



Research Article

Volume-03|Issue-10|2022

Citizenship, Citizenship Education and Issues of Implementation in Zimbabwe

Dr. Rodwell Kumbirai Wuta

Lecturer, Belvedere Technical Teachers' College

Article History

Received: 16.10.2022

Accepted: 24.10.2022

Published: 31.10.2022

Citation

Wuta, R.K. (2022). Citizenship, Citizenship Education and Issues of Implementation in Zimbabwe. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 39-46.

Abstract: *The concept of 'citizenship' recognises the realisation of liberties balanced up with responsibilities and duties in a democracy, an arrangement deemed key to the development of a just society. Though a crucial aspect of education for Zimbabwe as a republic, citizenship education seems to be lagging behind in terms of implementation. Thus, this reflection preliminarily defines and dimensionalises citizenship. It thereupon explores the origin, evolution and internationalisation of citizenship. From both the progressive and quietist perspectives, this article reflects on qualities of a good citizen after which the concepts of citizenship and Unhu/Ubuntu are juxtaposed. The reflection then appropriates from the UK, the USA and South Africa, among other countries, some ideas deemed worthwhile in guiding the possible escalation of citizenship education which is currently at a low ebb in Zimbabwe. The article also explores the possible threats to citizenship education locally. Consequently, the reflection concludes that the little being offered locally under citizenship education sounds more quietist than progressive. Hence, the government of Zimbabwe is urged to escalate citizenship education by decreeing it one component of the country's educational policy thereby rendering it a statutory curriculum subject. The same government is implored to religiously-sincerely implement citizenship education both in its minimalist and maximalist fashions as this helps strengthen the democratic culture within and beyond schooling.*

Keywords: Citizenship, Citizenship Education, Implementation.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The genesis of the concept 'citizenship' is traceable to as far back as Protagoras of Abdera [circa 490-420 B.C.], one of the earliest Sophists of Ancient Greece who defined it as 'cultural education' (Hpanyengwi-Chemhuru, 2014). The evolution of citizenship from its ancient form to modern citizenship seems to have materialised in Europe and the United States of America – the Western-Occidental world representative of what is referred to as the 'core' in philosophical discourse. It is through ideological globalisation that the modern conception of citizenship diffused to the so called 'peripheral' countries like South Africa. Hence, Vilakazi and Mathebula (2013:183) submit that the modern South African concept of citizenship has its roots in the English law of citizenship and nationality.

Locally, Nziramasanga (1999:349) reports that, "during the colonial era and shortly after the attainment of Independence the Zimbabwe system of education provided very little of this essential part of education," implying that citizenship education was hitherto marginalised. Hence, Nziramasanga (1999:354) concludes that, "the current scope and status of Citizenship Education in our country is near absent." Thus, the implementation of this highly-sloganeered topical concept is still at a low ebb in Zimbabwe. To substantiate the foregoing, Nziramasanga (1999:350) recounts that, "currently the school curriculum does not

offer citizenship education as a separate discipline...real Citizenship Education is marginalised and, to a larger extent, never taught" (Nziramasanga, 1999:350). Notably, the use of the word 'never' implies that the latter part of the foregoing quote has been overtaken by events because citizenship is currently being taught although, of course, being peripherised.

Nziramasanga (1999:349) further argues that, "while it is important that all parts of the curriculum contribute to the development of the citizen, it is considered that there should be a specific part of the curriculum entitled Citizenship Education." Thus, citizenship education should be introduced as a specific stand-alone learning area. Participants in Nziramasanga (1999:351) also suggest that, "a national Citizenship/Civic Education curriculum should span right across the entire education sector from primary to high school, and should continue into further education." In other words, citizenship education should be offered from infant to tertiary, a position endorsed by Muropa *et al.* (2013:661) where they recommend that, "Unhu/Ubuntu and Citizenship Education should be valued in the same way as the English language has been valued and should, therefore, be taught from zero grade to university." This is with a view to making Zimbabwean education capable of raising good citizens, people with *Unhu/Ubuntu*. The preceding is further affirmed by Sibanda (2014:29) where he proposes "the inclusion of the concept of *Unhu/Ubuntu* in the national curricula right from pre-school to university and deliberate citizenship education as some of the possible means of transmitting the values of *Unhu/Ubuntu*." This

explicitly recognizes the close propinquity between citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu*.

The Curriculum Framework for Primary and Secondary Education 2015-2022 - herein called the Updated Curriculum or Government of Zimbabwe / GoZ (2015:17) - articulates the five learner-exit profiles, one of which is 'national identity'. Under national identity, the said Curriculum Framework accentuates 'patriotism', 'recognition-valuing of national symbols' and 'participatory citizenship' [volunteerism] (GoZ, 2015:17), all of which constitute citizenship education. Thus, national identity as a learner-exit profile is intended to demonstrate that Zimbabwe's education is designed and predisposed to moulding good citizens.

On curriculum goals, GoZ (2015:22) states that the Updated Curriculum aims at fostering the appreciation of 'national heritage and identity', which infuses citizenship education at the Primary School level. The Curriculum Framework 2015-2022 also aims at fostering an appreciation of 'civic education' at the Lower Secondary School level [Forms 1-4]. It lastly aims at churning out learners who demonstrate competencies in 'civic education' at the Upper Secondary School level [Forms 5-6]. Thus, the Updated Curriculum essentially seeks to raise good citizens.

The Curriculum Framework's content structure also incorporates 'civic education' as one of its transversal themes to be taught and learnt in context. It fosters citizenship education at the Infant School level through the learning area of Family and Heritage Studies where learners explore concepts such as 'being responsible', among others (GoZ, 2015:32). The same curriculum infuses a stint of citizenship education at the Junior School level through Heritage and the Life-skills Orientation Programming [LOP] designed to promote 'civic' competencies (GoZ, 2015:35). The Curriculum Framework 2015-2022 also infuses citizenship at the Secondary School level through Heritage Studies as well as the LOP which accentuates volunteerism [participatory citizenship] and provides each learner an opportunity to practise the general and specific skills expected from school leavers in a 'civic' environment (GoZ, 2015:38-39).

It is, therefore, observable that Zimbabwe's curriculum structure is devoid of a specific learning area called 'citizenship education', confirming what has been noted by Nziramasanga (1999:350) that "currently the school curriculum does not offer Citizenship Education as a separate discipline." Furthermore, the fact that the LOP has not really taken off since the inception of the Updated Curriculum is, in itself, an indictment on the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education [MoPSE]. Admittedly, the said Ministry is currently trying to enforce this LOP but its future seems to be bleak. It is against this background that this article

reflectively explores the concept of citizenship and appropriates ideas from other countries to guide the possible escalation of citizenship education in Zimbabwe.

PROBLEM POSTULATION

The chief driving concern of this reflection is the less value accorded to citizenship education by Zimbabwe's Curriculum Framework for period 2015-2022. To make matters worse, this deficiency in citizenship education is in the wake of "vandalism, violence and indiscipline in the Zimbabwean schools and society as a result of lack of values, relevant ethics, morals, individual and collective responsibilities for protecting property and valuing human life" (Nziramasanga, 1999:349). Such observable inadequate recognition for citizenship education in Zimbabwe is evidenced by the fact that the subject - though an important component of instruction - has not yet been made a separate, statutory and examinable curriculum subject like English, Geography, History, among others.

AIM

This article, therefore, seeks to contribute towards the designation of citizenship as a statutory curriculum subject to be studied from Early Childhood Education [ECE] to tertiary level.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

This reflection is conceived within the context of the Nziramasanga Commission Report of 1999 [herein called Nziramasanga (1999)], which, in itself, is one of the principal documents on education in postcolonial Zimbabwe. Nziramasanga (1999:349-355) attempts to address issues to do with citizenship education in Zimbabwe and it does so in the purview of the *Unhu/Ubuntu* philosophy - the controlling ideology and cornerstone of African values. The article is also fathomed within the confines of the Updated Curriculum Framework for period 2015-2022 (GoZ, 2015), which is the current enshrinement of Zimbabwe's education system from Early Childhood Education [ECE] to secondary level.

As it incorporates the *Unhu/Ubuntu* philosophy, this reflection also espouses Gade's theory of 'narratives of return' because the *Unhu/Ubuntu* philosophy, in itself, reposes within Gade's 'narratives of return'. "The major statement behind 'narratives of return' is a desire or yearning to 'return' to the past for possible solutions to challenges and problems associated with the postcolonial dispensation" (Gade, as cited in Makuvaza, 2017:351). Beyond the 'narratives of return', this article is also informed by Robertson's theory of 'glocalization' wherein glocalization is "a hybrid term coined by merging *globalisation* and *localisation*" (Monnier, 2010:9). Hence, Ritzer (as cited

in Monnier, 2010:9) defines glocalization as, “the interpenetration of the global and the local resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas.” The two sub-processes of glocalization include the particularisation of the universal driven by the ‘Particularists’ and the universalization of the particular powered by the ‘Universalists’. This article, therefore, takes the ‘particularistic’ stance with which it seeks to adopt universal ideas and adapt them to fit the local particular needs and opportunities in their Afro-Zimbabwean cultural context. In other words, this article seeks to particularise the universal by adopting especially the Western citizenship ideas which sound largely universalistic and fine-tune them to suit the particular Zimbabwean situation.

An abridged review of related literature

Nziramasanga (1999:349-355) has attempted to unpack the concept of citizenship in the Zimbabwean context. This Commission Report also advocates for the escalation of citizenship education in the country because it discovered that this learning area is grossly peripherised in schools – a *status quo* which has unsavoury implications for the Zimbabwean neophyte at whatever level. Whilst Nziramasanga (1999:351) delineates the scope of citizenship education viz topics that should constitute the citizenship education syllabus for Zimbabwean schools, the Commission Report does not comprehensively dimensionalise the concept of citizenship for an enhanced understanding of how people should operate in a democracy-republic. This manifests a conceptual gap which this article seeks to fill by characterising the various brands of citizenship.

In agreement with Nziramasanga (1999); & Sibanda (2014:29) proposes “the inclusion of the concept of *Unhu/Ubuntu* in the national curricula right from pre-school to university and deliberate citizenship education as some of the possible means of transmitting the values of *Unhu/Ubuntu*.” Sibanda (2014), therefore, visualises the close propinquity between citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu* – the African philosophy of life. Just like Nziramasanga (1999), Sibanda (2014) does not delve deeper into the dimensionalisation of citizenship, which again manifests a conceptual gap in literature. It is also noted that both Nziramasanga (1999); & Sibanda (2014) did not preoccupy themselves with appropriating citizenship ideas from other countries. Hence, this article seeks to adopt worthwhile citizenship ideas from abroad in order to enrich the local conceptualisation of citizenship education for the benefit of Zimbabwean learners so as to guarantee a better future in the country.

Furthermore, participants in a study conducted by Muropa *et al.* (2013:660) “argue that merely teaching students about the theory of citizenship is ineffective unless homes, schools, colleges and universities themselves reflect democratic practices by giving students the opportunity to have a say in decision making.” Muropa *et al.* (2013), thus, advocate for the

increased perpetuation of democratic ideals – the backbone of citizenship - both at home and school so that neophytes appreciate what it really means to be a citizen. Like Sibanda (2014); & Muropa *et al.* (2013) draw intelligible parallels between citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu*. However, Muropa *et al.* (2013) tend to overlook the dimensionalisation of citizenship, a situation which leaves the concept of citizenship difficult to fully fathom. This manifests a conceptual gap in literature which this article seeks to bridge by comprehensively dimensionalising the concept of citizenship. Moreover, Muropa *et al.* (2013) do not make an attempt to appropriate citizenship ideas from other countries. This article seeks to fill this hiatus by incorporating ideas on citizenship from other countries – ideas which have the potential to enrich the Zimbabwean conception of citizenship.

As demonstrated in the background, the Updated Curriculum Framework for period 2015-2022 (GoZ, 2015) seems to treat citizenship as a transversal theme, which renders citizenship education a concept found in many subjects and not a stand-alone subject. This is consistent with the claim made in Nziramasanga (1999:350) that citizenship education is optional and non-examinable and hence learners fail to gain a complete understanding of it. This article, therefore, seeks to reflect on how this disturbing curricular drawback could be addressed so that Zimbabwean neophytes are afforded the opportunity to gain a more complete understanding of the concept citizenship thereby equipping them to operate efficaciously in a democracy.

METHODOLOGY

As a concept paper, this article is in the form of literary criticism whereby the author reflects on literature which is available in the domain of citizenship education both globally and locally. At a global scale, the article reflects on sources such as Wringe (1984); Davies *et al.* (1999); Bottery (2000); & Vilakazi & Mathebula (2013), among others – sources which seem to shed light on issues to do with the origin, development, characterisation and globalisation of citizenship education. At a local scale, such literature is contained in, but not limited to, Nziramasanga (1999); & Muropa *et al.* (2013); Sibanda (2014); & GoZ (2015), *interalia*. This reflection, therefore, reposes within secondary research.

Dimensionalising Citizenship

The term ‘citizenship’ derives from the word ‘civic’ - a derivative of the Latin word ‘*civicus*’, “which means belonging to citizens” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:181). ‘Citizenship’ is “active participation in managing the affairs of the country” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:178). This is endorsed in Nziramasanga (1999:349) where it is stated that, “citizenship is the set of relationships that prevail between an individual and state or nation. It is part of

his/her existence in a democratic state which includes rights, duties and responsibilities.” This denotes an equilibrium between the benefits-privileges and obligations of democratic nationhood, an arrangement which is key to the development of a just society.

McLaughlin (as cited in Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:181) maps citizenship along a continuum of minimal and maximal interpretations. Minimal views limit political involvement and participation primarily to voting for elected representatives. This denotes majority engagement in less active terms. In the contrary, “a maximal concept of democracy emphasises the broad participation [decision-making] of ‘the people’ in the government – direct democracy” (McLaughlin, as quoted in Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:181), which denotes majority participation in more active terms. This maximal conception of citizenship harmonizes with “the re-emergence of civic agency in democratic societies...defined as a bottom-up development paradigm in which people are agents of their own development, contrasted with top-down development in which people are ‘helped’ or ‘saved’ by others” (Boyte, as quoted in Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:181). Civic agency, thus, accentuates majority empowerment and the democratic development of citizens.

Citizenship is generally imbued with the identity, civic virtue, civil and politico-socio-economic dimensions. In terms of citizenship by identity, “to be a citizen normally means that one belongs to a particular group. This may have legal connotations and there may be issues related to perceptions of nationhood” (Davies *et al.*, 1999:2). This involves individuals identifying with a certain group or nation. Furthermore, “the call for us to be citizens of the world has been heard” (Davies *et al.*, 1999:2), which is exemplified by Socrates (circa 470-399 B.C.) when he said: ‘I am not an Athenian, or a Greek, but a citizen of the world’ (Kleingeld & Brown, 2014). This denotes the agenda for cosmopolitan citizenship in which neophytes are oriented to act locally but think globally and is consistent with the global village rhetoric which urges learners to strive to identify with the world as a whole.

Civil citizenship emphasises that, “there are rights for certain people in certain countries to property, trial by jury, recourse to appeal and so on” (Davies *et al.*, 1999:3). Civil citizenship, thus, equips the young with the basic knowledge of the law and human rights issues so that in case of human rights violation they know how to seek legal recourse. Political citizenship or political literacy, which is not only limited to political issues, also emphasizes the right to vote and its realisation. Hence, Davies *et al.* (1999:3) argue that, “discussions over the question of whether voting is a right or duty, whether the system of voting is fair...the relative merits of the broadly-stated ‘system’ of democracy..., are some of the issues which are

significant in the field of political citizenship.” Civil and political citizenships are, therefore, in close propinquity as they are both entrenched in the human rights discourse. Moreover, “a politically literate person will know what the main political disputes are about, what beliefs the main contestants have of them and how they are likely to affect him” (Crick & Porter, as cited in Wringe, 1984:98). Political literacy is, therefore, exigent for a citizen as it distinguishes a citizen from a mere inhabitant.

Social citizenship recently became another pertinent aspect of citizenship education which is “to do with, generally, the fight to ensure that all citizens have access to acceptable levels of health, education and living standards” (Davies *et al.*, 1999:3). It, therefore, incorporates economic factors as well and hence societies become relatively egalitarian.

“It is in the area of civic virtue that debates raise most explicitly issues about community service and other forms of contributing actively to an immediate improvement of social conditions” (Davies *et al.*, 1999:4). This dimension of citizenship conscientises learners that they have the responsibility to work towards the betterment of their society. Hence, education for civic virtue “helps pupils to recognise a necessary interdependence between responsibilities and liberties” (Bottery, 2000:211), thus, equilibrating between the assumption of duties and enjoyment of rights – a give-and-take arrangement which is key for the development of a just society.

Citizenship: Genesis, Evolution and Internationalisation

The ancient origin of the concept ‘citizenship’ could be ascribed to Protagoras [circa 490-420 B.C.] who defined citizenship education as cultural education (Hapanyengwi-Chemhuru, 2014). The citizenship tradition was also maintained in the Ancient Greek *Polis* of Athens under the governorship of Pericles in years 450-429 B.C. (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:179). In the Athenian democracy during Pericles’ time, “citizenship had three essential and complementary dimensions: status, feeling and practice” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:179), whereby: ‘status’ implied the relationship of the individual to the state, ‘feeling’ suggested a sense of belonging to a community of citizens and ‘practice’ denoted active participation in public affairs or the life of the community.

According to Vilakazi & Mathebula (2013:179), the hierarchy of the Athenian citizenship placed Greek males over thirty years of age right at the apex [Courts]. In the middle, came Adult Greek males above 18 years of age [Assembly-Agora]. At the base were women, children, slaves and foreigners who were relegated to the status of non-citizen. It is ‘the people’ who participated in governance – those in the ‘courts’ and ‘assembly’, who were ascribed citizen status. Thus,

the ancient Greek Governor Pericles (as cited in Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:179), avows that, “our constitution is called democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people.” Hence, Pericles’s notion of ‘the whole people’ excluded women, children, slaves and foreigners who were deemed non-citizens. This was maintained by Plato [circa 427-348 B.C.] – an idealist philosopher whose scheme held that, “the only real citizens were the rulers” (Hapanyengwi-Chemhuru, 2014:243). Similarly, for Aristotle [circa 384-322 B.C.] – a Greek empiricist philosopher, “the only real citizens were the aristocracy who were freemen” (ibid.). This proffers a very parochial view of citizenship.

Nevertheless, “Pericles’ definition links with Marshal’s (1950) modern categorisation of citizenship as the extension of legal, political and social rights” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:179). Thus, the ancient conception of citizenship evolved into citizenship in its modern form where “the citizen rights of those who remained outside the citizenship body in historical Athens, that is, children and women...as well as foreigners...should be taken into account” (Marshal, as quoted in Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:179), manifesting common citizenship constitutive of a unified citizenship regime.

According to Davies *et al.* (1999:2), during the period 1969-1999 modern citizenship education further evolved in three crude and overlapping stages, first of which was ‘Political literacy’ dominant in Europe [particularly UK] in the 1970s. This was followed by ‘Adjectival educations’ which were global in nature and were dominated by anti-sexism and anti-racism in the 1980s - the ‘unresolved agenda’. Last came ‘Education for citizenship’ of the 1990s which incorporated the socio-economic-civil spheres of human existence. It is ‘Education for citizenship’ which culminated into the 1999 introduction of citizenship education and its eventual implementation as a statutory subject in the English national curriculum in 2002 following the Crick Report of 1998. Thus, “European governments are putting citizenship education high on the international agenda” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:186).

It should be reminisced that from 1776 to the 1990s, citizenship education [civic education] also evolved phenomenally in the USA. Thus, the Western-Occidental model of citizenship education subsequently got globalised – a development substantiated by Vilakazi & Mathebula (2013:191) where they argue that, “Europeans and Americans have done a great deal in terms of giving character and shape to the subject of citizenship education.”

The Europeans had ties with South Africa that date back to 1652 and 1795, years that mark the arrival of the Dutch and the Britons at the Cape, respectively. “When the Boer Republics and the British colonies

formed the South African Union government in 1910, there were no South African citizens, only British subjects and Union nationals” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:183). Subsequently, “the Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act [Act No.26 of 1970] attested to the National Party’s commitment to race- and ethnic-based notions of citizenship” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:183). With this legislation, only Europeans would enjoy citizenship in urban centres and areas outside the Homelands-Bantustans. To foster ethnic-based citizenship, the apartheid government “enforced division of the Bantu along ethnic lines” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:184) – the Bantustan policy. Therefore, Africans’ citizenship would be restricted to their respective Homelands-Bantustans. However, through the people’s protracted struggle for democratisation, the final constitution of 1996 was drafted with a statute which reconfigured South African citizenship into ‘common citizenship’ - a unified citizenship regime (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:186). Thus, race- and ethnic-based citizenship was undone.

In South Africa’s contemporary constitutional democracy, “the term ‘citizenship’ reflects two distinct formulations: citizenship as a legal status [to be a citizen] and citizenship as a practice [to act as a citizen]” (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:178), incorporating the minimalist and maximalist conceptions of citizenship.

A good citizen: The progressive and Quietist Theses

According to Davies *et al.* (1999:51), a person deemed a good citizen should have ‘social awareness characteristics’ which resonate with meeting community obligations. Such characteristics include, “considerations for the feelings of others and cooperation” (Best, 2000:188-189), that constitute the art of living. Social awareness characteristics also include “observance of certain accepted standards of conduct and behaviour” (Best, 2000:190) - which goes with moral probity, “respect for the other person’s point of view” (Best, 2000:189) - meaning tolerance for a diversity of views and “service to the community” (Best, 2000:190) - denoting volunteerism which is one of the noblest duties of a citizen. Individual tolerance for a diversity of views is exalted by Nziramasanga (1999:350) where he argues that, “citizenship education would develop respect for other citizens’ views on various social, economic and political issues.” This underpins the progressive thesis which views good citizenship as being wary of ideological bigotry. Furthermore, a good citizen is ‘an informed citizen’ (Best, 2000:188), an individual who possesses ‘knowledge’ characteristics which include knowledge of socio-politico-economic rights issues within the citizenship discourse (Davies *et al.*, 1999:55). This reaffirms the progressive argument which construes citizenship education as that which nurtures an enlightened, active, reflective, critical and level-headed citizenry.

Davies *et al.* (1999:53-54) argue that a good citizen should have 'conservative characteristics'. As the word 'conservative' implies, a good citizen should be contented with the *status quo*. Hence, he/she should accept authority, keep rules and obey laws – Best's (2000:188) 'law-abiding citizen'. He/she should accept assigned responsibilities and be patriotic. Correspondingly, Nziramasanga (1999:350) argues that, "Citizenship Education would develop patriotism, obedience to legitimate authority..." and Best (2000:187) avows that, "a citizen's first duty is loyalty to his ruler..." Unfortunately, terms 'patriotism' and 'loyalty' are occasionally abused as one may need to be partisan and docile for them to be considered patriotic and loyal, respectively. Thus, conservative characteristics substantiate the quietist thesis which views citizenship education as mere propagation of quietism.

Therefore, a respectable argument should be the one which views a good citizen as neither recalcitrant nor docile but level-headed. Thus, good citizens should be easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave.

Interfacing citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu*

Nziramasanga (1999:349) argues that, "rights, duties and responsibilities should be part of a person with genuine and acceptable *Unhu/Ubuntu*." Hence, it is on the basis of this close propinquity between *Unhu/Ubuntu* and citizenship that Nziramasanga (1999:62) proclaims:

Unhu/Ubuntu then is a concept that denotes a good human being, a well-behaved and morally upright person, characterised by qualities such as responsibility, honesty, justice, trustworthiness, hardwork, integrity, a co-operative spirit, solidarity, hospitality, devotion to family and the welfare of the community.

Thus, 'a good human being' denotes a good citizen, 'responsibility' is one of the defining characteristics of citizenship and 'devotion to family and the welfare of the community' also manifests the social obligation expected of a good citizen.

Participants in a study by Muropa *et al.* (2013:660) also "argue that merely teaching students about the theory of citizenship is ineffective unless homes, schools, colleges and universities themselves reflect democratic practices by giving students the opportunity to have a say in decision making." This demonstrates the close propinquity between *Unhu/Ubuntu* and democracy 'the linchpin of citizenship education'. Above all, citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu* converge where they cherish patriotism.

The analogous ideals of citizenship and *Unhu/Ubuntu* are both applicable in the Afro-

Zimbabwean context with the former having Western-Occidental connotations whereas the latter portrays African nuances.

Appropriating ideas from other countries to inform the projected escalation of citizenship education in Zimbabwe

This reflection consistently takes into cognisance Nziramasanga's (1999:354) cautionary word that, "in the fast-changing and interdependent global village of the Third Millennium, Zimbabwe cannot watch its youth being tossed about by all the winds of change. We should be progressively selective of foreign influences that we need." Hence, the article appropriates ideas from other countries not out of *Xenophilia* but to cope with globalisation sensibilities.

Citizenship education is either, "a distinct part of public policies [as it is in Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the UK] or one component of educational policies [as is the case in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Lithuania, the Netherlands and other countries]" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:187). In Zimbabwe, citizenship education is neither a distinct part of public policies nor one visible component of educational policies. It is rather scantily infused in Heritage Studies as well as in *Unhu/Ubuntu* which equally has a shaky grounding in GoZ (2015) where it is mentioned in passing without any meaningful reflection upon it. In short, citizenship education is not manifested at policy level. Hence, the current reflection challenges the MoPSE to, for a start, incorporate citizenship education as one component of Zimbabwe's educational policy in order to strengthen the democratic culture within and beyond schooling.

"As European societies need the participation of active citizens" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:187), the Zimbabwean societies need the same. Vilakazi & Mathebula (2013:187) further suggest that efforts should be made to "promote active citizenship in democracies in schools as well as in the field of lifelong learning." This implies that citizenship education should transcend the school because the knowledge of democratic culture, "which is made up of shared values and common rules of society" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:187), is exigent for community life in Zimbabwe. Thus, in the context of *Unhu/Ubuntu*, the democratic culture has to be learnt from womb to tomb.

Across Europe, the organisation of citizenship education is "either subject-based or cross-curricular, or optional" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:187). In Zimbabwe, the administration-configuration of citizenship education is cross-curricular and optional. This reflection, however, argues that the cross-curricular and optional administration-configuration of citizenship education does not give it the earnestness that it deserves. Hence, this reflection advocates that citizenship be offered as a statutory subject in line with

Nziramasanga's (1999) recommendations that, "Citizenship education be compulsorily taught in the entire school curriculum, as a matter of urgency" (p.354), and, "there should be a specific part of the curriculum entitled Citizenship Education" (p.349). These suggestions concur with the British model of citizenship which render citizenship education a statutory subject.

With the continual evolution of citizenship education in the UK, "the competencies, abilities or outcomes of the national curriculum had to be redefined as knowledge, skills and understanding [values or attitude]...levels of learning and levels of outcome to be achieved by learners" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:188). These are in line with the internationally acceptable competency levels which are cognitive, psychomotor and affective learning [Education of the head, hand and heart]. The current reflection, therefore, recommends that Zimbabwe's school system adopts this British model of citizenship, of course not wholesale adoption but adoption with careful adaptations. This, for the greater part, concurs with the *Unhu/Ubuntu* philosophy which, according to Nziramasanga (1999:75), accentuates holistic education addressing 'the head, the heart and the hand'.

In the USA, the concept was essentially called 'civic education'. In 1987, the Center for Civic Education was founded, a non-profit organisation which published its first volume entitled '*CIVITAS: Bulletin 86*' in 1991. The Bulletin was followed by a book entitled *CIVITAS* that stressed: 'civic virtue' which instilled habits and principles required for responsible citizenship, 'civic participation' which sought to develop those skills requisite for democratic participation, and 'civil knowledge' for empowering citizens with the knowledge necessary for formation, implementation and enforcement of public policy and problem-solving. According to *CIVITAS*, "learners should know their rights and responsibilities, and be aware of social issues and political institutions" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:190). In 1994, the Center for Civic Education published another book entitled *National Standards for Civics and Government*. This book identifies the civic mission for schools, explains the need for increased attention to civic education, gives a definition of skills to be attained *viz* intellectual and participatory, and focuses on content standards [what the student should know and be able to do as a result of being exposed to civic education at a particular level or grade], thus, the book defines the content to be mastered and learning outcomes to be achieved (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:190-191).

Therefore, this reflection exhorts the MoPSE to publish Bulletins and Books for scholarly reference in executing the citizenship education program following the US model. The MoPSE could call for scholarly contributions in form of presentation papers

and/or book chapters on citizenship education which are then subjected to peer-review - the best international practice exigent for meaningful publications in any given area of academic endeavour.

In South Africa:

The general aims of the National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (2012)...are to equip learners, irrespective of their socio-economic background, race, gender, physical ability and intellectual ability, with knowledge, skills and values necessary for fulfilment and meaningful participation in society as citizens of a free country (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:192).

Thus, citizenship education is underpinned by inclusivity and is a component of educational policy. Moreover, "the National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement promotes citizenship as a practice and as part of the learning programme in South African schools" (Vilakazi & Mathebula, 2013:192). Thus, citizenship education is 'caught' and 'taught' in South Africa and hence it has a great deal in common with the global trends. Therefore, this reflection further advocates that the MoPSE should make citizenship education a distinct component of educational policy in Zimbabwe. The article also urges the Government of Zimbabwe to religiously-sincerely implement citizenship education both in its minimalist and maximalist forms, a predisposition which concurs with civic agency in democratic societies.

Threats to Citizenship Education

Since citizenship is underpinned by democracy, therefore, the success of citizenship education especially in Sub-Saharan Africa is hampered by some governments' lack of a genuine democratic predisposition. This is observable in the emphasis that some African leaders place on loyalty as a quietist rhetoric and patriotism which they deliberately abuse and misconstrue for partisanship. The successful institution of citizenship as a statutory subject in Zimbabwe's school curriculum in particular essentially depends on the democratic predisposition of the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education and the Updated Curriculum for period 2015-2022. Implementation progress or lack of it also depends on the preparedness of the government to raise and manage an enlightened, informed, critical, active and reflective citizenry. Above all, the escalation of citizenship education is locally threatened by the uncertainty as to what it is, lack of adequate resourcing, lack of staff expertise, the chief impediment being the priority given to the national curriculum subjects whose teaching is a statutory obligation. This constitutes the implementation mirage.

CONCLUSION AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

The little being offered locally under citizenship education sounds more quietist than progressive. Therefore, in order to make citizenship education genuine and strengthen the democratic culture within and beyond schooling, the Government of Zimbabwe could embark on the following:

- Incorporate citizenship education as one component of Zimbabwe's educational policy.
- Offer citizenship education as a statutory subject following the British example.
- Publish Bulletins and Books for scholarly reference in the teaching of citizenship following the US model.
- Religiously and sincerely implement citizenship education both in its minimalist and maximalist forms following the South African model.

REFERENCES

1. Best, W. D. (2000). *The students' companion*. Edinburgh: Longman.
2. Bottery, M. (2000). *Education, policy and ethics*. London: Wellington House.
3. Davies, I., Gregory, I., & Riley, S. C. (1999). *Good citizenship and educational provision*. London: Falmer Press.
4. GoZ (2015). *Curriculum framework for primary and secondary education 2015-2022*. Harare: Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education.
5. Hapanyengwi-Chemhuru, O. (2014). Foundations of modern education. In B. R. S. Chivore [Coordinator], *Theory of Education: Diploma in Education [Primary] Open and Distance Learning* (pp.112-157). Harare: UZ Department of Teacher Education.
6. Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2014). Cosmopolitanism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, Accessed from <http://plato.standard.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/cosmopolitanism/>.
7. Makuvaza, N. (2017). Old People's Homes [OPHs] and intergenerational cultural transfer discontinuity in Zimbabwe. In P. Ngulube (Ed.), *Handbook of Research and Social, Cultural and Educational Considerations of Indigenous Knowledge in Developing Countries* (pp.346-368). IGI Global 2016. Accessed 24/06/2020 from <https://books.google.co.zw/>
8. Monnier, C. (2010). *Globalising cultures: The question of cultural diversity*. Retrieved from <https://globalsociology.pbworks.com/w/page/14711190>.
9. Muropa, B. C., Kusure, L. P., Makwerere, D., Kasowe, R., & Muropa, Z. (2013). Unhu/Ubuntu and its relationship with civics and citizenship education. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 4(4), 658-661.
10. Nziramasanga, C. T. (1999). *Report of the presidential commission of inquiry into education and training*. Harare: Government Printers.
11. Sibanda, P. (2014). The dimensions of 'Hunhu/Ubuntu' [Humanism in the African sense]: The Zimbabwean conception. *IOSR Journal of Engineering [IOSRJEN]*, 4(1), 26-29.
12. Vilakazi, S. and Mathebula, T. (2013). Citizenship Education. In K. Horsthemke, P. Siyakwazi, E. Walton and C. Wolhuter (Eds.), *Education Studies: History, Sociology and Philosophy*, pp. 177-200. Oxford: University Press Southern Africa (Pvt) Ltd.
13. Wringe, C. (1984). *Democracy, schooling and political education*. London: George, Allen Unwin Publishers (pvt) Ltd.