

Towards Validating Research Discourses among Bantu in Africa: *Obuntubulamu* as a Possible Transforming Agent

Johnnie Wycliffe Frank Muwanga-Zake

Introduction

The desperation caused by misaligned educational systems and research in Africa is surreptitiously articulated in the lamentations of Ulimwengu (2013) commenting on Chinua Achebe's works:

Indeed, despite political independence, African scholarship has failed to sever its appendage status with the West, and so rarely evolve their projects of investigation, most often relying on the largesse of the big Western foundations, trusts whose agenda may be at variance with African interests³¹.

Research based on or controlled by foreign paradigms such as Western research discourses yields knowledge and products partly meant for controlling developing countries such as African countries. The control is deliberate and permeates every social, political and economic sphere of the world, not so different from militaristic adventures. Expectedly, therefore, in Africa, some of the Western paradigms tend to antagonise Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) (Scidev, 2002). Indeed, much of the African IKS have been and continue to be controlled through Western epistemologies and ontologies. Research paradigms from the West are among major influences in Africa that have structured knowledge acquisition and use.

³¹ From <http://www.africareview.com/opinion/African-intellectuals-have-failed-their-people/979188-1742422-qtvbevz/index.html>. Accessed on November 20, 2017.

The challenge is that Western paradigms sometimes are incompatible and antagonise African IKS, as they compete for space and influence. The use of Western paradigms could thus strangle African IKS to death if no concerted effort is applied to re-awaken African paradigms, especially to enhance development in Africa. The kind of revitalisation needed is well articulated in Asante (2009) as Afrocentricity, and includes making African ideals and values central in research. Afrocentricity functions in African cultures and consciousness in contrast to discourses that make Africans marginal actors on the periphery of experiences in their own courtyard.

The use of *Obuntubulamu* discourse in research among Bantu aims at:

- Improving research participation and outputs among Bantu;
- Obtaining data that is valid;
- Developing Bantu IKS – some knowledge would require *Obuntubulamu* to access so that it can be researched and developed further. For example, the brewing of banana wine and the processing of bark cloth in Buganda could be developed further to enhance economic and environmental sustainability; and
- Motivate Bantu academia to accept *Obuntubulamu* discourse in research so that it can be promoted in African academic institutions and globally.

The main reason to recommend *Obuntubulamu* is upon the argument that validity of research is improved if locally evolved paradigms are used. Valid findings could be instrumental in growing IKS specifically adapted to the nature of local people and conditions (Langill, 1999). Locally evolved solutions lead to more sustainable development (UNESCO, 2001). For example, African IKS could be used to research sustainable production and storage of quality traditional wines (Du Plessis & Raza 2004). Other IKS benefits include food security and environmental protection (UNESCO, 2001). The recommendation of *Obuntubulamu* would

be boosted and revealed through a critical review of the discourses that govern research in African environments.

Obuntubulamu among African Bantu (the Baganda) is an example of a discourse that is Afrocentric and indigenous to Africa. It could support the Bantu struggle for emancipation as it can be a vehicle in crafting spaces for Bantu epistemology. However, *Obuntubulamu*, which in South Africa is known as Ubuntu, should firstly be acknowledged among the epistemologies *because of* rather than *in spite of* its versions of validity (Ellen & Harris 1996). Indeed, the resultant localisation of research discourses *because of* local needs, culture and context has been abundantly recommended (Ogunniyi 1996; Ditton 2007) especially if accompanied by the interrogation of the 'universal truths' (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006; Evans & Powell, 2007; Wells & Wells, 2007; Denzin, Lincoln & Smith 2008).

There are expectedly positions that desist the adoption of local discourses. For example, academia (located in foreign, often Western discourses) questions the existence of African IKS and sees it as undefined, vague, backward and useless in the international scheme of development, partly because Western discourses have domineered over African paradigms and have normalised the invalidation of African IKS (Raseroka, 2005). Additionally, education often socialises African academia out of African IKS and so has no serious regard of African IKS, but instead attempts to strangle African IKS out of research.

A review of literature about the effects of Western research discourse in Africa is outlined in this paper. The paper shows that the issues identified have engendered campaigns for a need to transform research in Africa. The premise of this paper is that African IKS could provide valid alternative discourses and paradigms for research in African environments. The paper proposes *Obuntubulamu* as an alternative discourse among African Bantu. It also illuminates upon *Obuntubulamu*-Western paradigms that have worked. The paper concludes with challenges that call for further research in using *Obuntubulamu* as a research paradigm.

Literature review

The issues

All research should use valid methodologies, since, according to Lincoln & Denzin (1994, p.578), validity has the power of truth and so identifies acceptable research. However, lack of validity happens through the use of wrong paradigms, and that these can lead to inaccurate construction of knowledge, which often become universal or global 'truths', albeit distorted, in favour of 'international or acceptable standards' (Gay in Atwater, 1996, p.823). Similar arguments are cited in Pinkus (1996) and Ogunniyi (1996).

Africa has probably borne most of the blunt due to invalid applications of research paradigms. That Europeans 'discovered' and colonised Africans, was inadvertently, sometimes deliberately, accompanied by the use of global truths and the unfortunate uses of invalid foreign research discourses and paradigms upon communities, whose culture, language and context Eurocentric researchers rarely related with or understood. Valid African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) such as the traditional methodology of acquisition and oral transmission of knowledge, have hitherto often been rejected as worthless in mainly Westernised formal education (Mbow, 2003). As the foregoing chapter by Ssenkosi and Kasoma shows, Africa was apparently considered *tabula rasa*, devoid of any knowledge and discourses. It is one painful legacy of the colonial past of Africa.

Deceptively, independence has not conferred upon Africans the status of creators of knowledge or innovators and many an academic African are still under Western intellectual bondage of which they are products, and in which they comfortably reside. That is, we in Africa assimilated into mostly Western values, norms and criteria of judgement systems to the extent of suffering what Breton & Largent (2000) refer to as paradigm addiction. Paradigm addiction presents to Africans ready-made approaches, theoretical assumptions, ontologies, and epistemologies that are assumed to be ideologically and politically correct (Robbotom & Hart, 1993). This might account for the subversion of the local or indigenous paradigms, values, and consequently to the failure of research to contribute positively towards improving the lives of

Black Africa. In other words, academic research has become synonymous with epistemicide of African IKS.

In Africa, academic institutions, through certification, and funding agencies through finance, control research discourses, which consequently determine paradigms (methods, style of writing and interpretation of findings). The control is economically beneficial to the West. However, for reasons beyond the scope of this treatise, many educational institutions and funding agencies prefer and surreptitiously impose certain research methodologies upon the researchers and the researched. This imposition is instrumentalist where the researcher is additionally instructed how to interpret data and the researched are told the meaning and the implications of the interpretation. It is contrary to academia's desire, often stated, which is to inculcate freedom of thought and thesis among researchers (Robbotom & Hart, 1993). Dreyfus & Rainbow summed up the scenario adequately by stating that:

In terms of the relationship between researcher and researched, 'the Great Interpreter who has privileged access to meaning' plays the role of adjudicator of what is 'really going on', while insisting that the truths uncovered lie outside the sphere of power. Willis (1980, p.90) terms this claim of privileged externality, this assumed politically neutral position, a 'covert positivism' in its tendencies toward objectification and distanced relationship between subject and object(cited in Lather 1991, p.10).

Foreign paradigms are not necessarily wrong but the problem is the denial, especially by the Africans, that the 'educated' African is assimilated into values and knowledge systems that are external to Africa, which often sterilises the Africans against the development of African IKS. Regrettably, such systems simultaneously make the 'educated' African anti-African. As Wangari Maathai (2009) laments, 'Africans have been obscured from themselves' and are taught to professionally hate themselves. Foreign paradigms often dismiss the accounts of events and understanding of those Africans who stick to their roots and IKS as hearsay, critically devoid of international recognition and as academically pedestrian since

they are ignorant of acceptable Eurocentric sources and trends. That is, the decision of who is 'educated', as well as what is to be accepted as valid and useful knowledge is still held outside African value systems. Consequently, Africans have rarely, if at all, initiated qualifications on foundations of IKS and many Masters and PhD theses inclusive of IKS and Africa are uselessly heaped in libraries. Useful research has been that which grows Eurocentric paradigms and knowledge: it is the research that is published in journals that are academically and globally recognised as well as highly ranked. It is Eurocentric knowledge and findings that are referenced so frequently that the author acquires fame and a high impact value. As argued by Ssentongo and Draru in Chapter Three of this book, it is research based on Western paradigms that attracts funding and other forms of support, and; it is the research that earns academics promotions and high salaries.

Henceforth, besides colonisation and contemporary 'global' trends, the 'educated' African is an accomplice in perpetuating foreign paradigms. Behind academic jargon, the 'educated' African tends to equate personal survival with paradigm survival – i.e., the survival of those value systems that apparently offer employment and define 'modern' lifestyles. In support, the academia in governments and education institutions manipulate and control society in order to prevent exit out of the existing paradigm by failing those students or job applicants who criticise the status quo and align themselves with localised methodologies. Breton & Largent (2000) argue that such academia ignores knowledge or suppress criticisms of the anomalies in the Western paradigms.

Critical treatises against Western paradigms exist within the West and in Africa but are rarely funded for further review or publication, especially by the 'educated' African. Not fitting in either paradigm, the educated Africans neither is criticised for backwardness even as they try to 'catch up', nor do they fit in their traditional paradigms which they too criticise as backward, even as the local public acknowledges and upholds their academic achievements. Lost and rootless, the rejection in European and African communities is a daunting abyss, which nonetheless leads the educated African further to addictions of Euro-centricity, and beacons the

educated African to destroy African IKS, environment and culture. It is thus not surprising that, for example, in Uganda trees are uprooted for what is perceived as Eurocentric 'development', while in the USA uprooting a tree requires permission from the authorities; England is so upbeat about Shakespeare, while Ugandans loathe the idea of story-telling their children in vernacular, etc.

It is an anomaly that the educated Africans who would lead the resurrection of African IKS, and its research paradigms, are in denial of who they are. To solve this anomaly, Breton & Largent (2000) propose that '... our view of reality must change, as must the way we perceive, think, and value the world'. Curbing paradigm addiction might require the adoption of a strategy that refuses to accept those 'systems of discourse (economic, political, scientific narrative)' (Denzin in Lincoln & Denzin 1994, p.579) that ignore who we are collectively and individually.

Discourse

Michel Foucault (1926-1984) articulates much of the discourse-power relationships, focusing on the ways discourses constitute and govern individual subjects (Weedon in Pinkus, 1996). For example, Foucault identified structuralism as a major philosophy that has influenced knowledge structures, as it positions reality and its dependent thoughts in the symbolic systems such as languages (Pinkus, 1966). Structuralism progeny such as post-structuralism and post-modernism extend discourse to include expressions, which according to Mkabela (2005) could embrace other forms of expressions native to Africa and might provide avenues to alternative research paradigms and epistemology such as *Obuntubulamu*.

Foucault, in a way similar to Karl Marx's notion of power and the control of production, argued that discourse is power that individuals, systems or institutions use to organize knowledge production and dissemination as well as to control society (Van Dijk, 1989). The power of the discourse is applied through tools such as mass media, financial houses, academia and technology (Mattelart, 1979 in Van Dijk, 1989). Thus the elite in the dominant discourse include journalists, writers, artists, and directors

(Van Dijk, 1989) as well as the academic research supervisors and publishers most of whom reside outside Africa and are external to African IKS. The elite set the tone and style of text or talk, determine the topics/ knowledge, and decide the participants and recipients of discourses, as well as decide how to portray certain peoples (Jary & Jary 1991, p.196; Van Dijk 1989). For example, Africa and Africans are often portrayed as backward, wild and savage. Kanyandago (2010) notes, for example, that the social contexts of Africans are rarely represented (or often misrepresented) in books, as the uses of African languages and cultures are marginalised.

Naturally, discourse differs according to race and culture because, according to Fish (in Lincoln & Denzin, 1994), distinctively different interpretive communities have unique standards or versions of proofs of truth and validity. For example, African research participants have own languages, personalities and experiences that are not easy to represent in Western discourses (Mphahlele 1996). It is even more challenging in that African cultures and knowledge systems (episteme), including research, discourses and validations are often unwritten. Thus, foreign research discourses and attendant paradigms would misrepresent the participants' behaviour and understanding since paradigms may not be universally valid.

Fortunately, philosophically, a discourse accommodates possibilities and sites for criticising, challenging, resisting and contesting powers that control discourse (Pinkus 1996) to the extent that each episteme can allow alternative discourses to exist. That is, Western and African discourses each create spaces for each other and for criticism – the two can thus co-exist. Regrettably, the developed countries use political, technological and economic power to globally disallow alternative discourses. The research discourses of the developed countries have hitherto marginalized and subjugated alternative discourses (Mphahlele, 1996) to the extent that academia (often pro-Western) prescribe foreign mostly Western procedures to African research. The approach to African education has been largely perennialist, as defined by Hutchins (1899 – 1977), in ensuring that Western civilisation is supreme

and everlasting as a basis for seeking truths everywhere (Travers & Rebores 1990).

In perennialism, some aspects of behaviourism are found. So, perennialism assumes that every human mind should be developed along pre-determined disciplines. It should be noted that acceptable disciplines are often the condescending accomplishments from the West. So, there is a globally incessant emphasis of Western achievements such as Shakespeare's works of literature, Picasso's art, Newton's laws of motion, Winston Churchill's accomplishments, etc. That is, through perennialism, Western discourse has global status and currency of universal 'truth' and dictates research design and interpretation in Africa. Thinking and operating outside the Western paradigms is difficult and leads to a student failing a course (Mphahlele 1996), or a researcher failing to publish findings in highly rated academic journals. Indeed, most of the African academic journals have no rating.

A need for transformation in research

What is wrong with Western research paradigms in African contexts?

Some of the challenges of Western paradigms in Africa have been outlined above and might be reiterated in this section. Perhaps more importantly, Western academia is oblivious about, or deliberately ignores, the social disharmony, unhappiness it causes in Africa, as stated above. Additionally, several authors observe that Western research has in Africa caused blind obedience, inner deadness, injustices, epidemic substance and process addictions, economic exploitation, cynicism, as well as chronic stress (Breton & Largent 2000; Scidev 2002). Breton & Largent (2000) sufficiently describe the status of research and how it is controlled:

We see a pervasive mind-set of control and domination permeating our cultural institutions, a mind-set driven by the fear of anarchy. If someone, some authority or power over us—does not control us, society will fall into chaos, or so we are to believe. But, who controls the controllers? What kind of order do those in positions of power have

in mind? Is it power-over an order that works—i.e., that creates social harmony and makes us happy? Or does it create wars, blind obedience, inner deadness, injustices, epidemic substance and process addictions, economic exploitation, cynicism, chronic stress, and unhappiness?

Sleeter & Grant (in Atwater 1996) support Breton & Largent (2000), and add that knowledge is central to power. Africa's dependency upon foreign hand-outs arguably started when the Western capitalist, economic and political competitiveness took control of the global village, and stifled possibilities of alternative discourses in Africa. The control is indicative of power and superiority grounded in the idea that scholarly pursuit, insight, and wisdom have their origins in Europe and America (Forster 2006). Tensions arise when the underlying assumptions, principles, and world views embedded in these Western discourses and the attendant paradigms are not valid or reliable (Breton & Largent, 2000; Maykut & Morehouse 1997; Guba & Lincoln 1994) for and in Africa.

Philosophically, validation and reliability tensions arise in Africa where Western individualism is applied. Foucault argued that individualism is fundamental to Western discourse. In Western philosophy, an individual exists prior to, separately and independently and others are an added extra to a self-sufficient being (Louw 2004). Moreover, Forster (2006) infers a relationship between individualism and Rene Descartes' philosophical statement: 'I think therefore I am'. Ontologically, this statement influences reductionism, which simplifies nature's complexity to observable and measurable parts and phenomena; reductionism in some cases leads to the questionable assumption that the sum of parts (constituents) equals the whole, and has defined some aspects of science and democracy.

Reductionism is fundamental to positivism in science which assumes that reality is measurable and exists independent of the observer. Yet, positivism might not apply to all African IKS (Jefferies, *et. al.*, 2007), and could at times be absurd (Mkabela, 2005) particularly where African IKS is rejected out-

right (Mbow 2003; Raseroka 2005; Kawooya 2006). Rejection of African IKS happens because, in realist ontology, positivism only trusts science to explain reality. Additional tensions arise from scientific sequencing of processes against qualitative and nonlinear African IKS epistemology (Lalonde, 1993); although cases of science-IKS overlaps exist. Emeagwali (2003) believes that, in mainly attempting to explain regularity and to deliberately exclude the unique and intractable, reductionism hardly caters for discovery that is 'intuitive, accidental, conjectural, or inspirational (spiritual)' that is characteristic of African IKS. This is because IKS epistemology recognises pre-existence of knowledge as a creation of the super-natural; it thus embraces the immeasurable and non-empirical as well as (metaphysical ontology) realities which could be acquired intuitively through spiritual intervention, social constructivism and agreements. Nonetheless, while scientists hesitate to apply rigour to some of Western knowledge systems, such as Christianity, they discount traditional African beliefs as scientifically nonsensical, and then demonise traditional African practices and herbs as witchcraft. For example, traditional African medical practitioners are 'Witch Doctors', a derogatory term in Western discourse, although the Biblical miracles and beliefs, not subjected to scientific rigour, are sensible truths. In which case, besides sometimes being incompatible approaches for Bantu, many Western epistemologies are promoted with a superiority stance that ignores African realities.

Furthermore, reductionism explicates individual rights that are foundations of democracy and capitalism but which pre-empt over community interests to the extent of creating homelessness and food shortages, as some individuals own vast amounts of capital, land included, where communities would otherwise grow food and build shelters. In contrast, land was communal in most of Africa, and still is in places such as rural South Africa and Lesotho. For example, through *Obuntubulamu*, Bantu obtain land for growing food and obtain IK for environmental protection. This kind of communalism associated with 'primitivity', where individualism is unsustainable, seems to be working in some 'developed' communities especially in the Far East and among some

groups such as the Jews. Only that, again, we see a selective denunciation of African paradigms: so Western discourses can appreciate Chinese herbals but refer to African herbs as witchcraft.

On the basis of misinterpretation of African IKS, Western academia predicts anarchy where it does not control the research discourse. The belief that Africans, especially those outside Western discourses, cannot do anything by themselves (Mwenda 2013) is apparent in denying recognition of Afrocentric paradigms. Western media tell half-truths about Africa as they obscure the opportunities, innovations, enterprising individuals, and creative organizations in Africa (Mwenda 2013), unless these are in Western interests. Strategies of disinformation and selective omission of non-European achievements, inventions and of technologies; the distortion or rejection of data obtained from African IKS; and clandestine naming of African artefacts and practices have additionally undermined African IKS in formal education (Emeagwali 2003).

African research students would potentially underperform, misunderstand and misapply research principles because they use foreign epistemology and pedagogy, that contradict aspects of African IKS and discourses in which they grew up. Some of the foreign discourses are irrelevant but have displaced traditional norms that could have been most appropriate in the local environments (Jefferies, Carsten-Stahl & McRobb 2007). For example, positivism might not directly contribute to an understanding of African spirituality that it often refers to as witchcraft, while carefully finding spaces for Western spiritualism. So, the accusation of *laissez faire* approach to research and to mismanaging funded projects levelled against Africans is probably harsh against the foreign-funded projects that are carriers of foreign funders' interests and discourses. Western knowledge systems, such as perennialism are responsible for the systematic subjugation of other knowledge systems or other ways of knowing (Chilisa 2015). Chilisa adds that Western methods give the *false* impression that only White people are capable of producing knowledge thus excluding the knowledge systems and ways of knowing of the historically marginalized and oppressed Africans from contributing

to the research process. Chilisa concludes that, research contributes to the process of 'othering', further colonization, and marginalization of Africans.

Hence, Steve Biko (in Forster 2006) struggled against apartheid along with its pre-occupation of perfecting the Western knowledge system over Black Africa (i.e., over perennialism). Ways of perfecting Western discourse include a demand by funding agencies and academia to position a research proposal in already recognised Western literature, and an articulation of how the research would contribute towards established Western knowledge. So, a literature review is a pre-requisite, but it covertly and deliberately assimilates the researcher into the Western discourse, and the research likely yields results that support the same truths, thus perpetuating and globalising Western truths. This transmission of discourses (e.g., the research, policy, planning, management, implementation and knowledge) to Africa could happen through personnel, labelled expatriates, but the failure of projects had led to questioning the need to directly involve foreign organisations in service delivery (Lewis 1998) and how they should be involved (Mukasa 1999). It is one way through which the West has globalised its discourses and competitively submerged and misrepresented IKS (Scidev 2002; Leach & Fairhead 2002).

Evidently, Western research paradigms serve Western capital safeties and political interests (Ditton 2007), and carry an underlying tendency towards self-righteousness and with it, a sense of entitlement (Mwenda 2013). While, it is evident that foreign, particularly Western research approaches, have yielded important benefits to Africa in many fields such as medicine, technology and economics, and should not be dismissed (Emeagwali 2003), simultaneously however, Western research discourse endangers Afrocentric discourses by providing benefits and already-made solutions. Mwenda (2013) believes that Western discourses strangle self-initiative thus creating a dependency mentality among Africans.

As an alternative to Western paradigms or as an additional research approach, the African IKS that would support develop-

ment projects was stunted when readymade products, approaches, theoretical assumptions, ontologies, and epistemologies, which are assumed to be economically, technologically, ideologically and politically correct (Robbotom & Hart 1993) were dictated to Africans. Now Africa agonises over high levels of unemployment and economic decay, stores useless research data and academic theses, and even closes factories. Ulimwengu (2013) complains of venerated PhDs in history without historians in Africa. Wrong paradigms from foreign powers have enhanced the creation of starvation, sicknesses, rampaging warlords, and corrupt politicians (Mwenda 2013). That is, some aid projects and industries fail because they are premised upon data extracted from invalid research discourses.

Transforming research to include African paradigms

African IKS have had little influence in shaping its own research agendas and paradigms (Prior 2006) and is benchmarked upon imported systems of quality assurance (Kistan, 1999) that have, in the first place, rejected African IKS. The consequence of this one-sided presentation has been to perpetuate the narrative of Africa as a place of hopelessness, poverty, misery and adversity (Mwenda 2013). It is not surprising then that notable African philosophers such as Hountondji (1996) mystify African epistemology while recommending Western knowledge systems to Africans, arguing that philosophy is universal.

In my opinion, we in Africa need the courage to develop Africa ourselves, and this requires reclaiming power over research discourse, from the dominant Western paradigms to African paradigms, to enable production of knowledge that is valid and relevant to Africans, to avoid cultural domination, and to reverse the genocide of African IKS. Transformation in research is needed, whereby institutions and researchers mind less about international recognition, learn and understand local cultures and African IKS, and cater for local interests.

The academia would nonetheless see a need for transforming research in and for Africa if they can answer the following:

- i. The ontological question: What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?
- ii. The epistemological question: What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?
- iii. The methodological question: How can the inquirer go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known?

The answers would be cognisant of Asante's (2009) argument that decolonisation is a struggle by which Africans attempt to establish their own discourses. However, a challenge is that transformation which the West and educated Africans consider desirable will find ready-made research systems in Africa clothed in foreign understandings. Thus transformation would have to compete with and struggle to defuse the assimilation (as described by Jean Piaget) of African researchers into foreign research discourses (Breton & Largent 2000; Prior 2006).

Transformation requires the adoption of Foucault's advice (e.g., in Mpahlele, 1996) against any subversive genealogy, which refuses to accept alternative discourses such as IKS. Instead of Africans becoming Westernised, African researchers should enhance African IKS with pride. The African research paradigms as alternative or additional genealogy would after all enrich the global diversity with a potential to solve African and world problems. The proposed transformation integrates new ideas in the brain (Ferguson 1982; Miller & Sellar 1985, p.8; Sohne 1985), similar to Piaget's cognitive accommodation, where researchers' thinking adopts IKS to research African realities. Therefore, an open system that offers security to budding pro-IKS researchers along with pro-Western discourses is pre-requisite. Doll (1989) and Ferguson (1982) recommend open systems that freely interact with the environment, taking in information, interrogating it, and using it. According to Etchberger & Shaw (1992, p.412), practical transformation processes include:

- i. Perturbation – dissatisfaction or uneasiness with the way things are;
- ii. Awareness of a need to change and improve;
- iii. Commitment to change;
- iv. Vision of what change entails;
- v. Projection into vision – Realisation of participants, and;
- vi. Cognitive and overt changes in actual physical and mental processes to a reality.

Evidence of Stage (i) and (ii) in the above can be etched out of Breton & Largent's (2000) lamentations against the current control and domination of mind-sets as well as of cultural institutions. Stages (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) are being actively pursued and are well-articulated, for example in Bangura (2011). Bangura sees African-centred methodologies as emergent, whose advantages can be summarized as follows:

- i. they combine theoretical and empirical approaches;
- ii. they focus on methodological issues within and between disciplines;
- iii. they offer very broad perspectives of the possible uses and issues surrounding research techniques and methods; and
- iv. they challenge researchers to build bridges that link new research questions with innovative methods that can address issues of power, authority, and representation in the research process.

Alternative research discourses in Africa

African IKS

From the above, alternative discourses suitable to IKS for and in Africa are necessary. One alternative is *Obuntubulamu*. However, a starting point is to contrast IKS from other knowledge systems.

The term 'indigenous' is from the Latin word *indigen*, which means native or original inhabitant of a geographical place. However, there are complaints about the vagueness in distinguishing between what is indigenous and non-indigenous in relation to regional and historical ethnographic contexts (Ellen & Harris (1996).

Several authors such as Chilisa (2011), Mertens, Cram & Chilisa (2013), Denzin, Lincoln & Smith (2008), the World Bank (2013), etc., have dealt with the vagueness, and in relation to people, the World Bank's definition seems appropriate. The World Bank's operational Policy 4.10 refers to 'indigenous peoples' as a distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- i. Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
- ii. Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories;
- iii. Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and cultural; and
- iv. An indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region".

Formally, IKS is a body of local knowledge and skills unique to a culture, which enables a country to survive (E.g., Cosijn, Pirkola, Bothma & Jävelin 2002). Thus, IKS essentially contributes and supports the local knowledge economy, through mobilising, building and boosting a country's knowledge capital as a foundation for local-level decision making and problem-solving in agriculture, health care, food preparation, education, natural-resource management, etc. (Warren 1991). For example, IKS skills, experiences and insights were essential ingredients of the Ethiopian food security program (World Bank Group 1997). IKS should be considered in African development contexts, and in industry as well as commerce (Ellen & Harris 1996).

IK is founded on the reality of what is known (Nkurunziza 2004). Auspiciously, African IKS is not static. While IKS develops within people's cultural values between generations, it adapts continuously to changing environments (Cosijn, *et al.* 2002) and evidently adopts useful foreign paradigms and knowledge such as innovations, language and arts. However, African IKS has so far failed to effectively facilitate scholarly products (Raseroka 2005) because Africans abandoned their intellectual tools for ex-

pression and exploration in a systematic way (Du Plessis & Raza 2004). Fundamentally, IKS has to operate outside the Western theoretical and colonial understanding (Leach & Fairhead 2002).

Afrocentricity

Afrocentricity originates from an African-American struggle for emancipation from a Eurocentric bondage. Afrocentricity is an empowering counter hegemonic philosophy, which questions epistemological considerations based in European cultural realities (Baker 1991). Baker states that objectivity or cultural neutrality is moot in Afrocentricity because the episteme is based on a western positivistic tradition and adds that as an epistemological consideration, the Afrocentric discourse attempts to shift, construct, critique, and challenge the way of knowing or discerning knowledge from an epistemology engendered within a European cultural construct to one which is engendered or centred within an African cultural construct. It harbours the idea that African people should re-assert themselves against disorientation and de-centeredness (Asante 2009). Asante describes the Afrocentric paradigm as a shift in thinking and a *structural* adjustment among Africans in the way they respond to the relationships with, and to attitudes toward, the environment, kinship patterns, preferences, and history excluding any foreign influence. Thus, Afrocentricity makes African IKS the centre of research.

African-centred research makes African paradigms and interests central and essential – these become fundamental in planning and executing research, as well as in analysing data. As an epistemological consideration, the Afrocentric discourse attempts to shift, construct, and critique, and challenge the way of knowing or discerning knowledge from an epistemology engendered within a European cultural construct (Baker 1991) to one which is centred within African IKS. Hence, Afrocentricity in some ways becomes antagonistic against hegemonic foreign discourses which dispense foreign interests.

Obuntubulamu – an Afrocentric IKS example

Obuntubulamu is an example of an African paradigm that is critical to achieve Bantu participation in research if there is to be cooperation, mutual interpretation of results, interrogation of the research process, and thesis by all role players. Besides *Obuntubulamu*, other groups of Africans could use their value systems in research in similar ways.

Obuntubulamu is a Luganda word and Luganda is the language of the Baganda in Uganda. *Obuntubulamu* carries the same meaning as *Ubuntu* in IsiXhosa and IsiZulu in reference to the social conduct or etiquette expected of a *Muntu* (human being). So, *Obuntubulamu* and *Ubuntu* are used interchangeably in this paper. The suffix ‘-ntu’, refers to human society and way of life (Foster 2006). *Obuntubulamu* is an authentic representation of Afrocentric IKS because Bantu (plural of *Muntu*) inhabit over three quarters of Africa, from West to South Africa.

Obuntubulamu is one aspect of African IKS among Bantu, based on the belief in a universal bond of sharing that connects all humanity. Ssekabaka Daudi Chwa II (the 34th King of Buganda Kingdom in Uganda, from 1897 until 1939) articulates some aspects of *Obuntubulamu* thus:

- It is important to share happiness or unhappiness with a neighbour and relative;
- It is recognised etiquette for one to greet everyone on the road;
- It is customary to invite foreigners to share a meal;
- It is the duty of everyone to respond to an alarm at any time of day or night or a cry for help to go at once and render assistance to the party in distress or danger (Low 1971 as cited in Andrea & Overfield (2012, p.430 - 431).

According to Eze, *Ubuntu (Obuntubulamu)* can be summarised as follows:

‘A person is a person through other people’ strikes an affirmation of one’s humanity through recognition of an

‘other’ in his or her uniqueness and difference. It is a demand for a creative intersubjective formation in which the ‘other’ becomes a mirror (but only a mirror) for my subjectivity. This idealism suggests to us that humanity is not embedded in my person solely as an individual; my humanity is co-substantively bestowed upon the other and me. Humanity is a quality we owe to each other. We create each other and need to sustain this otherness creation. And if we belong to each other, we participate in our creations: we are because you are, and since you are, definitely I am. The ‘I am’ is not a rigid subject, but a dynamic self-constitution dependent on this otherness creation of relation and distance (2010, pp.190 –191).

This is reiterated by Tutu (2004) who states that ‘My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours’. We belong in a bundle of life. We say, ‘A person is a person through other persons’. Thus, it is the duty of everyone, when requested, to direct a traveller to a destination, or even to offer shelter from rain or for the night. Hence, according to Broodryk (2002), humane and collective actions and relationships define Ubuntu (*Obuntubulamu*). *Obuntubulamu* deems that society must be run for the sake of all, requiring cooperation as well as sharing and charity. Mtuzze explains that it is a kind of existence, where one person’s personhood and identity is fulfilled and complemented by the other person’s personhood, where “each person exists because the other person exists” (1999, p.84). *Obuntubulamu* is consequently the quality of being human, involving caring, sharing, respect, compassion as well as ensuring a happy and qualitative human community life in the spirit of family.

Integrating Obuntubulamu as a philosophy in Research

In integrating *Obuntubulamu* with the usual research practices, one has to acknowledge relativism in that each epistemology adds a subjective reality to an experience. The integration also borrows from critical theorists, focussing on the ideal of concentrating on

human cultural norms, values, symbols, and social processes viewed from a subjective perspective. *Obuntubulumu* is subjective to Bantu, and one of the pillars of validity in researching Bantu experiences. However, for us to access that validity, we have to uncloth the Bantu and remove the current Eurocentric epistemology and ontology. The unclotting process implies decolonising the research, to start with.

Prior (2006) and Smith (1999) advise that decolonising research decentres the focus from the aims of the researcher to the agenda and advocacy of the indigenous people, while Martin (2008), Evans & Powell (2007) as well as Wells & Wells (2007) recommend understanding participants' social fabric, local context, priorities, and culture. Therefore, inclusion of community values, together with participants is widely recommended (Lincoln & Denzin 1994; Pinkus 1996; Mammo 1999). This participatory approach engenders a working relationship (Mkabela, 2005) such that the participants clearly and cooperatively can state their priorities in the research process. Fortunately, *Obuntubulumu* allows for entry into Bantu communities.

The adoption of local discourses in research is not new. For example, in Australia, Martin (2008) recommends methodologies that are compatible with the Aboriginal beliefs and culture. While Asante (2009) does not offer possibilities for relationships between Afrocentricity and hegemonic discourses, it is here argued that Western-based research is essential in Africa especially where applications designed along Western-based epistemology are used. After all, the cultural, economic, political and social conceptual frameworks are in fact foreign, and Africans might find difficulty in locating exact translations into vernacular. However, there is a need to balance the universal truths (Pedro, Enrique, Ernesto & Lucio 2004) and local beliefs and paradigms to avoid absolute assimilation. Bantu should firstly sieve out discourses that tend to turn Africans into labourers and that tend to legitimise as well as perpetuate social, political, economic, power and resource allocation imbalances (Matthews 1980).

Bantu interrogate truths or credibility (Louw 2004) as communal narratives. In support, Broodryk (2006) points at the need

for inclusivity of everyone in a group using open collective forums. The Western plurality for truths, credibility and power are presumably interjected by community interests as a whole. Hence, a more holistic; not only the individual (Who are you - psychology), and third person (Who do others say you are - sociology) are considered, but also the interrelatedness (Who are we and how does that inform who you are and who we perceive you to be?) are examined (Forster 2006). In that way, IKS-based discourse does not separate the 'knower' from the 'known' (Du Plessis & Raza 2004) because Bantu are collective and their knowledge, including research belongs to all (Emeagwali 2003). Thus, Bantu reject Western paradigms and rarely reconcile with the top-down power relations explained by Dreyfus and Rainbow in Lather: "... a facilitator has privileged access to meaning, is the adjudicator in explaining what data or knowledge really means, and claims externality and political neutrality in relation to the interpretation" (1991, p.10).

Obuntubulamu as a way of life among Bantu does not accommodate authoritative discourses. The rejection of imposing authorities is observable in political structures of Bantu Kingdoms and Chiefdoms, where negotiation, debate and agreement are fundamental. *Obuntubulamu* is about sharing (Broodryk 2006), including thoughts.

Sharing is implied in Mkabela's (2005) advice in adopting *Obuntubulamu* as a research philosophy that there must be cultural and social immersion into a Bantu community as opposed to scientific distance. Even Western qualitative research does not allow a researcher's intimacy to participants as *Obuntubulamu* desires. Immersion into a community requires the researcher to share their knowledge and intentions of the research. This is because the quality and depth of respondents' cooperation and information (data) depends on the perception Bantu have of 'who' the researcher is. By the researcher sharing family history, Bantu respondents are more at ease to share information because then they 'know' the researcher (Muwanga-Zake 2009). Whereas a qualitative ethnographer is advised to be reflexive in terms of assessing the impact of the research upon participants, an *Obuntubu-*

lamu researcher is reflexive by being a *Muntu* – reflexivity is an expected attribute of a *Muntu*. Bantu collaborate and relate with participants as equals, with respect to their values, needs, norms, and mores. This approach ameliorates power in the discourse of the research (Muwanga-Zake 2009), which is similar to Social Constructivist paradigms. For example, Gergen (1985), views discourse about the world as an artefact of communal interchange, and is concerned with explicating the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world (including themselves), which is similar to action research.

Social Constructivism in *Obuntubulamu* articulates common understanding regarding mutual respect for others, an agreement on research and interpretative criteria, and dialogue or "mutual exposure" of beliefs (Mkabela2005, p.179). *Obuntubulamu* as a philosophy implies that participants collaborate in the research among themselves even though they each have unique individual ways of using the skills and knowledge from the research. Hence, Forster argues that

‘... ethics of *Obuntubulamu*, as it relates to the concepts of ontological being, can add to Western knowledge systems the richness of human consciousness, identity and what it truly means to be a human person (a *Muntu*)’ (2006, p.1).

Thus there is a potential to move an individual researcher from a Cartesian solitary to solidarity and from independence to interdependence (Louw 2004). Greet, introduce yourself, understand their needs, and if possible sit and eat with Bantu, as Ssekabaka Chwa II advises in Andrea & Overfield (2012), to gain cooperation and validation of your research (Muwanga-Zake, 2007; 2009). The author has experienced that process as a serious pre-requisite of social entry among the Baganda (Uganda), Sotho (Lesotho and South Africa), as well as the Xhosa and Zulu in South Africa. This is in concert with Social Constructivism and its elements of ethnography, which, according to Gergen (1985), view discourse about the world as an artefact of communal interchange. Bantu cooperate where the research clearly contributes towards the de-

velopment, albeit without contravening, their culture (Muwanga-Zake 2009).

Obuntubulamu supports dialogue through which individuality is catered for and plurality is supported in the practice of collective responsibility. It is during dialogue that each *Muntu* exposes him/herself to others, and during which differences are ironed out to a homogeneous agreement that is cognisant of norms and values of that community. Discussions confront plurality and interrogate truths or credibility (Louw 2004). Thus, outcomes from a discussion are not absolutist. This is because, according to Louw (2004), *Ubuntu (Obuntubulamu) respects the particularity of the other*, and therefore links up closely to its respect for *individuality*, that is not Cartesian. Louw explains the shortcomings of Cartesian models, especially the *modernistic*, individuals: they exist prior to, or separately and independently from the rest of the community or society such that the *rest of society is an added extra to a pre-existent and self-sufficient being*. Cartesian individualism is solitary, sometimes against communal interests. Collective Cartesian individuals often translate into serious capitalist competitiveness; this is Western democracy and capitalism.

By contrast, while there are individual decisions and capital ownership, competition would not be severe in *Obuntubulamu* because it defines the individual in terms of relationships with others. The Bantu discourage a *Muntu* to take precedence over the community. The "individual" *Muntu* flourishes but assists, and interacts with, others. A *Muntu* signifies a plurality of personalities in a community.

In terms of Constructivist Research, every knowledge system, including IKS, and therefore *Obuntubulamu*, naturally confirms or forms new constructs from interpreting experiences (Cobern 1996). Bantu often wish to confer with community members before committing themselves to an answer. Thus, research questionnaires given to individuals might be returned with somewhat similar answers. Non-structured questions would facilitate dialogue during interviews (Denscombe 1998; Merriam 1998), encouraging participants' interactivity. A *Muntu* interviewed in isolation could be interpreted as a benevolent informant who reveals sacred IKS

without community permission, and subsequently might be rejected by the community (Muwanga-Zake, 2009). Hence, among Bantu, focus groups would be more appreciated than individual-researcher interactions. This is because Bantu participants are partners in constructing developments and in designing the research scheme (Willis 2000) in a way outlined by Cennamo, Abell, & Chung (as cited in Willis 2000), who advise for participant-centred negotiations that nurture reflexivity and questions rather than asks participants to complete tasks. Hence, the research procedures suit Mkabela's (2005) suggestion of participants being human agents (Bantu) as opposed to objects or simply 'data sources' or informants.

Therefore, while *Obuntubulamu* discourse is essentially constructivist, *Obuntubulamuis* simultaneously idiosyncratic and interpretive as the researcher's experiences are important considerations in the interpretation of data. For example, the *Obuntubulamu*-based researcher is a visible participant with concrete desires and interests instead of the Western scientific-being of an anonymous voice of authority and power (Harding cited in Mkabela 2005), which is characteristic of the distanced scientificpassive reporting, devoid of the human element. Hence, research among Bantu requires the analysis of the *Obuntubulamu* discourse, including culture (e.g., attitudes such as how s/he greets you), environment (and its relation with IKS), gestures and glances, thoughts, understanding, values, and emotions which Foucault (in Cohen & Manion 1987) and Mphahlele (1996) advised. *Obuntubulamu* discourse indicates levels of researcher acceptance in the community.

Acceptance is an ethical dimension. Similar to Western research genealogy, Ubuntu (*Obuntubulamu*) ethics include permissions from the authorities to conduct research (Merriam, 1998). Asking for willing volunteers is a Western research virtue (Cates & Goodling 1997) but is an *Obuntubulamu* requirement as it determines the nature and extent of access to information and improves power relations between participants and the researcher (Mkabela 2005, p.183) and could reduce tensions and improve power relations. However, *Obuntubulamu* obligates observing and respecting participants' protocols regarding the discretion and reticence of

elders to provide access to IKS (Mkabela 2005). There could be spiritual (including traditional healers), administrative (e.g., chiefs) and many other forms of leadership among the Bantu. Seniority in chronological age is another important consideration. Hence, *Obuntubulamu* additionally requires the researcher to introduce oneself to, and obtain permission from, the elders, spiritual leaders, chiefs, and other forms of leadership in a community. For example, while permission from the education and school authorities is constitutionally an ethical requirement in South Africa, a traditional chief should be visited, not only to know who the visitor to his chieftdom is, to allow the research, and to guide the researcher about how to go about reaching participants. Places often have sacred areas and personalities.

In the qualitative sense of research, Bantu discourses include the nature of greeting and quality of socialisation. The subjectivity and bias among participants (Hickey & Zuicker 2002) are mitigated by *Obuntubulamu* communal consensus.

As far as Developmental Research is concerned, the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) (cited in Raseroka 2005) desired a people-centred and inclusive development. The development of participants (Reeves & Hedberg 2003) requires collaboration, which is a tenet of *Obuntubulamu*, in interpreting findings; in implementing the findings; and in gaining research skills. Ultimately there would be mutual understanding between the researcher and the participant community and its social dynamics in relation to the research.

***Obuntubulamu* and Western Knowledge Systems in research**

Table 1 provides an overview of the comparison between African IKS and Western IKS. *Obuntubulamu* as a representative of a research approach embedded in African IKS shows that there could be similarities, and therefore that integrating Western research paradigms in *Obuntubulamu* is possible among Bantu.

Table 1: Comparison of African IKS and Western Knowledge Systems in research

	African IKS	Western IKS
Philosophy	<i>Obuntubulamu</i> (Why <i>Obuntubulamu</i> ?) Negotiated processes and outcomes; collectiveness and consensus; social development	Participative philosophies: Post-modernism, Developmental, Constructivism, Ethnography
Methodology	<i>Obuntubulamu</i> , IKS & methodology: Bantu research and dissemination of knowledge. E.g., Oral messages, games, greeting, etc.	Ethical considerations, Action research, interpretivism, Case studies, Discourse analysis, etc.
Research in African context	<i>Obuntubulamu</i> and participative research philosophies	

Three tenets of Western research methodology described in Crotty (1998) are in concert with *Obuntubulamu*: (1) a respect for others; (2) an agreement on criteria; and (3) dialogue or ‘mutual exposure’ of beliefs in regard to ethical considerations and discourse analysis. *Obuntubulamu* engenders participant dialogue and a non-*Muntu* facilitator would have to transform into a *Muntu* (Mkabela 2005), from solitary to solidarity, and from independence to interdependence (Louw 2004), with the Bantu community. Becoming a *Muntu* is a methodology involving submitting oneself to *Obuntubulamu*. The *Obuntubulamu*-becoming process requires “cultural and social immersion as opposed to scientific distance to understand African phenomena” (Mikaela 2005, p.179). For example, *Obuntubulamu* appreciates sharing a researcher’s family history, clan, and totem; this makes participants to ‘know’ the researcher – the researcher has proven that s/he is a *Muntu* with a lineage who live/d

somewhere, etc. Afrocentricity requires researchers to state their location in time and space (Asante 2009). Fortunately, a *Muntu* perception of the other is not fixed or rigidly closed, but is adjustable or open-ended and allows the other to be (Louw 2004). Thus, a non-*Muntu* would also be able to become a *Muntu*.

It is ethical, albeit an Action Research, in that participants are empowered to develop research skills in their communities (Stevenson 1995), and a case research in the uniqueness of *Obuntubulamu* and of Bantu as at a community level. The case is also defined in terms of the local discourses including language (Hitchcock & Hughes 1995; Neuman 1997), especially unique ones such as gestures, glances, values, and emotions in relating with a researcher (Foucault, in Mphahlele 1996). For example, sharing a meal is indicative of complete acceptance, and therefore a revelation of the value participants attach to the research. Discourse analysis includes translations of questions and responses between vernacular and another language, and this might require some etymological analysis (Asante 2009). These examples of discourses should be analysed as measures of acceptance that seriously determine research validity.

Prior (2006) notes that giving a 'voice' to participants evokes discourse through a process, which develops meaning or 'truth' through a relationship of trust, reciprocity and co-operatively generated methods of research that remain true to the context in harmony with the cultural values and epistemology of the Indigenous peoples. Similarly, it is in the realm of *Obuntubulamu* to socialise and enhance inclusivity as defined in Broodryk (2006). In this regard, *Obuntubulamu* bears similarity to the Western management practice of teamwork where everyone brings something the team needs and the team defines a common goal.

Data from *Obuntubulamu* paradigms is analysed from an idiosyncratic constructivist and interpretive approach, with clear revelation of the researcher's deeds (Gay & Airasian 2000) and interests, besides those of participants within the framework of discourse analysis. Then a constant comparative method to analyse some of the participants' statements to determine recurring

themes and patterns in their responses, is appropriate (Hitchcock & Hughes 1995; Maykut & Morehouse 1997; Denscombe 1998).

Differentiating ethnography from Obuntubulamu

It is common to equate ethnographic approaches to *Obuntubulamu*. As Table 2 below shows, there are similarities. However, *Obuntubulamu* is a cultural characteristic of Bantu, whose methodology is known and does not require exploration. In other words, while ethnography seeks to investigate cultural processes, *Obuntubulamu* provides already known procedures of conducting research in Bantu communities.

Table 2: Comparing and contrasting ethnography and Obuntubulamu

Features of ethnographic research (Hamersley & Atkinson (2007), Wolcott (2008), and Fetterman (2009).	Obuntubulamu
Seeks group patterns - their ideas and beliefs expressed through language or other activities, and how they behave	Same
Data collection is mainly by interviews, symbols, artefacts, observations, and many other sources of data	Same
Describes the culture of a group in very detailed and complex manner.	It is a culture
Focuses more on questions about how to report findings in the field than on methods of data collection and interpretation	Methods of data collection and interpretation are key. Participants own interpretation.
Data analysis involves interpretation of the functions and meanings of human actions.	Discourse analysis is important
Emphasises on exploring social phenomena rather than testing hypotheses	Same
Describes how a cultural group works	Same

and to explore their beliefs, language, behaviours and also issues faced by the group, such as power, resistance and dominance.	
Requires to identify and locate a culture - shared language, patterns of behaviour and attitudes of discernible patterns.	Located in Bantu in Africa
Select cultural themes, issues or theories to study about the group. - study by examining people interactions	Same
Should collect information in the context or setting where the group works or lives - respect the daily lives of individuals, reciprocity, data ownership	Same
Forge a set of rules or generalisations - incorporates the views of participants (emic) as well as the views of the researcher (etic).	Working rules already known
It is multifactorial - may be qualitative or quantitative	Qualitative
It is inductive - not structured to test hypotheses	Same
It is dialogic - findings may be expounded on by the study's participants	Same
It is holistic.	Same
Social meanings and ordinary activities of people (informants) in naturally occurring settings	Known
The goal is to collect data in such a way that the researcher imposes a minimal amount of personal bias on the data	Researcher already part of community – transformed into a Muntu
Transparent and reflexive - explores influences of the researcher's involvement. Despite these attempts of reflexivity, no researcher can be totally unbiased. This factor has provided a	Transparent and reflexive BUT researcher already part of community – transformed into a

basis to criticize ethnography	Muntu
Personal experience - participation, rather than just observation	Same
The interplay of individual and social structure important	Same
Range from a realist perspective, in which behaviour is observed, to a constructivist perspective where understanding is socially constructed.	Same
Critical theory - addresses issues of power within the researcher-researched relationships and the links between knowledge and power.	Researcher-researched relationships not existent

Inhibitors against African research discourses such as *Obuntubulamu*

The complexity of an 'educated' African

Africa is an example where the power of Western discourse manipulates the subject's thinking and production of meaning (Weedon, 1987; Diamond & Quinby in Pinkus 1996; Mphahlele, 1996). Africans have indeed been assimilated and governed in Western ways described by Weedon (in Pinkus 1996). I showed in Chapter Four that the main culprit and instrument is formal education which articulates mainly Western values with a major aim of marketing Western products into Africa, despite the fact that Western paradigms have in cases created friction and ideological as well as spiritual wars in African societies in the process of re-defining and socialising Africans out of African IKS. Thus, education worried African leaders such as Ssekabaka Daudi Chwa II who lamented about foreignisation *when* Baganda started ignoring native traditional customs, although he advised Baganda to get education (Low 1971).

Foreign paradigms define lifestyles for Africans with little regard for African cultural significance (Fanon, 1970; Bhabha 1994; Prior 2006). One unapparent effect is that Western discourses are instrumentalist (Robbotom & Hart 1993) in the sense that, ulti-

mately the Western corporations fire and hire, and set the rules of the job – they decide on the employable skills and knowledge. Ultimately, the Eurocentric discourse and its attendant education have deliberately transformed Africans into consumers of Western products. Indeed, Africans abandon their traditional names and naming regimes, pronunciation of those names, and adopt foreign names - Africans continue to be defined by foreigners, ‘who have labelled them as they have wished and sometimes those selfshame labels we have adopted to define ourselves and each other’ (Ulimwengu 2013). Africans produce no military hardware, but yearn for guns to fight each other; rarely produce skin creams but spend substantively to lighten and imitate European white skins; have few hair-care factories but spend to straighten hair to look like Europeans; and now create programmes that are copycats of those in the West – they also cat walk; etc. The adoption is indicative of Africans’ foreign-based albeit sometimes, false inferior or ‘global view’ of African IKS and of who they are as they strive to feel equal to Europeans. Raseroka asserts:

... African communities generally have a diminished appreciation of IKS. Imperialism successfully implanted the perception that IKS is worthless or shameful because it did not fit into the colonial education system, its scientific notions and/or the missionary worldview (2005, p.6).

African academia deranges African IKS as shameful because it does not fit into foreign mostly Western knowledge and spiritual notions (Kawooya 2005; Raseroka 2005). Indeed,

... the political classes in our countries have rendered African intellectuals innocuous, incapable of thinking independently because such an activity does not enhance one’s career while sycophancy sure does.

And, those who elect to follow in the footsteps of the likes of Chinua, by writing, soon discover that you do not have to be a hopeless writer to apply for the dole. By refusing to read as a habitual activity, our people have con-

demned the writer to a life of poverty and despair that only the very stoic can survive (Ulimwengu 2013³²).

Ulimwengu (2013) correctly observes that the independent intellectual is a rare breed in Africa, seeing as independent thinking is not in high demand, and even those who are employed to be advisors are rarely meant to advise critically. Regrettably, Africa needs 'aid' (or even heavy loans) to sustain and perpetuate these Western lifestyles. Western lifestyles force Africans to become beggars, and, in the words of President Joyce Banda of Malawi (in Mwenda 2013), to be forever chained to the obligation of gratitude to the donors. The pretence that Western paradigms are independent of the economic, commercial, academic and political power (Lather 1991) blinds Africans. It is daunting where Africans are not even aware they are addicted and subjects of Western intellectual bondage, because they often have no clear philosophical understanding of Eurocentric discourses. Complaining about how the African intellectuals have failed their people and betrayed their mission, Ulimwengu (2013) sums up an educated African thus:

A creature of Western imperial thought, imprisoned in the mental straitjackets of his enslavement, the African intellectual has remained in a permanent state of infancy, suckling on a condescending breast whose milk leaves a strange aftertaste he cannot quite place, though he will still grab for it tomorrow.

Our scholarship has failed to sever its appendage status with Empire, and our universities rarely evolve their projects of investigation, most often relying on the largesse of the big Western foundations, trusts and *stiftungen* whose agenda may be at variance with ours, where we have any, that is (*Ibid.*).

³² From <http://www.africareview.com/opinion/African-intellectuals-have-failed-their-people/979188-1742422-gtvbevz/index.html>. Retrieved on 20th November 2017.

Thus, many educated Africans are distanced from their origins, but are simultaneously unable to integrate fully into Western societies. Some educated Africans become socially isolated. Hence, some lecture half-baked 'isolated' discourses that do not fit anywhere and help no one – they are neither useful to the West nor to Africa to the extent that the educated African becomes unemployable and useless. So many African parents have paid colossal sums to purchase Western education for naught benefit, except when Western paradigms offer employment (Brenton & Largent 2000). Thus, many educated Africans have emigrated and African countries are complaining about the resultant brain drain.

Ultimately, African academia are 'the great interpreters' with an assumed ability to understand and adjudicate what goes on, sometimes for the sake of proving to others that, indeed 'education' has transformed it into a globally educated being. Hence, it is the educated and religious Africans who have demonised traditional healing practices as witch craft, to the extent of criminalizing the traditional ancestral spirit world. Consequently, such Africans rarely, if at all, initiate research based upon African IKS, and Africa thus has few or no qualifications on foundations of African IKS. According to Brenton & Largent (2000), such educated Africans ignore or suppress knowledge of anomalies in education. Indeed, the 'educated' African is often an accomplice in perpetuating foreign paradigms and in the genocide of African IKS, and so fails researchers who align themselves with Afrocentricity.

Challenges of Obuntubulamu in Research

Bantu IKS is not readily available in the public domain as much of it remains tacit, sacred and embedded in practices, relationships and rituals (Bhola 2002; Cosijn *et al.* 2002), and is often transferred orally between generations (Mbow 2003; Kawooya 2006). In addition, oral transmission of knowledge is often rejected as methodologically wrong – it is difficult to reference. Bantu IKS is considered worthless in mainly Westernised formal education (Mbow 2003: viii; Raseroka, 2005; Kawooya 2006) because it does not demonstrate obvious and immediate contribution to Western knowledge – *Obuntubulamu* would not make anyone a researcher

in the Silicon Valley (USA), unless of course it relates with marketing their products. Indeed, conventional approaches imply that development processes always require transfers from locations that are perceived as more advanced (World Bank Group 1997). This has led often to overlooking the potential in local experiences and practices. Moreover, the secretive, sacred, undocumented nature and the oral transmission of African IKS (Mbow 2003; Kawooya 2006) has made deliberate alteration or misinterpretation easier (Emeagwali 2003), this making the theoretical resolution and conceptual issues about the identity of African IKS a challenge. Further complications arise from intellectual property rights and ownership of secretive discourse (Mwanga-Zake 2009).

Obuntubulamu stresses the practice and need to allow every individual to have their equal say in any discussion and on ultimately reaching an agreement acceptable to all. Hence, *Obuntubulamu* could lead to conformist behaviour in order to achieve solidarity. However, the desire to agree, which, within the context of *Obuntubulamu* is supposed to safeguard the rights and opinions of individuals and minorities, is often exploited to enforce group solidarity. Therefore, *Obuntubulamu* might be abused to legitimise what Sono (1994: xiii, xv) calls the ‘constrictive nature’ or ‘tyrannical custom’ of a derailed African culture, especially its ‘totalitarian communalism, which ... frowns upon elevating one beyond the community’. The role of the group in African consciousness, says Sono, could be:

...overwhelming, totalistic, even totalitarian. Group psychology, though parochially and narrowly based..., nonetheless pretends universality. This mentality, this psychology is stronger on belief than on reason; on sameness than on difference. Discursive rationality is overwhelmed by emotional identity, by the obsession to identify with and by the longing to conform to. To agree is more important than to disagree; conformity is cherished more than innovation. Tradition is venerated, continuity revered, change feared and difference shunned (1994, p.7).

Louw (1995) and Sono (1994) advise against heresies and communal intolerances that abrogate the innovative creations of intellectual African individuals, or against those who refuse to participate in communalism. In short, although *Obuntubulamu* articulates such important values as respect, human dignity and compassion, the *Obuntubulamu* desire for consensus also has a potential dark side in terms of which it demands an oppressive conformity and loyalty to the group. Failure to conform will be met by harsh punitive measures (cf. Mbigi & Maree 1995; Sono 1994; Van Niekerk 1994).

Besides, *Bantu* openness and communal constructivism could cause introverts to hide true feelings. Hence, *Obuntubulamu* can easily derail into an oppressive collectivism where conformist behaviour becomes the norm for solidarity (Muwanga-Zake 2009). The possibility of taking Afrocentric methodology as a form of discrimination is real.

Suggestions for practice

Adopting Obuntubulamu

Adopting *Obuntubulamu* in research among Bantu would be in concert with Eisenhart & Howe (1992) and Heron's (1996) advice about the need for clarity about the grounds of validity and on the extent to which those validities have been reached. Fundamentally, we have to benchmark social research in Africa upon IKS of each community, such as *Obuntubulamu*, if we are to obtain valid data. 'The decision of what is good and what is bad in indigenous and modern knowledge must be left to the community of knowledge users' (Bhola 2002, p.11). That is, Africans should be assisted, but not forced to make choices of research paradigms that best suit their agenda and needs, along with the considerations below.

Assessing and incorporating into the research process the participants' values

One needs to be sure that the research framework fits the research situation as viewed by the stakeholders (Le Compte *et al.* 1993). For example, in Black Africa, IK is communal and the whole community is interested in the happenings in the area. Therefore, it is important, through the authorities, to make sure that the whole community (not a selected individual) understands and views your aims in a positive light. This requires convincing them rather than imposing a research agenda upon them. For the Bantu, it implies adopting *Obuntubulamu* during the research process.

Empowering the people (value criteria)

Heinecke *et al.* (1999), Le Compte *et al.* (1993), and Greene (1994) argue that the questions and values that are addressed and promoted are important in determining the framework and methodology. That is, research ought to be beneficial to the people (as it is to the researcher) and in the long term, the research should contribute towards social transformation of participants (Elliot, 1991; Le Compte *et al.*, 1993; Heron 1996). People will participate more genuinely if it is made clear to them how they benefit (Martin *et al.*, 1988; James 1988).

It should be obvious that skills and empowerment are part of, or are supposed to fit into the participants' value system. Thus, IKS plays a role since it provides the foundations upon which benefits and further development could be made. One way of incorporating these values into the research process is to involve locals. Take an example of AIDS. Bantu would participate better in the process of deriving ways to curb this scourge, if their own understanding and measures, cultural taboos, and medicines are given prominent consideration in the research within the framework of *Obuntubulamu*. Introducing the research, the training, and the collection of data happen simultaneously. Training during research is widely supported (Guba & Lincoln 1989; Le Compte *et al.* 1993; Hitchcock & Hughes 1995; Heinecke *et al.* 1999; Myers 2000). This

is different from a community becoming a statistic for testing already made drugs from a pharmaceutical company.

A need for Technical and Instrument validity

An important aspect of investigations is the fit between research questions, data collection procedures, analysis techniques, and data required (Eisenhart & Howe 1992; Hitchcock & Hughes 1995). One has to make sure that participants understand, within the framework of their IKS, the research instruments and descriptions of findings (Eisenhart & Howe 1992; Le Compte *et al.* 1993; Huysamen 1994; Hitchcock & Hughes 1995; Heron 1996; Reeves & Hedberg 2003).

For the Bantu, this implies formulating questions that do not violate their value systems – questions that are not taboo to ask. For example, it would be embarrassing to interview an adult by the opposite sex about the number of days s/he has sex, especially in front of more than one person. *Obuntubulamu* requires assurance that the interviewer is apparently mature and preferably older than the interviewee. Embarrassing questions are likely to attract wrong answers, to the extent that researchers wrongly concluded that Bantu do not talk about sex – we do, but with people the culture assigns for that.

Another consideration is the English language, even to graduates. Language problems sometimes imply that a researcher has to go through the instruments with participants and to make sure that participants understand them the way s/he wants them to. This sometimes means resorting to simpler English language, using familiar accents of English, or where necessary, to translating statements into vernacular.

The importance of participants' views

One consideration that should come through data clearly is the voice of the people rather than the researcher's interpretations. Participants have views, however 'uneducated' they might look. This is important especially if your research in one way or the other is going to be used to design policy affecting those people. Le

Compte *et al.* emphasise this view saying “... kinds and degrees of truth are held ... differentially for different audiences and constituencies. ...” (1993, pp.315-316). That is, the epistemological position that the participants’ realities are paramount, and therefore, the ontological position that knowledge is primarily subjective to the holder and secondarily objective only when the subjectivities lead to an agreed meaning, should be considered. This is fortunately a tenet of *Obuntubulamu*.

Validating African discourses in research

Many documentaries depict Africans as subjects of ignorance and backwardness, waiting passively for international charity for their own good (Mwenda 2013). Such documentaries and derogatory publications or theses based on invalid investigations, have highlighted the danger in failing to reveal underlying intentions, and have sometimes created resentment as well as animosity against new research projects (Muwanga-Zake 2009), while the African participants are not even aware of the implications, who will view and benefit from the documentaries and exactly what the research is leading towards (i.e., the conclusions). So, research and all documentaries about Africa ought to be validated.

Validation is particularly recommended to foreigners researching and recording documentaries. Gay, *et al.* (2006) Heron (1996) and Le Compte *et al.* (1993) include fairness, authenticity, development and description in validation. This rather Western measure of validation seems equally applicable in Africa and is a basis for criticising the use of Western discourses in Africa. Fair representations are balanced, accurate, and in Africa reveal the multiple realities such as colonisation, apartheid and slavery. Ultimately, fairness improves descriptive validity (Maxwell 1992), and could lead to the growth of African IKS, in terms of personal and social transformations. Authenticity is valued and requires sincerity about the intentions of the researcher, and integration with African IKS.

Afrocentricity is a research-validating platform for African IKS, one of which is *Obuntubulamu*. African IKS satisfies a need for using particular epistemological approaches that are concomitant

with a culture (Ditton (2007), and its local values and subsistence patterns (Eisenhart & Borko 1993). Furthermore, Afrocentricity caters for social and historical realities that are important especially in formerly colonised African communities for fairness (Le Compte, Preissle, with Tesch 1993).

IKS can be used to improve the quality of researcher-researched relationships (Pinnegar & Daynes 2007). While the question: “Who am I?” is fundamental, especially regarding participants’ contributions to research in terms of permanence, physicality and spirituality (Forster 2006, p.10), it is replaced by ‘Who are we in Africa?’ So, the decisions regarding what Africans wish to show the world requires a whole tribe or community, but not an individual. This plurality, obtained through individual contributions, additionally implies that communal accounts and stories are more authentic data.

Conclusion

The global economy is largely driven by information and knowledge capital. Of course Africans need Western knowledge. However, African development will lag behind as long as Africa mainly relies on imported epistemology and knowledge. One of the lessons to learn from the Far East is that it incorporates Western knowledge into its IKS. The Far East has been selective and adopts Western knowledge that is relevant to their development. Africa ought to follow similar strategies.

Fundamentally, Afrocentricity should form the basis for research in Africa, not as a competing paradigm, but as a complementary one, to enable valid epistemologies that could yield authentic and relevant knowledge for African communities. As this chapter has illustrated, considerations of Afrocentricity such as *Obuntubulamu* would help Bantu to understand and apply some of the Western knowledge, but this requires indigenous Africans to lead research. A major challenge is to transform African academia towards growing African IKS that fits African contexts and employs Africans.

My experience of *Obuntubulamu* in evaluations and research showed that projects among Bantu communities are beyond simple invita-

tions and explanations to participants. Every project among Bantu requires *Obuntubulamu*, with unequivocal recognition of the culture and needs of the community. The values Bantu attach to the project, or alternatively the extent to which the project solves their problems should be relayed through *Obuntubulamu*, which should not be hastened. The *Obuntubulamu*-Western participative paradigm provides a platform for Bantu to be part of an implementable and sustainable development. This *inter alia* requires understanding the social, historical and economic situation of Bantu participants, while improving participants' understanding of Western paradigms.

References

- Andrea, A. J. & Overfield, J. H. 2012. *The Human Record: Source of Global History Since 1500*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Asante, M. K. 2009. *Afrocentricity*. <http://www.asante.net/articles/1/afrocentricity/> (accessed March 16, 2010).
- Baker, L., D. 1991. Afrocentric Racism. [http://www.africa.upenn.edu/K-12/Afrocentric Racism 16168.html](http://www.africa.upenn.edu/K-12/Afrocentric%20Racism%2016168.html) (accessed January 20, 2010).
- Bangura, A. K. 2011. General Introduction: The Need for Authentic African-Centered Research Methodologies. In Bangura, A. K. Eds. (2011). *African-Centered Research Methodologies. From Ancient Times to the Present*. San Diego, California: Cognella.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhola, H. S. 2002. Reclaiming old heritage for proclaiming future history: the knowledge-for-development debate in African contexts. *Africa Today*, 49(3), pp. 3-1.
- Brenton, D. & Largent, C. 2000. *The*

ParadigmWeb.<http://www.trufax.org/paradigm/pardigm/welcome.html> (accessed March 31, 2009).

Broodryk, J. 2006. Ubuntu African Life Coping Skills.Theory and practice.<http://www.topkinisis.com/conference/CCEAM/wib/index/outline/PDF/BROODRYK%20Johann.pdf>(accessed June 12, 2007).

Cates, W. M., & Goodling, S. C. 1997. The Relative Effectiveness of Learning Options in Multimedia Computer-Based Fifth-Grade Spelling Instruction. *Education Technology Research and Development*, pp.45 (2), pp.27-46.

Chilisa, B. 2015. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. New York: SAGE Publications Inc.

Cobern, W. W. 1996. Constructivism and non-western science education research. *International Journal of Science Education*, Vol. 18(3), pp.295-310.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. 1987. *Research Methods in Education*, 2nd edn.London: Croom Helm.

Cosijn, E., Pirkola, A., Bothma, T. & Järvelin, K. 2002. Information access in indigenous languages: a case study in Zulu, in H. Bruce, R. Fidel, P. Ingwersen, & P. Vakkari (Eds.), *Emerging frameworks and methods. Proceedings of the fourth International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science (CoLIS 4)*, July 21-25, 2002, Seattle, USA..
<http://www.info.uta.fi/tutkimus/fire/archive/CPBJ-Zulu.pdf>(accessed March 28, 2009).

Crotty, M. 1998. *The foundations of social research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Denscombe, M. 1998. *The Good Research Guide for Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Denzin, N.Z., Lincoln, Y.S. & Smith, L.T. (eds.) 2008. *Handbook of Indigenous Methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ditton, M. 2007. Intercultural qualitative research and Ph.D. students. *Intercultural education*, 18 (1), 41-52.
- Du Plessis, H. & Raza, G. 2004. Bridging Scales and Epistemologies: Linking Local Knowledge with Global Science in Multi-Scale Assessments. Alexandria, Egypt 17 – 20 March 2004.
http://ma.caudillweb.com/documents/bridging/papers/dupl_essis.hester.pdf(accessed June 12, 2007).
- Eisenhart, M. & Borko, H. 1993. *Designing classroom research: Themes, issues, and struggles*. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.
- Ellen, R. & Harris, H. 1996. Concepts of indigenous environmental knowledge in scientific and development studies literature: A critical assessment.
http://lucy.ukc.ac.uk/Rainforest/SML_files/Occpap/indigkn_ow.occpap_1.html#Page4 (accessed June 22, 2010).
- Emeagwali, G. 2003. African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (AIK): Implications for the Curriculum. In Falola, T. (Ed.) *Ghana in Africa and the World: Essays in Honor of Adu Boahen*. Africa World Press. New Jersey.
<http://www.africahistory.net/AIK.htm>(Accessed September 9, 2007).
- Evans, M. A. & Powell, A. 2007. Conceptual and practical issues related to the design for and sustainability of communities of practice: the case of e-portfolio use in pre-service teacher training. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 16(2), 199-214.
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a779355880&fulltext=7132409281>(accessed June 19, 2007).

Fanon, F. 1970. *Black skin white masks*. St Albans: Paladin.

Fetterman, D. 2009. *Ethnography: Step by Step*, 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Forster, D. 2006. Identity in relationship: The ethics of Ubuntu as an answer to the impasse of individual consciousness. Pretoria: UNISA.
http://www.spirituality.org.za/files/ubuntu_and_identity_DForster_02006.doc (accessed June 12, 2007).

Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. 2000. *Educational Research. Competencies for Analysis and Application*, 6th edn. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. 2006. *Educational research. Competencies for analysis and applications*, 8th edn. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson; Merrill Prentice Hall.

Gergen, K. J. 1985. The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist*, pp.40 (3).

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Third edition. London, UK: Routledge

Heron, J. 1996. *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the Human Condition*. London: SAGE Publications.

Hickey, D. T., & Zuicker, S. J. 2002. A new perspective for evaluating innovative science programmes. *Science Education*, 87, pp.539-563.

Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. 1995. *Research and the teacher: a qualitative introduction to school-based research*, 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.

- Hountondji, P. J. 1996. *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality*, 2nd edn. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jary, D. & Jary, J. 1991. *Collin's Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: Harper Collins publishers.
- Jefferies, P., Carsten-Stahl, B., & McRobb, S. 2007. 'Exploring the relationships between pedagogy, ethics and technology: building a framework for strategy development'. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 16 (1), 111 – 126. Also <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759390601168122>
- Kanyandago, P. 2010. Revaluating the African Endogenous Education System for Community-Based Learning. In Zeele, J., van der Linden, J., Nampota, D. & Ngabirano M. (Eds.). (2010). *The Burden of Educational Exclusion. Understanding and Challenging Early School Leaving in Africa*. Amsterdam: Sense Publishers, pp.99 – 114.
- Kawooya, D. 2006. Copyright, Indigenous Knowledge and Africa's University Libraries: The Case of Uganda. World Library and Information Congress: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council 20-24 August 2006, Seoul, Korea. <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/116-Kawooya-en.pdf>.(accessed June 12, 2007).
- Kistan, C. 1999. Quality Assurance in South Africa. *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol.7(3), 125 -133.
- Lalonde, A. 1993. African Indigenous Knowledge and its Relevance to Sustainable Development. In Inglis, J. T. (Ed.) *Traditional Ecological Knowledge Concepts and Cases*.http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9321-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.(accessed August 7, 2007).

Langill, S. 1999. *Indigenous Knowledge: A Resource Kit for Sustainable Development Researchers in Dryland Africa. People, Land and Water Program Initiative.* Ottawa: IDRC.

Lather, P. 1991. *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/ in the postmodern.* New York: Routledge.

Leach, M. & Fairhead, J. - September, 2002. Manners of contestation: Citizen science and indigenous knowledge in West Africa and the Caribbean. *International Social Science Journal*, 54, 299-311.
<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118941653/issue>
(Accessed March 26, 2009).

Le Compte, M. D., Preissle, J., with Tesch, R. 1993. *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research, 2nd Edition.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Lewis, D. 1998. Development NGOs and the challenge of partnership: changing relations between North and South, *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol. 32 (5), pp.501-512.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Denzin, N. K. 1994. The Fifth Moment. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Louw, D. J. 2004. Ubuntu: An African assessment of the religious other. *Philosophy in Africa.* University of the North. <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Afri/AfriLouw.htm> (Accessed August 10, 2008).

Maathai, W. 2009. *The Challenge for Africa.* New York: Random House, Inc.

Mammo, T. 1999. *The paradox of Africa's poverty: the role of indigenous knowledge, traditional practices and local institutions—the case of Ethiopia.* Lawrenceville and Asmara: Red Sea Press.

- Martin, K. L. 2008. *Please Knock Before You Enter Aboriginal Regulation of Outsiders and the Implications for Researchers*. Teneriffe: Post Pressed.
- Matthews, M. R. 1980. *The Marxist theory of schooling: A study of epistemology and education*. New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc.
- Maxwell, J. A. 1992. *Understanding and validity in qualitative research*. Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 62(3), pp.279-300.
- Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. 1997. *Beginning Qualitative Research. A Philosophical and Practical Guide*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Mbiti, S. 1989. *African Religions and Philosophy*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Mbow, A. M. 2003. Preface, in *General History of Africa, Abridged edition. UNESCO (1985 & 1990)*. Cape Town: ABC Press.
- Merriam, S. B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, D. M., Cram, F. & Chilisa, B. (Eds.) 2013. *Indigenous Pathways into Social Research. Voices of a New Generation*. London: Routledge.
- Mkabela, Q. 2005. Using the Afrocentric method in researching indigenous African culture. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(1), 178-189. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR10-1/mkabela.pdf> (accessed December 6 2007).
- Mphahlele, M. K. 1996. Supervision of science education research: critique of the discourse. *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual meeting, 25 to 28 January. South African Association for Research in Mathematics and Science Education*, pp.236-249.

- Mtuzo, P. T. 1999. *Hidden presences in the spirituality of the Amaxhosa of the Eastern Cape and the impact of Christianity on them*. Unpublished thesis submitted to Rhodes University, South Africa.
- Mukasa, S. 1999. *Are expatriate staff necessary in international development NGOs? A case study of an international NGO in Uganda*. Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics and Political Science. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29092/1/int-work-paper4.pdf>. Accessed April 4, 2013).
- Muwanga-Zake, J. W. F. 2007. Introducing educational computer programmes through evaluation: A case in South African disadvantaged schools. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, Vol.3(3), 30-48.
- Muwanga-Zake, J. W. F. 2009. Building Bridges Across Knowledge Systems: Ubuntu a participative Research Paradigms in Bantu Communities. *Discourse*, Vol.34(4), pp.413-426.
- Mwenda, A. M. - April, 2013. Madonna and Africa's 'Celebrity Saviors'. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/04/16/opinion/madonna-charity-africa-mwenda/> and <http://www.ugandandiasporanews.com/2013/04/16/opinion-madonna-and-africas-celebrity-saviors/> (accessed April 18, 2013).
- Neuman, W. L. 1997. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd edn. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nkurunziza, D. R. K. 2004. Epistemological and Cultural Perspectives of Indigenous Knowledge. – IK. In Kanyandago, P. & Mugumya, L. (Eds.). *Celebrating 10 Years of Academic Excellence*. Nkozi: Uganda Martyrs University.

- Ogunniyi, M. B. 1996. Science, Technology and Mathematics: The Problem of Developing Critical Human Capital in Africa. *International Journal of Science Education*, Vol.18(3), pp.267-284.
- Pedro, H. K., Enrique, H. S., Ernesto, L. M. & Lucio, R. F. - October, 2004. Technology in schools: Education, ICT and the knowledge society. http://www1.worldbank.org/education/pdf/ICT_report_oct04a.pdf(accessed June 23, 2007).
- Pinkus, J. 1996. *Foucault*. <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~ALock/theory/foucault.htm>(accessed June 5, 2002).
- Pinnegar, S. & Daynes, J. G. 2007. 'Locating narrative inquiry historically Thematicas in the turn of narrative', in D.J. Clandinin (ed.), *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry Mapping a Methodology*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp.3-34.
- Prior, D. 2006. Decolonising research: A shift toward reconciliation. *Nursing Inquiry*, Vol. 14(2), pp.162-168.
- Raseroka, K. 2005. Africa to Africa: Building its knowledge community. Speech by President of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) to AEGIS, Africa-Europe Group for Interdisciplinary Studies European Conference of African Studies, at the School of Oriental and African Studies and the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London, June 29 - July 3. www.aegis-eu.org/archive/ecas2005/KayAEGISLondon%20final%20version.doc(Accessed March 31, 2009).
- Reeves, L. P. & Hedberg, J. G. 2003. *Interactive learning systems evaluation*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

- Robbotom, I. & Hart, P. 1993. Towards a meta-research agenda in science and environmental education. *International Journal of Science Education*, Vol. 15(5), pp.591-605.
- Scidev. 2002. Indigenous knowledge.
<http://www.scidev.net/dossiers/index.cfm?fuseaction=dossierfulltext&Dossier=7>(accessed February 6, 2007).
- Smith, L.T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Ssekabaka Daudi Chwa. Education, Civilisation, and Foreignization in Buganda, in Low, D. 1971. *The Mind of Buganda*. University of California Press.http://college.cengage.com/history/primary_sources/world/edu_civ_for_buganda.htm.(accessed April 3, 2013).
- Stevenson, R. B. 1995. Action research and supportive school contexts: exploring the possibilities for transformation. In S. E. Noffke & R. B. Stevenson (Eds.) *Educational action research: becoming practically critical* New York: Teachers College Press, pp.197-209.
- The World Bank Group. 1997. *What is Indigenous Knowledge?*
<http://www.worldbank.org/afr/ik/basic.htm>(accessed June 24, 2010).
- Travers P. D. and Rebores R. W. 1990. *Foundations of Education, Becoming a Teacher*. Allyn & Bacon: Englewood Cliffs.
- Tutu, D. 2004. *God has a dream: a vision of hope for our time*. New York: Doubleday.
- Ulimwengu, J. 2013. Are Africans enslaved intellectuals to be pitied or despised? Ask Achebe. *The East African*.<http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/OpEd/comment/Africa-enslaved-intellectuals-to-be-pitied-or-despised/>

[/434750/1740998/-/item/0/-/12oqs97/-/index.html](#)(accessed April 17,2013).

UNESCO 2001. *Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge, Medicinal Plants and Local Communities (MPLC) in Africa: Promotion of local communities' strategies for the conservation of medicinal-plant genetic resources in Africa.* <http://www.unesco.org/most/bpik1.htm> (accessed August 7, 2007).

Van Dijk, T. A. 1989. 'Structures of discourse and structures of power'. *Communication yearbook* 12, pp.18-59.

Wells, R. & Wells, S. 2007. Challenges and opportunities in ICT educational development: A Ugandan case study. *International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT*, 3(2), 100-108.<http://ijedict.dec.uwi.edu/viewissue.php?id=12.10> (accessed March 10, 2008).

Willis, J. 2000. The maturing of constructivist instructional design: Some basic principles that can guide practice. *Educational Technology/January-February*, pp.5-16.

Wolcott, H. F. 2008. *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing*, 2nd edn. Plymouth: AltaMira Press.

World Bank 2013. OP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples.<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTOPMANUAL/0,,contentMDK:20553653~menuPK:4564185~pagePK:64709096~piPK:64709108~theSitePK:502184,00.html>(accessed May 23, 2016).