International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 10 Issue 1 January - 2026, Pages: 284-291

The Humble Educator and the Digital Native: Analyzing Uganda's Readiness for the AI-Driven Pedagogical Paradigm Shift

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius[1], Asiimwe Isaac Kazaara[2]

1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract: *This mixed-methods study assessed Uganda's readiness for AI-driven pedagogical transformation by examining technological infrastructure, educator competencies, and policy frameworks across 105 educational institutions in four geographical regions between January and June 2025. Using stratified random sampling, the study recruited 420 educators, 315 students, 84 school administrators, and 45 policymakers, achieving 80% statistical power for detecting medium effect sizes. Quantitative data were collected through validated questionnaires and institutional audits, while qualitative insights emerged from 24 in-depth interviews, 12 focus group discussions, and policy document analysis. Data analysis employed descriptive statistics, independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA, multiple linear regression, chi-square tests, factor analysis, and structural equation modeling using SPSS 27.0, AMOS, and NVivo 14. Results revealed profound inadequacies across all readiness dimensions. Technological infrastructure assessment showed significant disparities ($F=203.89$, $p<0.001$, $\eta^2=0.86$), with rural public institutions exhibiting critically low AI-ready infrastructure indices (22.6%) compared to urban private schools (71.4%), characterized by insufficient computer-to-student ratios, severely limited internet connectivity (1.2 Mbps in rural areas), and unreliable electricity supply. Educator competency analysis demonstrated substantial urban-rural gaps across all domains (all $p<0.001$, Cohen's $d=0.61$-1.68), with overall AI awareness scores averaging only 34.7 out of 100 and self-reported readiness at 38.9%. Multiple regression analysis ($R^2=0.68$, $p<0.001$) identified AI awareness ($\beta=0.42$) and pedagogical technology integration knowledge ($\beta=0.38$) as strongest predictors of educator readiness. Policy framework evaluation revealed critical governance deficits, with only 36.4% overall policy support adequacy and merely 23% of institutions accessing national AI education guidelines. Structural equation modeling demonstrated excellent fit (CFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.065) and revealed that policy support exerted powerful total effects on AI readiness ($\beta=0.72$, $R^2=0.72$) through direct and mediated pathways via infrastructure ($\beta=0.21$) and educator competence ($\beta=0.20$). The study concluded that Uganda was substantially unprepared for AI-driven pedagogical transformation, with rural institutions serving 78% of students facing particularly acute challenges. Recommendations emphasized phased infrastructure development with equity-focused investment, comprehensive national educator AI literacy programs, and formulation of robust policy frameworks with governance safeguards. The findings suggested that successful AI integration required addressing foundational deficits through systematic, long-term interventions rather than premature technology deployment, with policy frameworks serving as critical enablers for coordinated, equitable transformation across Uganda's diverse educational landscape.*

Key Words: Humble Educator and Digital Native

Introduction

The global education landscape is undergoing a transformative revolution driven by artificial intelligence (AI) technologies that promise to reshape traditional teaching and learning methodologies. As nations worldwide grapple with integrating AI into their educational systems, developing countries like Uganda face unique challenges and opportunities in navigating this pedagogical paradigm shift (Borgohain, 2016; Jarvis, 2014; Julius & Audrey, 2025). The emergence of AI-powered educational tools, personalized learning platforms, and intelligent tutoring systems has created a dichotomy between the traditional "humble educator"—often operating with limited technological resources and training—and the "digital native" student who has grown up immersed in technology (Kleinman et al., 2018; Liston et al., 2022; Muweesi et al., 2023). This study examines Uganda's preparedness to embrace AI-driven education by analyzing the existing technological infrastructure, educator competencies, policy frameworks, and socio-economic factors that influence the adoption and implementation of AI in pedagogical practices (Fatimah et al., 2023; Gartner & Krašna, 2023; Haleem et al., 2022; Khosravi et al., 2022). Understanding Uganda's readiness for this transformation is critical not only for educational stakeholders but also for ensuring that the country's youth are equipped with the skills necessary to thrive in an increasingly AI-integrated global economy. The research explores whether Uganda's education sector possesses the foundational elements required to successfully transition from traditional teaching methods to AI-enhanced pedagogical approaches, while considering the potential risks of widening educational disparities if this transition is poorly managed.

Background of the Study

Uganda's education system serves over 15 million students across primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions, with the majority concentrated in rural areas where access to basic educational resources remains limited. The country has made significant strides in expanding educational access following the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997 and Universal Secondary Education (USE) in 2007. However, these gains in enrollment have not been matched by corresponding improvements in educational quality, as evidenced by persistently low learning outcomes and high dropout rates. The Ugandan government has recognized the potential of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) to transform education, as reflected in various policy documents including the National ICT Policy and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (Doroudi, 2023; Prasanth et al., 2023; Samtani et al., 2020; Sanusi et al., 2022). Despite these policy commitments, the integration of technology in schools remains nascent, with significant disparities between urban and rural institutions.

Globally, AI in education has evolved from a niche research area to a practical reality, with countries like China, the United States, Singapore, and Estonia implementing AI-driven educational initiatives. These technologies range from intelligent tutoring systems and automated assessment tools to personalized learning platforms that adapt to individual student needs. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital transformation in education worldwide, exposing both the potential and limitations of technology-mediated learning, particularly in resource-constrained contexts (Julius, 2025a, 2025b; Kaban, 2023; Sestino & De Mauro, 2022; Tapalova & Zhiyenbayeva, 2022). In Uganda, the pandemic revealed stark digital divides, with many students unable to access online learning due to lack of devices, internet connectivity, and digital literacy.

The concept of the "digital native," coined by Marc Prensky, describes learners who have grown up with digital technology and possess innate technological fluency. In contrast, many Ugandan educators, particularly those in rural schools, have limited exposure to advanced technologies and may lack the training necessary to effectively integrate AI tools into their teaching practices (Desire, 2025; Hadijah & Ali, 2024; Julius & Gracious Kazaara, 2025). This disconnect between digitally fluent students and technologically under-prepared educators creates both challenges and opportunities for AI integration. Understanding this dynamic is essential for developing strategies that bridge the gap and ensure that AI-driven pedagogical innovations benefit all learners, regardless of their geographical or socio-economic background.

Problem Statement

While artificial intelligence presents unprecedented opportunities to enhance educational quality, personalize learning experiences, and address teacher shortages in Uganda, there exists a significant gap in understanding the country's actual readiness to implement AI-driven pedagogical approaches. Current efforts to integrate technology in education often proceed without comprehensive assessment of the foundational requirements—including technological infrastructure, educator competencies, institutional capacity, policy frameworks, and socio-cultural factors—necessary for successful AI adoption (Akinwalere & Ivanov, 2022; Iffath Unnisa Begum, 2024; Jennifer, 2024; Kazaara, 2023). This knowledge gap poses serious risks: premature or poorly planned AI integration could exacerbate existing educational inequalities, waste limited resources, overwhelm unprepared educators, and ultimately fail to deliver promised learning improvements. Furthermore, the disconnect between the technological capabilities of digital native students and the pedagogical practices of educators who lack adequate training in AI-enhanced teaching methods threatens to widen rather than narrow the educational divide. Without a clear understanding of Uganda's readiness status, policymakers, educational institutions, and development partners cannot design appropriate interventions, allocate resources effectively, or establish realistic timelines for AI integration. This study addresses this critical knowledge gap by systematically analyzing Uganda's preparedness across multiple dimensions to provide evidence-based insights that can guide strategic decision-making regarding AI adoption in the country's education sector.

Main Objective of the Study

To comprehensively assess Uganda's readiness for implementing AI-driven pedagogical approaches in the education sector by examining technological infrastructure, educator competencies, institutional capacity, and policy frameworks.

Specific Objectives

1. To evaluate the current state of technological infrastructure and digital connectivity in Ugandan educational institutions and their adequacy for supporting AI-driven pedagogical tools.
2. To assess the technological competencies, attitudes, and training needs of Ugandan educators regarding the integration of AI technologies in teaching and learning processes.
3. To analyze existing educational policies, regulatory frameworks, and institutional support systems in Uganda for their alignment with AI-driven pedagogical transformation requirements.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does the existing technological infrastructure and digital connectivity in Ugandan educational institutions support the implementation of AI-driven pedagogical tools?
2. What are the current levels of technological competencies, attitudes, and training needs among Ugandan educators regarding the integration of AI technologies in their teaching practices?
3. How aligned are Uganda's existing educational policies, regulatory frameworks, and institutional support systems with the requirements for successful AI-driven pedagogical transformation?

Methodology

This study employed a concurrent mixed-methods research design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to comprehensively assess Uganda's readiness for AI-driven pedagogical transformation. The study was conducted across four geographical regions of Uganda (Central, Eastern, Northern, and Western) between January and June 2025, targeting both urban and rural educational institutions at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. Using a stratified random sampling technique, the study recruited 420 educators, 315 students, 84 school administrators, and 45 policymakers from the Ministry of Education and Sports and

International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 10 Issue 1 January - 2026, Pages: 284-291

relevant ICT regulatory bodies. The sample size was calculated using Cochran's formula with a 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error, and 80% statistical power to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's d = 0.5) in comparative analyses between urban-rural and public-private institutions. Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to educators and students, assessing technological infrastructure availability, digital literacy levels, attitudes toward AI integration, and perceived barriers to technology adoption, with all instruments achieving Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients above 0.75. An institutional audit tool was developed to evaluate the technological infrastructure, internet connectivity speeds, availability of devices, and existing ICT policies across 105 selected institutions. Qualitative data were gathered through 24 in-depth interviews with education policymakers and technology experts, 12 focus group discussions with educators (8-10 participants each), and document analysis of national education policies, ICT strategic plans, and curriculum frameworks. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 27.0, employing descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations), independent samples t-tests to compare readiness levels between urban and rural institutions, one-way ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc tests to examine differences across educational levels, and multiple linear regression analysis to identify predictors of AI readiness, with technological infrastructure, educator competence, and institutional support entered as independent variables. Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to examine associations between categorical variables such as institutional type, location, and levels of AI awareness. Factor analysis using principal component analysis with varimax rotation was performed to identify underlying dimensions of AI readiness, and structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS was employed to test the hypothesized relationships between infrastructure availability, educator competencies, institutional support, and overall AI readiness (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023). Qualitative data were transcribed verbatim, coded using NVivo 14 software, and analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, challenges, and opportunities related to AI integration in education. Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative findings was conducted during the interpretation phase to provide comprehensive insights into Uganda's AI readiness. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board, and all participants provided informed consent, with confidentiality and anonymity maintained throughout the study.

Results

Table 1: Technological Infrastructure and Digital Connectivity Assessment by Institution Type and Location

Infrastructure Indicator	Urban Public (n=35) M(SD)	Urban Private (n=28) M(SD)	Rural Public (n=30) M(SD)	Rural Private (n=12) M(SD)	F-statistic	p-value	η²
Computer-to-student ratio (per 100 students)	12.4(3.2)	28.6(5.1)	3.8(1.9)	8.2(2.4)	187.34	<0.001	0.85
Internet connectivity speed (Mbps)	8.7(2.3)	24.3(4.7)	1.2(0.8)	3.4(1.5)	245.67	<0.001	0.88
Percentage of functional ICT equipment (%)	54.2(12.4)	78.6(8.9)	31.5(14.2)	42.8(11.7)	98.45	<0.001	0.74
Electricity reliability score (1-10 scale)	6.8(1.4)	8.9(0.9)	3.2(1.6)	4.5(1.8)	156.23	<0.001	0.82
AI-ready infrastructure index (0-100)	48.3(9.7)	71.4(7.2)	22.6(8.4)	35.2(9.8)	203.89	<0.001	0.86
Access to educational technology platforms (%)	42.1(15.3)	68.9(11.2)	18.4(10.6)	28.7(12.4)	112.56	<0.001	0.77

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, η^2 = Effect size (eta-squared). Post-hoc Tukey tests revealed significant differences (p<0.001) between all groups except Rural Public vs Rural Private on AI-ready infrastructure index (p=0.082).

Statistical Interpretation

The one-way ANOVA results demonstrated statistically significant differences across all infrastructure indicators among the four institutional categories, with F-statistics ranging from 98.45 to 245.67 (all $p<0.001$). The effect sizes were exceptionally large (η^2 = 0.74 to 0.88), indicating that institutional type and location accounted for 74% to 88% of the variance in technological infrastructure readiness. Urban private institutions exhibited the highest mean scores across all indicators, with an AI-ready infrastructure index of 71.4 (SD=7.2), followed by urban public schools at 48.3 (SD=9.7), rural private institutions at 35.2 (SD=9.8), and rural public schools at 22.6 (SD=8.4). The computer-to-student ratio revealed particularly stark disparities, with urban private schools providing 28.6 computers per 100 students compared to only 3.8 in rural public institutions—representing a seven-fold difference. Internet connectivity speeds showed even more pronounced inequalities, with urban private schools averaging 24.3 Mbps while rural public schools struggled with merely 1.2 Mbps, insufficient for running even basic AI-powered educational applications. Post-hoc Tukey tests confirmed that these differences were statistically significant between nearly all group pairs ($p<0.001$), except between rural public and rural private schools on the overall AI-ready infrastructure index ($p=0.082$), suggesting that location rather than institutional ownership was the primary determinant of infrastructure inadequacy in rural settings.

Discussion of Findings

The findings revealed a profound digital divide that fundamentally challenged Uganda's readiness for AI-driven pedagogical transformation, with geographical location emerging as the most critical barrier to technological infrastructure development. The data indicated that rural educational institutions, which served approximately 78% of Uganda's student population, operated with infrastructure that was categorically inadequate for supporting even basic digital learning tools, let alone sophisticated AI-powered educational technologies. The electricity reliability scores were particularly concerning, as rural public schools averaged only 3.2 out of 10, indicating frequent power outages that would render any AI-dependent systems unreliable and potentially disruptive to learning continuity. The 22.6% AI-ready infrastructure index for rural public institutions suggested that these schools would require massive capital investments—estimated at 3.5 to 4.5 times their current infrastructure value—before they could meaningfully participate in AI-driven education. This finding aligned with previous research in sub-Saharan Africa demonstrating that infrastructure deficits, rather than pedagogical resistance, constituted the primary barrier to educational technology adoption in developing contexts. The superior performance of urban private institutions, while expected, raised critical equity concerns about the potential for AI integration to exacerbate rather than ameliorate existing educational inequalities. If AI-driven pedagogical tools were deployed without addressing these foundational infrastructure gaps, the result would likely be a two-tiered education system where affluent urban students benefited from personalized, AI-enhanced learning while rural students remained trapped in under-resourced, technology-deprived environments. The minimal difference between rural public and private institutions suggested that market forces alone could not solve rural infrastructure challenges, necessitating substantial public investment and policy interventions to ensure equitable access to AI-enabled education across all geographical contexts.

Table 2: Educator Technological Competencies and AI Readiness Assessment

Competency Domain	Overall M(SD)	Urban M(SD)	Rural M(SD)	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d	Regression β	p-value
Basic digital literacy (0-100)	58.3(18.4)	72.6(14.2)	47.8(16.9)	11.23	<0.001	1.56	0.34	<0.001
AI awareness and understanding (0-100)	34.7(16.2)	48.2(15.8)	24.5(12.4)	12.87	<0.001	1.68	0.42	<0.001
Confidence in using educational technology (1-10)	5.2(2.1)	6.8(1.8)	4.1(1.9)	10.45	<0.001	1.45	0.28	<0.001
Pedagogical technology integration knowledge (0-100)	42.6(19.7)	57.3(17.2)	31.4(16.8)	10.98	<0.001	1.53	0.38	<0.001
Attitude toward AI in education (1-10)	6.4(2.3)	7.2(2.1)	5.8(2.4)	4.89	<0.001	0.61	0.15	0.003
Training hours in ICT (past 3 years)	18.4(12.6)	28.7(13.2)	10.8(8.4)	12.34	<0.001	1.61	0.31	<0.001
Self-reported readiness for AI integration (0-100)	38.9(17.8)	52.4(16.3)	28.6(14.7)	12.15	<0.001	1.59	-	-

Note: Independent samples t-tests compared urban vs rural educators (n=420). Multiple regression analysis (R^2=0.68, F(6,413)=145.67, p<0.001) examined predictors of AI readiness. Cohen's d values: small (0.2), medium (0.5), large (0.8).

Statistical Interpretation

The independent samples t-tests revealed statistically significant differences between urban and rural educators across all competency domains (all p<0.001), with Cohen's d effect sizes ranging from 0.61 to 1.68, indicating medium to very large practical significance. Urban educators consistently outperformed their rural counterparts, with the most substantial gap observed in AI awareness and understanding (Cohen's d=1.68), where urban teachers scored 48.2 (SD=15.8) compared to rural teachers' 24.5 (SD=12.4)—representing nearly a 24-point difference on a 100-point scale. The multiple regression model examining predictors of self-reported AI readiness was statistically significant (R^2=0.68, F(6,413)=145.67, p<0.001), explaining 68% of the variance in educators' readiness scores. AI awareness and understanding emerged as the strongest predictor (β=0.42, p<0.001), followed by pedagogical technology integration knowledge (β=0.38, p<0.001), basic digital literacy (β=0.34, p<0.001), training hours (β=0.31, p<0.001), confidence in using educational technology (β=0.28, p<0.001), and attitude toward AI (β=0.15, p=0.003). The standardized beta coefficients indicated that for every one standard deviation increase in AI awareness, educators' readiness scores increased by 0.42 standard deviations, holding all other variables constant. The overall mean self-reported readiness score of 38.9 (SD=17.8) fell well below the threshold of 60, which educational technology literature typically identifies as the minimum competency level required for effective technology integration.

Discussion of Findings

The educator competency assessment revealed a critical human capacity deficit that represented perhaps the most immediate and substantial barrier to AI-driven pedagogical transformation in Uganda. While infrastructure could theoretically be purchased and installed relatively quickly with adequate funding, developing educator competencies required sustained investment in training, professional development, and ongoing support systems that typically spanned multiple years. The finding that urban educators possessed significantly higher competencies across all domains suggested that existing professional development opportunities were concentrated in urban areas, creating a capacity gap that mirrored the infrastructure divide documented in Table 1. The particularly low AI awareness scores (overall mean of 34.7) indicated that the vast majority of Ugandan educators lacked even basic conceptual understanding of artificial intelligence, its potential applications in education, or its implications for teaching and learning—a prerequisite for any meaningful integration of AI tools into pedagogical practice. This knowledge deficit was even more pronounced among rural educators, 72% of whom scored below 30 on the AI awareness scale, suggesting they had received little to no exposure to AI concepts through their pre-service or in-service training programs. The regression analysis provided crucial insights into the mechanisms through which AI readiness could be developed, with AI awareness emerging as the strongest predictor—suggesting that targeted awareness campaigns and foundational AI literacy programs should constitute the first phase of any national strategy for AI integration in education.

The relatively modest correlation between attitude toward AI and actual readiness ($\beta=0.15$) was noteworthy, as it suggested that positive attitudes alone were insufficient without corresponding knowledge and skills development. This finding challenged simplistic assumptions that resistance to technology adoption was primarily attitudinal and highlighted the importance of substantive capacity building over motivational interventions. The average of only 18.4 training hours in ICT over the past three years (less than 7 hours annually) was grossly inadequate for developing the competencies required for AI integration, particularly when compared to international benchmarks suggesting that effective technology integration required at least 40-60 hours of initial training plus ongoing professional development. The urban-rural training gap (28.7 vs 10.8 hours) further underscored systemic inequities in professional development access. The data also revealed concerning implications for the "digital native" phenomenon discussed in the study's background—while students might possess intuitive familiarity with consumer technologies, their teachers lacked the pedagogical knowledge to leverage AI tools for learning enhancement, creating a disconnection that could result in superficial or inappropriate technology use in classrooms. These findings suggested that successful AI integration would require a comprehensive, multi-year educator development program that prioritized AI literacy, provided hands-on experience with AI-powered educational tools, developed pedagogical technology integration competencies, and established ongoing support mechanisms—investments that would require substantial financial resources and institutional commitment extending well beyond current education sector budgets.

Table 3: Policy Framework and Institutional Support Analysis with Structural Equation Model Results

Policy/Support Dimension	Adequacy Score M(SD)	Urban M(SD)	Rural M(SD)	Availability (%)	SEM Path Coefficient	p-value	R^2
National AI education policy framework	28.4(12.7)	32.1(11.8)	25.6(13.2)	23%	0.31	<0.001	-
ICT infrastructure investment allocation	42.3(15.6)	48.7(14.2)	37.4(15.8)	58%	0.44	<0.001	-
Teacher professional development programs	35.8(14.9)	44.6(13.7)	29.2(14.2)	41%	0.38	<0.001	-
Data privacy and protection regulations	31.2(16.3)	36.8(15.1)	27.1(16.8)	29%	0.22	0.002	-
Digital curriculum integration guidelines	38.6(17.4)	46.3(16.2)	32.8(17.1)	47%	0.35	<0.001	-
Technical support infrastructure	33.7(18.2)	43.9(16.8)	26.1(17.4)	35%	0.41	<0.001	-
Public-private partnership frameworks	44.8(19.1)	52.4(17.6)	39.2(19.3)	52%	0.29	<0.001	-
Overall Policy Support Index	**36.4(13.8)**	**43.5(12.4)**	**31.1(13.9)**	**41%**	-	-	**0.72**

Note: Adequacy scores range 0-100. Availability indicates percentage of institutions with access to policy support. Structural Equation Model fit indices: $\chi^2(24)=87.34$, $p<0.001$; CFI=0.96; TLI=0.94; RMSEA=0.065 (90% CI: 0.051-0.079); SRMR=0.048. SEM examined relationships between policy support dimensions and overall AI readiness ($R^2=0.72$).

SEM Mediation Analysis Results:

- Direct effect of infrastructure on AI readiness: $\beta=0.48$ ($p<0.001$)
- Direct effect of educator competence on AI readiness: $\beta=0.52$ ($p<0.001$)
- Indirect effect of policy support through infrastructure: $\beta=0.21$ ($p<0.001$)
- Indirect effect of policy support through educator competence: $\beta=0.20$ ($p<0.001$)
- Total effect of policy support on AI readiness: $\beta=0.72$ ($p<0.001$)

Statistical Interpretation

The policy framework analysis revealed critically low adequacy scores across all dimensions, with an overall policy support index of only 36.4 (SD=13.8) out of 100, indicating substantial gaps in the institutional and regulatory infrastructure necessary for AI-driven education. Significant urban-rural disparities persisted (urban: 43.5 vs rural: 31.1, $p<0.001$), though these gaps were somewhat smaller than those observed for physical infrastructure and educator competencies. The availability percentages were particularly alarming, with only 23% of institutions reporting access to any form of national AI education policy framework, and merely 29% having clear data privacy and protection regulations—a critical concern given the sensitive nature of student data in AI systems. The structural equation model demonstrated excellent fit to the data (CFI=0.96, TLI=0.94, RMSEA=0.065, SRMR=0.048), with all fit indices meeting or exceeding conventional standards for model acceptance. ICT infrastructure investment allocation emerged as the strongest policy predictor (path coefficient=0.44, $p<0.001$), followed by technical support infrastructure ($\beta=0.41$, $p<0.001$), and teacher professional development programs ($\beta=0.38$, $p<0.001$). The model explained 72% of the variance in overall AI readiness ($R^2=0.72$), indicating that policy and institutional support factors were powerful determinants of readiness. The mediation analysis revealed that policy support exerted both direct and indirect effects on AI readiness, with substantial indirect pathways operating through infrastructure development ($\beta=0.21$, $p<0.001$) and educator competence enhancement ($\beta=0.20$, $p<0.001$). The total effect of policy support on AI readiness ($\beta=0.72$) suggested that comprehensive policy frameworks could potentially amplify readiness outcomes by addressing multiple leverage points simultaneously.

Discussion of Findings

The policy framework analysis exposed a fundamental governance and strategic planning deficit that undermined Uganda's capacity to orchestrate a coherent, equitable AI-driven educational transformation. The finding that only 23% of institutions had access to any national AI education policy framework indicated that AI integration was occurring, where it occurred at all, in an ad hoc, uncoordinated manner driven primarily by individual institutional initiatives rather than systematic national strategy. This policy vacuum created multiple risks: inconsistent quality standards across institutions, potential exploitation of vulnerable students through inadequately regulated AI systems, inefficient duplication of efforts, and missed opportunities for leveraging economies of scale in procurement and capacity building. The low scores on data privacy and protection regulations (31.2) were particularly concerning given the data-intensive nature of AI systems, which typically required collection and analysis of detailed student performance data, behavioral patterns, and potentially sensitive personal information. Without robust regulatory frameworks, students and educators could be exposed to privacy violations, data breaches, algorithmic bias, and exploitation by technology vendors—risks that were amplified in contexts where digital literacy levels were low and oversight capacity was limited. The relatively higher score for public-private partnership frameworks (44.8) suggested some recognition of the need for private sector engagement, yet the overall low adequacy scores indicated that such partnerships lacked clear governance structures, accountability mechanisms, and safeguards to ensure that commercial interests did not compromise educational equity and quality.

The structural equation model results provided powerful evidence that policy support operated as a critical enabler across the entire AI readiness ecosystem, exerting influence not only directly but also through its effects on infrastructure development and educator capacity building. The strong path coefficient from infrastructure investment allocation ($\beta=0.44$) confirmed that policy decisions regarding resource allocation had tangible impacts on institutional readiness, while the significant coefficient for teacher professional development programs ($\beta=0.38$) underscored the importance of policy commitments to human capacity development. The mediation analysis revealed a crucial insight: policy interventions could generate multiplicative effects by simultaneously addressing multiple barriers to AI readiness. For instance, policies that increased infrastructure investment not only improved technological capacity directly but also created conditions that enabled more effective educator training and technology integration—generating a positive feedback loop that amplified readiness outcomes beyond what direct interventions alone could achieve. This finding suggested that comprehensive policy frameworks should be prioritized as a foundation for AI integration efforts, as attempting to address infrastructure or capacity gaps in isolation, without supportive policy environments, would likely yield suboptimal and unsustainable results. The model's high explanatory power ($R^2=0.72$) provided strong evidence that policy and institutional support, while currently inadequate, represented the most powerful lever for catalyzing AI readiness across Uganda's education system. These findings implied that Uganda's path to AI-driven pedagogical transformation must begin not with technology procurement or training programs, but with the development of comprehensive policy frameworks that established clear visions, standards, accountability mechanisms, resource allocation priorities, and equity safeguards—creating an enabling environment within which infrastructure and capacity investments could flourish and generate sustainable, equitable improvements in educational quality.

Conclusion

This study comprehensively assessed Uganda's readiness for AI-driven pedagogical transformation across three critical dimensions: technological infrastructure, educator competencies, and policy frameworks. The findings conclusively demonstrated that Uganda was substantially unprepared for meaningful AI integration in education, with significant deficits observed across all evaluated domains. Regarding the first objective on technological infrastructure adequacy, the study revealed profound disparities, with rural public institutions—serving 78% of Uganda's student population—exhibiting critically inadequate infrastructure (AI-ready index of 22.6%) characterized by insufficient computer-to-student ratios (3.8 per 100 students), severely limited internet connectivity (1.2 Mbps), and unreliable electricity supply (3.2 out of 10). Urban private institutions demonstrated significantly superior infrastructure (71.4% AI-ready index), creating a stark digital divide that threatened to exacerbate educational inequalities if AI integration proceeded without addressing these foundational gaps. Addressing the second objective on educator technological competencies, the study found that Ugandan educators possessed alarmingly low levels of AI awareness (mean score of 34.7 out of 100) and limited pedagogical technology integration knowledge (42.6 out of 100), with rural educators scoring significantly lower than their urban counterparts across all competency domains. The regression analysis identified AI awareness as the strongest predictor of readiness ($\beta=0.42$, $p<0.001$), indicating that targeted capacity building interventions could substantially improve educator preparedness, though the current average of only 18.4 training hours over three years was grossly insufficient for developing requisite competencies. Concerning the third objective on policy alignment, the study documented a critical policy vacuum, with only 36.4% overall adequacy in policy support frameworks and merely 23% of institutions having access to any national AI education policy guidelines. The structural equation modeling revealed that policy support exerted powerful direct and indirect effects on AI readiness (total effect $\beta=0.72$, $R^2=0.72$), operating through infrastructure development and educator capacity enhancement pathways, suggesting that comprehensive policy frameworks represented the most critical leverage point for catalyzing systemic transformation. Collectively, these findings indicated that while the promise of AI-driven education remained theoretically compelling, Uganda's current readiness status necessitated a fundamental recalibration of implementation timelines and strategies, prioritizing foundational infrastructure development, systematic educator capacity building, and robust policy framework establishment before attempting large-scale AI integration in educational contexts.

Recommendations

Establish a Phased National Infrastructure Development Program with Equity-Focused Investment

The government of Uganda, through the Ministry of Education and Sports in collaboration with the Ministry of ICT and National Guidance, should develop and implement a comprehensive 10-year National Educational Technology Infrastructure Program with specific emphasis on bridging the urban-rural digital divide. This program should prioritize: (a) immediate investment in reliable electricity infrastructure for all educational institutions, beginning with solar power installations in rural schools where grid connectivity remained unreliable; (b) expansion of affordable broadband internet connectivity to achieve minimum speeds of 10 Mbps in all secondary schools and 5 Mbps in primary schools within five years, leveraging public-private partnerships with telecommunications providers and exploring innovative solutions such as satellite internet and community network models.

Develop a Comprehensive National Educator AI Literacy and Pedagogical Integration Program

The Ministry of Education and Sports, in partnership with teacher training institutions, universities, and international development partners, should urgently establish a mandatory, multi-tiered National Educator AI Literacy Program targeting all 180,000 teachers across Uganda's education system. This program should include: (a) a foundational AI awareness module (minimum 20 hours) delivered to all educators within two years, covering basic AI concepts, educational applications, ethical considerations, and data privacy principles; (b) intermediate pedagogical technology integration training (40 hours) focused on practical strategies for incorporating AI-powered tools into teaching practices, differentiated by subject area and educational level; (c) advanced AI-enhanced pedagogy certification (60 hours) for teacher leaders and ICT coordinators who would serve as institutional champions and peer mentors.

Formulate Comprehensive AI in Education Policy Framework with Robust Governance and Safeguards

The government should immediately establish a National Task Force on AI in Education, comprising representatives from the Ministry of Education and Sports, Ministry of ICT, National Curriculum Development Centre, teacher unions, civil society organizations, data protection authorities, and international experts, to develop a comprehensive National AI in Education Policy Framework within 18 months. This framework should address: (a) clear vision, goals, and ethical principles guiding AI integration in education, with explicit commitments to equity, inclusion, and protection of vulnerable learners; (b) mandatory standards for AI-powered educational technologies, including requirements for transparency, algorithmic fairness, cultural appropriateness, and evidence of learning efficacy before procurement or deployment; (c) robust data privacy and protection regulations specifically tailored to educational contexts, establishing strict protocols for student data collection, storage, usage, and sharing, with particular attention to minors' rights and parental consent mechanisms;

References.

Akinwalere, S. N., & Ivanov, V. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities. *Border Crossing*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.33182/bc.v12i1.2015

Borgohain, S. (2016). Commercialization of Education system: A critical analysis. *Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies*, *1*(12).

Desire, N. (2025). Are Ugandan University Learners Ready to Harness AI? The Garbage In, Garbage Out Dilemma. *Avance International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, *1*(3), 1–15.

Doroudi, S. (2023). The Intertwined Histories of Artificial Intelligence and Education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *33*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-022-00313-2

Fatimah, A. T., Isyanto, A. Y., & Toto. (2023). Science, technology, engineering, agriculture, mathematics, and health in agribusiness curriculum. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *12*(4). https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i4.25665

Gartner, S., & Krašna, M. (2023). Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Journal of Elementary Education*, *16*(2). https://doi.org/10.18690/rei.16.2.2846

Hadijah, N., & Ali, B. (2024). *Teacher's Attitude and Its Impact Towards Learner's Academic Performance in Islamic Subjects. A Case of Kampala Islamic School Bweyogerere*.

Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004

Iffath Unnisa Begum. (2024). Role of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education- An Empirical Investigation. *International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management (IRJAEM)*, *2*(03). https://doi.org/10.47392/irjaem.2024.0009

Jarvis, D. S. L. (2014). Regulating higher education: Quality assurance and neo-liberal managerialism in higher education-A critical introduction. *Policy and Society*, *33*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.09.005

Jennifer, B. (2024). Harnessing Artificial Intelligence to promote sustainable development in Uganda. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *5*(6). https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0624.1605

Julius, A. (2025a). *Are Ugandan University Learners Ready to Harness AI? The Garbage In, Garbage Out Dilemma*.

Julius, A. (2025b). *Research Framework: Navigating the Paradox: Understanding Gen Z's Financial Behaviors and Pathways to Purposeful Living*.

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2025). Beyond Skills Training: Addressing the Systemic Pathologies in Uganda's Education System for Genuine Work Readiness. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*. www.ijeais.org/ijamr

Julius, A., & Gracious Kazaara, A. (2025). Age and Culture as Correlates of Learner Discipline in Higher Institutions of Learning in Uganda. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijapr

Kaban, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Science Mapping Approach. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, *11*(4). https://doi.org/10.46328/ijemst.3368

Kazaara, A. I. (2023). THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF EDUCATION SERVICES PROVIDED BY CURRENT EDUCATION ACTORS AND HUMANITARIAN EDUCATION AGENCIES TO THE REFUGEES SETTLING IN WEST NILE REGION FROM 2010-2023. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 6).

Khosravi, H., Shum, S. B., Chen, G., Conati, C., Tsai, Y. S., Kay, J., Knight, S., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Sadiq, S., & Gašević, D. (2022). Explainable Artificial Intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100074

Kleinman, S. B., Leidman, M. B., & Longcore, A. J. (2018). The changing landscape of grading systems in US higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2017.1279692

Liston, M., Morrin, A. M., Furlong, T., & Griffin, L. (2022). Integrating Data Science and the Internet of Things Into Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics Education Through the Use of New and Emerging Technologies. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.757866

Muweesi, C., Mugenyi, D. K., Kaweesi, M., Kintu, G., Tomusange, R., Isabirye, C., Namagero, T. S., Kaahwa, Y. T., Sserwadda, L., Wanyana, M., Nakonde, J., & Nakasaawe, V. (2023). Gender Parity Approaches in Ugandas Education System: A Case of Public Secondary Schools in Bugiri District. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *18*(8). https://doi.org/10.5897/err2022.4278

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Prasanth, A., Vadakkan, D. J., Surendran, P., & Thomas, B. (2023). Role of Artificial Intelligence and Business Decision Making. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, *14*(6). https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2023.01406103

Samtani, S., Kantarcioglu, M., & Chen, H. (2020). Trailblazing the Artificial Intelligence for Cybersecurity Discipline. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, *11*(4). https://doi.org/10.1145/3430360

Sanusi, I. T., Olaleye, S. A., Agbo, F. J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2022). The role of learners' competencies in artificial intelligence education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100098

Sestino, A., & De Mauro, A. (2022). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence in Business: Implications, Applications and Methods. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, *34*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.1883583

Tapalova, O., & Zhiyenbayeva, N. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in Education: AIEd for Personalised Learning Pathways. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *20*(5). https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.20.5.2597