efficacy. Continuous, school-embedded professional development, like peer mentoring, collaborative lesson planning, inclusive pedagogy coaching, and teacher learning communities, should replace one-off workshops to enable practical application in real classroom conditions. Expanding access to low-cost, locally produced teaching and learning materials (e.g., adaptable visual aids, multi-level activity guides, and assistive tools) is essential, particularly when co-developed with teachers to ensure usability. Furthermore,

effective inclusive education requires stronger collaboration among schools, families, local leaders, and civil society organizations. Community-based disability awareness campaigns and sustained advocacy can reduce stigma, improve identification and support of learners with disabilities, and redistribute responsibility for inclusion beyond teachers alone. Despite ongoing policy efforts, inclusive education in Uganda remains below desired levels, indicating the need for long-term, multi-stakeholder commitment to systemic change. Future research should prioritize participatory, community-based approaches that examine how local education leaders and communities can co-design inclusive systems, as well as the feasibility of low-cost communities of practice involving teachers, families, and stakeholders. Ultimately, enhancing inclusive education outcomes depends on recognizing teacher self-efficacy as system-dependent and ensuring that structural, institutional, and community conditions enable teachers to translate commitment into effective and sustainable classroom practice.

VI. Limitations of the Study

Observations and informal conversations involving a sensitive issue are bound to suffer from bias, particularly the desire for the respondents to give the desired response. The rather small sample size of participants from one region creates a selection bias and undermines the representativeness of the findings to the rest of the country. Additionally, because participants were recruited from teachers attending a professional training program, the sample may be biased toward individuals with a pre-existing interest in or favorable disposition toward inclusive education, thereby limiting the generalizability of the findings. Future studies may benefit from including participants from other parts of the country and conducting multi-country studies to understand these perspectives on a more global level in Sub-Saharan Africa. What we stated in the discussion section was an honest declaration, but it may mean that the informal conversations between the teachers and authors and data analyses could have been biased by the authors' experiences. The diversity of the authors' experiences is also

to be a strength of this study. Typically, reflexivity involves examining one's own judgments, practices, and belief systems during the data collection and analysis process. Although efforts were made to minimize subjectivity and enhance objectivity through ongoing reflexivity, particularly during the analysis and interpretation of qualitative data, researcher bias remains a potential limitation. All authors have professional experience in special education and/or inclusive practices within school settings, and most have lived in or received training in East Africa, including one author of Ugandan heritage. While this positionality contributed valuable depth to the interpretation of the findings, it may also have influenced data interpretation and analytic decisions.

References

Abimanyi-Ochom, J. & Mannan, H. (2014). Uganda's Disability Journey: Progress and Challenges. *African Journal of Disability. 3* (1), Art. #108, 6 pages. https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v3i1.108

Azeem, M., & Salfi, N.A.(2012). Usage of Nvivo Software for Qualitative Data Analysis. *Academic Research International. 2* (1), (pp. 262-266).

Azungah,T. (2018). Qualitative Research: Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Data Analysis. *Qualitative Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-18-00035.

Bailey, B. (2021). *Seven Powers: Power of Acceptance*. https://consciousdiscipline.com/seven-powers-power-of-acceptance/

Bailey, J. (2004). The Validation of a Scale to Measure School Principals' Attitudes toward the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools. *Australian Psychologist. 39* (1), (pp. 76-87). https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060410001660371

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review. 84* (2), (pp.191–215). https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bannink, F., Idro, R. & Van Hove G. (2016a). Teachers' and Parents' Perspectives on Inclusive Education for Children with Spina Bifida in Uganda. *Journal of Childhood & Developmental Disorders. 2* (2), (pp. 2472-1786). https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-1786.100026

Bannink, F., Idro, R., & Van Hove, G. (2016b). Family Relationships, Support and Care : Perspectives of Children with Spina Bifida in Central Uganda. Knowledge *Management For Development Journal. 11* (2), (pp.122-140). http://journal.km4dev.org/

Bradshaw, Lori, & Mundia. (2006). Attitudes to and Concerns about Inclusive Education: Bruneian In Service and Preservice Teachers. *International Journal of Special Education. 21* (1), (pp. 35-41). DOI:10.12691/education-2-4-6

Bui, Xuan, Quirk, Almazan, & Valenti. (2010). *Inclusive Education Research & Practice*. Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education

Carlow University. (2015). Carlow in Uganda: Special education team offers training and hope. https://www.carlow.edu/carlow-in-uganda-special-education-team-offers-training-and-hope

DANIDA. (2005). Establishing a National Institute and Local Centres for Inclusive Education in Uganda. Kampala: DANIDA.

Das A.K., Gichuru, M. & Singh, A. (2013). Implementing Inclusive Education in Delhi, India: Regular School Teachers' Preferences for Professional Development Delivery Modes. Professional Development in Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.747979

DeWitt, P. (2019). How Collective Teacher Efficacy Develops. *Educational Leadership 76*, (pp. 31-35). https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-collective-teacher-efficacy-develops

Ejuu. (2012). Early Childhood Development Policy Advanced in Uganda. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood. 13* (3). https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2012.13.3.248

Fackler, S., Malmberg, L.-E., & Sammons, P. (2021). An international perspective on teacher self-efficacy: Personal, structural and environmental factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 99*, 103255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103255

Government of Uganda (2008). The Education Act, https://www.unicef.org/eca/sites/unicef.org.eca/files/IE_Webinar_Booklet_1_0.pdf

Kefallinou, A., Symeonidou, S., & Meijer, C.J. (2020). Understanding the value of inclusive education and its implementation: A review of the literature. *Prospects, 49* (3-4), 135- 152. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09500-2.

King-Sears, M. E. (1997). Best academic practices for inclusive classrooms. Focus on Exceptional Children, 29(7), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.17161/fec.v29i7.6753

Malinen, O. P., Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Xu, J., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2013). Exploring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices in three diverse countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 33*, 34-44. Available from: https://

doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.02.004

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2019). Education sector laws, policies, investment plans, regulations, strategies, and programs. https://www.education.go.ug/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Policies-and-Regulations.pdf

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2019). *Special needs and inclusive education*. https://www.education.go.ug/special-needs-inclusive-education/

Nadege, R. (2014). "Research Study on Children with Disabilities Living in Uganda Situational Analysis on the Rights of Children with Disabilities in Uganda." Kampala: UNICEF.

Nampijja, M., Ayiro, L., & Nalugya, R. (2022). Pedagogical approaches and access to education among early childhood education learners with disabilities in Africa during the COVID-19 pandemic: Review of available literature. In *Psychosocial, educational, and economic impacts of COVID-19*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.104921

Nardi, K. (n.d.). *How special education in Uganda is slowly improving*. The Borgen Project. https://borgenproject.org/special-education-in-uganda/

Nyende, F. (2012). *Children with disabilities in universal primary education in Uganda: A rights-based analysis to inclusive education* (Master's thesis, Institute of Social Studies, The Netherlands). https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Children-with-Disabilities-in-Universal-Primary-in-Nyende/89f6f364116c9030f18f822ec9eac5683057d574

Okech, J. B., Yuwono, I., & Abdu, W. J. (2021). Implementation of inclusive education practices for children with disabilities and other special needs in Uganda. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research, 8* (1), 97-102. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.97.102

Oliver-Kerrigan, K. A., Christy, D., & Stahmer, A. C. (2021). Practices and experiences of general education teachers educating students with autism. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 56* (2), 158-172.

Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher efficacy: What is it and does it matter? Principal, 87(5), 42-45.

Riche, N. (2014). *Research study on children with disabilities living in Uganda: Situational analysis on the rights of children with disabilities in Uganda*. UNICEF.

Riche, N., Anyimuzala, J., & UNICEF Uganda. (2014). Research study on children with disabilities living in Uganda: Situational analysis on the rights of children with disabilities in Uganda. UNICEF.

Rohwerder, B. (2018). Disability stigma in developing countries (K4D Helpdesk Report). Institute of Development Studies. https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/

20.500.12413/13795

Sachs, S. K. (2004). Evaluation of teacher attributes as predictors of success in urban schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 55(2), 177–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103261569

Salend, S. J., & Garrick Duhaney, L. M. (1999). The impact of inclusion on students with and without disabilities and their educators. Remedial and Special Education, 20(2), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259902000209

Sands, D. J., Kozleski, E. B., & French, N. K. (2000). Inclusive education for the 21st century. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., & Malinen, O. P. (2012). Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. European journal of special needs education, 27(1), 51-68.

Scott, B. J., Vitale, M. R., & Masten, W. G. (1998). Implementing instructional adaptations for students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms: A literature review. Remedial and Special Education, 19(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259801900205

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1996). Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958–1995: A research synthesis. Exceptional Children, 63(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299606300106

Sharma, U., & Desai, I. (2002). Measuring concerns about integrated education in India. The Asia-Pacific Journal on Disabilities, 5(1), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-2-3-5

Sharma, U. (2012). Inclusive and special education: A way forward in the Solomon Islands. AusAID & Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, Solomon Islands Government.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x

Sightsavers. (2021). Uganda inclusive education project. https://www.sightsavers.org/programmes/uganda-inclusive-education-project/

Standard Neurodiversity Project. (n.d.). Student support. Stanford Medicine, Stanford University. https://med.stanford.edu/neurodiversity/student-support--im-.html

Stella, C.S.C., Forlin, C., & Lan, A.M. (2007). The influence of an inclusive education course on attitude change of pre-service secondary teachers in Hong Kong. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(2), (pp. 161–179). https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660701268585

Subedi, D. (2016). Explanatory sequential mixed method design as the third research community of knowledge claim. *American Journal of Educational Research, 4*(7), 570-577.

Toyon, M. A. S. (2021). Explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research: Phases and challenges. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 10(5), 253-260. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i5.1262

Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2025). *National population and housing census 2024* : Main report. UBOS.

Uganda Society for Disabled Children. (2011). *Directory of national and district organizations of and for persons with disabilities*. https://afri-can.org/empowerment/USDC%20Directory__A5[1].pdf

UNICEF. (2014a). Situational analysis on the rights of children with disabilities in Uganda. UNICEF.

UNICEF. (2014b). *UNICEF annual report 2014*. https://www.unicef.org/reports/unicef-annual-report-2014

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights/convtexte.htm

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. UNESCO.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2005). Guidelines for inclusion: *Ensuring access to education for all* (Programme Document ED. 2004/WS/39).UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000140224

Woolverton, L. J. (2021). *Teachers' attitudes and perceptions of the inclusive classroom* (Doctoral dissertation, McKendree University). ProQuest.

국문초록

우간다 무코노 지역 초·중등 일반교사의 통합교육에 대한 태도, 우려 및 자기효능감 분석

유(조)은미[1]·마가렛 남피자[2]·엘리자베스 H. 모건[3]·다이앤 숙영 이[4]·에넷 오스왈드[5]

[1]캘리포니아주립대학교, 새크라멘토, 특수교육과 교수,
[2]아프리카 인구·보건연구센터 연구원,
[3]모건주립대학교 도시교육리더십학과 교수,
[4]몬터레이 반도 칼리지 유아교육학과 교수,
[5]몬터레이 반도 칼리지 유아교육학과 교수

본 연구는 통합교육을 통해 모든 학습자에게 공정한 교육 기회를 제공하고자 하는 국제적 흐름 속에서, 우간다 무코노 지역 초·중등 일반교사의 통합교육에 대한 태도, 우려, 그리고 자기효능감을 분석하는 데 목적을 두고, 설명적 혼합연구방법(explanatory sequential mixed methods design)을 적용, 우간다 무코노 지역의 공립 초등학교 및 중학교에 재직 중인 일반교사 71명을 대상으로 1단계 양적 설문조사와 2단계 개방형 문항을 통한 질적 자료를 순차적으로 수집·분석하였다. 양적 자료는 통합교육에 대한 태도, 통합교육 실행에 대한 우려, 자기효능감을 측정하기 위해 기술통계, 상관분석, 위계적 회귀분석(hierarchical multiple regression analysis)을 실시하였고, 질적 자료는 NVivo를 활용한 주제분석을 통해 보완적으로 해석하였다. 연구 결과, 교사들은 포용교육에 대해 중간 수준 이상의 긍정적 태도(M = 3.35, SD = 0.603)와 비교적 높은 자기효능감(M = 4.80, SD = .608)을 보여준 동시에 교육 자원 부족(M = 3.08, SD = .690)과 업무 부담(M = 2.71, SD = .667)에 대한 유의미한 우려를 나타냈다. 업무량에 대한 우려는 태도에 유의미한 영향을 미쳤으며, 자기효능감 역시 포용적 관점을 형성하는 데 긍정적으로 기여하는 것으로 확인되었다. 교사들은 원칙적 차원에서는 자신감을 보였지만, 질적 분석에서는 실제 실행 과정에서의 어려움을 나타냈고, 교수 자료의 부족, 정부의 지원 미흡, 그리고 장애에 대한 사회적 낙인이 주요 도전 요인으로 나타났다. 이는 우간다에서 통합교육의 효과적인 정착을 위해 교사의 전문성 강화, 제도적·구조적 지원, 교육 자원 확충, 그리고 지역사회의 인식 개선이 함께 이루어질 필요가 있음을 보여준다.

※ 핵심어 : 통합교육, 우간다, 장애, 교사 우려, 교사 태도 및 자기효능감

논문접수: 2026. 05. 10. / 수정본 접수: 2026. 06. 02. / 게재승인: 2026. 06. 08.