
The Potency of Ubuntu-gogy as a Decolonised Pedagogy in Universities: Challenges and Solutions

Bunmi Isaiah Omodan
bomodan@wsu.ac.za
CAPTD, Faculty of Education
Butterworth Campus
Walter Sisulu University

ABSTRACT

Pedagogy, a subset of modernity that could be regarded as the supremacy of Western epistemology, has been the major core of curricula implementation in the university system. This includes but is not limited to teaching, learning, and the teaching and learning process. However, this article argues that pedagogy and its implementation process are too Westernised, thereby rendering the teaching-learning process in rural classrooms ineffective because the Western epistemic process portends a pseudo-process with complicated pedagogical contour. This article challenges the impotence of pedagogy to reinvigorate the potency of Ubuntu-gogy as an alternative to the current pedagogical process in university classrooms. Ubuntu-gogy as a decolonial classroom technique underpinned the study. This study is located in the Transformative Paradigm (TP), informed by Participatory Research (PR) design in order to transform the assumed colonial Western epistemology using the views of university students and lecturers in a selected rural university in South Africa. A convenient selection method was used to select ten participants: five postgraduate students and five lecturers. An unstructured interview was used to elicit information from the participants while the data were subjected to Thematic Analysis (TA). The study discovered that the major challenges of Ubuntu-gogy are that university stakeholders lack interest in indigenous knowledge production and its implementation, and that the stereotypical mentality of people hinders the proposition of ubuntu-gogy. While collaborative instruction and Africanisation of things are a dimension of promoting ubuntu-gogy in the university system, all stakeholders must collaborate to ensure that knowledge is all-inclusive and culturally valued to enhance students' participation.

Keywords: *Pedagogy, modernity, ubuntu-gogy, rural universities, Africanised pedagogy*

INTRODUCTION

Perusing the current decoloniality movement in Africa and beyond, various allegations and counter-allegations have been made against the hegemony of the Western epistemological process imposed on the education system, especially in the teaching and learning process, otherwise called pedagogy. Among various decolonial arguments and propositions are the need to inject indigenous content into the teaching and learning process (Bangura, 2005), the need for university transformation, experiential knowledge construction and

respect for socially inclined knowledge production that caters to students' social and cultural background (Crossman & Devisch, 2002; Breidlid, 2009; Lee, 2009; Ronoh, 2017). On the other hand, agitations have been made for curriculum reconstruction to accommodate local and indigenous environmentalism in order to ensure that the teaching-learning process is laced from the known to the unknown. This idea is a contest against the western structured process of knowledge that does not accommodate students' social, cultural and indigenous contradictions across board (Seleti & Kaya, 2013; Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019; Madimabe, 2020). This study is limited to the trajectory

around the impotence of pedagogy, the westernised teaching-learning system, and the potency of ubuntu pedagogy, an Africanised teaching-learning system that accommodates the injection of local, social and environmental knowledge into the process of knowledge generation.

Literature confirms that students in rurally located universities find it difficult to relate the classroom teaching process with their social and cultural backgrounds (Vaccarino, 2009; Smit, Hyry-Beihammer & Raggl, 2015; du Plessis & Mestry, 2019). Even most of the recommended textbooks, at the time, were embedded with foreign contents which are not directly related to the background and experience of the users (Duan, 2013). Knowledge in such textbooks is not indigenous; therefore, students find it difficult to relate them with their socio-cultural and environmental experiences. This lacuna forms the argument that pedagogy has not provided lasting solutions to the teaching and learning problem because of its unilateral power allotted to teachers/lecturers, thereby making them so powerful in the process of knowledge construction (Bangura, 2017). Featherstone (2020) argues that pedagogy also rendered students passive and independent. In such a pedagogical process, where students are rendered passive and left alone to construct knowledge from their lonesome spaces, the place of social, cultural and environmental influence becomes imminent. This trajectory may be connected with the deficiencies of the national curriculum and educational policies, which have been the yardstick for university planning and teaching objectives. It is linked to national directions because, in most cases, universities are there to implement national policies. The argument is that a national curriculum and educational policies to ameliorate the vacuum of curriculum reconstruction are fundamental and unavoidable in challenging anti-indigenous

classroom construction. It further confirms that decoloniality in the education system, mostly in university classrooms, needs to be intensified.

Problematising the Hegemony of Pedagogy within Decoloniality

Decoloniality, as a concept, is a movement against the leftover of coloniality (decolonisation). Various scholars use the former as a force to erase the systematic colonisation bedeviling African systems (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015; Dube, 2020), while the latter is the devil that must be challenged (Mignolo, 2011). These systems include the education sector and its agencies, such as higher institutions, and secondary and primary schools. However, decolonial agitations in the South African education system, according to Fataar (2018, p.vii), includes a call for an all-inclusive education approach that accommodates inter-cultural knowledge and the "heterodox of being human," which promotes openness in human beings. He further argues that such an approach will eradicate "knowledge parochialism" and decongest the idea of knowledge superiority. From this perspective, one could conceptualise decoloniality, according to the study, as an agitation against superiority in knowledge construction where students and all the participants share their responsibilities without power differential or knowledge imposition between the participants (teachers/lecturers and the students). Perhaps, this is what Davids (2018) means by a decolonised pedagogy with the potential to emancipate students from unethical colonial teaching. This also found its place in the argument of Aliakbari and Faraji (2011) that an emancipatory teaching and learning process empowers students to think critically in order to transform their academic predicaments for the better. Waghid (2018, p. 61) states that such self-decency is

participatory and allows students to develop a "sense of agency." Based on the above, one could say that a decolonial classroom process is fair, democratic, humane and expedient for the success and progress of university students.

Based on the above explorations, one could argue that university classrooms, most especially in the rurally located communities, are not yet decolonised, or better say, the agitation of decoloniality is still a concept that needs to be translated into reality. Grosser and Nel's (2013) argument supports the view that students lack the critical skill to think independently. That is, a lack of critical thinking skills is still prevalent in underdeveloped and developing countries. South African rural schools are not exceptions, as Rademeyer (2007) found out that students' lack of critical thinking skills is responsible for their poor academic performance.

Although language ability was also part of the extraneous variables responsible for poor performance (Howie, 2007), this has generated the unanswered question of whether students in South Africa are exposed to teaching practices that enhance their critical thinking abilities. This, perhaps, is why Hoffman, Duffield and Donoghue (2004), Lombard and Grosser (2004), and Grosser and Nel (2013) recommend that students should be made to acquire critical thinking skills to enable them to solve problems with reflective practice techniques. Based on this lacuna, one could deduce that the university teaching-learning space is yet to be decolonised, which necessitated the proposition to explore the potency of ubuntugogy as an Africanised teaching-learning system to unravel the decadence of modernity hidden under the implementation of teaching and learning space.

Ubuntugogy as a Theoretical Framework

Ubuntugogy, taking ahead of pedagogy, is a science of teaching and learning derived from an Africanised philosophy called Ubuntu (Bangura, 2017). Ubuntu, which precipitates humanity, love, compassion, oneness and kindness, informed the origin that defined the coinage of ubuntugogy (Bangura, 2005). Ubuntu, in its etymology, is traceable to many African languages and cultures such as Shona, IsiNdebele, IsiSwati/IsiSwazi, IsiXhosa, Yoruba and IsiZulu, which literarily means humanity and "being humane," fellowship, kindness, and brotherliness, among others (Samkange & Samkange, 1980; Mugumbate & Nyanguru, 2013; Omodan & Ige, 2021). It was seen to be peculiar to the African community (Tutu, 1999); perhaps this is why Omodan and Dube (2020) referred to ubuntu as Africanism. This also surfaces in the Zulu adage "umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu" meaning a person is a person through others (Lefa, 2015). The aphorism typified the saying that the existence of a human being is not for self alone but for others. That is, human beings are created because of others. This is not far from the argument that ubuntu believes that "I am because we are" (Lefa, 2015; Tsotetsi & Omodan, 2020). One could then deduce that ubuntu strengthens people's togetherness, mutualism, empathy, openness and commitment to one another. Perhaps, this is why Mthiyane and Mudadigwa (2021) concluded that ubuntu as a philosophy "goes beyond spiritual aspects which address the inner being and sensitivity in response to different situations."

Having explicated the origin of ubuntugogy as an extract from the Africanised philosophy of ubuntu, it is quintessential to conceptualise ubuntugogy, an educational paradigm that was first used exposed in 2005 as superior to pedagogy, andragogy, heutogogy and ergonagogy (Bangura, 2005). Pedagogy,

andragogy, heutogy and ergonagogy, according to Ganyi and Owan (2016), were founded with reflection from multi-faceted and pluralistic background alien to Africanism. However, the superiority of ubuntu pedagogy lies in the fact that it takes its principles from the existential viewpoint of ubuntu. The idea here is that if the ubuntu that gave birth to ubuntu pedagogy, preaches oneness, togetherness, collaboration, cooperation and collectivism (Tutu, 1999, Samkange, 1980); one could then argue that ubuntu pedagogy, is a teaching and learning system that take solace in collaborative learning which could be seen as a way to bridge the power differentials between teachers/lecturers, and students, as the case may be. This is practically one of the principles of ubuntu that every process of development is rooted in the collective responsibilities of all. This argument is corroborated by Ganyi and Owan (2016, p. 36) that the "model of traditional African knowledge dissemination system through communal education carried on by the narration of folktales, myths, legends and other traditional festival enactments that contain the wisdom of our traditional communities". Ubuntu pedagogy, as an Africanised teaching and learning system, possesses the indigenous knowledge potency to proclaim people's culture and identities needed to unravel classroom issues.

As the theoretical framework of this study, ubuntu pedagogy is relevant not only because it bridges the classroom power differentials but because it is relevant to decolonised societal ingenuity towards the educational advancement of African societies. The argument here is that modernity, which has dominated the core and periphery of university education, including its teaching and learning processes, portends the operational supremacy of Western epistemology. This pedagogical imposition of Western epistemology from its etymological and traditional views is

expected to promote democratic education in its full flag. Ironically, the specie of democracy that exists in the experimentation of the same Western epistemology is being viewed as only a pseudo-democratic classroom hegemony invented along a complicated pedagogical contour, which must be challenged to pave the way for an indigenous process of knowledge construction. This argument is laced with decoloniality, focusing on ubuntu pedagogy, defined as the science and art of teaching and learning underpinned by humanity, collaboration, togetherness, cooperation and Afrocentricism. ubuntu pedagogy as a decolonised classroom technique is illuminated here to contest the hegemony of pedagogy (Western epistemology). Decoloniality in the context of Ubuntu pedagogy agrees that the pedagogy of western epistemology is good, but it does not make the Africanised body of knowledge construction, knowledge process and knowledge development inferior or less good. Instead, ubuntu pedagogy is better in the university classroom.

RESEARCH QUESTION

In order to unravel the potency of ubuntu pedagogy as a teaching and learning decoloniality system, the following question was raised to guide the study:

- How can the views of lecturers and students on ubuntu pedagogy be incorporated into university teaching and learning decoloniality strategies?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

In order to answer the research question, the following research objectives were formulated to pilot the study. Therefore, the study:

- Explores the challenges hindering the use of humane and indigenous practices, otherwise regarded as ubuntu pedagogy.

- Investigates the possible solutions that could enhance the potency of ubuntu in university classrooms.

METHODOLOGY

The study is located in the Transformative Paradigm (TP) informed by Participatory Research (PR). A convenient selection method was used to select participants. An unstructured interview was used to elicit information from the participants while the data were subjected to thematic analysis. Below is the methodological process.

Research Paradigm and Design

This study adopted a transformative paradigm to lens the study. This paradigm is relevant because its major assumption is transforming people's predicament from the status quo for the better (Mertens, 2017). Therefore, this study intends to emancipate university students from the colonial classroom hegemony into a transformed teaching-learning system where students' voices and ideas are recognised in knowledge generation. Besides, the epistemology and ontology informing the study can not be divorced from the historical nature of marginalisation (Chilisa, 2011) emanated from the existing pedagogical practices. Therefore, TP is relevant because it unlocks human beings into freedom (Scott & Usher, 2011). This paradigm could be argued as best for this study because its emancipatory mission challenges social incongruity by advocating for change in this study and education change through collaborative and cooperative practices (Shah & Al-Bargi, 2013). In order to implement the collaborative tendencies of the transformative paradigm, the study adopted Participatory Research as a research design. This design derived its principles from people's collaborative and participatory nature (the researcher and the researched). The design enables the researcher and the people facing the problem to work together

jointly to find a solution (de Vos, Strydom, Fouch & Delpont, 2011). This design is relevant to the research process because it enables equal involvement and opportunities for other researchers and the researched. It also values the experiences and ideas of the people facing the problem under investigation. Hence, the selected lecturers and students were made co-researchers in this study, and their participation remained inclusive without discrimination.

Participants and Participants' Selection

The participants in the study were university students and lecturers. The selected students have at least two years of experience in the university setting. At the same time, the selected lecturers have at least two years of experience teaching and learning in the university community. The assumption here is that both the selected students and the lecturers might have gained enough experience to give them adequate knowledge regarding the use of Africanised teaching and learning, which is ubuntu. Since there is no special characteristic in the targeted participants, a convenient selection method was used to select both students and lecturers. This method was used because it enables the researcher to use easily approachable participants without any special rigour. This, perhaps, is why it is called the accidental sampling technique (Alvi, 2016).

Method of Data Collection and Data Collection Process

An electronic interview was adopted to elicit information from the selected participants. Electronic interviews such as email, WhatsApp and telephonic were employed to get information from the students and the lecturer. This method was appropriate because, at the time of the study, most of the universities in South Africa, including the selected university, still worked from home due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, the

participants were not available on campus but could be reached electronically. A letter containing the problem, the purpose and the research question, including the design and paradigmatic lens, were sent to the participants. This was done to make them aware of the nitty-gritty of the study as co-researchers and they were made to respond to the interview question, which were derived from the objectives of the study. Some of them agreed to respond in writing, some gave a voice note, and others preferred to be called telephonically. Their responses were gathered, transcribed and collated within the principles of researcher ethics.

Data Analysis and Ethical Consideration

Thematic analysis (TA) was used to interpret the data collected from the participant through a participatory process. Thematic analysis is relevant to respond to the objectives of the study, which formed the interview questions. According to Keevash, Norman, Forrest and Mortimer (2018), TA allows researchers to categorise data into themes and sub-themes to ensure the coherent presentation of data. That is, the data collected were categorised into themes based on the study's objectives. Sub-themes also emerged from the larger themes. This process enabled the researcher to be better familiar with the data (Mohammadpur, 2013). To do this, six steps of doing thematic analysis propounded by Braun and Clarke (2006) were followed. They are: familiarisation with the transcribed data, coding the data, identifying the relevant themes, reviewing the themes, naming the themes, and producing the result (Braun &

Clarke, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2013). Ethics was also observed to protect the researcher's and participants' identities from potential harm (Dube, 2016). The researcher sought the participants' consent and ensured they were aware of the study process with no potential harm. They were informed that their participation was not under any force or obligation; therefore, they were allowed to decline or withdraw their participation at any time. Their identities were also protected with pseudonyms during the data analysis process. The participants were represented with the following codes: lecturers were L1, L2, L3, L4 and L5, while the students were S1, S2, S3, S4, and S5. The result is presented below.

Presentation and Data Analysis

The above-mentioned methodological process was implemented in this session. The data collected within the purview of the transformative paradigm were analysed using the Thematic Analysis. The data were presented in line with the study's objectives: to explore the challenges hindering the use of indigenous practices, otherwise regarded as Ubuntugogy, and investigate the possible solutions that could enhance the potency of Ubuntugogy in university classrooms. According to the data, each objective was categorised into two sub-themes; the sub-themes under objective 1 are stakeholders' lack of interest and stereotypical mentality. The sub-themes under objective 2 are collaborative instruction and Africanisation of things. See the table below for more clarity.

Table 1: Thematic representation of data based on the research question and objectives

Research Question: How can ubuntu-gogy be explored as an alternative to decolonise the university teaching and learning space?	
Objectives	Analysis of Sub-themes
To explore the challenges hindering the use of indigenous practices, otherwise regarded as ubuntu-gogy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stakeholders' lack of interest 2. Stereotypical mentality
To investigate the possible solutions that could enhance the potency of ubuntu-gogy in university classrooms.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborative instruction 2. Africanisation of things

Objective 1, theme 1: Stakeholders' lack of interest

Based on the data collected, the indication exists that stakeholders such as students and educators demonstrate a lack of interest in implementing indigenous knowledge systems in schools, mostly in universities. Ngulube, Dube and Mhlongo (2015) also confirmed that the university system in Southern Africa is yet to be decolonised because the local content in the knowledge production has been neglected to nothing. The current study also confirms the trajectory and these suffixes in the following participants' statements:

***L1:** "Ubuntu-gogy being what it is (an indigenous method of teaching) is presumed to be bedevilled by many local obstacles even from within as not all scholars (local) agree to the processes/steps embedded in the method."*

***L2:** "Lecturer's interest or otherwise, goes a long way in stampeding the effective utilisation of indigenous teaching-learning process."*

***L3:** "... once there's no mutual agreement between the main actors of the indigenous teaching/learning process, the take-off suffers a major setback, which has been observed in the past. Even many of those indigenous processes are not explainable."*

***S2:** "The other thing that hinders is the fixed mindset of educators, especially those who are old and do not want to retire."*

L1's statement confirms that many scholars, including university lecturers, might not agree with implementing the indigenous method of teaching that accommodates local and environmental knowledge in the teaching-learning process. This appears to be an issue when the supposed implementers disagree with the proposition of ubuntu-gogy in the system. This, perhaps, is why L2 said that the interest of the lecturers is sacrosanct in the process. It is not far from L3's experiences and observations that the place of agreement among the actors, the lecturers and other classroom practitioners is not negotiable in implementing ubuntu-gogy. L3 also reiterated that many of those indigenous

contents are not explainable. In our opinion, this could be why stakeholders differ in the implementation process. Not only this, but S2 also argued that the mindset of the educators is not also fixed into the current hegemony of pedagogy and probably does not see any reason for the deviation. To further justify this, the issue of interest among stakeholders is a challenge, and the following participants have these to say.

S5: "I think that one of the major challenges is the curriculum/content itself. What we are learning is mostly based on research from European countries and as students, we cannot relate to what the lecturer teaches. Only a few modules capture local and indigenous content, but it does not accommodate all students."

S3: "Then, indigenous practices are left with nobody to support. Lecturers are the drivers at the tertiary level to ensure that the knowledge and information are transferred in a well-mannered form from generation to generation. So, if lecturers ignore our indigenous practices and their invaluable knowledge, the students will also regard them as ineffective because students will imitate what they observed from their lecturers."

As an abstract stakeholder in teaching and learning, the curriculum also has its own share of the challenges of ubuntu pedagogy. This was reflected by participant S5 above that the curriculum is designed to accommodate the westernisation of knowledge ahead of localised knowledge. Thus, the participants also recognised that few modules are designed to promote indigenous knowledge. This indicates that the implementation of ubuntu pedagogy

is implementable, though it may take the concerted effort of stakeholders to make it happen. S3's statement also stated the importance of lecturers in implementing ubuntu pedagogy and that if lecturers continue to disrespect the local system, this attitude will also inform the students' actions and may be passed from generation to generation.

Objective 1, theme 2: Stereotypical mentality

The unethical stereotypical mentality is a situation in Africa where people do not value their own product and production process. This is not far from the fact that Africans have been made to believe that westernised or imported knowledge is better than self-made or indigenously made knowledge. Perhaps, this is what Mitova (2020) intends to unravel to pave the way for the trustworthiness of Africanised knowledge. The participants' statements below demonstrate a mentality among university classroom participants that localised knowledge is not valued.

S1: "... because we people who are in authority to rule what is right and wrong about the way teaching has revolutionised their lifestyles in a way that they think everyone should try to evolve to what they imagine as civilised."

L4: "Secondly, people do not trust or value what was and think it is outdated. This means that the ways that were followed before are not adaptable to our current lives. For instance, back then, corporal punishment was allowed in schools and now it is impossible to do it."

L5: "Students cannot relate to the teaching content because there is a lot of negativity from people who do not understand the

importance of learning in some local communities. If you display what you have learnt in an indigenous way, you will be bullied."

S5: "The environment, in general, is negative as there is a lot of bullying or threats made to students in case they reveal their social and local experiences."

Deducing from the statement made by S1, it is believed that people in the teaching profession who have learned from the Westernised system mostly believe that the Westernised system is the civilised one that must also be adopted and continued. S4 also corroborates S1 that the introduction of indigenous knowledge is outdated and, therefore, it does not value it, emphasising the previously used method of instilling discipline in children, which has been taken away by the assumed civilisation. In the same vein, S5 also corroborates the argument that students find it difficult to promote and relate learning to their indigenous lives because such students will be tagged local and primitive. This still boils down to the fact that people valued westernised knowledge systems because of the attachment of assumed civility. S5's statement also corroborates the above statements and argument that a display of local knowledge construction attracts bullying and unclosed stereotype among learners. S5 further confirms that society does not, to some extent, support the promotion of the indigenous knowledge system.

Objective 2, theme 1: Collaborative Instruction

The data collected based on the second objective is presented below. The participants' statement indicates that the full implementation of collaborative instruction will go a long way in ensuring indigenous

knowledge practices, otherwise called ubuntugogy. The idea of a collectivising effort is not far from the principle of ubuntu; that human beings are created because of others (Lefa, 2015) from the belief that "I am because we are" (Tsotetsi & Omodan, 2020). These statements below show the importance of collaborative instructions as a solution to the challenges of ubuntugogy in rural universities:

L1: "Promoting a common ground on which all scholars/major actors of the teaching-learning process would agree to start the new method would go a long way in helping the process as it is meant to ameliorate the problems being encountered by students in the classroom."

L2: "Critical social engagement and knowledge related to real-life events which will encourage critical/reflective thinking as what is learnt in class can be related to what is happening to the individual learner in the society/environment in which they live."

L4: "The techniques and procedures of operationalising teaching and learning in the universities must be easy, collaborative, and reflective to accommodate students' environmental experience and lifestyle."

L3: "In our classroom, we could have embraced different cultures; we also need to give our students a voice in their learning and allow them to share their experiences; classrooms should allow for freedom of expression."

S4: "Lecturers should consolidate local ways of knowing and

teaching in their work. Local environment and community resources should be used on a standard premise to interface what they teach to the ordinary lives of the students; this will help students in their critical thinking as they will be focusing on what happens daily."

The statement from L1 indicates that the major actors, such as students and lecturers, probably other stakeholders in the university system, need a concerted effort to ensure that students are exposed to an all-encompassing indigenous knowledge. To support the above, L2 also recommended that a critical social engagement where students will be allowed to relate classroom activities to life events is needed with an assumption that it will assist students in overcoming the problem of a lack of critical thinking abilities. L4's statement also reiterated the place of a collaborative and reflective method of teaching where students' environmental experiences and lifestyles will be accommodated in the process. L3 also supported the above by recommending that learning should be done so that students' voices would matter. This commonality, as argued by the participants, according to S4, is not limited to the classroom alone but also extends to the utilisation of the environmental and community resources in the teaching exemplification with the assumption that it will assist students in thinking critically. This confirms that the implementation of ubuntu pedagogy is limitless to students and lecturers; all stakeholders are involved. See the statements below:

S1: "Collaboration amidst diversities will help students upgrade or even be more competitive in class as well as in some topics, and their different cultures will be included. Lecturers should work closely with guardians to realise a high

level of complementary instructive expectations between domestic and school and lastly recognise the full educational potential for each student and give challenges vital for them to realise that potential."

S3: "Teachers should come up with topics that will help students easily engage in class, like creating a topic of cultural or maybe social differences. This will help students come up with ideas or solutions to the states they live in, solutions that they think might help them better understand the content."

The statement made by S1 is a clear indication that collectivism and collaborative knowledge construction remain a style that could be used to implement and sustain ubuntu pedagogy in the university system. According to him, this will enable them to identify various diversities and cultural differences with a complementary instructional method from parents, students, and universities. To support this, S3 also recommended that university classrooms be structured to enable students to engage with themselves from various diversities, such as cultural and social differences. According to S3, *"this will help students come up with ideas or solutions to the states they live in and solutions that they think might help them better understand the content."*

Objective 2, theme 2: Africanisation of things

The second solution provided by the participants is the Africanisation of issues, things and the process of making things. This means that Africans should start thinking and using their knowledge system to ameliorate issues. This may be why Davids (2018) suggested decolonising knowledge by promoting Africanised epistemology.

Africanised epistemology is not far from the agitation of ubuntugogy where local and cultural values are intuited in knowledge production. These statements also corroborate the argument:

S2: "I am not an expert in implementation, but I think we should look into those old pedagogical ways and transform them to fit into our society, like basing our knowledge in Africa because Africa is rich in many things and yet it is painted with a brush of being barbaric."

S5: "...however, if we can get our economy on track...Universities will be able to increase the number of lecturers who offer local content in different languages with expertise in curriculum refinement. And they will get people who will translate the foreign content into African languages."

L1: "Lets us go back to our roots (azibuyele emasisweni); instead of modifying Western tradition, let us praise our African identity. Let us be proud of our Africanity; other practices may be oppressing but we are the ones who should modify them to make it fit into our current life."

S3: "Lecturers and teachers should stop ignoring these practices and pay more attention to them and their usefulness. Once our lecturers change their mindset and attitude, then our African practices will remain alive forever."

L5: "We need to liberate and cherish our spirit and practices every day. We are Africans, not Westerners, so our classroom behaviour should reflect African

identity, not Western, especially when making examples in class."

When asked to share a possible solution to ubuntugogy, S2 recommends that the teaching-learning system be transformed and redirect the knowledge process to take solace in Africanism because Africa is rich in knowledge. S5's statement also supported the need to translate local content into learnable content towards curriculum refinement. It suggested that experts are needed to translate foreign content into an African language. Perhaps, the participants viewed ubuntugogy as having a language problem. L1 also suggested Africans' need to return to their roots instead of modifying Western tradition. This may mean that Africans must explore their hidden values and inject them into the knowledge production process. S3 also suggested that African practices need more attention from scholars. In the same vein, L5 recommended that liberation from coloniality towards cherishing indigenous practices is needed to implement Ubuntugogy.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Based on the above data presentation and analysis, the following findings emerged. The findings were presented according to the two objectives. The findings under the first objectives are stakeholders' lack of interest and the stereotypical mentality of people. At the same time, the findings under the second objective are collaborative instruction Africanisation of things.

Stakeholders' lack of interest

Based on the above data, one could deduce that the stakeholders' lack of interest is a major challenge to the smooth and acceptable promotion of ubuntugogy in the university system, especially in the rural ecology of South Africa, where the system is needed most. This finding is practically against ubuntu's proposition, which preaches oneness, togetherness, collaboration,

cooperation, and collectivism (Tutu, 1999; Samkange, 1980) among communal endeavours. This finding contradicts Fataar's (2018, p. vii) argument that a decolonised agitation in South Africa should include an all-inclusive education approach that accommodates inter-cultural knowledge, the "heterodox of being human" promotes openness in human beings. In the same vein, perhaps, this is why Gunstone (2008) recommended an unavoidable implementation of the indigenous knowledge curriculum. Moahi (2012), in his research, also recommended that indigenous knowledge production must be made compulsory for first-year students.

Stereotypical mentality

Based on the above data analysis, it has been confirmed that the stereotypical mentality is a challenge to developing and promoting an Africanised knowledge system. This finding confirms that the university system in Africa needs to be transformed and decolonised (le Grange, du Preez, Ramrathan & Blignaut, 2020; Mitova, 2020). This transformation is not limited to teaching and learning but also promotes an ingenious knowledge system where students will relate their environmental happenings, culture and value with classroom activities (Macqueen, 2019). This finding, however, negates the argument that decolonised pedagogy poses the potential to emancipate students from unethical colonial teaching. Therefore, there is a need to introduce ubuntu, where classroom hegemony will be reduced to humanity to emancipate students and their predicament regarding lagging in gaining critical thinking skills.

Collaborative instruction

Based on the above analysis, it was discovered that collaborative effort among all the stakeholders, whether in the teaching and

learning process and the administrative and social engagement, is vital to implementing ubuntu in the university system. It is consistent with Omodan and Tsotetsi's (2020) findings that engagement and team spirit towards productivity are practical ways of ensuring classroom decoloniality. They are tantamount to the indigenous practices aimed to ensure ubuntu as a means of decoloniality. The finding also conforms with the principles of ubuntu that preach unity of purpose, collaboration, oneness, togetherness, mutualism, empathy, openness and commitment to one another, which "goes beyond the spiritual aspects of being, rather the sensitivity in response to different situations" (Samkange, 1980; Mthiyane & Mudadigwa, 2021). Perhaps, this could be argued to have complemented Aliakbari and Faraji's (2011) emancipatory teaching and learning process, which enhances students' critical thinking skills.

Africanisation of things

Based on the above analysis, we found out that the Africanisation of things is a way to promote ubuntu in the university system. This finding aligns with Hountondji (2002) that Africans must continue to see things in Africanised ways. It also supports Seleti and Kaya (2013), who argue that Africans must start to promote African products, including recognising an indigenous epistemology that could be regarded as a process of Ubuntu. This, according to Seleti and Kaya (2013), Ezeanya-Esiobu (2019), and Madimabe (2020), will challenge the Western structured process of knowledge, which does not accommodate the social, cultural and indigenous contradistinctions of students across the board. Therefore, when the contradictions and contradictions along with students' cultural hegemony are recognised before, during and after knowledge

production, it will enhance their criticalness towards emancipation.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was akin to ensuring that ubuntugogy is promoted among university stakeholders in order to ensure that all learners are accommodated in the process of knowledge construction. This was done by exposing the challenges of ubuntugogy as an Africanised teaching and learning system to provide viable solutions to the challenges. Based on the findings, it was concluded that the major challenges are stakeholders' lack of interest in the indigenous knowledge production and its implementation and the stereotypical mentality of people hindering the proposition of ubuntugogy. Therefore, collaborative instruction and the Africanisation of things promote Ubuntugogy in the university system. Based on this, this study recommends that all stakeholders must ensure that there is a collaborative effort that knowledge is all-inclusive and culturally valued to enhance students' interest in making African knowledge worthwhile and superior in the university system. Lastly, further studies could be initiated to explore possible correlations between ubuntugogy curriculum reform.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest whatsoever.

REFERENCES

- Alvi, M. H. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research. <https://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/70218>
- Bangura, A. K. (2005). Ubuntugogy: An African educational paradigm that transcends pedagogy, andragogy, ergonagy and heutagogy. *Journal of Third World Studies*. 22(2), 13-53. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45198556>
- Bangura, A. K. (2015). *Toyin Falola and African epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bangura, A. K. (2017). African-centred internet literacy: An ubuntugogy metadata approach. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 10(10), 88-108.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2), 77–101.
- Breidlid, A. (2009). Culture, indigenous knowledge systems and sustainable development: A critical view of education in an African context. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29, 140–148. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.09.009>
- Chilisa, B. (2011). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Crossman, P. & Devisch, R.. (2002). Endogenous knowledge an anthropological perspective. In C.A. Odora Hoppers (Ed.), *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems* (pp.96–128). Claremont, Cape Town: New Africa Books.
- De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouch, C. B. & Delport, C. S. L. (2011). *Research at grassroots* (4th ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- du Plessis, P., & Mestry, R. (2019). Teachers for rural schools: A challenge for South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 39(1), 1-9.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.15700/saje.v39ns1a1774>
- Duan, D. (2013). Adaptability of the in-use textbooks to students in rural junior middle school in Henan, China. *English Language Teaching*, 6(8), 133-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n8p133>
- Dube, B. (2016). A socio-religious hybridity strategy to respond to the problems of religious studies in Zimbabwe. PhD Thesis. University of the Free State.
- Ezeanya-Esiobu, C. (2019). *Indigenous knowledge and education in Africa*. Springer Open.
- Featherstone, L. (2020). Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed at fifty. *Justor Daily Newsletter*. <https://daily.jstor.org/paulo-freires-pedagogy-of-the-oppressed-at-fifty/>
- Ganyi, F. M., & Owan, J. I. (2016). Impact of transculturalism and globalisation on the concepts of oral literature and "ubuntugogy" as educational paradigms for African liberation and development in the 21st century. *English Language, Literature & Culture*, 1(3), 30-39. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ellc.20160103.13>
- Grosser, M. M. & Nel, M. (2013). The relationship between the critical thinking skills and the academic language proficiency of prospective teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(2), 1-17.
- Gunstone, A. (2008). Australian university approaches to indigenous policy. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 37, 103-108.
- Hoffman, K., Duffield, C., & Donoghue, J. (2004). Barriers to clinical decision-making in nurses in Australia. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 21(3), 8-13.
- Hountondji, P.J. (2002). Knowledge appropriation in a post-colonial context. In C. Odora Hoppers (Ed.), *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation* (pp. 23–38). Claremont: New Africa Books.
- Howie, S. & Hughes C. (1998). *Mathematics and science literacy of final year school students in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Keevash, J., Norman, A., Forrest, H., & Mortimer, S. (2018). What influences women to stop or continue breastfeeding? A thematic analysis. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 26(10), <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjom.2018.26.10.651>
- le Grange, L., du Preez, P., Ramrathan, L., & Blignaut, S. (2020). Decolonising the university curriculum or decolonial washing? A multiple case study. *Journal of Education*, 80, 25-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i80a02>
- Lee, Y. (2009). Indigenous knowledge construction and experiential learning of Taiwanese Aborigines. *International Education Journal*, 2(2), 155-161.
- Lefa, B. J. (2015). The African philosophy of ubuntu in South African education. Masters dissertation., Cape Peninsula University of Technology. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274374017_The_African_Philosophy_of_Ubuntu_in_South_African_Education/download,05/05/2020.
- Lombard, B. J. J., & Grosser, M. M. (2004). Critical thinking abilities among prospective educators: Ideals versus realities. *South African Journal of Education*, 24(3), 212–216.
- Macqueen, I. (2019). Testing transformation and decolonisation: Experiences of

- curriculum revision in a history honours module. *Yesterday & Today*, 22, 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2223-0386/2019/n22a1>
- Madimabe, M. P. (2020). Enhancing the teaching and learning of mathematical geometry using the indigenous knowledge approach. Masters dissertation. University of the Free State, South Africa.
- Mertens, D.M. (2017). Advances in mixed methods design. Webinar. *Mixed Methods International Research Association*, 1-19. <https://www.ualberta.ca/international-institute-for-qualitative-methodology/media-library/international-institute-of-qualitative-methods/webinars/mixed-methods/2017/dmertensadvances-in-mm-designfinal.pdf>
- Mitova, V. (2020). Decolonising knowledge here and now. *Philosophical Papers*, 49(2), 191-212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2020.1779606>
- Moahi, K.H. (2012). Promoting African indigenous knowledge in the knowledge economy: Exploring the role of higher education and libraries. *Aslib Proceedings*, 64(5), 540-554.
- Mohammadpur, A. (2013). Qualitative research method counter method: The practical stages and procedures in qualitative methodology. Tehran: Sociologists Publications.
- Mthiyane, S. E., & Mudadigwa, S. (2021). The causes of ethical turpitudes in schools: Evidence from four schools in Gauteng, South Africa. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Research*, 3(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.51986/ijer-2021.vol3.02.01>
- Mugumbate, J. & Nyanguru, A. (2013). Exploring African philosophy: The value of ubuntu in social work. *African Journal of Social Work*, 3(1), 82-100.
- Ngulube, P., Dube, L., & Mhlongo, M. (2015). Towards a cartography of indigenous knowledge systems in library and information science training and education in anglophone eastern and southern Africa. *Indilinga: African Journal of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 14(2), 145-168.
- Omodan, B. I., & Tsetetsi, C. T. (2020). Decolonisation of knowledge construction in university classrooms: The place of social constructivism. *Journal of Gender, Information and Development in Africa*, 9(2), 183-204. <https://doi.org/10.31920/2634-3622/2020/9n2a10>
- Omodan, B. I., & Dube B. (2020). Towards decolonial agitations in university classrooms: The quest for Afrocentric pedagogy. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(4), 14-28. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.4.2>
- Omodan, B. I., & Ige O. A. (2021). Analysis of ubuntu as a transformative strategy to mitigate social unrest in the university system. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(2), 1-11.
- Rademeyer, A. (2007). SA vaar swakste in toets: Leerlinge se leesvaardighede nie op peil. bBeeld, 30 November.
- Ronoh, J. C. (2017). Indigenous knowledge in the school curriculum: Teacher educator perceptions of place and position. Master Thesis. Nelson Mandela University, South Africa.
- Samkange, S. J. T., & T. Marie Samkange. (1980). *Humanism or ubuntuism: A*

- Zimbabwe indigenous political philosophy.* Salisbury: Graham Publishers.
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (2011). *Researching education.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Seleti, H. O., & Kaya, Y. N. (2013). African indigenous knowledge systems and relevance of higher education in South Africa. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 12(1), 30–44.
- Shah, S. R., & Al-Bargi, A. 2013. Research paradigms: Researchers' worldviews, theoretical frameworks and study designs. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(4), 253-265.
- Smit, R., Hyry-Beihammer, K. E., & Raggl, R. (2015). Teaching and learning in small, rural schools in four European countries: Introduction and synthesis of mixed-/multi-age approaches. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 97-103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.04.007>
- Tsotetsi, C. T., & Omodan, B. I. (2020). Deconstructing power differentials in a supervision process: Mentoring in ubuntu perspective. *Ubuntu: Journal of Conflict Transformation*, 9(1), 105-129. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1eb5d4e406>
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness.* Michigan: Doubleday Publishers.
- Vaccarino, F. (2009). Learning and teaching in culturally diverse classrooms: A case study exploring teachers' and students' perceptions. *The International Journal of Learning: Annual Review* 16 (4), 105-118. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v16i04/46231>