Japan Bilingual Publishing Co.

Cultural Conflict and Integration

https://ojs.bilpub.com/index.php/cci

REVIEW

Decoloniality and the Heritage-Based Education 5.0 Curriculum in Zimbabwe

Rodwell Kumbirai Wuta [1,2]

[1] *Department of Educational Foundations, Belvedere Technical Teachers' College, Harare P.O. Box BE100, Zimbabwe*

[2] *Department of Educational Foundations, The University of Zimbabwe, Harare P.O. Box MP167, Zimbabwe*

ABSTRACT

Zimbabwe has a chequered history of settler colonialism whose long-lasting effects and structures are configured into a matrix called 'coloniality' (the colonial logic). In the first three decades of independence, Zimbabwe's higher and tertiary education curriculum was in an inherited situation as it followed the colonial Education 3.0 Model. Hence, it remained an education for disenfranchisement and disempowerment. In 2019, the Zimbabwe Government sought to address this anomaly by operationalising the Heritage-Based Education 5.0 curriculum (HBE 5.0 curriculum). With decolonial lenses, therefore, this review paper examines Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum in terms of the potential to counteract and challenge the vestiges and legacies of colonialism that continue to afflict Afro-Zimbabweans in the postcolonial era. Informed by the postcolonial and Afrocentric theories, the paper discourses the decolonial outlook of the HBE 5.0 curriculum, estimating the emancipatory and anti-imperialistic predispositions that render it fashionable within the postcolonial dispensation. As emerging from the discussion, the HBE 5.0 curriculum is to a larger extent replete with decolonial proclivities consistent with critical consciousness and *Sankofa*. Hence, the said curriculum is strategically positioned to contribute to the rediscovery, restoration, and reparation of Afro-Zimbabwean power, knowledge, and being. With its penchant for decoloniality, therefore, the HBE 5.0 curriculum is envisioned to contribute significantly to the moulding of a new humanity living in a free, united, peaceful, and prosperous Zimbabwe. Consequently, the paper recommends escalation of critical consciousness, *Sankofa*, and the heritage-based philosophy to underpin the Education 5.0 curriculum within the decolonial trajectory of unlearning

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Rodwell Kumbirai Wuta, Department of Educational Foundations, Belvedere Technical Teachers' College, Harare P.O. Box BE100, Zimbabwe; Department of Educational Foundations, The University of Zimbabwe, Harare P.O. Box MP167, Zimbabwe; Email: rodwellwuta@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23 July 2025 | Revised: 25 December 2025 | Accepted: 7 January 2026 | Published Online: 19 January 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/cci.v3i1.619

CITATION

Wuta, R.K., 2026. Decoloniality and the Heritage-Based Education 5.0 Curriculum in Zimbabwe. Cultural Conflict and Integration. 3(1): 44–54.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/cci.v3i1.619

Western ideologies.

Keywords: Coloniality; Decolonisation; Decoloniality; Postcoloniality; Afrocentrism

1. Introduction and Background

This paper explores the confluence of decoloniality and Zimbabwe's Heritage-Based Education 5.0 curriculum (abbreviated as HBE 5.0 curriculum). Thus, the paper discourses the decolonial outlook of Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum, estimating the emancipatory and anti-imperialistic predispositions that render the said curriculum framework fashionable within the postcolonial dispensation.

As a decolonial reflection, the current discourse comes against a background of Zimbabwe's chequered history of settler colonialism. Thus, the year 1890 marks the arrival of the Pioneer Column in Zimbabwe, the hoisting of the Union Jack at Salisbury, and the effective British South Africa Company (BSAC) occupation of Mashonaland. Period 1893–1894 sees the demise of the Ndebele Kingdom and extension of the BSAC rule to Matebeleland, a double-barreled event that concluded the colonisation of land between the Limpopo and Zambezi Rivers—the land which colonialists then named Rhodesia (after Cecil John Rhodes their leader and founder).

The Pioneer Column comprised of the core company members who had shares in the BSAC as well as mere mercenaries who (upon being promised gold claims and acres of land each) simply joined with prospects of making economic fortunes in the land North of the Limpopo. It is these mercenaries who in the history of the colonisation of Zimbabwe are called the 'settlers'. From 1890 to 1922, Rhodesia was a BSAC colony and this company rule was an epitome of what Mendoza refers to as 'exploitation colonialism' [1]. With the rising influence of the settlers, a Settler Government took over power from the BSAC in 1923 and this new government earned the name—'the Responsible Government'. Exploitation colonialism, thus, morphed into 'settler colonialism', to use Mendoza's nomenclature. Operating under some Crown control, the Responsible Government administered Rhodesia until Ian Douglas Smith's Unilateral Declaration of Independence of 1965, which saw the Settlers (under Smith) shaking off their mother country's influence thereby asserting full settler control over Rhodesia (full-blown settler colonialism taking root).

The higher and tertiary education given particularly to Africans by the settler colonial regime in the then Rhodesia, herein dubbed Education 3.0 was a product of the colonial antecedents synopsised in the foregoing. This colonial Education 3.0 Model encompassed the three missions of 'teaching', 'research', and 'community outreach'. Such a system was inhibiting and limiting, i.e., it limited African potentialities at best to 'job-seeking' and 'serving' since it availed less or no opportunities for Africans to innovate and industrialise to become job-creators and employers. It was, therefore, an education for oppression, disenfranchisement, disempowerment, underdevelopment, and impoverishment of Africans.

Residues of settler colonialism (i.e., the long-lasting effects and structures) are configured into a matrix called 'coloniality' or the 'colonial logic'. A glaring manifestation of coloniality (the preponderance of Euro-North American-centric modernity) within the so-called postcolonial Zimbabwe was the inheritance of and continuance with the colonial Education 3.0 Model of higher and tertiary curriculum up until 2018. It is against this background of coloniality that the paper reflects on Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum as promulgated and operationalised since 2019, estimating its potential to challenge and counteract the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being.

2. Theoretical Underpinnings

The current paper is informed by the postcolonial theory because "the decolonial project is well embedded in the postcolonial agenda" [2]. The postcolonial theory provides a critique of the Euro-North American-centric modernity [3]. Exponents of the postcolonial theory include Antonio Gramsci, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha, according to whom, this theory attempts to disrupt the dominant discourse of colonial power [4]. Thus, the postcolonial theory is endowed with a strong change agenda [4], motivated by the realisation that academic systems of knowledge are rooted in a colonial mindset and that the voices of the ex-colonised have been made invisible. In other words, the postcolonial theory

challenges the perpetuity of colonial logic especially within the domain of education in the formerly colonised societies. Hence, the postcolonial theory serves to explain and destabilise coloniality within the formerly colonised societies of Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) in general and Zimbabwe in particular.

The postcolonial theory harmonises with the Afrocentric theory, which is sometimes called the Afro-centered paradigm or Afrocentric cosmic view or simply Afrocentrism. Afrocentrism is a reaction by African writers and philosophers to deconstruct the colonial and Western-orchestrated submissions and positions, most of which are mendacious, so that Africans are afforded the opportunity to understand African reality from the African perspective [5]. Africans, thus, needed to view reality from an Afrocentric worldview rather than treat everything Eurocentric as the truth. Afrocentrism is a manifestation of critical consciousness which enjoins Africans to view and interpret their own experiences on their own terms, through the lenses of their worldviews, and with a questioning frame of mind, rather than being forced to understand their own reality through Eurocentric lenses [6]. Afrocentrism is not isolationism but thinking and acting African [7]. The Afrocentric theory, therefore, has a liberatory inclination which readily harmonises with decoloniality.

3. Research Methodology

This is documentary analysis or secondary research, a qualitative research design in which the researcher systematically examines existing documents or literature to extract meaningful data relevant to issues under scrutiny. Documentary analysis is efficient, less time-consuming, and cost-effective as it requires data selection instead of data collection; information for documentary analysis is available; the design itself is unobtrusive and non-reactive [8]. It is for these reasons that documentary analysis was preferred as the research design for this reflective piece. In the current paper, the analysis of documentary evidence is specifically in the form of discourse analysis, which is the process of interpreting the powerful meanings underpinning a text enabling the researcher to distil valuable insights from research data [9]. The paper, therefore, is a reflection on other people's literary works that include primary and secondary sources (journal articles, book chapters, and handbooks) that speak to the confluence of decoloniality and the HBE 5.0 curriculum. Sources of literature considered herein include mainly the Education 5.0 Doctrine and many other reflections on specific theories related to coloniality, postcoloniality, decolonisation, and decoloniality in the Afro-Zimbabwean context.

4. Colonialism and Coloniality Untangled

Colonialism is whereby a stronger nation (a superpower) takes over the economic, social, and political power of a weaker nation [2], i.e., the superpower destroys the weaker nation's sovereignty, thereby establishing a colony by right of conquest or by right of occupation. Settler colonialism is a type of colonisation whereby colonists usually coming from across the oceans occupy a territory and establish themselves in the land that is not originally theirs [1]. The above is an apt description of the British settlers who, under the auspices of the BSAC, invaded land between the Limpopo and Zambezi Rivers (Zimbabwe) as from 1890. These British settlers destroyed the sovereignty of the Ndebele- and Shona-speaking peoples (the indigenous peoples of Zimbabwe) and established a new political order which embodied their invented and self-proclaimed sovereignty. This was the genesis of 'coloniality', which today is conspicuous in virtually all domains of Afro-Zimbabwean existence, higher and tertiary education included.

The preceding is affirmed by Ali Mazrui (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni [3]), according to whom, settler colonialism ushered Africa into the Euro-North American-centric modernity whose dark side is what manifests 'coloniality' [3]. Settler colonialism continues to shape power relations wherever this kind of colonisation has established itself [1]. Coloniality as a corollary to settler colonialism, therefore, is a logical and epistemological conquest process which is still ongoing, herein dubbed the 'continuity of coloniality'. This ongoing coloniality can also be referred to as 'global coloniality' because globalisation is, today, still driven by coloniality on a world scale [3]. This warrants the conclusion that globalisation has imperialistic tendencies. African leaders of today, therefore, continue to manage not true postcolonial states but 'postcolonies' or 'postcolonial neocolonised' states in which the indirect global colonial system is maintained after replacing the direct colonial rulers.

'Coloniality' encompasses basically the residues of colonialism[1]; it is also viewed as a colonial process that is active, continuous, structural, and epistemological[10], and not an occurrence in the remote past of which only ruins are left[1]. Hence, coloniality is not an episodic event but an epic and ongoing phenomenon that transcends the successive epochs of the modern era.

Coloniality or the colonial logic is best articulated in the form of a triad, i.e., the coloniality of 'power', 'knowledge', and 'being'[3]. Coloniality of power depicts the demarcation of the world into the so-called 'core zone of being' (the Global North) and 'peripheral zone of non-being' (the Global South that incorporates Zimbabwe), leading to the racial hierarchisation of humanity across the globe with asymmetrical power relations existing between the Global North and Global South. Cultures of the Global North are seen exerting immense influence over cultures of the Global South. Coloniality of power, therefore, points to the continuity of Western hegemony over the formerly colonised peoples (Afro-Zimbabweans included) even in the postcolonial era[11], a lop-sided arrangement which needs further interrogation. Coloniality of knowledge encompasses the denigration of African epistemologies matched with the exaltation and legitimation of Western epistemologies, the colonisation of African knowledge spaces by Western epistemologies, and the belief that Westerners are the custodians of highly valued knowledge worth being sought[11,12]. Coloniality of being resonates with and revolves around the Western-orchestrated idea of questioning African humanity. It involves the commodification or objectification or thingification of Africans[3], namely, viewing Africans as sub-humans or people in their infancy of humanity.

Coloniality, therefore, is a matrix within which settler colonialism (together with its long-lasting structures and effects) is couched and configured[1,13]. According to Quijano (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni), coloniality includes control of the economy, authority, gender-sexuality, and knowledge[3]. Hence, it (coloniality) is synonymous with the indirect economic, political, social, and epistemological control of the formerly colonised peoples by their erstwhile colonisers, which brings coloniality into close propinquity with neocolonialism.

It is, thus, noted that 'colonialism' differs from 'coloniality' because the former ends with the attainment of political or simply flag independence (when external and direct administrative rule comes to an end) whereas the latter (colonial logic) continues to shape the socio-politico-economic relations even after the end of direct colonial administrative rule[1]. Thus, coloniality spans beyond the end of colonial rule. To Maldonado-Torres (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni), coloniality survives colonialism[3], and hence the colonial logic continues to be endemic and pervasive in the formerly colonised regions today.

Amidst the fetish of flag independence so phenomenal in the formerly colonised places of SSA in general and Zimbabwe in particular, the continuity of global coloniality is on the whole evident. It is against this backdrop that Abdi (as cited in Makuvaza and Shizha), declares, "SSA requires first and foremost a decolonising philosophy as well as a decolonising education"[10], which evokes the decolonial discourse centered particularly on the interface between decoloniality and Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum.

5. The Decolonial Theory

The decolonial theory is an intellectual framework underpinning decoloniality (the decolonial agenda), challenging the colonial legacy, critiquing Eurocentric power structures, knowledge systems, and identities that persist beyond direct formal colonisation. It goes beyond postcolonialism by focusing on dismantling the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being.

5.1. Decoloniality and Decolonisation Unraveled

Decoloniality and decolonisation are both anti-imperialist projects wherein the former is the 'how' part of the latter[14]. The two agendas are related but different in some respects. The push for 'decolonisation' and the envisioning of a transformed world can be traced to as far back as the anti-colonial movements of the 19th and 20th Centuries[14]. Thus, decolonisation was an episodic elite-driven project in which the elites mobilised the peasants and workers as the foot soldiers in a struggle to replace the direct colonial administrators[3], whereas decoloniality manifested and continues to manifest through epic resistance, thought, and action. Decolonisation is on the whole historically inspired and politically motivated whereas decoloniality is a logically and epistemologically grounded movement.

Decolonisation manifested in liberation wars fought in America, Caribbean, Asia, and Africa, among other places. Unfortunately, the African struggles for decolonisation in the 20th century did not produce a genuine decolonial and postcolonial dispensation marked by the birth of a new humanity as demanded, for instance, by Franz Fanon (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni[3]). What was produced instead was the 'post-colony' or 'postcolonial neocolonised world'. This demonstrates that the African wars for decolonisation in some way reinstated 'coloniality' because the postcolonial dispensation that they purport to have established was and still is not decolonial enough. In view of the above, the decolonial agenda, therefore, remains topical and relevant.

5.2. Decoloniality: The Concept in Generic

Chief proponents of the decolonial theory include Frantz Fanon, William Dubois, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, and Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni, among others. Decoloniality seeks to build a new and better world permeated by the ideals of equality, justice, and democracy. The decolonial agenda, therefore, is wary of the colonially induced injustice, inequality, inequity, and iniquity.

Decoloniality is adversative to the neocolonial forces (under the guise of globalisation) that continue to afflict the ex-colonised peoples of the world and hence it is emancipatory in outlook[3,14]. Thus, decoloniality seeks to expose coloniality as the dark side of the Euro-North American-centric modernity, which continues to shape and define the lives of the formerly colonised peoples across the globe[14]. Decoloniality, therefore, poses as an antidote to the colonial logic—a cancer that continues to objectify and dehumanise the formerly colonised peoples of the world.

Decoloniality counteracts a situation whereby universities in Africa, for instance, continue to produce alienated Africans that are socialised into hating the Africa that produced them and liking the Europe and America that hate them[3]. Hence, decolonial theorists view institutions of learning within the formerly colonised countries as agents of alienation. Decoloniality, thus, views education in the formerly colonised states as a reflection of the West (Europe-America) and a propagation of self-hate among the ex-colonised peoples.

Arguably, research methodologies in their current form are tools of gate-keeping[3]. To decolonial theorists, therefore, Western epistemologies are deliberately designed to intellectually subjugate and dehumanise the ex-colonised peoples, shadow the Indigenous Knowledge Systems peculiar to the ex-colonised regions of the world, and thwart the ex-colonised peoples' heritage-based worldviews that are destined for prominence. In spite of all this reconnaissance and deliberate shadowing by the neocolonial forces, decoloniality continues to gain momentum among the formerly colonised peoples of the world.

The decolonial agenda targets in particular the 'triad of coloniality', which subsumes the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being[3,14]. It is a way of thinking, knowing, and doing[3], designed to challenge the colonial logic. Beyond its liberatory predisposition, decoloniality is a way of life for the formerly subjugated peoples across the globe[14], who are still wallowing under the neocolonial forces skewed not in their favour. The roots of decoloniality are traceable to the iniquities committed by Westerners against vulnerable global peoples like Africans, Caribbeans, and West Indians, among others—iniquities whose effects and structures are visible up to this day.

Above all, decoloniality is a call for the democratisation, de-homogenisation, de-Westernisation, and de-Europeanisation of knowledge[3]. As a call for the democratisation of knowledge, decoloniality demands equal knowledge-production opportunities for all peoples of different races across the globe. As a call for the de-homogenisation of knowledge, decoloniality challenges the dominant but unfounded notion of Western universalism in the global knowledge-production. As a call for the de-Westernisation and de-Europeanisation of knowledge, decoloniality attempts to nullify the view that Westerners and/or Europeans are the custodians of highly valued knowledge which is worth being sought.

Decoloniality on the whole speaks to unlearning Western ideologies.

5.3. Decoloniality Contextualised

African renaissance is one unmistakable strand of African decoloniality. "African renaissance is a unique opportunity for Africans to define themselves and their agenda according to their own realities and taking into account realities of the world around them. It is about Africans being agents of their own history and masters of their destiny"[15].

This accentuates the emancipatory ideal which underlies African renaissance as a strand of decoloniality in the local context. African renaissance is predicated on the realisation that what is regarded as education in SSA is, in fact, a reflection of Europe in Africa. Thus, African renaissance is consistent with the rebirth and reaffirmation of African epistemologies and the African philosophy of education.

Sankofa principle is another vivid strand of African decoloniality. Thus, the concept of *Sankofa* re-emerged as a decolonial methodology to position the indigenous African ways of knowing as central to African and black emancipation[16]. *Sankofa* is about strategically looking back to the pre-colonial African past, temporarily, across societal domains in order to move forward to implementing decolonial and indigenisation policies[16]. *Sankofa* is an Akan word from the Akan-Adinkera tribe in Ghana[17], which can be broken down into '*sa*', '*nko*', and '*fa*' wherein *sa* means 'return', *nko* means 'go' and *fa* means 'fetch'[18]. *Sankofa*, therefore, means go back to the precolonial African past to fetch that which may have been lost or forgotten, which could be of value in building a brighter future. It is wisdom in learning from the past which ensures a strong future[18]. Consequently, the *Sankofa* principle coincides with the notion of African renaissance.

The agenda for Africanising/indigenising education, which has since gained currency in SSA, is by all standards a decolonial movement. The term Africanisation is often used in relation to educational reform and in the sense of bringing African culture into formal schooling[15]. Africanisation of education, therefore, is the hybridisation of African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (AIKSs) and Western Knowledge Systems (WKSs) with the former occupying a larger portion[12,19], in a bid to foster instructional relevance and contextuality in accordance with the decolonial praxis. This serves to restore, repair, and rediscover the African power, being, epistemology, worldview(s), culture(s), and heritage—the core and niche of decoloniality.

In Zimbabwe in particular, decoloniality manifests in the rising wave of liberation philosophy, which currently finds expression in critical consciousness as an antidote to oppression. The escalation of critical consciousness is seen in the recent introduction of Critical Consciousness and Life Skills (CCLS201) as an institution-wide Module at the University of Zimbabwe. The CCLS201 was introduced in alignment with the University of Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 trajectory and the desired transformative curriculum for the purposes of engendering critical thinking and consciousness-raising[20]. As a university-wide module, CCLS201 seeks to equip students with critical literacy for cultivating a questioning frame of mind with which an individual goes beyond reading the word to reading the world[21]. Since critical consciousness entails, among other things, thinking and acting against the colonial and oppressive elements within society, therefore, the CCLS201 Module readily harmonises with the decolonial agenda for counteracting the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being.

5.4. A Critique of Decoloniality

It is alleged that the current theories of decoloniality are grounded in under-motivated and hyper-philosophising inferences from empirical premises[22]. This connotes that the essential decolonial ideals propounded in the context of formerly colonised regions of the world are spirited but inadequately explained, poorly reflected upon, scantly substantiated, and hence they turn out to be 'pseudo-philosophies' constitutive of fake or false philosophies.

This is reiterated by Mbembe (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni) who views the contemporary decolonial philosophies especially those grounded in anti-colonialism and dialectical materialism as enclosed inside an 'intellectual ghetto' of some kind[3]. 'Ghettoisation' is whereby any given scholarship is closed from external influences and currents of thought. This implies that the contemporary theories of decoloniality that have since emerged in the formerly colonised regions of the world are territorialised into a cocoon of a type, isolated and closed from external influences and currents of thought ushered by the forces and flows of globalisation. Within this intellectual ghetto, the anti-colonial and Marxist theories of decoloniality articulate pseudo-philosophies. Hence, the decolonial project is indicted for being an enclave of the chauvinistic anti-colonialist scholarship, which is adversative to the Western universalistic outlook of philosophy and knowledge-production. Mbembe, thus, seems to have been a spirited exponent, staunch sympathiser and apologist of the colonial logic.

In an effort to counter Mbembe's critique and vindicate decoloniality, Zeleza (as cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni) maintains that the African strand of decoloniality has never been

territorialised into an intellectual ghetto, it has never been cocooned and isolated from exotic influences and exogenous currents of thought. Instead, African decolonial thought "has been excessively exposed to external and imported Euro-American paradigms"[3]. If Western influences are what define genuine, true, and believable philosophy then the African decolonial thought remains a fountain of genuine, true, and believable philosophes not pseudo-philosophies. The existence of Henry Odera Oruka's Western-oriented 'professional philosophy' (as one of the currents of African philosophy) also testifies the influence of the Western Universalist philosophy on African philosophy in general and African decolonial thought in particular. Decoloniality, thus, remains a worthwhile paradigm for the rethinking and redefinition especially of higher and tertiary education in Africa South of the Sahara.

6. Understanding Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 Curriculum

Spanning from the colonial era (1890–1980), the higher and tertiary education and training given to a rigorously selected few Afro-Zimbabweans was guided by a blueprint called Education 3.0. This colonial Education 3.0 curriculum was confined to the three missions of teaching, research, and community engagement. Arguably, this model of higher education and training was not meant to raise Afro-Zimbabwean entrepreneurs, nor was it designed to nurture future job creators or employers. Worse still, it was largely an education for recalling and regurgitating dead facts and not for comprehension and application. It was also an education ordinarily to produce good Afro-Zimbabwean labourers to assist in the colonial exploitation of the country's resources and, at best, to mould good Afro-Zimbabwean servants to serve in the colonial administration of the land between the Zambezi and Limpopo rivers. It is permissible, therefore, to argue that the colonial Education 3.0 curriculum which perpetuated right into the so-called postcolonial dispensation could be best referred to as education for continued but indirect disenfranchisement and disempowerment of Africans.

In 2018, Prof Amon Murwira (the then Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education, Innovation, Science, and Technology Development, MoHTEISTD) and Prof Fanuel Tagwira (the current Permanent Secretary for the MoHTEISTD) observed that Zimbabwe's higher and tertiary education needed to be reconfigured to boost critical skills development in the country[23,24]. Upon this realisation, the MoHTEISTD formulated the HBE 5.0, a blueprint which commands Zimbabwe's higher and tertiary education curriculum to retain the three missions of teaching, research, and community outreach, and add two more missions of innovation and industrialisation "effectively re-orientating Education 3.0 to Education 5.0"[24]. This way, the MoHTEISTD drifted from an essentially colonial, disenfranchising, and disempowering model of a higher education curriculum to a home-grown, relevant, and empowering one, which has the vast potential to promote heritage-based creativity, innovation, industrialisation, entrepreneurship, national economic growth, and development.

This drift from the essentially colonial Education 3.0 to the HBE 5.0 constitutes a decolonial turn, thus, the HBE 5.0 curriculum challenges and counteracts the coloniality of power (Western hegemony) and coloniality of knowledge (preponderance of Western knowledge-production). The preceding argument sounds admissible because just after the attainment of independence in Zimbabwe and fellow Sub-Saharan countries, colonial legacy (mainly the coloniality of power and knowledge) remained in place. This is corroborated by Veintie (as cited in Makuvaza and Shizha), who claims, "the colonial structures of power remained, and the indigenous populations continue to be marginalised"[10]. The preceding reveals the continuity of coloniality and hence the colonisers may have left the country through the protracted armed struggle but their influence continues to be felt through the Eurocentric education curriculum on offer[25]. It is against this backdrop that Abdi (as cited in Makuvaza and Shizha) argues, "SSA requires first and foremost a decolonising philosophy as well as a decolonising education"[10]. Hence, the heritage-based ideology (underpinning the HBE 5.0 curriculum) serves to provide the highly cherished decolonising philosophy for higher and tertiary education in Zimbabwe.

The fact that Education 5.0 is guided by the heritage-based philosophy explains why the country's higher and tertiary education curriculum is officially referred to as the Heritage-Based Education 5.0 curriculum (the HBE 5.0 curriculum)[26]. Zimbabwe's national heritage is embodied in the country's agricultural, climatological, mineralogical, and

cultural heritage—the readily available resources which Afro-Zimbabweans are urged to harness for individual and national development. The HBE 5.0 curriculum, therefore, is grounded in the philosophical understanding that sustainable national development should be predicated on resources which are locally available. Hence, "Zimbabwe is adopting an education system that imparts knowledge, which is suitable for exploitation of locally available resources for its transformation to an industrialised and modernised economy"[27]. This emphasis on education for endogenous development (based on locally available resources and in accordance with the heritage-based philosophy) readily challenges and counteracts the coloniality of power (Euro-Oriental-American influence) and coloniality of knowledge (exaltation and legitimation of Occidental and Oriental epistemologies).

The HBE 5.0 curriculum seeks to achieve the Zimbabwe Government's Vision 2030—that of attaining an Upper Middle-Income Economy by the year 2030. However, the fact that this Vision 2030 draws on the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) may reveal Western proclivities because the SDGs themselves are, on the whole, Western-oriented and Western-dominated. This is substantiated by Bouhali and Rwiza (as cited in Wuta) who argue that, "the Western projects of development, as stated in the MDGs (now SDGs), are hegemonic and irrelevant to the situations of the African countries as they embody a real continuation of the legacy of colonialism"[28]. Nevertheless, Vision 2030 is attainable through harnessing Zimbabwe's locally available resources, i.e., the country's cultural, climatological, agricultural, and mineralogical endowments constitutive of the Afro-Zimbabwean heritage. Hence, the heritage-based philosophy and curriculum being popularised and promoted by the MoHTEISTD supports the application of acquired knowledge on the local environment in order to produce relevant goods and services[29]. The HBE 5.0 curriculum, therefore, is consistent with the restoration, reparation, and rediscovery of the Afro-Zimbabwean power, knowledge, being, worldview(s), and culture(s)—the core of decoloniality.

7. The Confluence of Decoloniality and HBE 5.0 Curriculum

Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum trajectory is suffused with the transformative ideals of critical consciousness, *Sankofa*, and heritage-based philosophy, which, in themselves, are some of the forces of decoloniality in the Afro-Zimbabwean context.

To begin with, the HBE 5.0 curriculum is permeated by critical thinking[30], which, in itself, is the backbone of critical consciousness herein construed as an antidote to oppression, especially oppression of a colonial origin. It is, therefore, noted that critical thinking and critical consciousness are the ingredients of decoloniality. This position sounds admissible because it takes a critical thinker and a critically conscious mind to decipher the forces of coloniality (the dark side of Euro-North American-centric modernity) and engage in thought, activism, and action on the ground to challenge this Euro-North American-centric modernity and all its structures and ramifications.

The linear progression of critical consciousness entails critical reflection (social analysis), critical motivation (political agency), and critical action (social action)[20,31,32]. The observation that Education 3.0 was colonial, disenfranchising, disempowering, and oppressive manifests 'critical reflection', which translates to critical literacy[21]. The courage that the MoHTEISTD demonstrated in its advocacy for a shift from an essentially colonial model of higher education (Education 3.0) to a postcolonial, decolonial, and empowering HBE 5.0 curriculum constitutes 'critical motivation'. The aspect of taking concrete action (through promulgating and operationalising the HBE 5.0 curriculum) against the perpetual disenfranchisement of Afro-Zimbabwean graduates is what manifests 'critical action'. Critical action is demonstrated vividly by the University of Zimbabwe, which, in line with its transformative curriculum agenda and Education 5.0 trajectory, introduced Critical Consciousness and life skills (CCLS201) as a university-wide module designed mainly for consciousness-raising and critical literacy[20]. This is consistent with the decolonial agenda of shaking off the vestiges of colonialism, challenging and counteracting the coloniality of power and of knowledge. Thus, decoloniality, as embedded in critical consciousness, pervades Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum.

The HBE 5.0 curriculum is grounded in what is known as the heritage-based philosophy[27,30]. Heritage, per se, is the legacy of a people's past that remains today, it includes the tangible and intangible remains of a people's culture as well as natural features and resources. As a principle of

putting to full utility the local resources which are readily available, the heritage-based philosophy is an epitome of decoloniality which seeks to rediscover, restore, and repair the Afro-Zimbabwean power, knowledge, being, worldview(s), and culture(s) through a culture-embedded higher and tertiary education curriculum. The heritage-based ideology constitutes a decolonising philosophy deliberately designed to inform a decolonising higher and tertiary education curriculum in the country. In other words, the heritage-based philosophy is an antidote to the colonial logic in general and the coloniality of power and knowledge in particular. Hence, it harmonises favourably with the *Sankofa* principle which enjoins Afro-Zimbabweans to look back to the precolonial African past in search of that which could have been left behind or forgotten, which could be of value in combating problems of the postcolonial dispensation that repose within the colonial logic.

As already mentioned, higher and tertiary education in colonial Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) (a system dubbed 'Education 3.0) was an education for the disempowerment, impoverishment, and oppression of Africans because in the process Africans were deliberately and structurally relegated to positions of employment seekers not employment creators, employees not employers, and civil servants not entrepreneurs. This *status quo* perpetuated even after Zimbabwe's attainment of political independence in 1980, i.e., it remained intact for almost four decades into the so-called postcolonial era. It is upon realising this essentially colonial and oppressive outlook of Education 3.0 that in 2018 Zimbabwe's MoHTEISTD drifted to an emancipatory and empowering industry-oriented HBE 5.0 curriculum model by adding two more missions of 'innovation' and 'industrialisation'[30]. This transformation was, in itself, a 'decolonial turn' within which Afro-Zimbabweans denounced, challenged, and counteracted the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being using tertiary education as a tool and institutions of higher learning as sites for cultural and epistemological renewal.

The HBE 5.0 curriculum is mediated to use "cutting-edge, competitive, universal, scientific and technological knowledge for production of quality goods and services"[27]. This is a welcome inclination accommodating the forces of globalisation. However, the aspect of 'universality' as imprinted in the scientific and technological knowledge deemed central to the HBE 5.0 curriculum denotes a neoliberal-Western proclivity. The HBE 5.0 curriculum, thus, appears to be in flirtation with the Western universalist school of thought which asserts that certain Western ideas are universally applicable and superior, forming a model for global progress. This is contemptuous of ideas from other non-Western cultures, it is incompatible with the ideal of inter-cultural dialogue, and hence antithetical to decolonial ethos. Once scientific and technological knowledge remains neoliberal-Western in flavour, therefore, the decolonial inclination and heritage-based outlook of the HBE 5.0 curriculum is compromised.

8. Conclusions

Coloniality (the colonial logic, its structures and effects) remained in place after colonialism had been brought to an end through the 20th-century decolonisation movements and processes located in the formerly colonised states. As established in the foregoing, colonialism is the direct administration of a colony whereas coloniality subsumes the residues of colonialism well after the attainment of political or flag independence. Decolonisation entails challenging the direct colonial administration politically whilst decoloniality involves counteracting the colonial logic epistemologically. Though alleged to constitute pseudo-philosophies, decoloniality has been found out to be a paradigm worthy of adoption by the ex-colonised peoples of SSA in general and Zimbabwe in particular because it (decoloniality) has the potential to contribute to the reclamation, restoration, reparation, and rediscovery African power, being, epistemology, worldview(s), and culture(s) using higher and tertiary education as a tool. Since it is suffused with the notions of critical consciousness, Africanisation/indigenisation, and heritage-based thinking, therefore, Zimbabwe's HBE 5.0 curriculum is replete with decolonial proclivities. Hence, the said curriculum is envisioned to contribute significantly to the moulding of a new humanity living in a free, united, peaceful, and prosperous Zimbabwe. The paper, therefore, urges the reformulation of policy to escalate the ideals of critical consciousness, Africanisation, and heritage-based thinking within Zimbabwe's higher and tertiary education curriculum—consistent with the decolonial trajectory of unlearning Western ideologies.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable, for studies not involving humans or animals.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable. The study did not involve humans.

Data Availability Statement

The data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Mendoza, B., 2020. Decolonial theories in comparison. Journal of World Philosophies. 5(1), 43–60.

[2] Thondhlana, J., Garwe, E.C., 2021. Repositioning of Africa in knowledge production: Shaking off historical stigmas—Introduction. Journal of the British Academy. 9(s1), 1–17.

[3] Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J., 2015. Decoloniality as the future of Africa. History Compass. 13(10), 485–496.

[4] Ncube, B.C., Wuta, R.K., 2025. Decolonising education in postcolonial Zimbabwe: Context and the way forward. 1(2), 243–261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.63726/jchd.v1i2.510

[5] Higgs, P., Van Niekerk, M.P., 2003. The programme for Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) and higher educational discourse in South Africa: A critical reflection. South African Journal of Higher Education. 16, 38–49.

[6] Dei, G.J.S., 2012. Indigenous anti-colonial knowledge as 'heritage knowledge' for promoting Black/African education in diasporic contexts. Decolonisation, Indigeneity, Education and Society. 1(1), 102–119.

[7] Okoye, U.O., 2023. Afrocentrism ideology: The way forward for African development. International Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Management. 3(3), 28–34.

[8] Bowen, G.A., 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal. 9(2), 27–40. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

[9] Mhlanga, E., Shumba, O., 2013. Reporting research results and findings. In: Tichapondwa, M.S. (Ed.). Preparing Your Dissertation at a Distance: A Research Guide. VUSSC: Wellington, New Zealand. pp. 216–237.

[10] Makuvaza, N., Shizha, E. (Eds.), 2017. Introduction. In Re-thinking Education in Postcolonial Sub-Saharan Africa in the 21st Century: Post-Millennium Development Goals. Sense Publishers: Rotterdam, Netherlands. pp. 1–11.

[11] Wuta, R., 2025. Indigenous Knowledge: A Catalyst of Sustainable Development or Manifestation of Anachronism and Pseudoscience in Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of Indigenous Social Development. 13(3), 30–53. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/jisd.v13i3.81221

[12] Shizha, E., 2010. The interface of neo-liberal globalisation, science education and indigenous African knowledges in Africa. Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences. 2(1), 27–58.

[13] Igba, S.A., Liaga, E.A., 2021. Coloniality, legitimacy in state-building, and the use of force in Africa. The Thinker. 89(4), 45–55. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359716799_Coloniality_Legitimacy_in_Statebuilding_and_the_Use_of_Force_in_Africa

[14] Ranawana, A., 2023. Decolonisation and Decoloniality: A Position Paper for Research and Evidence Cultures in Christian Aid. Christian Aid: London, UK.

[15] Msila, V., 2009. Africanisation of education and the search for relevance and context. Academic Journals Educational Research and Review. 4(6), 310–315.

[16] Barise, A., 2023. Reflections on invoking Sankofa in African language policy and planning. Available from: https://bild-lida.ca/blog/uncategorized/reflections-on-invoking-sankofa-in-african-language-policy-and-planning-by-aisha-barise/ (cited 20 July 2025).

[17] Carter G. Woodson Center for Interracial Education, 2020. The Power of Sankofa: Know History. Berea College: Berea, KY, USA. Available from: https://www.berea.edu/centers/carter-g-woodson-center-for-interracial-education/the-power-of-sankofa/

[18] Slater, J., 2019. Sankofa—The need to return back to move forward: Addressing reconstruction challenges that face Africa and South Africa today. Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae. 45(1), 1–24.

[19] Mawere, M., 2015. Indigenous knowledge and education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Africa Spectrum. 50(2), 57–71.

[20] Banda, W., 2023. Critical Consciousness, Problem-Solving and Life Skills, CCLS102 Module. University of Zimbabwe Department of Educational Foundations: Harare, Zimbabwe.

[21] Zireva, D., 2024. Nurturance for reading the world: Critical consciousness in societies guided by Unhu/Ubuntu. International Journal of Humanities, So-

cial Sciences and Education. 11(3), 42–52.

[22] Hull, G., 2021. Some pitfalls of decoloniality theory. The Thinker. 89, 63–74.

[23] Murwira, A., 2019. Towards revitalizing the roles of universities in development [Zimbabwe]. Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education, Science and Technological Development (MoHTEISTD): Harare, Zimbabwe.

[24] Tagwira, F., 2018. Re-thinking education in the 'New Dispensation' in Zimbabwe: A Presentation Paper. Available from: https://safrap.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/2018-safram-key-note.pdf (cited 20 July 2025).

[25] Mavhunga, P.J., 2006. Africanising the school curriculum: A case for Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research. 18(3), 440–456.

[26] Garwe, E.C., 2025. Heritage-Based Education 5.0: Zimbabwe's decolonial approach to higher education. Discover Education. 4, 289. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00753-7

[27] Government of Zimbabwe, 2018. Education 5.0: Doctrine for the Modernisation and Industrialisation of Zimbabwe through Education, Science and Technology Development to Achieve Vision 2030. MoHTEISTD: Harare, Zimbabwe.

[28] Wuta, R.K., 2020. The Role of Indigenous Education in Contemporary Times: A Search for a Holistic Philosophy in Zimbabwe [PhD Thesis]. Great Zimbabwe University: Masvingo, Zimbabwe.

[29] Muzira, D.R., Bondai, B.M., 2020. Perception of educators towards the adoption of Education 5.0: A case of a State University in Zimbabwe. East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences. 1(2), 43–53.

[30] Wuta, R.K., 2022. Extendibility of the Education 5.0 concept to Zimbabwe's secondary school system as encapsulated in the Curriculum Framework 2015–2022. Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 3(5), 26–33. Available from: https://indianapublications.com/articles/IJHSS_3(5)_26-33_6295e4086e9c02.04596410.pdf

[31] Freire, P., 2005. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 30th Anniversary Edition. Ramos, M.B. (Trans). Continuum: New York, NY, USA.

[32] Wuta, R.K., Tandi, C., 2025. Cultivating intellectual acuity and transformative praxis: Navigating challenges of implementation in Zimbabwean teacher education institutions. In: Tandi, C., Mawere, M., Zivave, W., et al. (Eds.). Pedagogics, Curriculum Transformation and the Future of Teachers' Colleges. Langaa Research and Publishing Common Initiative Group: Bamenda, Cameroon. pp. 411–432.