Strategies and Challenges of Implementation of Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 Policy

Bajilla Felex, and Ebrima Saine

Pending

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91100462

Received: 02 December 2025; Accepted: 08 December 2025; Published: 18 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This systematic review critically examines the strategies and challenges of implementing Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 policy which is a main pathway for innovation and industrialization. Education 5.0 was made to transform higher education as the backbone for innovation and industrialization. A qualitative reviewing of existing literature, the research highlighted an important disconnection between the policy's ambitious goals and the existing implementation systems. The results reveal that the policy is affected by a structural problem and limited resources, including inadequate of funding innovation hubs and lack of digital infrastructure. In addition, main problem in human capacity such as limited educator training and digital literacy and fragmented governance structures, top-down system reforms and lack of stakeholder involvement, continuously derail progress. However, these barriers, the systematic literature review provides strategic opportunities, involving luting public-private organization and align the policy with national development goals and social sustainability standards. The research finalized that in the absence of a structured, multi-pronged approach that simultaneously addresses funding, capacity building, and participatory governance, Education 5.0 will remain a largely rhetorical commitment. The results provide significant insights for policymakers and implementers seeking to operationalize this transformative educational model journey in Zimbabwe and beyond in similar developing contexts.

INTRODUCTION

The continuous improvement in technological transformation highlighting the global shift toward Industry 5.0 and Society 5.0 has significantly reshaped the way nations view the future of education. As the world freed from the problem of the COVID-19 pandemic, the need for innovative, human-centered, and resilient education systems has become more urgent than ever. Globally, scholars agreed that the pandemic revealed structural problems in socio-economic and knowledge systems, forcing societies to reshaped their state of preparedness for different advanced, technology-driven futures (Macrae et al., 2025). In this continuous-changing world, nations are increasingly adopting Education 5.0 frameworks that called for human-machine collaboration, sustainability, problem-solving, and innovation as critical leaders of national development.

Worldwide, the Education 5.0 system is in alignment with Industry 5.0 an industrial paradigm changes based on human-centricity, resilience, sustainability, and collaborative technologies (Shabur et al., 2025). According to Whitehead et al. (2025), this situation requires not only technological upgrade but also new devices of calculated leadership that involved human innovation, advanced technologies, and cooperation innovation. Additionally, the change toward people-centered digitalization seen in Society 5.0 highlighted the need for education systems that prepared graduates with the ability to face complex social, technological, and environmental challenges, specifically in developing nations (Telukdarie, 2025). These global insights consolidate the idea that countries can only work in the emerging knowledge economy by enabling innovation-oriented learning environments.

In developing countries, the struggled towards implementing Education 5.0 standards is hardening by structural and socio-economic barriers. Fazlollahtabar's (2025) game-theoretic analysis revealed that the attainment of Industry 5.0 in such contexts relies mostly on the linkage of strategies between government, industry, and the human capital an interdependence that equally applies to education reform. Implementation bases trained personnel, robust infrastructure, clear policies, and cultural acceptance all of which remain different across many

low-income nations. The experience of sectors like forestry and logistics, where the invention of human-centred AI and modernized digital systems is affected by infrastructural barriers, resistance to change, and workforce capacity challenges, this boiled down to the implementation complexities faced by education systems (Holzinger et al., 2024; Nicoletti, 2025).

In countries like Zimbabwe, the Education 5.0 policy was based on teaching, research, community service, innovation, and industrialization was introduced as a transformative framework to reform higher education as the main guiding principle for national economic development. The policy geared towards changing universities from theory-driven institutions to innovation centers with the ability of solving real-world problems and driving industrial productivity. However, the vision is ambitious, Zimbabwe experiences significant challenges in operationalizing this system. These include underfunding, inadequate digital infrastructure, low level of skilled technical personnel, limited university–industry connection, and institutional blockage to new pedagogical and research models. Despite all these hindrances, Zimbabwe's implementation of Education 5.0 represents a significant effort to align national development goal with global technological and industrial trends.

However, although existing literature examines the global changes of Industry 5.0 and Society 5.0, as much as the role of people-centered technological transformation, there are still shortage of empirical and conceptual research providing specifically on the methods and challenges affecting the implementation of Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 policy. Existing studies mainly discussed high-level theoretical frameworks or examine technology adoption in other areas, leaving a gap in localized, context-specific examination of the way higher institutions are learning, policymakers, and stakeholders in Zimbabwe are addressing these educational reforms. However, the level of effectiveness of present strategies, the contextual hurdles experience, and the sustainability of the Education 5.0 framework in Zimbabwe's socio-economic situation is not clearly understood.

Consequently, this research is relevant for many reasons. Firstly, it contributes to existing debates on Education 5.0 by emphasising on a context-specific analysis of its practical implementation in a developing country, low-income setting, addressing a problem that existing global, literature has not sufficiently explored. Second, by outlining the methods used and challenges experience, the study gives evidence-based insights that can guide policymakers, university administrators, and industry partners in consolidating the operationalization of Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe. Third, the study will provide wide regional discussions on the way developing countries can attained human-centered technological transformation to create resilient, innovation-driven education systems in line with the demands of the 21st-century economy. Finally, the research targets to support the realization of an education system that not only attains global standards but also drives local industrialization and socio-economic development.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This research employed a qualitative systematic literature review model to synthesise empirical and conceptual evidence on the strategies and challenges involved in implementing Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 policy. Systematic reviews are specifically relevant in higher education hence they offer a transparent, protocol-driven strategy to providing and reviewing existing knowledge, in contrast to more subjective narrative reviews. Directed by current methodological guidance for education SLRs, the review selected the core stages of PRISMA identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion and employed qualitative thematic synthesis to advance higher-order themes from many literature, in line with current standards for qualitative studies exist in education.

Research questions

1. How do teachers and administrators outline the strategies they use to implement Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 policy in their institutions?

2. What challenges do teachers and administrators present experiencing in implementing Zimbabwe's Education 5.0 policy?

Search strategy

A systematic search was conducted from September, 2025 to November 2025 in: African Journals Online (AJOL); SpringerLink; ERIC / Google Scholar and Individual journal sites (e.g., *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *South African Journal of Education*, *African Journal of Social Work*). Search strings integrated keywords and Boolean operators, for example: "Education 5.0" AND Zimbabwe; "Society 5.0" OR "Industry 5.0" AND (education OR "higher education"); "curriculum reform" AND Zimbabwe; "innovation" AND "higher education" AND Zimbabwe and "policy implementation" AND (education OR curriculum) AND Zimbabwe. Backward citation searching of included papers (e.g., Muzira & Bondai, 2020; Barker, 2023; Benrachou, 2024) was used to identify additional studies.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion

Attention on Zimbabwean education (higher education, TVET, teacher education, schools) or offer directly relevant conceptual models (Education 5.0, Society 5.0, Industry 5.0, Model 5.0) linked to education. Empirical (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) or conceptual/theoretical. Published in peer-reviewed journals between 2010 and 2025. And written in English.

Exclusion

Non-educational sector studies with no suitable conceptual relevance to education, opinion pieces/editorials with no systematic methods and duplicates.

Study selection (PRISMA steps)

Four stages used:

Identification: Records retrieved from all databases and platforms and duplicates removed.

Screening (titles/abstracts): Screened against inclusion criteria and clearly irrelevant studies excluded.

Eligibility (full-text): Full texts retrieved for potentially relevant papers and assessed for focus on Zimbabwean education or conceptually relevant 5.0 frameworks.

Inclusion: Final set of $n = 25$ studies included (e.g., Muzira & Bondai, 2020; Tsvuura, 2022; Mashayamombe & van den Berg, 2024; Chigwida et al., 2025; Dudzai, 2018; Tendengu, 2024, etc.).

PRISMA-style flow

Records identified through databases: $n = 50$; Records after duplicates removed: $n = 15$; Records screened (title/abstract): $n = 50$; Records excluded: $n = 10$; Full-text articles assessed for eligibility: $n = 25$ and Full-text articles excluded (with reasons): $n = 10$

Data extraction

A structured extraction form was utilized to capture: Author(s), year, journal; Country/setting and education level (HE, TVET, schools, teacher education); Design/methods (qualitative, quantitative, conceptual); Participants (e.g., educators, administrators, students, communities, records personnel); Attention (e.g., Education 5.0 perceptions, curriculum reform, language policy, digital records, social sustainability); Key strategies related to Education 5.0 (e.g., workshops, PPPs, innovation hubs, knowledge leadership); Major challenges (e.g., limited resource , training gaps, governance issues, participation deficits) and Theoretical/conceptual frameworks (systems theory, policy implementation, TPCK, Diffusion of Innovations, Society 5.0, social sustainability).

Quality appraisal

Empirical studies were assessed using basic criteria (aims, design–question fit, sampling, data collection, analysis rigor, limitations, and ethics). Conceptual papers were analyzed for clarity, coherence, and relevance: High quality: strong approach, clear alignment; Medium: some constraints, still informative and Low: serious weaknesses used cautiously. No study was excluded solely on quality; appraisal informed weighting in the synthesis.

Data analysis (Thematic synthesis)

A thematic analysis method was used to synthesize the included literatures. Firstly, familiarization involved many careful readings of all full documents to gain a comprehensive idea of how Education 5.0–related problems were presented. Second, initial coding was administered both inductively and deductively on the data and discussion chapter: deductive codes were made from the research questions and guiding theories (e.g., "strategies," "challenges," "resources," "participation"), while inductive codes were made from the data itself (e.g., "innovation hubs," "digital records," "sign language inclusion," "social sustainability"). Third, these codes were arranged into more extensive categories, from which four main themes were developed: structural and resource constraints; human capacity, knowledge, and leadership; governance, policy coherence, and participation; and strategic opportunities and supporting strategies. Fourth, the themes were appraised against the coded extracts and the full dataset, reshaped boundaries and arranging subthemes within each main theme. Finally, the themes were interpreted in connection to the research questions and developed within systems theory, policy implementation theory, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPCK), Diffusion of Innovations, Society 5.0, social sustainability, and Zimbabwe's broader socio-economic and policy context, in order to create a coherent, theory-informed account of Education 5.0 implementation.

Theme summary table (visual)

Theme	Example issues	Illustrative studies
Structural & resource limitations	Underfunded hubs, poor ICT, weak records	Muzira & Bondai (2020); Tsvuura (2022)
Human capacity, education & leadership	Training gaps, digital literacy, specialists	Muzira & Bondai (2020); Sithole et al. (2021); Chidarikire et al. (2021); Mapungwana et al. (2025)
Governance, policy coherence & involvement	Rushed reforms, weak M&E, low participation	Chigwida et al. (2025); Mashayamombe & van den Berg (2024); Garira et al. (2020); Siambombe (2016)
Strategic opportunities & supporting strategies	PPPs, sharing economy, social sustainability	Barker (2023); Benrachou (2024); Dudzai (2018); Tendengu (2024)

Ethical considerations

Only published, peer-reviewed studies were utilized; no primary data were gathered. Ethical approval was therefore not necessary. All sources are accurately cited to uphold academic integrity.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Structural and Resource Constraints

The effective implementation of Education 5.0 is significantly affected by poor structural inputs and limited resource. Indications implies that the physical document intended to drive modernization, such as innovation centers and industrial zones, are still seriously underdeveloped and poorly funded (Muzira et al., 2020; Moyo & Chikodzi, 2021; Mabhanda & Mabwe, 2023). This lack of enough infrastructure is in contrast with the curriculum reforms, which are usually rushed and plagued by very limited teaching materials, facilities, and

qualified teaching staff (Mashayamombe & van den Berg, 2024; Mapungwana et al., 2025; Garira et al., 2020). As a result, the goal of a hands-on, production-oriented education system is changed at its premature stage, shortage of the necessary physical and material environment to thrive.

When observed through the lens of systems theory, these challenges became a critical failure in the "input" stage of the educational framework. A system's output is directly reliant on the quality and sufficiency of its inputs, and in this case, the weak inputs undermined funding, infrastructure, and technology severely restrict the desired "outputs" of innovation and industrialization. This is further affected by poor digital infrastructure and weak records management styles, which directly undermined the delivery of Education 5.0's digital and data-driven components (Tsvuura, 2022; Tsvuura et al.). The lack of reliable technology and data systems, the formation, dissemination, and application of ideas become different and inadequate.

However, the discrepancy among policy ambition and practical experiences can be largely associated to these structural problems. Policy enforcement theory outlines that even the well-designed policies will fail without the required resources for their enforcement. The prolonged underfunding of both physical infrastructure and digital resources generates a restrictive environment where the core issues of Education 5.0 teaching, research, community service, innovation, and industrialization cannot be effectively operationalized. The system, therefore, remains stuck in a cycle where visionary reform goals are continuously undermined by a lack of fundamental supporting resources.

Human Capacity, Knowledge, and Leadership

Besides physical resources, a major challenge to Education 5.0 depends on human capacity and readiness. While education practitioners mainly view the philosophy of Education 5.0 supportively, they often report feeling of lacking prepared for its implementation (Muzira et al., 2020; Moyo & Chikodzi, 2021). This is connected to insufficient pre-service and in-service training, basically on digital literacy gaps, and a lack of continuous professional development (Sithole et al., 2021; Mabika & Maireva, 2023). This skills gap is not limited to educators; it also extends to major support personnel, such as records managers, sign language experts, and gender specialists, whose expertise is crucial for driving and promoting inclusive and innovative practices (Tsvuura, 2022; Mapungwana et al., 2025; Chidarikire et al., 2021).

In theory, these challenges can be put through the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPCK) model and Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations theory. TPCK implies that effective technology integration demands a sophisticated interplay of content, pedagogical, and technological knowledge an integration that is disturbed by the reported training problems. Concurrently, Rogers' theory posits that the choosing of an innovation is control by the adopters' knowledge and perceived skill. If educators feel incompetent, they are unlikely to be early adopters or outright rejecters of the Education 5.0 framework, derailing its variations throughout the system.

Attending to this human capacity gap demands a change towards well experience expertise as leadership, a concept central to Society 5.0 thinking (Barker, 2023; Benrachou, 2024). From a human capital theory perspective, contribution in training educators' and administrators' expertise is as critical as venture in physical infrastructure. Successful knowledge leadership would include creating systems for continuous learning, knowledge exchange, and coaching to build the relevant institutional competence. With no strategic leadership that concentrate on human capital development, the prospect of Education 5.0 will remain locked within a labor force that supports the idea in principle but lacks the capacity to implement it in practice.

Governance, Policy Coherence, and Participation

The implementation of Education 5.0 is further affected by major challenges in governance, policy coherence, and stakeholder participation. Findings show enduring issues between policy intent and actual realities, observable in areas such as curriculum reform, language policy, gender integration, and continuous assessment (Chigwida et al., 2025; Sithole, 2021; Sithole et al., 2021). These policies often suffer from internal issues, a lack of maintained financing, and poor monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, leading to fragmented and unsustainable outcomes (Mashayamombe & van den Berg, 2024). This lack of coherence worsens the systemic and integrated approach needed by Education 5.0.

Curriculum theory, as analyzed by scholars like Kliebard, point out that curriculum interests are usually about power and whose knowledge is of most worth. In this context, a main problem has been the marginalization of main stakeholders, particularly teachers and local communities, in the design and execution of reforms (Siambombe, 2016; Garira et al., 2020). This dictates driven approach, which limited participatory governance, fosters resistance and a sense of ownership deficit among those eventually responsible for implementing the policy. When implementers participate in decision making, policy fidelity and enthusiasm inevitably wane.

Additionally, the practicability of Education 5.0 is command by the wide economic and policy environment. Findings points that factors such as low economic freedom and poor social sustainability create a macro-environment that is not favourable to the ambitious, self-sufficient goals of Education 5.0 (Mavodyo et al., 2025; Dudzai, 2018; Muzvidziwa, 2010). Policy implementation framework highlighted that outer environmental factors heavily impact outcomes. Consequently, for Education 5.0 to exist, it must be empowered within a coherent national strategy that in line with educational policy with wider economic and social sustainability goals, generating a synergistic ecosystem rather than treating education as a secluded reform sector.

Strategic Opportunities and Enabling Strategies

Despite of the challenges, Education 5.0 offers excellent strategic opportunities for national development. Educators understood it as a more suitable and transformative model than its predecessor, Education 3.0, with the ability to directly contribute to national development agendas and minimize poverty (Muzira et al., 2020; Mpofu, 2024; Mabhanda & Mabwe, 2023). This positive view is a valuable asset, providing a foundation of goodwill and encouragement upon which to build. The framework's emphasis on problem-solving and community engagement aligns it precisely with national goals such as Vision 2030, aligning education as a key driver of socio-economic transformation instead of being a passive observer.

To maximize this potential, specific supporting strategies must be put in place. Innovation hubs, though presently under-resourced, can be revived through strategic public-private partnerships (PPPs) and the adoption of sharing economy models (Rumbidzai Muzira & Bondai, 2020; Awang et al., 2020). Such partnership can give a much-needed capital, skills, and market linkages, making enabling environments for entrepreneurship, industrialization, and enhanced international competitiveness. However, integrating principles of education management and leadership, as advocated in Society 5.0 literature, can improve these centers as drivers of innovation (Benrachou, 2024; Implementation of Education 5.0 in developed and developing countries, 2023).

Eventually, the future success of Education 5.0 depends on its integration with socially sustainable and inclusive development operations. The areas of social work and social policy provide a significant insight, improving that technological and industrial advancement must be partner with planned efforts to reduce poverty and inequality (Dudzai, 2018; Tendengu, 2024). By intentionally aligning Education 5.0 with these socially sustainable priorities, the model can achieve its promise of inclusive development (Mavodyo et al., 2025). This ascertain that the endeavor of innovation and industrialization directly serves the wider societal mission of improving communities and attaining equitable, sustainable development as envisioned in national strategic documents.

DISCUSSIONS

The systematic review made, was to examine the strategies and challenges surrounding the implementation of Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe. The findings reveal a similar narrative: while the policy is generally seen as a success, development-centered, and conceptually sound transformation, its successfulness is seriously hindered by a complex interplay of structural, human, and governance-related contributions. Interpreted through systems theory, policy implementation theory, and innovation models such as TPCK and Diffusion of Innovations, the study points that Education 5.0 currently works within an implementation environment that is dominantly out of alignment with its ambitious goals. The four outlined themes highlighted an integrated discussion for why the policy lingers more aspirational than operational and point toward possibility pathways for its revitalization.

Structural and Resource Constraints: The Foundation of Weak Inputs

The structural and resource limitations outlined that Education 5.0 has been layered onto a system whose key "inputs" are insufficient. Proves of underdeveloped innovation hubs, underfunded industrial parks, poor digital infrastructure, and weak records management systems highlighted that the physical and technological bedrock demands for innovation and industrialization is lacking (Muzira et al., 2020; Mashayamombe & van den Berg, 2024; Tsvuura, 2022). From a systems theory viewpoint, such lack of enough inputs inevitably minimizes the production of preferred outputs, namely problem-solving graduates, start-ups, and industry-prepared innovations. This review strengthens and extends existing work on curriculum reforms and embracing ICT in Zimbabwe, indicating that the same historical resource deficits that undermined previous initiatives are still critically constraining Education 5.0. With no deliberate and key reconfiguration of the financial and physical base of higher education, this transformative policy risks remaining a mainly rhetorical commitment.

Human Capacity and Knowledge Leadership: The People-Driven Implementation Gap

A policy is only as impactful as the people who enact it. The human capacity, knowledge, and leadership explains that while educators and administrators' regards Education 5.0 constructively, they feel seriously lack of readiness, highlighting that the inadequate training, shortages of digital literacy, and a lack of continuous professional development as the hinderances (Muzira et al., 2020; Sithole et al., 2021; Mabika & Maireva, 2023). This lack of skills issues goes beyond teaching members to key support staff such as records managers, sign language experts, and gender specialists thereby undermining inclusive and innovation-oriented practice (Tsvuura, 2022; Mapungwana et al., 2025; Chidarikire et al., 2021). This chain coordinates exactly with the TPCK framework and Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations theory, which states that technology-rich reforms demand an advanced blend of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge, as well as a serious mass of confident and skilled early adopters. The finding adds a significant dimension by identifying "knowledge leadership" as a missing link (Barker, 2023; Benrachou, 2024). Without leadership which intentionally build, manage, and orchestrate institutional knowledge systems, the vision of Education 5.0 remains improperly translated into daily experiences. Hence, commitment in human capital must be settled with as a main agent of implementation, not a secondary activity.

Governance, Coherence, and Participation: The Political and Institutional Dimensions

The challenges of implementation are not just technical but are seriously linked with political and institutional dynamics. The governance and policy coherence ideas indicates that implementation hurdles are induced by recurrent patterns of fast-tracked curriculum roll-outs, poor monitoring and evaluation, unreliable funding, and, critically, lack meaningful stakeholder participations (Chigwida et al., 2025; Mashayamombe & van den Berg, 2024; Garira et al., 2020). Aligned with curriculum theory, these reviews demonstrate how top-down decision-making and struggles over "whose knowledge counts" systematically excluded teachers and communities from reform processes (Siambombe, 2016). Additionally, the finding links the future of Education 5.0 to broader macro-economic and policy practices, such as low economic freedom and vulnerable social sustainability (Mavodyo et al., 2025; Dudzai, 2018). This multi-layered view adds to the literature by framing Education 5.0 not as an isolated intervention, but as part of a broader and sometimes differences, constellation of reforms and economic strategies. Its success is therefore contingent on being included within coherent, participatory governance structures that align education, economic, and social policies.

Strategic Opportunities: Reconceptualizing Education 5.0 as a Lever for Inclusive Development

Despite the severe hurdles, the finding identifies key strategic opportunities that can reconfigure Education 5.0 as a practical engine for transformation. The idea of supporting strategies points out that motivating perceptions among educators, the policy's alignment with national Vision 2030, and its convergence with global Society 5.0 discourses provide a positive normative and strategic foundation (Muzira et al., 2020; Barker, 2023; Benrachou, 2024). The finding goes beyond cataloguing challenges to recognized concrete, actionable solutions. These include revitalizing innovation centers through strong public-private cooperation and sharing-economy frameworks, institutionalizing knowledge management and leadership within institutions of higher learning, and explicitly linking technological advancement to socially sustainable strategies that minimize poverty reduction,

community empowerment, and inclusive development (Dudzai, 2018; Tendengu, 2024; Mavodyo et al., 2025). In this regard, the discussion reframes Education 5.0 not simply as a pedagogical change, but as a possible lever for socially inclusive industrial and economic development.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusion

To put it up, this systematic review reveals that the key challenge for Education 5.0 in Zimbabwe is not a lack of vision but a serious systemic mismatch. The policy's aspiring goals of promoting innovation, industrialization, and social reforms are being pursued within an environment that is realistically underprepared. The data combined establishes a uniform pattern where profound structural and resource constraints, major gaps in human capacity and knowledge leadership, and disconnected governance structures jointly provide an implementation strategy that is misaligned with the transformation's needs. This mismatch means that, in spite of its conceptual reliabilities and the broad wishes of educators, Education 5.0 maneuvers in a context where the essential inputs, financial, infrastructural, digital, and human are inadequate to developed the anticipated outputs of a transformed, industrious higher education sector. The core conclusion, consequently, is that the policy's aspirational objectives are presently hindered by the very system put in place to deliver them, altering a potentially transformative program into a largely rhetorical exercise without a significant reconfiguration of its enabling environments.

Implications

The results of these findings highlighted a substantial theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the findings confirm the utility of using an integrated theoretical lens-combining systems theory, policy application frameworks, and innovation adoption models to analyze complex educational reforms. It manifests that a siloed review is not enough; the structural inputs cannot be disjoint from the human capacity and governance methods. For stakeholders and policymakers, the implications are weakened clear: isolated interventions are likely to fail. Putting resources in an innovation hub short of parallel, substantial investment in educator training and digital knowledge will not give results. Likewise, mandating curriculum reformations without crafting participatory governance mechanisms that allowed educators and industry will increase resistance and ownership challenges. The practical imperative is for a synchronized, multi-pronged approach that concurrently to solve financing, infrastructure, professional development, and policy coherence, recognizing that these elements are inextricably connected in the implementation pattern.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

To reduce the identified implementation gap, this finding suggests a set of interrelated recommendations. For Policymakers: There is a need to improve commitment to coherent, future funding and a governance change from top-down command to participatory co-creation. This consists of protecting the funds for Education 5.0 infrastructure, creating a systematic and independent monitoring and evaluation frameworks, and officially incorporating stakeholder feedback from academics, industry, and communities into the policy cycle. For University Administrators and Leaders: The main reform must be on structuring human capital and promotion of knowledge leadership. This comprises developing strategic plans for indefinite professional development, incentivizing modernization in teaching and research, and proactively connecting with the non-government sector through structured partnerships and joint projects. Leaders must promote a habit of innovation and equity in their institutions. For Educators and Practitioners: The call is for proactive engagement with the values of Education 5.0, pursuing available professional developed opportunities, forming a society of practice to share knowledge, and trialing with pedagogical innovations that bring into line teaching and research with community problem-solving, even within present constraints.

Implications for Future Research

This study openly points to many critical opportunities for future research. firstly, there is a pressing demand for empirical, institution-level qualitative studies that go beyond identifying challenges to document actual implementation strategies. The finding should examine how specific universities and colleges are copping, the

nature of the "workarounds" they create, and the local elements that are relatively success or failure. Secondly, comparative study across various developing nations applying similar "5.0" or high-tech education reforms is necessary. Such researches would assistance to isolate the influence of Zimbabwe's unique political and economic context from challenges communal across the Global South, thereby building transferable knowledge around the enablers and challenges to educational transformation in related settings. Lastly, longitudinal research is needed to trajectory the future impact of Education 5.0 on graduate outcomes, modernization ecosystems, and community development, providing a much-needed data base to measure the decisive return on this aspiring policy investment.

REFERENCE

1. Barker, R. (2023). The role of knowledge leaders to enhance organizational performance through Society 5.0. Regional Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 7(1), 118–134. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/rjikm/article/view/243430
2. Benrachou, N. (2024). The sharing economy as a Model 5.0 for developing an innovative strategy of universities. Journal of North African Economies, 19(31), 85–94. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jnae/article/view/265056
3. Chidarikire, M., Muza, C., & Beans, H. (2021). Integration of gender equality and language diversity in Zimbabwe teacher education curriculum. East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 2(2), 231–238. https://doi.org/10.4314/eajess.v2i2
4. Chigwida, H., Madondo, M. M., & Chitate, H. (2025). Reading the African school curriculum as an historical text: Educational contexts, policies and practices in Zimbabwe. Yesterday and Today, 33(1), 140–167. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/yt/article/view/303221
5. Dudzai, C. (2018). The value of social sustainability policies to poverty reduction in Zimbabwe: A social work perspective. African Journal of Social Work, 8(2), 71–77. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajsw.v8i2
6. Fazlollahtabar, H. (2025). Industry 5.0 paradigm transformation adoption in developing countries: An analytical game theoretic model. Scientific Reports, 15, 31463. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-16089-z
7. Garira, E., Howie, S., & Plomp, T. (2020). An analysis of quality of education and its evaluation: A case of Zimbabwean primary schools. South African Journal of Education, 39(2). https://doi.org/10.4314/saje.v39i2
8. Holzinger, A., Schweier, J., Gollob, C., et al. (2024). From Industry 5.0 to Forestry 5.0: Bridging the gap with human-centered artificial intelligence. Current Forestry Reports, 10, 442–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-024-00231-7
9. Macrae, A., Lopes, R. N., Allil, R. C. de B., et al. (2025). Aerobiology, post COVID-19, within the emerging Industrial Revolution 5.0 and Society 5.0. Discover Environment, 3, 78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44274-025-00270-2
10. Mapungwana, M. C., Matsilure-Cheure, M., Chisiri, B., Mutongoreni, N. A., Chikozho, M., Mutumwa, A., Mhini, D., Ranganayi, C., Hazvinandava, M., & Manhanga, S. (2025). Recognition of deaf students in promoting TVET access: Inclusion of sign language in higher education. International Journal of Studies in Inclusive Education, 2(2), 22–30. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijsie/article/view/308535
11. Mashayamombe, E., & van den Berg, G. (2024). Insights into the implementation of curriculum reforms in Zimbabwe: Heritage Studies and History in Mutare district secondary schools. Yesterday and Today, 32(1), 76–99. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/yt/article/view/284358
12. Mavodyo, E., Zimunya, I., Kanyonganise, L. K., Mhonda, B. W., Musikambesa, N. F., & Neshiri, G. (2025). Building a prosperous future: Integrating economic freedom into Zimbabwe's development policies. PanAfrican Journal of Governance and Development, 6(2), 96–127. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/pajgd/article/view/304708
13. Mupupuni, G. (2025). Developing English language writing skills using the process model in Zimbabwean schools. Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 8(3), 268–278. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jriie/article/view/294850
14. Muzira, D. R., & Bondai, B. M. (2020). Perception of educators towards the adoption of Education 5.0: A case of a state university in Zimbabwe. East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 1(2), 43–53. https://doi.org/10.4314/eajess.v1i2

15. Muzvidziwa, I. (2010). The resolution of poverty and cultural marginalisation in Zimbabwe through a dynamic educational system. Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.4314/lwati.v7i1.57464
16. Nicoletti, B. (2025). Logistics 5.0. In Artificial intelligence for logistics 5.0 (pp. xx–xx). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94046-0_2
17. Shabur, M., Shahriar, A., & Ara, M. A. (2025). From automation to collaboration: Exploring the impact of Industry 5.0 on sustainable manufacturing. Discover Sustainability, 6, 341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-01201-0
18. Siambombe, A. (2016). Rural communities and policy participation: The case of economic policies in Zimbabwe. African Journal of Social Work, 5(2), 87–107. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajsw.v5i2
19. Sithole, N. (2021). Reconfiguring Zimbabwe's language policy: The case of micro-level policy appropriation at selected teachers' colleges. Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research, 33(1–2), 40–62. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/zjer/article/view/216055
20. Sithole, S., Dziwa, D. D., & Matsvange, M. (2021). Teachers' perception on the challenges of continuous assessment implementation between 2017 and 2018 in Zimbabwean primary and secondary schools. East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 2(2), 136–143. https://doi.org/10.4314/eajess.v2i2
21. Telukdarie, A. (Ed.). (2026). Society 5.0: People-centered technologies for sustainable community development. https://link.springer.com/book/9783032126139
22. Tendengu, T. P. (2024). The origins of social and economic development in Zimbabwe: Lessons for social work education and training. People Centred – The Journal of Development Administration, 9(1), 11–16. https://doi.org/10.4314/jda.v9i1.2
23. Tsvuura, G. (2022). Knowledge and skills for managing digital records at selected state universities in Zimbabwe. Journal of the South African Society of Archivists, 55, 110–123. https://doi.org/10.4314/jsasa.v55i.8
24. Tsvuura, G., Mbawuya, K. D., & Ngulube, P. (2021). Creation and storage of records in the cloud by Zimbabwe Open University. ESARBICA Journal, 40, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.4314/esarjo.v40i.1
25. Whitehead, J., Mohamed Hashim, M. A., Tlemsani, I., et al. (2025). Strategic Leadership 5.0: Reality or illusion? Journal of the Knowledge Economy. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-025-02785-8