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ABSTRACT
The study aims to investigate the appropriateness of teacher education provided by teacher training institutions to teachers for an inclusive set-up in primary schools, Eswatini. Learners with disabilities in Eswatini are usually found in special schools; however, the government of Eswatini advises parents to send these children to nearby community schools. The study investigated whether the teachers in public primary schools were appropriately trained by the teacher training institutions for inclusive classrooms. A qualitative approach was used in the study, employing the multiple case study design. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from Eswatini senior inspector of inclusive education, a parent of an out-of-school child with a disability, two teachers and a school principal from each of the four schools involved in the study. The recommendations would assist teacher training institutions in Eswatini to improve inclusiveness in their courses. The study revealed that teachers were not competent to teach learners with disabilities in an inclusive classroom. Some primary schools did not admit children with disabilities due to their pre-service training. The study recommended that the pre-service training should be aligned with the situations in schools. Through the study, a model ensuring teachers' competence in inclusive education was produced.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The teachers' training institutions in Eswatini are responsible for the production of relevant or appropriate teachers to teach in all public primary schools. In the past, learners with disabilities were supposed to be sent to special schools with teachers capable of teaching them not in the public schools because the teachers were not capacitated. The Eswatini government (Swaziland, Ministry of Education and Training, 2018) through the National Education and Training Sector Policy is currently advising parents to send their children with disabilities to nearby public schools because it is believed that teachers in these schools are capacitated to handle inclusive classrooms. However, most parents still send their children with disabilities to special primary schools in Eswatini. Therefore, it is imperative to investigate whether the teachers in the public primary schools are appropriately trained at the teacher training institutions in Eswatini. Such an investigation answered why parents prefer to send their children with disabilities to special primary schools. The study's main question is: To what extent do the teacher training institutions provide appropriate training for inclusive classroom teachers for primary schools in Eswatini? The study's sub-questions are:
1. How far are primary schools managed inclusively in Eswatini?
2. What are the primary school teachers' experiences in teaching an inclusive classroom in Eswatini?
3. How should the training of primary school teachers for inclusive classrooms be improved at the teacher training institutions in Eswatini?

**Theoretical framework**

The study employed the Suitability, Availability and Equitability (SAVE) Framework by Tesemma (2012) as a foundation of the study. This framework was developed because the frameworks that existed at the time did not address issues of both human rights and educational rights of learners with disabilities, such as the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Adaptability (4A) Scheme by Tomaševski (2001:14) for the United Nations. The SAVE Framework was concerned with all the elements of the 4A Scheme and also embraced learners with disabilities. The researcher of this study used the SAVE Framework because the focus was on providing appropriate education to primary school teachers in an inclusive classroom, is inclusive education (Makoelle & Thwala 2022).

The SAVE Framework comprises the minimum standards of education to be provided to all learners including those with disabilities, which are suitability, availability and equitability. The minimum standards of the SAVE Framework have the following requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Equitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. adapting the system instead of the child;</td>
<td>1. making available sufficient inclusive schools of good quality nearby;</td>
<td>1. ensuring equality of access and results and non-discrimination;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. using appropriate ‘language’ and discourse;</td>
<td>2. allocation of adequate public funding for ensuring inclusion;</td>
<td>2. recognition of education as a civil and political right, but also as an economic, social and cultural right;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cultural and local sensitivity to disability;</td>
<td>3. making sufficient teachers of good high quality available for inclusion;</td>
<td>3. recognition of the educability of learners with disabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. safe and appropriate location of schools;</td>
<td>4. equipping teachers with skills of pedagogy of disruption of disability stereotypes;</td>
<td>4. freedom of choice and involvement of parents or caregivers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. individualisation of curricula and other support services;</td>
<td>5. respecting the rights and duties of teachers;</td>
<td>5. creating inclusive schools with an inclusive culture, ethos and organisation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. disability- and age-appropriate transition plan;</td>
<td>6. developing teachers as ‘foot soldiers’ of social justice;</td>
<td>6. making schools economically affordable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. curricular and instructional sufficiency, flexibility, relevance and appropriateness;</td>
<td>7. equipping teachers to play a pastoral role;</td>
<td>7. allocating equitable public funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. proper academic testing and assessment of disabled learners;</td>
<td>8. supplying teachers with disabilities as role models;</td>
<td>8. political commitment to take affirmative action and for redress;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. effective school–community relationships;</td>
<td>9. Provide textbooks, uniforms and educational supplies at lower and affordable prices;</td>
<td>9. respect for difference; and listening to the voices of learners with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. tackling the exclusionary potential of the hidden curriculum through equity pedagogy;</td>
<td>10. providing disability-friendly adaptive and assistive devices at lower and affordable prices; and availing disability-friendly school transport services at lower and affordable prices.</td>
<td>Source: Tesemma (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. care in disciplining disabled learners; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. universal design of facilities, services and products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Inclusive Education is currently advocated throughout the global sphere because every learner benefits from it as indicated by The Education and Training Sector Policy (Eswatini, Ministry of Education and Training 2018, par.1.2.1). The teachers in schools should, therefore, be prepared to teach learners with
and without disabilities in the same classroom (Makoelle & Thwala 2022), it is therefore important to focus our discussion on whether the teachers are trained to be soldiers of inclusion. Teacher preparedness at pre-service is a factor to realise the dream of Inclusive Education in schools (Global Education Monitoring Report Team, International Task Force on Teachers for Education, 2020). The inclusion orientation is not only for class teachers, but also for principals who manage the schools who have a role to play in ensuring that all children are in school, who would support the teachers with teaching (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022); hence, the requirement of pre-service teachers for inclusion, who eventually become school principal. Inclusion in a school starts with the principal of the school, who is in charge of the overall functioning of the school (Shongwe, 2015). The school principal plays a role in supporting the subject teachers in their teaching to accommodate both learners with and without disabilities. The component of inclusive education is expected to be compulsory in all teacher training programmes for the successful preparation of teachers who are ready to implement inclusion in schools (Nguyet and Thu Ha, 2010). In line with the inclusive component being compulsory, the teachers’ training institutions have included it; however, the teachers still feel not competent in handling learners with disabilities in the schools (Shongwe, 2022).

The curriculum at teachers’ training institutions should focus on how to teach a class of learners with and without disabilities (Zwane and Malale 2018). The curriculum should further prepare the teacher to embrace learners of such integration in all activities of the schools. However, the schools in Eswatini, besides lacking properly trained teachers for an inclusive classroom, have different challenges which include unfriendly building structures, teaching materials and many more (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022). The curriculum at the teachers’ training institutions in Eswatini needs refinement in its components to ensure that the teachers are comfortable with diverse learner classrooms. Some learners with disabilities require extra care, normally provided for by their parents (Thwala, Ntinda & Hlandze, 2020), and the teachers should be trained on how they should provide such care. However, it is difficult for teachers to implement inclusion if they never experienced it in their training. Therefore, tertiary institutions must develop an inclusive environment during the training of teachers, such as physical structures, attitudes of personnel and lecturing methods (Madlela, 2022)

Most teachers in primary schools complain that are not confident with their skills of handling learners integrated in a diverse classroom (Shongwe, 2022), which suggests that they should be made comfortable during their initial training as teachers. The support for the learners may lead to constructs and frameworks that assist the learners in coping with the learning (Rangar-Amol & Gasa, 2021). The teacher training institutions in Eswatini have included a component of inclusion in their curriculum; however, the teachers on the ground indicate that they are not ready to teach a classroom of learners with and without disabilities (Shongwe, 2022). The component in the current curriculum content on the inclusion of teacher training institutions is not appropriate for the teachers. Since student-teachers go for internships (teaching practice) before completing their qualification, the institutions should ensure that their student-teachers can handle classrooms of diverse nature at this level. UNESCO (2020) recommended that to prepare teachers for inclusive teaching, values such as supporting all learners, working with others valuing learner diversity, and valuing development, should be embedded in their curriculum. It is therefore important that the curriculum for preparing inclusive teachers at teacher training institutions is reviewed to have these values. Teachers indicated that only the Education courses reflected inclusive teaching and the courses dealing with teaching subjects never prepared them on pedagogies of teaching these subjects in a classroom of diverse learners (Massouti, 2021). This means that the teachers need to have practical experience in teaching an inclusive classroom during their pre-service.
For the student teachers to have practical experience in inclusion, teacher training institutions should embrace diversity in all aspects of doing things within the institutions (Madlela, 2022).

3. METHODS

A qualitative research approach was employed to investigate the problem as the participants were to give their perceptions; hence, an interpretive paradigm was engaged. The researcher used the interpretive paradigm in the study which is appropriate to explore the facts of the problem from the perspective of participants (Yin 2016), as in the case of the teachers in public primary schools. A multiple-case study design was used, involving four schools selected from Eswatini. The researcher employed purposeful sampling, which allowed him to choose schools that met certain criteria (McMillan & Schumacher 2010). The study involved 15 participants, which included two teachers and a principal from each of the four schools. Among the four schools, one of them was known to be a model for inclusive schools. Other participants in the study were a parent of an out-of-school child with a disability and a senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education. The school principals were chosen because they were responsible for a school’s overall day-to-day functioning of schools, while teachers are the ones teaching the learners in the classrooms. The parent of an out-of-school child with a disability was involved to determine whether it was the nearby school failing to accommodate his child, while the senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education was responsible for the implementation of Inclusive Education in schools.

The researcher conducted recorded semi-structured interviews with all the participants using interview guides that were prepared in advance. The interviewed participants included the principals, teachers, parent of an out-of-school child and senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education. When developing the interview guides, the SAVE Framework was considered because it was the one that guided the study. The SAVE Framework was considered to investigate whether the Inclusive Education provided by the schools was meeting the minimum standard for the right to education of children with disabilities in primary schools (Tesemma 2012). The researcher made it a point that ethical consideration was adhered to before collecting the data from all the participants as suggested by the British Educational Research Association (2018). Permission from the director of education was sought before involving schools that were part of the study as advocated by Widdowson (2011). The researcher requested the participants to sign consent forms to show a voluntary willingness to take part in the study, and that they could withdraw from the study at any stage. The findings were presented in themes that emerged from the data collected.

These pseudonyms were employed as follows:
P12 (Principal of Inclusive School 2): Refers to the Head Principal of the second inclusive school.
PC (Parent of an Out-School-Child): An individual identified as the parent of a child currently not attending school.
P1 (Principal of School 1): The Head Principal of the first school.
P3 (Principal of School 3): The Head Principal of the third school.
P4 (Principal of School 4): The Head Principal of the fourth school.
SI2 (Inclusive School 2): Pertains to the second inclusive school.
S1 (School 1): Refers to the first school.
S3 (School 3): Refers to the third school.
S4 (School 4): Refers to the fourth school.
TC2 (Teacher C of Inclusive School 2): The educator identified with the initial 'C' teaching at the second inclusive school.
TD2 (Teacher D of Inclusive School 2): The educator identified with the initial ‘D’ teaching at the second inclusive school.
TA1 (Teacher A of School 1): The educator identified with the initial ‘A’ teaching at the first school.
TB1 (Teacher B of School 1): The educator identified with the initial ‘B’ teaching at the first school.
TE3 (Teacher E of School 3): The educator identified with the initial ‘E’ teaching at the third school.
TG4 (Teacher G of School 4): The educator identified with the initial ‘G’ teaching at the fourth school.
TH4 (Teacher H of School 4): The educator identified with the initial ‘H’ teaching at the fourth school.

The use of these pseudonyms was instrumental in preserving the confidentiality of the participants’ identities within the program, facilitating discussions and communications without revealing the true identities of the involved individuals.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher presented the findings in themes that aligned with the research questions of the study and highlighted whether it was in line with the requirements of the relevant standard of the SAVE Framework. The senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education, parent of an out-of-school child, principals and teachers responded to different interview questions that addressed issues on the problem of the study. The biographical data of the participants was first shown in table form (Table 1-5) before the presentation of data.

The findings were presented in themes aligned with the study questions. Firstly, the findings presented responded to the question of the study, ‘How far are primary schools managed inclusively in Eswatini?’

The table 2 shows the biological data of the participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School principal</th>
<th>Experience as school principal (years)</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Qualification in special and inclusive education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>No formal qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education in Leadership and Management of Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Qualified manager of Managing Inclusive Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Primary Teachers’ Certificate</td>
<td>No formal qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education in Leadership and Management</td>
<td>No formal qualification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the biographical data of participating school principals involved. From the provided data, it is evident that P12 is the sole school principal possessing formal qualifications in the field of special and inclusive education. Conversely, P1, P3, and P4 lack specific qualifications in this domain despite their varying experiences as school principals. This aspect may be a significant consideration when evaluating their expertise and knowledge regarding inclusive education and their potential contributions to programs or projects focused on inclusive education.
Managing primary schools inclusively

Here, the researcher wanted to find out the extent to which the primary schools embraced inclusion in their management in Eswatini. SI2 admitted children with and those without disabilities, while S1, S3 and S4 admitted those with minor and without disabilities. However, the National Education and Training and Sector Policy (Swaziland 2018) required all primary schools to admit all children regardless of disabilities. P1 highlighted, "The school admits children with disabilities, but we don’t accept those with severe ones, the parents choose to send their children to special schools because they think our school is not competent to teach such learners." A study conducted earlier indicated that besides teachers not adequately prepared for an inclusive classroom, the Eswatini government introduced the mainstreaming of inclusive education prematurely because she was failing to support it (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022). On another note, SI2 accepted children without disabilities and those with disabilities regardless of severity. PI2 stated, "Our school admits children with disabilities regardless of severity and those without disabilities because we have qualified personnel." Since SI2 was known to be an inclusive school, the government was supporting the school with inclusive material. For instance, PI2 said, “The government supported us a lot, such as buying us embossers, projectors in six classrooms, six laptops and building a sensory room.” It showed that the government was giving more support to the known inclusive school than the rest of the other public schools. From the senior inspector’s view, all primary schools were expected to admit children with disabilities; however, some parents still had the attitude that only special schools are appropriate for children with disabilities, which is in line with some studies that share the same sentiments (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022). On a different note, the parent of the out-of-

Table 4. Biographical data of participating teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Experience in teaching (years)</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Qualification in special and inclusive education</th>
<th>Number of learners in class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Postgraduate Certificate in Education</td>
<td>Workshopped on Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bachelor of Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Degree in Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelor of Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Degree in Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Degree in Leadership and Management of Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Degree in Managing Inclusive Schools</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Primary Teachers' Diploma</td>
<td>A Little Bit of Inclusive Education of the Teachers' Diploma</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Primary Teachers' Diploma</td>
<td>A Little Bit of Inclusive Education of the Teachers' Diploma</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts; Postgraduate Certificate in Education</td>
<td>A Little Bit of Inclusive Education of the Postgraduate Certificate in Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education in Leadership and Management of Special and Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Degree in Managing Inclusive Schools</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Biographical data of the parent of an out-of-school child with a disability

| Parent's age of the out-of-school-child with a disability | 35-40 years old |
school-child (PC) with a disability highlighted that a school in his community did not admit his child because of her disability; hence, the child was not attending school at the time of the study. PC said, “The principal of the primary school in my area rejected my child and told me they cannot handle my child’s disability. He advised me to send my child to a special school.” It portrayed that the teachers from the local tertiary institutions are not adequately trained to manage schools to accommodate learners with special needs. Not admitting children with disabilities is against the equitability standard of the SAVE Framework as it requires that there should be no discrimination, children should have equal access to schools (Tesemma 2012); hence, the education of teachers at local tertiary institutions is not in line with the SAVE Framework.

S1, S3 and S4 principals did not embrace inclusion in terms of conducting workshops for teachers focusing on inclusion as a requirement by the availability standard of the SAVE framework. TB1 stated, “Our school does not organise workshops for us as teachers to learn more about inclusive education, it is difficult to implement inclusion.” P4 also said, “We don’t organise workshops on inclusion for our teachers.” P1 and P4 further stated that they have very shallow knowledge of inclusion. P4 said, “The component of Inclusive Education we had at teacher training was too limited for what we see in the school.” What was highlighted by the two principals portrayed that education teacher training did not make them aware that teachers need workshops to stay relevant for inclusion as indicated by the availability standard of the SAVE Framework (Tesemma 2012), which states that teachers should be equipped with appropriate skills to handle an inclusive classroom. However, S2 conducted workshops frequently for teachers on embracing inclusion in line with the availability standard of the SAVE Framework which requires that teachers should be equipped with relevant skills to handle a diverse class. For example, PI2 said, “We conduct teachers’ workshops regularly in the school to ensure that they are kept abreast on emerging inclusive issues.” PI2 realised that workshops for teachers on inclusion were necessary because she was aware that there are always emerging issues in inclusive education since she specialised in inclusive education as highlighted that those with appropriate knowledge about inclusion are aware of emerging issues in the field (Makoelle & Thwala 2022).

The equitability standard of the SAVE Framework requires that the school should create an inclusion culture, which should be embedded in the training of teachers (Tesemma 2012). Through the school infrastructure, inclusion culture should be manifested. On the contrary, the infrastructure for S1 and S4 did not accommodate learners with disabilities, while in S3, some of the building structures catered to learners with disabilities. The building structures of S1 and S4 were completely not in line with the inclusion culture because the building structures and landscape of their premises were not accommodating to learners with physical disabilities. P4 even said, “Some parents look at the non-friendly premises of the school to learners with disabilities and conclude that they cannot bring their children here.” Creating an inclusive culture in the schools also shows respect for differences among learners as highlighted in the availability standard of the SAVE Framework, and such should have been part of the principals’ training. The findings portrayed that teachers and principals who were exposed to inclusion or did inclusive education through training tend to understand how to create an inclusion culture in a school (Nguyet & Thu Ha, 2010). Since P3 had experience working in an inclusive school before, he was aware that the building structures should accommodate learners with disabilities; hence semi-accommodating such learners.

According to the requirement of suitability standard of the SAVE Framework, learners with disabilities should be screened and identified early so that they can be assisted in their learning (Tesemma 2012). This is one thing that is expected to be part of the training at teachers training institutions and should be emphasised. In the case of S1, S3 and S4, there never was any policy on screening learners in
The classroom; whenever the learners with disabilities were spotted, it was incidentally by those individual teachers and there was no guarantee that they were to be assisted thereafter. For example, TG4 stated, “We do not screen the learners for their disabilities in the school and we do not even have the screening tool.” On another note, P4 of S4 highlighted, “The education we received from teacher training institutions was not enough because we meet strange things on the ground.” However, P3 through the experience of serving in an inclusive school before becoming a principal at the present school, assisted him with some information on how to accommodate learners with disabilities in a school. Even though P3 had the experience of serving in an inclusive school, his current school was also not screening learners for their disabilities, which may be the result of a lack of training in inclusion as highlighted in the literature that assists in making an informed decision (Nguyet & Thu Ha, 2010). For example, P3 who also did not specialise in Inclusive Education, but had experience in teaching in an inclusive school before, stated, “I’m better than the rest of my teachers in the school because before I came here, I taught in an inclusive school. However, we do not screen learners for their disabilities because we do not have a screening tool.” These findings illustrated that school principals require knowledge of inclusion from pre-service training to manage inclusively as highlighted in the literature that without expertise in inclusive education struggle to implement inclusion in a school (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022).

The principal who was qualified to manage an inclusive school was able to run the school inclusively. PI2 in SI2 who was qualified in the management of an inclusive school as a degree holder, was aware of several things that needed to be done to make the school inclusive for the learners and teachers. Therefore, the SI2 complied with most requirements of the standards of the SAVE Framework. For example, PI2 ensured that: (1) the inclusive culture is inculcated in all the activities of the school; (2) there are teachers with inclusive specialisation; (3) workshops to capacitate teachers on inclusive education are frequently conducted; and (4) learners with disabilities participate in sporting activities in a meaningful way.

**Teacher experiences in an inclusive classroom**

The participants responded to the second question, “What are the primary school teachers’ experiences in teaching an inclusive classroom in Eswatini?” The findings revealed that the teachers who did not specialise in Inclusive Education in their training indicated that they were not conversant about accommodating learners with disabilities as also indicated in the literature (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022). However, the availability standard of the SAVE Framework requires that the teachers should be well-trained to be soldiers of inclusion (Tesemma, 2012). The teachers stated that they did not have enough expertise to deal with learners with disabilities, especially when they were together with those without disabilities. TA1 of S1 on her capacity regarding teaching in an inclusive classroom, said, “I only attended a workshop not organised by the school on Inclusive Education and I’m able to deal with some inclusion issues, but other situations are a challenge because I have little information on Inclusive Education from my pre-service training.” TE3, TF3 and TG4 also stated that they acquired little knowledge of Inclusive Education during their training. TE3 said, “The information I acquired in my pre-service training was more theoretical and the situation on the ground is different.” Similarly, TF3 said, “The education I got at teacher training did not prepare me for an inclusive classroom.” What the participants highlighted here showed that the inclusive component in their training during pre-service was not appropriate for the practical situations in the schools.

Teachers without specialisation in Inclusive education were struggling to teach an inclusive classroom; however, the availability standard of the SAVE Framework requires that all teachers should be equipped with pedagogy skills to handle learners with disabilities (Tesemma, 2012). This portrayed that the teachers were not conversant about teaching methods that are meant for an inclusive classroom. For
instance, TA1, who did not specialised in inclusive Education said, “I become frustrated with some learners having some challenging disabilities.” TE3 also not specialised in Inclusive Education said, “For me, it is difficult to identify a learner with disabilities except when alerted by the parent." The difficulty in dealing with disability situations by these teachers is a sign that the education they received at training is not appropriate for them to identify learners with disabilities in their classroom. On another note, teachers with specialisation in Inclusive Education were able to handle an inclusive classroom, which was in line with the availability standard requirement of the SAVE Framework because they had pedagogy skills for handling learners with disabilities in any classroom. In one scenario, TB1 said, “I use peer teaching because learners understand each other easily. I also do most of the marking in class to assist the learners as they write their work.” Unlike in the case of teachers not specialised in Inclusive Education, the participants portrayed that the teachers who specialised in Inclusive Education are conversant on identifying learners with disabilities and using teaching methods necessary for an inclusive classroom as stated in literature (Nguyet & Thu Ha, 2010).

**Appropriateness of teachers’ training**

The third research question addressed under this theme is, “How can the Eswatini teachers’ training institutions improve their education to produce primary school teachers competent for an inclusive classroom?”

Firstly, to respond to the third question of the study, the participants had to respond to the question, “How should primary school principals be trained to handle an inclusive school?” A principal with appropriate training in Inclusive Education was able to manage a school inclusively. It is worth noting that the education of the principal that specialised in Inclusive Education can be a yardstick for all teachers who may become principals later. The literature also was in line with capacitating school principals for them to be competent in managing schools inclusively (Edel, Thwala, Okeke, & Fakudze, 2022). S1 complied with the standard of availability of the SAVE Framework because the principal was qualified to manage inclusive schools. She was able to do things that made the school more inclusive, such as recruiting teachers with qualifications in Inclusive Education and running workshops on Inclusive Education for the teachers. Concerning training in Inclusive Education, PI2 said, “I qualify to manage an inclusive school; hence, I frequently run workshops for my teachers in the school so that they can cope with emerging inclusion issues.” She further suggested, “The principals should be workshopped on how to accommodate learners with disabilities because they keep referring these learners to our school.”

It came to the fore that the teacher training institutions in Eswatini include Inclusive Education in their training programme; however, there are several teachers in primary schools not specialised. This means the tertiary institutions can benchmark all teacher training programmes with those aiming at specialising in Inclusive Education. The senior mentioned a teacher training institution in Eswatini is equipping all teachers who specialised in Inclusive Education; therefore, the teachers were able to handle inclusive classrooms. She said, “--- We have one university that helps teachers to specialise in inclusive education.” However, the teachers who specialise in Inclusive Education are at a bachelor’s degree level, but many teachers in primary schools hold a primary teachers diploma without specialisation in Inclusive Education. This is contrary to what some literature suggests, which is, teachers should specialise in inclusive education to teach effectively (Nguyet & Thu Ha, 2010).

Secondly, in answering the third question of the study, the participants responded to the question, ‘How should the training of primary school teachers for inclusive classrooms be improved at the teacher training institutions in Eswatini?’ The participants highlighted that there was a need for the Ministry of Education and Training to collaborate with tertiary institutions on the challenges faced by primary teachers in handling learners of a diverse nature in the classroom. The literature also recommended that
the Ministry of Education globally is expected to make input in the development of a teacher training curriculum that focuses on inclusion because schools are managed by the Education Ministry (Nguyet & Thu Ha, 2010). The collaboration was perceived to be necessary to assist teachers’ training institutions to develop an appropriate curriculum that would produce teachers who can handle learners with disabilities in the classroom. For instance, the senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education stated, “It is important that the Ministry of Education and Training should work hand in hand with the tertiary institutions on the challenges faced by the primary teachers about handling a diverse classroom.” The collaboration could assist in the improvement of the education of the teachers to be competent in handling a diverse classroom to comply with the availability standard of the SAVE Framework that requires teachers to have relevant training (Tesemma 2012).

It came to the fore that all teachers in all primary schools of Eswatini should be trained in accommodating the learners with disabilities so that children with disabilities are sent to nearby schools in their communities, which was in line with the equity standard of the SAVE Framework that requires that learners should be sent to nearby schools in their community (Tesemma 2012). PC suggested that the government should train teachers who would manage to teach children with disabilities in the communities. This means that the teachers that were in the nearby schools had a challenge in teaching such learners. The parent of an out-of-school child with a disability said, “The government should train all teachers to teach children with disabilities so that we can send our children to nearby schools.” The concern of the parent portrayed that the situation in the schools was not in line with the requirement of the availability standard of the SAVE Framework because the education of the teachers did not allow them to accommodate learners with disabilities (Tesemma 2012). Therefore, it is the responsibility of tertiary institutions to structure their pre-service training for teachers to accommodate learners of a diverse nature.

The findings showed that the content in training primary school teachers did not adequately include caring for the physical needs of the learners for parents to feel comfortable sending their children to any primary school in their community. This did not align with the suitability standard of the SAVE Framework because the requirement is that the school should be sensitive to the needs of learners with disabilities (Tesemma 2012). The parent of the out-of-school child with a disability indicated, “Government should ensure that there are people that would care for the physical needs of the learners with disabilities in schools.” The concern of the parent portrayed that the teachers were not competent to physically assist learners who need special care with disabilities, which the teachers’ training institutions should include in the training of teachers as pointed out in the literature that teachers should specialise in inclusive education (D’Addio, April & GEM Report team, 2020).

The equitability standard of the SAVE Framework is that schools should create an environment with an inclusive culture (Tesemma 2012). Some teachers have a negative attitude toward learners with disabilities, which necessitates the teachers’ training institutions include dealing with attitudes toward disabilities in the curriculum. Due to a lack of knowledge about inclusion, some teachers in S1 have an attitude toward learners with disabilities in the classroom in primary schools. For example, the senior inspector of Special and Inclusive Education stated, “Teachers tend to offer resistance because some of them were trained a long time ago. I think the teachers are not well vested in Inclusive Education.” TB1 also indicated, “Some teachers tend to yell at learners because of their disabilities.” The teachers yelling at the learners could be out of frustration due to a lack of understanding of the situation of learners with disabilities also stated in the literature (D’Addio, April & GEM Report team, 2020).
4. CONCLUSION

The first research question was, “How far are primary schools managed inclusively in Eswatini?” It was evident that only SI2 was able to admit learners with disabilities and accommodate them. The tertiary institutions in Eswatini did not adequately prepare the primary school teachers for an inclusive classroom; only those teachers who specialised in Inclusive Education were properly prepared. Schools 1, 3 and 4 were not admitting learners with severe disabilities, they only admitted those with very minor disabilities. The principals of schools 1, 3, and 4 were unable to handle learners with disabilities; hence, they would always refer them to special schools. Furthermore, it was also confirmed by the parent of the out-of-school child that schools in the nearby community were not admitting children with severe physical disabilities because the school principals could not handle learners with such disabilities. One would conclude that the principals in S1, S3 and S4 that did not specialised in Inclusive Education, the knowledge they had was not in line with the requirement of the availability minimum standard of the SAVE Framework because of the teacher training programme content. The principal in SI2 who specialised in Inclusive Education was able to accommodate learners with disabilities, which means the content of the programme she received during training was appropriate and relevant. Therefore, the programme’s content, which specialised in Inclusive Education, met the requirement of the minimum standard of the SAVE Framework. The school principals that had not specialised in Inclusive Education in their teacher qualification struggled to accommodate inclusion in their schools even though they knew they had to be inclusive in their management.

The second question of the study was, “To what extent is the education of primary school teachers at the teacher training institutions in Eswatini appropriate to an inclusive classroom in Eswatini?” The study showed that the only appropriate and relevant training was for the teachers specialised in Inclusive Education in their teaching qualification. It has been evident in the presented data above that the participants who did not have qualifications in Inclusive Education were struggling to accommodate learners with disabilities in their schools. Hence, the content of the programme for teachers where teachers were specialising in Inclusive Education was in line with the requirement of the availability standard of the SAVE Framework. On the other hand, the teachers who specialised in Inclusive Education in their training were able to accommodate the learners with disabilities in their school. One would safely conclude that the programme’s content of the teacher training institutions where teachers were not specialising in Inclusive Education is not appropriate for teachers to teach in an inclusive classroom in primary schools in Eswatini. The teachers saw it as shallow for them to handle learners with disabilities in primary schools. Therefore, the content of the teacher training programmes where teachers are not specialising in Inclusive Education did not align with the requirement of the availability standard of the SAVE Framework.

Recommendations of the research study

In answering the last question of the study, “How can the Eswatini teachers’ training institutions improve their education to produce primary school teachers competent for an inclusive classroom?”, the researcher highlighted recommendations based on the findings. Toward the improvement of the training of teachers with appropriate Inclusive Education that would assist them in handling diverse learners in primary schools, the researcher recommended the following using the findings of the study:

1. The teachers’ training institutions in Eswatini should align their curriculum with the one for the degree programme specialising in Special and Inclusive Education. This would help the institutions to identify the content from the degree programme that makes the degree relevant to what is happening in the primary schools in Eswatini.
2. The teachers’ training institutions in Eswatini should include managing schools inclusively and dealing with teachers’ attitudes toward inclusion contents of their programme among other things.
3. The lecturers should emphasise inclusive methodologies during the teaching practice of pre-service teachers.
4. The pre-service teachers should be alerted on how to seek help when faced with situations that need inclusion in their classrooms.
5. The lecturers of the teacher training institutions should model inclusive teaching methods in their lectures for the student-teachers to comprehend inclusion.

**Future research study**

A quantitative approach to include primary schools from all four regions of Eswatini and lecturers at teachers' training institutions should be conducted for generalisation.
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