



International Journal of Education and Teaching

Publisher's Home Page: <https://www.svedbergopen.com/>



Research Paper

Open Access

Integrating Education 5.0 into Academic Staff Performance and Promotion: Perspectives from Zimbabwean Higher Education Institutions

Gladman Jekese¹ , Christopher Zishiri² , Wonder Muchabaiwa³  and Leo T. Mataruka⁴ 

¹Midlands State University, P. Bag 9055, Senga Rd, Gweru, Zimbabwe. E-mail: jekeseg@staff.msu.ac.zw

²Midlands State University, P. Bag 9055, Senga Rd, Gweru, Zimbabwe. E-mail: zishiric@staff.msu.ac.zw

³Midlands State University, P. Bag 9055, Senga Rd, Gweru, Zimbabwe. E-mail: muchabaiwaw@staff.msu.ac.zw

⁴Catholic University of Zimbabwe, 18443, Cranborne Avenue, Hatfield, Harare, Zimbabwe. E-mail: lmataruka@cuz.ac.zw

Article Info

Volume 5, Issue 2, December 2025

Received : 05 July 2025

Accepted : 19 November 2025

Published : 25 December 2025

doi: [10.51483/IJEDT.5.2.2025.41-50](https://doi.org/10.51483/IJEDT.5.2.2025.41-50)

Abstract

This article explores the integration of Education 5.0 on the academic staff job matrix, performance and promotion criteria at higher education institutions in Zimbabwe. The study, which employed a qualitative phenomenological case study design with open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, found that tangible value-adding projects have the potential to significantly boost morale, and consequently, academic staff performance. This study also reveals the need for a more accessible performance measurement tool for promotion. The study identified significant challenges faced by most university academic staff, including low understanding levels of Education 5.0 and its components. Difficulty in fulfilling the array of Education 5.0 components, due to lack of resources, skills and a supportive environment to promote innovation and industrialisation was also noted. The study recommends the creation of a supportive environment through dedicated funding and the consideration of academic staff perspectives and input in implementing Education 5.0 pillars as their promotion framework.

Keywords: Education 5.0, Higher and tertiary education institutions, Mission, Performance, Promotion

© 2025 Gladman Jekese et al. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

1. Introduction

In 2019, Zimbabwean tertiary institutions adopted Education 5.0, a system encompassing five pillars: teaching, research, community service, innovation and industrialisation. This shift was aimed at transforming universities' traditional missions and aligning them with Zimbabwe's goal of becoming an upper-middle-income economy by 2030. Education 5.0 has brought significant changes to curriculum design, research quality, university rankings, performance evaluation and promotion criteria (Chibuwe and Muromo, 2023; Chimbunde and Jakachira, 2024; Muchabaiwa and Chauraya, 2022; Munikwa and Mapara, 2022). However, the transition revealed several challenges, particularly in academic staff promotion and research funding, necessitating further improvements to realise its full potential.

The previous framework, Education 3.0, focused on three main objectives: teaching, research and university service. Teaching aimed to develop human capital by equipping graduates with the knowledge and skills necessary for participation in increasingly digitalised, innovative economies (Gacel-Ávila and Marmolejo, 2016; Jonjo et al., 2018). Research contributed to sustainable growth through innovation and the dissemination of new technologies, while university

* Corresponding author: Gladman Jekese, Midlands State University, P. Bag 9055, Senga Rd, Gweru, Zimbabwe. E-mail: jekeseg@staff.msu.ac.zw

service involved engagement with communities to address social, cultural and environmental needs (Muzira and Bondai, 2020). These pillars operated symbiotically, contributing to productivity and sustainable development.

Education 5.0 expanded these roles by adding innovation and industrialisation to the mission of Higher and Tertiary Education Institutions (HTEIs). The system aims to address talent transfer, boost the production of goods and services and enhance quality of life through education (Muzira and Muzira, 2020). Universities are now expected to foster a job-creator mindset, collaborating with local communities to uncover economic opportunities and reshape curricula to meet societal needs. This approach also involves creating university-linked start-ups and corporations to generate economic value and contribute to national growth (Alharbi, 2023; Togo and Gandidzanwa, 2021; Viriri et al., 2024). Another critical aspect of Education 5.0 is its focus on universities acting as industry solutions providers. This requires institutions to engage with local industries to identify and address their challenges through research and innovation (Alharbi, 2023). Benefits from these collaborations include mentorship opportunities, industrial exposure for students, enhanced research and teaching outputs for academic staff.

Despite its promising vision, the implementation of Education 5.0 has faced hurdles, particularly due to the absence of a robust transition framework. Key infrastructure such as program support, promotion criteria, physical resources and financial backing was insufficiently developed during the shift from Education 3.0 (Muzira and Muzira, 2020). This lack of preparation has hindered universities from fully achieving the goals of Education 5.0. For instance, discrepancies in academic staff promotion criteria and grade-based remuneration have created competency gaps among faculty members. Research programs, a cornerstone of Education 5.0, have also been affected due to inadequate funding. Research output, measured by productivity and impact factors, is essential for fostering a research innovation ecosystem and driving economic growth (Adam et al., 2016; Ivey et al., 2014). However, without a strong financial framework, universities face challenges in maintaining the quality and quantity of research (Vurayai, 2024).

While Education 5.0 has introduced transformative changes, its success depends on addressing these challenges. A comprehensive transition plan involving harmonised promotion criteria, enhanced funding mechanisms and infrastructural support is essential for realising the full potential of this innovative educational framework. With proper adjustments, Education 5.0 could significantly improve academic performance, research quality and the socio-economic impact of Zimbabwe's universities.

2. Literature Review

The literature on the performance and promotion of academic staff in higher and tertiary education institutions (HTEIs) highlights several interconnected factors and challenges. Continuous academic training programs have emerged as vital for improving teaching and learning, with systematic evaluations recommended to assess their impact (Bingwa and Ngibe, 2021). Job demands and resources, crucial to academic staff development, require targeted interventions to enhance job resources and alleviate pressures (Naidoo-Chetty and du Plessis, 2021). Institutional strategies and personal attributes such as self-efficacy and student-staff interactions, play significant roles in fostering academic integration (Abdul-Rahaman et al., 2022).

Global socio-economic dynamics have reshaped education, prompting governments to adapt policies and institutions to evolve in response to new demands (Guo et al., 2019). Academic staff are pivotal to innovation, industrialisation and research, which are central to HTEIs' missions (Allui and Sahmi, 2016). Effective retention strategies, clear expectations and recognition are crucial to maintaining staff motivation and productivity (Adam et al., 2016). However, the promotion process in HTEIs is often perceived as lengthy and discouraging, further complicating staff retention and career progression.

Research has become a dominant factor in academic promotion, overshadowing the importance of teaching and broader institutional missions (Schimanski and Alperin, 2018). This imbalance may compromise the quality of education, as universities prioritise research outputs to improve rankings and public assessments (Martínez, 2024). Scholars argue for a more holistic evaluation of academic contributions, integrating high quality teaching and institutional service alongside research excellence (Bharuthram, 2024; Fung, 2017).

According to Karp and Fletcher (2014), change is generally feared by individuals in any organisation. The advent of Education 5.0 has introduced additional responsibilities for academic staff, particularly in aligning with innovation and industrialisation goals (Graham, 2016). This shift has implications for workload, promotion criteria and academic productivity. Staff are now required to balance teaching, research and service, often under financial constraints and with limited publishing resources (Saaludin et al., 2016; Sadiq et al., 2019). In Zimbabwe, promotion criteria heavily depend on higher qualifications and alignment with HTEIs' missions, further intensifying the challenges faced by academic staff (Sulkowski et al., 2020).

Despite its potential, the adoption of Education 5.0 remains underexplored in its direct impact on academic staff's performance and promotion (Muchabaiwa and Chauraya, 2022; Muzira and Muzira, 2020). Existing literature primarily examines its alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) rather than its implications for HTEIs' operational dynamics (Togo and Gandidzanwa, 2021). Researchers emphasise the need for government guidance to reconcile these new demands with practical support for academic staff, including adequate funding and streamlined promotion procedures (Viriri et al., 2024).

While the literature underscores the critical role of academic staff in HTEIs, significant challenges persist in balancing teaching, research and institutional expectations. The rise of Education 5.0 and associated changes necessitate comprehensive strategies to address workload pressures, improve resource allocation and ensure equitable promotion processes. Such efforts are essential for enhancing academic productivity and fulfilling HTEIs' missions within an increasingly competitive and dynamic educational landscape.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study employed Kurt Lewin's three-step change theory: unfreezing, changing and refreezing, to examine the transition from Education 3.0 to Education 5.0 in HTEIs and its implications for academic staff performance and promotion (Cummings et al., 2016). Lewin's theory posits that behaviour is shaped by driving forces that facilitate change and restraining forces that hinder it (Hussain et al., 2018). The *unfreezing* phase involves breaking down the status quo to overcome resistance (Cummings et al., 2016). Education 5.0 was introduced to address the limitations of Education 3.0, particularly its inability to foster innovation and industrialisation (Papadimitriou, 2020). Under the older model, promotion criteria focused on teaching, research and service, but unfreezing these outdated practices was necessary to shift towards the objectives of Education 5.0, reducing resistance to change and fostering acceptance (Muzira and Muzira, 2020).

The *changing* phase requires stakeholders to adopt a new perspective and embrace the shift, while the *refreezing* phase focuses on stabilising the new system through formal and informal mechanisms (Cummings et al., 2016). Policymakers were expected to highlight Education 3.0's limitations, promote the adoption of Education 5.0 and establish policies to institutionalise these changes (Armstrong and Armstrong, 2021). However, this study argues that the change process was not implemented systematically, leading to anxiety and apprehension among academic staff, particularly concerning promotion procedures. The absence of a structured approach to unfreezing, transitioning and refreezing has left staff uncertain about their roles and performance criteria under the new model, potentially undermining the objectives of Education 5.0.

4. Methods

The study adopted a qualitative research approach framed within an interpretive paradigm to explore the impact of Education 5.0 on academic staff performance and promotion in HTEIs in Zimbabwe. A case study research design using a university institution in Masvingo Province was employed to gain a clearer picture of the phenomenon studied. Data was collected using open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to gain insight into the academic staff's understanding of Education 5.0 and its impact on their performance and promotion (Belotto, 2018). The study used open-ended questionnaires and unstructured interviews to collect data from participants drawn from 5 faculties, with 4 participants selected from each academic level. A purposive sampling technique was used to select 20 participants comprising full professors, associate professors, senior lecturers, lecturers and assistant lecturers (teaching assistants) from the participating University's five (5) schools. Of the 20 participants, 8 were females, 40% of the total, and 12 were males, constituting 60%. This ratio reflects where the participating universities had more male academic staff than their female counterparts (van den Besselaar and Sandström, 2016). Among the participants, 40% were PhD holders, while 60% were Master's degree holders (Etikan, 2016). All 20 participants had research experience, but 35% had no administrative experience.

Thematic procedures were used to analyse the study data. Data were coded and categorised to create order from the participants' convergent and divergent views, which helped unfold the underlying issues regarding the studied phenomenon. The codes used were as follows: AL - Assistant Lecturer, LC - Lecturer, SL - Senior Lecturer, AP - Associate Professor, PS - Professor.

5. Results

Several important themes related to the integration of Education 5.0 at the universities in Zimbabwe’s Masvingo Province emerged from the study data analysis. Nevertheless, three major themes revolved around the implementation aspect of this new system. The three themes are summarised as follows: academic staff’s perceptions of Education 5.0, challenges associated with the implementation of Education 5.0 and the impact of Education 5.0 on academic staff performance and promotions. These themes are illustrated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Analytical Strategy – Research Themes, Categories and Subcategories		
THEME 1		
Academic staffs’ understanding of Education 5.0		
Category 1	Academic staff with knowledge	
Category 2	Academic staff without knowledge	
THEME 2		
Academic staffs’ challenges with regards to performance and promotion		
Category 1	Performance challenges	1.1 Funding and Resources
		1.2 Innovation absorption by industries and universities
Category 2	Promotion requirements	2.1 Academic staff with knowledge
		2.2 Academic staff without knowledge
THEME 3		
Academic staffs’ reaction to implementation of Education 5.0 with regards to performance and promotion		
Category 1	Staff responded positively	1.1 Promotes collaboration and thinking outside the box
		1.2 Staff embraced and accepted the new mission
Category 2	Staff responded negatively	2.1 Too many requirements and workload
		2.2 Staff lacked motivation and not yet sure

5.1. Academic Staff’s Perceptions of Education 5.0

In exploring academic staff’s perceptions of Education 5.0 and its impact on staff performance and promotions, it was evident that there was varied levels of understanding among participants. Some academic staff demonstrated an understanding of Education 5.0’s principles and their relevance to performance and promotion, while others lacked critical knowledge or were unaware of the system’s implications. The participants were categorised into two groups: those with elementary knowledge and those lacking essential awareness of Education 5.0’s mission.

Participants with a clear understanding acknowledged Education 5.0’s transformative objectives, as echoed in the verbatim quotes from 3 participants:

Participant 1: *“Education 5.0 moves us from conventional outputs in teaching to producing self-sufficient graduates with innovative skills essential for industrialising Zimbabwe (LC).”*

Participant 10 added that: *“Beyond teaching, research, and community engagement, Education 5.0 incorporates innovation and industrialisation, adding value to students, universities and academic staff. Performance and promotions hinge on tangible outputs in these areas (AP).”*

Also, Participant 14 elaborated as follows: *“Universities have become creative hubs of scientific advances and innovation, contributing to industrialisation as producers rather than consumers of knowledge (PS).”*

These participants generally viewed Education 5.0 positively, appreciating its integration of technology, focus on innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration. They believed it positively influenced teaching methods, research outputs and student engagement. However, some participants expressed skepticism regarding the implementation of Education 5.0, particularly its use in performance appraisals and promotions. They argued that aspects like innovation and industrialisation fell outside their professional specialisations and, therefore, should not influence promotion criteria.

Their skepticism stemmed from challenges in transitioning from Education 3.0 to Education 5.0. The change process was marred by insufficient communication, lack of staff induction and inadequate dissemination of policy-related information, particularly regarding promotion criteria. These issues generated mistrust and resistance.

From a change management perspective, unfreezing old promotion criteria is essential to address resistance and drive engagement with Education 5.0 (Muzira and Muzira, 2020). Robbins *et al.* (2013) explain that resistance to change inhibits the development of skills necessary for implementing innovation effectively. Looking at these dynamics, it can be inferred that some academic staff's low perception of Education 5.0 was because their input was not sorted when the system was introduced, hence the scepticism. Furthermore, they were not appropriately inducted, and the lack of information dissemination from the policy implementers, especially that which affected their promotion prospects, was viewed with suspicion. Thus, the perception gap among university academic staff members highlights the need for comprehensive communication, professional development initiatives and support systems to ensure they are involved in decisions that affect them. They are well-informed and equipped to navigate the changing educational landscape, as championed by Education 5.0.

5.2. Challenges Associated with the Implementation of Education 5.0

The study identified several challenges undermining the implementation of Education 5.0 in Zimbabwean universities. These included limited technological infrastructure, a digital divide, inadequate faculty training, financial constraints, resistance to change and the need for supportive policies. These obstacles were highlighted as significantly hindering the adoption of this transformative educational paradigm.

Limited technological infrastructure emerged as a major challenge. Participants noted the scarcity of personal devices like laptops and tablets, compounded by their high costs relative to low academic staff remuneration. Shared desktop computers in universities were insufficient, restricting access to online resources and impeding research and educational activities outside university premises. Participant 8 highlighted this by stating that,

“Academic staff struggle to afford personal laptops due to high costs compared to low salaries. Personal devices are essential for research and fulfilling the goals of Education 5.0(PS).”

Similarly, another participant expressed frustration over limited access to essential devices, which restricted engagement with Education 5.0. Furthermore, unreliable internet connectivity disrupted online learning, collaboration and research, limiting the potential for innovation and industrialisation envisioned under Education 5.0.

Another issue was the lack of technical support. Participants pointed out the inadequacy of IT staff to resolve technical issues promptly. Delays in addressing these issues disrupted teaching, research and innovation activities. Participant 20 remarked that,

“The lack of technical support is a significant challenge. Dedicated support is crucial for using technology effectively in pursuit of Education 5.0 (SL).”

Despite efforts to increase information technology personnel, universities lacked sufficient specialists to meet academic staff needs, further hindering effective use of technology and innovative tools.

Faculty training and capacity building were also identified as critical gaps. Participants reported insufficient training opportunities to integrate technology into teaching, research and community service. For example, Participant 15 noted that,

“Most universities in Zimbabwe are not providing adequate training for faculty to incorporate technology into their work practices (AP).”

This lack of professional development impeded the ability of academic staff to fully embrace Education 5.0's goals. Financial constraints were another recurring theme noted in the study. Participants highlighted inadequate funding for essential resources like technology infrastructure, software licenses and other educational tools. While the government announced the transition to Education 5.0, no specific budget was allocated to support its implementation. Participants stressed the importance of financial support from government, international organisations and other stakeholders to overcome these challenges and ensure its sustainable implementation.

Resistance to change further complicated the adoption of Education 5.0. Participants expressed concerns about increased workloads without corresponding remuneration. The rebranding of degree programmes, introduction of new modules and modularization added to the teaching burden, leaving less time for research. Participant 17 remarked that,

“Education 5.0 brought additional workload without matching remuneration, demanding more from us without adequate compensation.”

Additionally, some academic staff experienced anxiety about shifting from traditional methods to technology-driven approaches, as noted by Participant 19:

“The adoption of Education 5.0 created anxiety among staff. It requires a mindset shift from all stakeholders.”

This resistance was partly attributed to the traditional teaching culture, which was less aligned with the demands of Education 5.0. Participants emphasized the need for convincing evidence, continuous support and a shift in mindset to address these misgivings. The study also highlighted the need for supportive policies and regulatory frameworks. Participants observed that the absence of clear guidelines and frameworks hindered the smooth transition from Education 3.0 to Education 5.0. They emphasized that addressing these policy gaps is essential for creating an enabling environment that fosters innovation and industrialisation.

5.3. Impact of Education 5.0 on Academic Staff Performance and Promotions

The third theme explored the impact of Education 5.0 on academic staff performance and promotions. Prior to its implementation in 2018, universities operated under Education 3.0, which focused on teaching, research and community service. Education 5.0 expanded this model by adding two pillars: innovation and industrialization. This shift, emphasizing technology integration and entrepreneurial approaches, significantly altered the roles and responsibilities of academic staff in higher education institutions.

Findings revealed that Education 5.0 had multifaceted effects on academic staff performance and career advancements. By prioritizing innovation and industrialization, the system enabled partnerships with external actors, reducing reliance on government funding and fostering self-reliance. Participant 12 noted that,

“Education 5.0 promotes self-reliance by generating additional income (PS).”

Initiatives like innovation hubs and industrial parks have facilitated collaborations between academia and industry, resulting in high-quality research and tangible products, as demonstrated by projects such as the *bio diesel project, livestock feed and artificial insemination* at Chinhoyi University of Technology, *Future Grains for Africa* at the University of Zimbabwe and research into *indigenous trees and herbs, pathology and diagnostic center* at Midlands State University.

Despite these benefits, some academic staff raised concerns about challenges posed by Education 5.0. Heavy teaching loads and insufficient institutional support often hindered faculty from prioritizing research. Furthermore, some participants felt that the new mission did not align with their fields, particularly in the arts and service sectors. For instance, Participant 13 remarked,

“It is not easy to industrialize in the arts field, but our published papers add to the body of knowledge. They constitute innovative work and have protected rights like patents (SL).”

Another participant 5 explained,

“Patents are more applicable in sciences and engineering. For the service sector, the goal is improving the quality of services rather than creating novel inventions (SL).”

Across all participants, it was evident that Education 5.0 expanded the scope of academic responsibilities beyond traditional teaching and research. Faculty members are now expected to incorporate technology, foster innovation and contribute to industrialization. Participant 2 stated,

“Education 5.0 has expanded our responsibilities. These new expectations have influenced our performance, limiting career advancements and promotions (AL).”

While these changes created opportunities for professional growth, they also imposed new challenges, such as increased workloads and resource constraints, which affected promotion prospects. Participant 1 noted,

“We are tasked with going beyond traditional teaching and research to come up with tangible goods. This has empowered us but also restricted promotion opportunities due to high expectations (SL).”

The shift to Education 5.0 required academic staff to acquire new skills and adopt innovative pedagogical approaches. Those who embraced these changes demonstrated enhanced performance, engaged students more effectively and fostered entrepreneurial mindsets among learners. This adaptation also benefited broader societal and economic development. Notable examples include patents for the Artificial Insemination Program and the Tap Card system at Chinhoyi University and Harare Institute of Technology respectively. One participant 3 observed,

“Chinhoyi University and Harare Institute of Technology patented their work on the Artificial Insemination Programme, BUS tracking system and Tap Card system (PS).”

However, the implementation of Education 5.0 brought several drawbacks. Many participants highlighted how the additional pillars increased workloads, reducing the time available for teaching and student engagement. Participant 7 expressed that,

“There are too many publications, which reduces the time available to attend to students and promotion (LC).”

Participant 6 added,

“It increases our workload and negatively affects research and publication. The vast teaching load also reduces promotion chances (AL).”

Academic staff often focused heavily on research and publications to meet promotion criteria, sometimes at the expense of their teaching responsibilities. This finding aligns with Cadez et al. (2017), who noted that overloading academic staff can stifle creativity and innovation in teaching.

A lack of a clear framework for promotions under Education 5.0 further compounded these challenges. Some participants struggled to understand how the new components were weighted in performance evaluations, making it difficult to meet promotion requirements. Participant 9 elaborated as follows,

“It does not explain the weighting of the new components, making it difficult to achieve (SL).”

These issues underscore the need for institutional support and recognition of academic staff efforts.

Participants emphasized the importance of creating a supportive environment to enable effective implementation of Education 5.0. They stressed the importance of recognizing faculty efforts, encouraging experimentation and innovation, providing adequate funding for professional development and access to modern technologies. Participant 11 summarised the broader implications:

“Education 5.0 triggers critical thinking for survival in a hostile environment. Its impacts are positive for society, the economy, and the nation (PS).”

Leadership plays a crucial role in fostering a culture of innovation and providing clear pathways for career advancement. By addressing these concerns, institutions can better align with the goals of Education 5.0 and support their academic staff in achieving professional growth while contributing to societal and economic development. Balancing these objectives with the core mission of education remains a key challenge for academic staff and institutions alike.

6. Discussion of Findings

Three major themes emerged from the data collected from 20 participants drawn from different levels of university academic staff. Using a Zimbabwean perspective, the data were analysed to provide insights into the impact of Education 5.0 on university academic staff performance and promotion. The first key finding relates to the academic staff's perceptions of Education 5.0. The finding reveals a mix of positive and negative perspectives. While some academic staff embraced the new education paradigm and recognised its potential for enhancing their performance and presenting opportunities for promotions, others expressed concerns about increased workload and the need for adequate compensation (Muzira and Bondai, 2020). These diverse perceptions highlight the importance of creating a supportive environment that addresses the concerns of academic staff in order to foster a positive mindset towards Education 5.0 within the academic body at all universities.

The second key finding sheds light on several critical aspects related to implementing Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe's universities since its inception in 2018. The study found that there were various challenges associated with the implementation of Education 5.0. These challenges include but are not limited to limited access to technological infrastructure, skill gap, resistance to change, insufficient training opportunities and unaffordable technological resources such as computers, laptops and tablets due to the academic staff's eroded low incomes (Shakemore et al., 2023; Vurayai, 2024; Zishiri et al., 2024). These challenges highlight the need for comprehensive support mechanisms to address the barriers hindering the effective adoption of Education 5.0.

The third and last key finding relates to the impact of Education 5.0 on academic staff performance and promotions. The study found the positive and negative impacts of Education 5.0 on academic staff performance and promotions. On the positive side, academic staff who actively embraced technology integration and innovative approaches demonstrated enhanced performance and engagement with students and contributed to the innovation and industrialisation goals of Education 5.0. Their efforts were being recognised and rewarded, leading to personal fulfilment and enhanced prospects of promotions. However, the negative impacts included challenges faced by academic staff in adapting to the changing educational landscape brought about by adopting Education 5.0. The negative impacts mainly emanate from inadequate

technological infrastructure and resources and insufficient training opportunities for academic staff across most universities in Zimbabwe.

Based on the three key findings, this study argues that government should allocate a dedicated budget to institutions while providing continuous and comprehensive support mechanisms, including adequate resources, training programs and a supportive culture of innovation. These measures can help mitigate the challenges associated with implementing Education 5.0 while fostering a positive environment for academic staff to thrive regarding their performance and promotion aspirations. On the other hand, universities should invest in improving the technological infrastructure in all their campuses, including reliable internet connectivity and access to up-to-date software and hardware, and provide funding for academic staff to acquire laptops and tablets and well-equipped computer labs. This will provide academic staff with the tools to effectively integrate technology into all the pillars of Education 5.0, ultimately enhancing their performance and promotion opportunities. The study further advocates for ongoing dialogue and collaboration between academic staff, administrators and policymakers to address academic staff concerns and improve perceptions of Education 5.0. The collective outcome of these efforts will ensure that Education 5.0 maximises its potential benefits for academic staff performance and promotions in Zimbabwean universities and beyond.

7. Conclusion

This research revealed a low understanding of Education 5.0 and its components in universities by academic staff due to ignorance and a lack of relevant information and policy documents. More importantly, the main objectives of Education 5.0 will not be realized unless measures are put in place to equip universities and academic staff with the necessary resources, skills and a favorable environment that promotes innovation and industrialization. Although universities are encouraged to fulfil their mission, when it comes to promotion, innovation and industrialization are important, however, research excellence appears to be the favored criteria. Due to this criterion, academics tend to neglect the scholarship of teaching and community service while concentrating too heavily on research. This promotion criterion is now discouraging academics from applying for promotions. Many academics believe that the profession has a heavy workload, making it difficult to meet promotion requirements, poor mentoring and capacity development. A guiding framework for promotion under Education 5.0 must be crafted to increase the performance and promotion of academic staff. The guiding framework needs to be sensitive to people's differing circumstances, professional and cultural backgrounds, and strategies for improving performance and promotion, and must accommodate this diversity. University policymakers need to listen to the views of their staff at different levels. By providing a forum in which staff can present their views on policy matters, this could impact staff performance and promotion.

References

- Abdul-Rahaman, N., Arkorful, V.E. and Okereke, T. (2022). *Academic Integration in Higher Education: A Review of Effective Institutional Strategies and Personal Factors*. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.856967>
- Adam, A.-K., Boakye, K.O., Ashie, A.A., Bawah, A.S. and Pobbi, M. (2016). *The Process of Staff Promotion in Relation to Salary or Wages Upgrade in the Public Sector Institutions: Local Government Service VS Ghana Education Service Policy Statements*. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(7), 245. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n7p245>
- Alharbi, A.M. (2023). *Implementation of Education 5.0 in Developed and Developing Countries: A Comparative Study*. *Creative Education*, 14(5), Article 5. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.145059>
- Allui, A. and Sahni, J. (2016). *Strategic Human Resource Management in Higher Education Institutions: Empirical Evidence from Saudi*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 361–371. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.044>
- Armstrong, D. and Armstrong, G. (2021). *Educational Trends Exposed: How to be a Critical Consumer*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003247159>
- Belotto, M. J. (2018). *Data Analysis Methods for Qualitative Research: Managing the Challenges of Coding, Interrater Reliability, and Thematic Analysis - ProQuest*. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/21b8de9a65315a8d00d10bbe0a8b062d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=55152>
- Bharuthram, R. (2024). *A Strategic Approach Towards the Internationalization of Higher Education: A Perspective from the South*. *EDULEARN24 Proceedings*, 442–442. 16th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2024.0181>

- Bingwa, L. and Ngibe, M. (2021). *The Impact of Academic Training Programmes in Improving Teaching and Learning: A Case of Academic Staff at a Selected University of Technology.* *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 35(2), 21–41. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20853/35-2-4620>
- Chibuwe, A. and Muromo, B. (2023). *Decolonisation Deferred? An Analysis of the Education 5.0 Doctrine, the Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education-approved Media and Communication Curriculum and Selected Writings by Zimbabwean Media Academics.* In *Decolonising Media and Communication Studies Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Routledge.
- Chimbunde, P. and Jakachira, G. (2024). *Continuities and Discontinuities Between Competency-Based Curriculum and Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe: Implications for Curriculum Harmonization: Competency-Based Curriculum and Education in Zimbabwe.* *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 16(3), Article 3.
- Cummings, S., Bridgman, T. and Brown, K.G. (2016). *Unfreezing Change as Three Steps: Rethinking Kurt Lewin's Legacy for Change Management.* *Human Relations*, 69(1), 33–60. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715577707>
- Etikan, I. (2016). *Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling.* *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5, 1. doi: <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fung, D. (2017). *A Connected Curriculum for Higher Education.* UCL Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781911576358>
- Gacel-Ávila, J. and Marmolejo, F. (2016). *Internationalization of Tertiary Education in Latin America and the Caribbean.* Brill. <https://brill.com/display/book/edcoll/9789463003018/BP000020.xml>
- Graham, A.T. (2016). *Role of Academic Managers in Workload and Performance Management of Academic Staff: A Case Study.* *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(6), 1042–1063. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215587312>
- Guo, L., Huang, J. and Zhang, Y. (2019). *Education Development in China: Education Return, Quality, and Equity.* *Sustainability*, 11(13), Article 13. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133750>
- Hussain, S.T., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M.J., Hussain, S.H. and Ali, M. (2018). *Kurt Lewin's Change Model: A Critical Review of the Role of Leadership and Employee Involvement in Organizational Change.* *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 3(3), 123–127. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.07.002>
- Ivey, P. W., Oliver, G. and Henry, M. (2014). *Evaluating the Impact of Research Produced by a Mission-Directed Emergent University.* *Journal of Research Administration*, 45(2), 73–88.
- Jonyo, B. O., Ouma, C. and Mosoti, Z. (2018). *The Effect of Mission and Vision on Organizational Performance? Within Private Universities in Kenya.* *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(2), 15–33.
- Karp, M.J.M. and Fletcher, J. (2014). *Adopting New Technologies for Student Success: A Readiness Framework.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.7916/D8862DMC>
- Martínez, S. (2024). *Attitude Assessment in a Competences Evaluation System: A Key Feature For Pre-Service Teachers.* *EDULEARN24 Proceedings*, 7628–7635. 16th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2024.1793>
- Muchabaiwa, W. and Chauraya, E. (2022). *The Gender Blindness of the Education 5.0 Framework: An Obstruction to Promotion Opportunities for Female Academics in Zimbabwe.* *Management in Education*, 08920206221126640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08920206221126640>
- Munikwa, S. and Mapara, J. (2022). *Grappling with Education 5.0 Curriculum Development in Zimbabwean Higher Education. The Case of Chinhoyi University of Technology.* *Journal of African Education*, 3(2), 181–203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2633-2930/2022/v3n2a7>
- Muzira, D. and Bondai, B.M. (2020). *Perception of Educators towards the Adoption of Education 5.0: A Case of a State University in Zimbabwe | East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences.* <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/eajess/article/view/218640>
- Muzira and Muzira. (2020). *An Assessment of Educators' Level of Concern on the Adoption of Education 5.0: A Case of One University in Zimbabwe.* *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 39(17), Article 17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/cjast/2020/v39i1730749>
- Naidoo-Chetty, M. and du Plessis, M. (2021). *Job Demands and Job Resources of Academics in Higher Education.* *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631171>

- Papadimitriou, A. (2020). *Beyond Rhetoric: Reinventing the Public Mission of Higher Education*. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 26(1), 1–4. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-019-09046-9>
- Robbins, S., Judge, T.A., Millett, B. and Boyle, M. (2013). *Organisational Behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education AU.
- Saaludin, N., Harun, S., Wahab, S.Z.A. and Yahya, Y. (2016). *Academic Staff Promotion In Higher Education by Using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)*. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1782(1), 040015. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4966082>
- Sadiq, H., Barnes, K.I., Price, M., Gumedze, F. and Morrell, R.G. (2019). *Academic Promotions at a South African University: Questions of Bias, Politics and Transformation*. *Higher Education*, 78(3), 423–442. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0350-2>
- Schimanski, L.A. and Alperin, J.P. (2018). *The Evaluation of Scholarship in Academic Promotion and Tenure Processes: Past, Present, and Future*. *F1000Research*, 7, 1605. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.16493.1>
- Shakemore, C., Kaiser, M.S., Jacqueline, K.F., Tavengwa, M., Taurai, S., Mary, M.S. and Nair, S. (2023). *Assessing Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) Skills Necessary in Sustaining Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe Higher Education Sector: A case of Chinhoyi University of Technology*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 12(4), Article 4. <https://ijarped.com/index.php/journal/article/view/805>
- Sukowski, Ł., Przytu, S., Borg, C. and Kulikowski, K. (2020). *Performance Appraisal in Universities—Assessing the Tension in Public Service Motivation (PSM)*. *Education Sciences*, 10(7), Article 7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10070174>
- Togo, M. and Gandidzanwa, C.P. (2021). *The Role of Education 5.0 in Accelerating the Implementation of Sdgs and Challenges Encountered at the University of Zimbabwe*. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(7), 1520–1535. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-05-2020-0158>
- van den Besselaar, P. and Sandström, U. (2016). *Gender Differences in Research Performance and its Impact on Careers: A Longitudinal Case Study*. *Scientometrics*, 106(1), 143–162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1775-3>
- Viriri, E., Ndimande, Hlongwa Nobuhle. and Mufanechiya, A. (2024). *Decolonising Higher Education in Zimbabwe: Prospects and Challenges of Education 5.0*. *Journal of African Education*, 5(1), 37–56. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2633-2930/2024/v5n1a2>
- Vurayai, S. (2024). *The Implementation of Education 5.0 under Funding Crisis in Zimbabwean Higher and Tertiary Education Institutions: The Challenges and Achievements*. *African Journal of Public Administration and Environmental Studies*, 3(1), 105–121. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2753-3182/2024/v3n1a5>
- Zishiri, Jekese and Muchabaiwa. (2024). *Challenges in Implementing Education 5.0 in Higher Education.....* *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/challenges-in-implementing-education-5-0-in-higher-education-in-zimbabwe-a-qualitative-analysis>

Cite this article as: Gladman Jekese, Christopher Zishiri, Wonder Muchabaiwa and Leo T. Mataruka (2025). *Integrating Education 5.0 into Academic Staff Performance and Promotion: Perspectives from Zimbabwean Higher Education Institutions*. *International Journal of Education and Teaching*, 5(2), 41-50. doi: 10.51483/IJEDT.5.2.2025.41-50.