

EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT: THE TANZANIAN EXPERIENCE

ANDERS DANIEL FAKSVÅG HAUGEN

Abstract: In recent times, few nation-building projects are perceived to be more successful than that of Nyerere's Tanzania. Since independence, the nation has served as a beacon of peace and stability in the East African region. Also, Tanzania has in the past decades evolved into one of the fastest growing economies in sub-Saharan Africa and was recognised as a lower middle-income country in 2020, five years ahead of its projected schedule. According to Tanzanians and educationists alike, there is a common understanding that education has played a central role in the nation's development, both politically, socially, and economically. Tanzanian education has since the days of Nyerere been widely recognised as successful in its citizen formation, with the effective installment of a unifying national identity as a main objective. In addition, education in the country has continuously been closely linked to prevailing objectives of national development. With development being given the highest priority, discourses of development have consequently been incorporated into the Tanzanian national identity, making important unifying elements. In this article, I explore the role of development discourses in Tanzanian education and the construction of national identity. By revisiting the dominating political discourse of development, conceptualised through the Swahili term *maendeleo*, I argue that the incorporation of elements of the development discourse in the Tanzanian national identity through education has contributed to the formation of a unified Tanzania where a population, rooted in collective values from its socialist past, has provided opportunities for local understandings of the neoliberal economic paradigm.

Key words: National Identity; Education; Identity Formation; Development; Neoliberalism.

“But all of us are Tanzanians. Together, we are the people. Our development is our affair; and it is the development of ourselves as people that we must dedicate ourselves to” (Nyerere, 1968: 10).

Introduction

Increasing global inequality has been one of the dominant narratives of international development in the past decades and presents one of the main challenges currently facing development educators (United Nations, 2020). This tendency of accelerating economic polarisation is commonly attributed to the worldwide dominance of the neoliberal economic paradigm of the past decades (Allred, 2022). As Collins and Rothe (2019: 57) described it: ‘[...] since the neoliberal project was put in place in the early 1980s, the economic divide has been magnified’. In search for solutions, exploration of alternative educational perspectives on, and approaches to, development has been called for. As African nations have ‘long created their own ingenious methods for sustaining their environments, promoting their economic interests, and protecting themselves from oppression and exploitation’ (Decker and McMahon, 2021: 12), the continent offers opportunities of unique character locally embedded in cultural and socio-geographical traditions.

Few post-colonial nation-building projects are perceived to be more successful than that of Tanzania (Abdi, 2008; Fukuyama, 2015). Since independence, the nation has enjoyed political stability and internal peace, conditions rare to the remaining East African region (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2010; Kimambo, Maddox and Nyanto, 2017). In addition, the past decades have seen Tanzania evolve into one of the fastest growing economies in sub-Saharan Africa (Masenya et al., 2018). In 2020, the World Bank recognised the nation as a lower middle-income country (World Bank, 2022), five years ahead of the government’s projected schedule (URT, 1999). For Tanzania’s development, both politically, socially, and economically, education is commonly recognised as one of the main contributors, by the Tanzanian government as well as educationist researchers (Block, 1998; Blommaert, 2014; Buchert, 1994; Lugalla and Ngwaru, 2019; URT, 1999).

In this article, I explore how the Tanzanian understanding of development, embedded in the Swahili term *maendeleo*, has contributed to an alternative, tailored version of the neoliberal paradigm in the country. After providing a theoretical basis for national identity formation through education, I argue that Tanzanian development education has created a shared understanding of development among Tanzanians, which has proved to be resistant to influence from neoliberalist ideology. This is done through the incorporation of *maendeleo* as a marker of national identity. Through these perspectives from Tanzanian education, I argue for educational construction of national identity as one way of effectively maintaining a local understanding of development when facing global economic paradigms.

Neoliberalism and development education

Today, neoliberalism is on a global scale the dominant economic paradigm. The term has emerged as shorthand for extreme capitalism with minimal government intervention (Allred, 2022: 113). The neoliberal ideology places the market at the centre: ‘rather than placing the economy at the service of the citizens, neoliberalism has forced workers to service the needs of the market’ (McCloskey, 2020: 174). Within a neoliberal understanding of development, individuals’ participation in the global market is given priority over taking part in politics or engaging in civic life, as self-improvement is valued over the common good (DeJaeghere, 2013: 504). In other words, citizenship, in a neoliberal understanding, ‘is to be manifested not in the receipt of public largesse, but in the energetic pursuit of personal fulfilment’ (Miller and Rose, 2008: 82).

Development education is in many ways difficult to define, and, as argued by Osler (1994), defining it is perhaps also counterproductive. Taking various forms in different countries and constantly being revised as our understanding of development evolves (Ibid: 1), development education should rather be understood broadly and as dynamic in nature. Existing definitions can, however, help in identifying core aspects of development education of a more universal character.

The United Nations (UN) defined development education to concern the issues of human rights, dignity, self-reliance, social justice, and causes of underdevelopment as well as ‘the reasons for and the ways of achieving a new international economic and social order’ (Hicks and Townley, 1982: 9). The Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) (2019), defined development education as ‘an educational process which enables people to understand the world around them and to act to transform it’, a definition underpinning by the Irish Aid *Global Citizenship Education Strategy 2021-2025* (Irish Aid, 2021). With a radical character, development education is committed to critical inquiry and action, providing agency to contribute towards justice and equality in the world (McCloskey, 2020: 174).

Historically, educators from the global South have influenced and inspired development educationists (Osler, 1994). Freire (1972) understood education as a way out of oppression, marginalisation, and exploitation, while Nyerere (1968) expressed a sincere belief in development through education for the collective good. While some ask if development education should look to more contemporary figures when mobilising the sector (Alldred, 2022), I argue in this article that Nyerere still offers important lessons, given the present neoliberal reality. As most current provisions of education are ‘placed within an invidious position by the context of working within the global neoliberal order’ (Alldred, 2022: 112), it is my understanding that development education can benefit from alternative education perspectives characterised by collectivism and people-centeredness.

Nation, education and development: theoretical perspectives

In 2015, the United Nations (UN) adopted Resolution 70/1, titled *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (United Nations, 2015). This resolution, with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), pointed the global direction for development to 2030. A majority of the SDGs are dependent on two key tools in order to be reached: (i) a well-functioning and responsible government based upon democratic principles, and (ii) an education system contributing to citizen formation as defined by UNESCO: ‘Educating children, from early childhood, to become

clear-thinking and enlightened citizens who participate in decisions concerning society. Society is here understood [...] as a state' (Delors, 1998). These tools are also more or less found as SDGs themselves, in Goals 4 and 16, respectively (United Nations, 2015).

It is difficult to consider government and education separately. Education is defined by Bailyn (1970: 10) as 'the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across generations', and has become standardised through states' provision of public education. Aiming to make education available to all groups of society and serving a variety of societal needs, public education systems have evolved into an important state concern and, ultimately, an institution of the state (Green, 1990: 77-79). Further, as education systems act on behalf of their government, and at the same time are responsible for empowering the people that ultimately elect the government, the two are heavily dependent on each other.

Public education is commonly recognised as an indispensable contributor to the process of nation-building. Anderson (2006) defines nations as 'imagined communities'. He points to the fact that within a nation, most members will never have known nor met most of their fellow compatriots. Yet, in their minds exists a deep feeling of belonging to the group through the sense of comradeship and shared identity (Ibid: 6-7). Malipula (2021) places the formation of this collective national identity at the forefront of nation-building:

“Nation building includes processes of collective nation identity formation aimed at legitimising public power within a specific territory using existing, or new acceptable traditions, customs and institutions. At its core, the process hinges on identity fusion and loyalty to national identity despite retention of the micro-identities of the people within” (Ibid: 435).

Similar to Malipula, Cogan (1998) proposes *a sense of identity* as one of five general attributes of citizenship. As the actual nature of a given population might be more divisive than unifying with the existence of

overlapping and multiple identities, Cogan (1998: 3) recognises a collective national identity of unifying character as an ‘essential ingredient of citizenship’.

Anderson’s (2006) understanding of nations as imagined communities contests nationalist views of nations as primordial and biologically based, as nations are understood as social constructs. Gellner (1964: 169) shares a similar view, and claims that ‘Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist’. Similarly, it is a common assumption that citizenship, as a product of social construction, is *educational* in nature rather than hereditary or congenital (Abdi, 2015; Cogan, 1998; Osler and Starkey, 2005). This assumption does, however, regard other aspects of citizenship than what Osler and Starkey (2005: 12-13) define as *status*, or similarly Cogan (1998: 2-4) identifies as *rights and entitlements*, which citizens are granted based on their country of birth. Rather, citizenship is understood as ‘feeling’ and ‘practice’ (Osler and Starkey, 2005: 14-18), or ‘sense of identity’, ‘fulfilment of obligations’, ‘interest’ and ‘involvement in public affairs’, and ‘acceptance of basic societal values’ (Cogan, 1998: 2-6).

Thus, with no one being born a citizen, citizenship becomes something that must be learnt, practised, and experienced. Citizenship should also in itself be understood as dynamic and subject to constant change. As described by Ndegwa (1998: 352), citizenship ‘is never fixed; as a social process, it is constantly and simultaneously being enacted, contested, revised, and transformed’.

National identity and its formation processes

National identities are, according to Fukuyama (2015: 33-36), formed through four basic processes, with the first being the adjustment of political borders. In this process, political borders are either broadened or narrowed with the objective of better fitting the population given a nation point-of-departure. Recently, Russian authorities have posited arguments of this nature in their efforts to justify their invasion of the Donbas region of Eastern Ukraine. The

second process concerns population adjustment through the moving or elimination of people in order to make more homogeneous units within the existing borders. The Balkan wars of the 1990s saw both refugee migration and ethnic cleansing with the objectives of reducing the heterogeneity of populations. Thirdly, the language, culture and customs of a nation's dominant group are adopted by subordinate populations through processes of cultural assimilation. Fukuyama here points to public education and choice of language in public administration as the primary instruments. Fourth and finally, posited national identities may undergo processes of adjustment in order to better fit constantly changing political realities. According to Fukuyama (2015: 35), nation-building should be understood as 'a constant interplay between changing borders, moving populations, assimilating cultures, and adjusting ideas'.

Fukuyama's (2015) first two processes present various options for adjusting the target population of a national identity. These processes are in most cases carried out in a top-down manner of political nature by the state. The two latter processes concern the instalment and adjustment of the actual national identity and are processes that to a large extent are carried out by education systems. According to Fukuyama (2015), successful nation-building processes tend to be characterised by involvement of all four processes, as well as consisting of a mixture of top-down and bottom-up initiatives and management, allowing for lasting national identities that are sustained by their populations.

Discussion: The Tanzanian experience

Education and development

Education is widely recognised as a pivotal contributor to the development of the Tanzanian nation. This is commonly credited to the *Baba wa Taifa* (Swahili for *father of the nation*), Julius Nyerere, who served as the nation's first president from 1961 to 1985 (Kimambo, Maddox and Nyanto, 2017). Nyerere considered education to be the only tool capable of transforming the country into the egalitarian, African-socialist state that he envisioned (Buchert, 1994:

94). In the education policy *Education for self-reliance* (1967), Nyerere elaborated on his understanding of education:

“[...] education, whether it be formal or informal, has a purpose. That purpose is to transmit from one generation to the next the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the society, and to prepare the young people for their future membership of the society and their active participation in its maintenance or development” (Nyerere, 1967: 1).

In line with the perspectives of Bailyn (1970: 11), Nyerere considered education fundamental to formation processes of the future citizenry. However, as he interestingly distinguished between societal development and maintenance, Nyerere recognised education’s transformative abilities in line with contemporary understandings of development education (Bracken, 2020: 57; O’Connell et al., 2021: 11). At the same time, he displayed awareness of education’s potential for contributing societal maintenance through processes of conservation.

As both a teacher and an economist, Nyerere saw transformative potential in education through the conveyance of a unifying culture with a shared national identity, and in preparing a skilled workforce tailored for the new independent Tanzania (Saronga, 2019: 198-199). The formation and instalment of a unifying national identity have since independence been identified as main educational objectives. In addition, Tanzanian education has continuously been closely linked to the nation’s development objectives. Nyerere’s political discourse of development constructed around the Swahili term *maendeleo* consequently became a component in the educational formation of Tanzanian national identity.

Development as ‘maendeleo’

Maendeleo originates morphologically from the verbs *kuenda* (to go) and *kuendelea* (to go on, continue) and is etymologically connected to *progress* (Decker and McMahan, 2020: 6). The Swahili term has evolved into an essential part of the postcolonial lexicon in East Africa, as it embeds local

understandings of development throughout the region (Ahearne, 2016). While these understandings often share common ground, Mercer (2002: 111) notes that ‘maendeleo is not a unitary, fixed discourse over time and space, but rather is mutable, contingent, and open to local reinterpretation and appropriation’.

In the Tanzanian context, *maendeleo* is inherently connected to development as Nyerere envisioned it in the context of his particular version of African socialism called *ujamaa* (Swahili for *familyhood*) (Lal, 2015). As the new independent nation took on the task of building the new Tanzania, they strategically looked to Swahili, the new national language, and embedded the nation’s new development discourse within the term *maendeleo* (Decker and McMahan, 2020: 154).

People-centredness was at the heart of Nyerere’s conceptualisation of development. Around the term *maendeleo*, Nyerere constructed an understanding of development as being *of, for* and *by* the people (Haugen, 2022). Having identified *ignorance* as one of the three sworn enemies of the country, Nyerere considered development of the people through education as essential for Tanzania’s future. As stated in his seminal essay on development, *Uhuru na Maendeleo* (Swahili for *Freedom and Development*): ‘By developing the people of Tanzania, we are developing Tanzania’ (Nyerere, 1968: 9). Further, development should be for the people. Being well-rooted within African socialism, the development of the nation should be of benefit to the whole nation: ‘For Tanzania is the people, and the people means everyone’ (Ibid: 9).

Further, Nyerere saw each citizen’s personal development as a part of the collective development of the nation. Consequently, a person’s development should not be seen as an opportunity to self-enrichment but rather to contribute to the common good. With education as the example, Nyerere (in Smith, 1971) provided the following illustration:

“Those who receive this privilege of education have a duty to return the sacrifice which others have made. They are like the man who has

been given all the food available in a starving village in order that he might have the strength to bring supplies back for a distant place. If he takes this food and does not bring help to his brothers, he is a traitor” (Ibid: 21).

Understanding development as to provide for *all* Tanzanians, illustrates the significance of collectivism as a permeating aspect of Nyerere’s developmental discourse. Equity and unity were fundamental values to his nation-building project and considered as cornerstones. Further, societal cohesion through a unified population would according to Nyerere provide favourable conditions for national progress. Therefore, development *by* the people was recognised as a crucial factor for success to the extent that central components of the development discourse of *maendeleo* were seen as markers of Tanzanian national identity by the Nyerere administration (Mercer, 2002: 111-112).

In summary, Nyerere represented a people-centred development as embedded in the Swahili term *maendeleo* strategically adopted from the ‘language of liberation’ (Decker and McMahan, 2020). As development should be *of, for* and *by* the nation, understood as its people, equity, unity and collectivism were central values and principles for development in Nyerere’s African socialism. Understood as preconditions for development, these principles and values of *maendeleo* were incorporated into Tanzanian national identity as markers. Working for and contributing to development understood as *maendeleo* consequently became synonymous with what it meant to be Tanzanian, having made a particular discourse of development an identity marker.

Maendeleo and development in Tanzania during the country’s socialist era had mixed outcomes. Importantly, public education and health services were expanded and contributed to an improved standard of living for many Tanzanians (Decker and McMahan, 2021: 154). *Ujamaa* also promoted community building and a philosophy of African socialism grounded in collectivism and people-centeredness that still holds sway in Tanzanian

culture. However, Nyerere's policies failed to deliver the desired results, and involved the suffering of inhabitants (Kaiser, 1996: 231). Among the policies that can be criticised, Operation Vijiji (Swahili for *village*) forced more than half the population to resettle in ujamaa villages, envisioned as self-reliant agricultural communities sustained by their own production (Ibid). The project dramatically disrupted existing food market systems in the country, and the famine that followed cost the lives of many Tanzanians (Kimambo, Maddox and Nyanto, 2017: 184).

Educational formation of national identity

Population adjustment

Immediately after independence, Tanzanian authorities with Nyerere at the forefront started the process of transforming the nation's education system. As Nyerere considered education as the chief impetus for national development, making education available to the whole population became a key objective. At these early stages, two colonially inherited obstacles caused concern, and the initial changes were concentrated around hurdling these barriers. Upon independence, Tanzanians found themselves with a discriminatory education system based on race inherited from the British. As Nyerere 'sought to define the character of sovereignty in the new nation as nonracial' (Bjerk, 2015: 61), structural changes were inevitable. Thus, a new system with one nationalised, state-provided education for all citizens regardless of ethnicity based on one, harmonised curriculum was introduced in 1963 (Mutahaba et al., 2017: 383). While marking a milestone of strong symbolic character, the limited capacity of Tanzanian education soon stood out as the government's main challenge in their efforts for universal provision of education.

Being almost equally divided religiously between Christianity and Islam, while at the same time consisting of over 120 tribes with a similar number of languages between them, the heterogeneity of the Tanzanian population provided president Nyerere with a challenging point-of-departure for his nation-building project. However, instead of adjusting borders or

regulating the population within them, Nyerere looked to education for ways to adjust his population. This was done through processes of *inclusive* character, as no tribe or religion was excluded. Through leaving behind its previous structures of racial segregation and exclusion, education became an important structural contributor of great symbolic character towards the unification around a collective national identity that replaced contesting identities of divisive character.

The removal of the structural hindrances that were inherited from the British colonisers as well as working on expanding educational capacity should not only be seen as population adjustment through education. Additionally, these changes arguably served as measures for rigging the Tanzanian education system for contribution towards the development of Tanzania in line with the understanding of *maendeleo*.

Cultural assimilation, or national unification?

With the *Education for Self-Reliance* policy, Nyerere (1967) launched Tanzania's first education policy since independence. Being the educational component of Nyerere's *ujamaa* politics, the policy brought the country's education in the direction of African socialism. From a content perspective, the 1967 curriculum reform brought about complete transformation of Tanzanian education, as three overall principles were incorporated into the nation's curriculum: (i) equality and respect for human dignity; (ii) sharing of the resources; and (iii) work by everyone and exploitation by none (Nyerere, 1967). Through education, Nyerere aimed to unify the diverse Tanzanian population by installing a national identity constructed around the values of his particular breed of African socialism. Tribalism and religion, representing factors of divisive character, were neglected as educational content. Instead, by incorporating principles and values of *maendeleo* such as equity, unity and collectivism as markers of national identity, Tanzanian education contributed to unifying the Tanzanian population around a development discourse. How the nation went about its development became synonymous with what it meant to be Tanzanian, and thus had a powerful impact on the success of Tanzania's nation-building project.

Identity adjustment

In the 1970s and early 1980s, Tanzania experienced times of economic struggles. The 1973 oil crisis together with key Tanzanian exports such as cotton and coffee experiencing a dramatic decline in value, caused the nation's socialist economy to falter (Decker and McMahan, 2021: 154; Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2010: 38). Also, financing the nation's ambitious development projects of *ujamaa* and Nyerere's African socialism had, despite the slogan of self-reliance, left the country heavily indebted. As a result, Tanzanian authorities were eventually forced by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank to abandon socialism and adopt a structural adjustment programme (SAP), causing gradual changes of liberalisation both politically and economically (Decker and McMahan, 2021: 154). Consequently, the nation's previous one-party system was replaced by a multiparty democracy in 1992 (Msekwa, 1995), and the economic sector shifted towards neoliberalism with the introduction of a capitalistic understanding of development constructed around individualism, private ownership and the free market as preconditions for economic growth (Kimambo, Maddox and Nyanto, 2017: 190-191).

Nyerere, refusing to accede to the changes enforced by the SAP, stepped down as president in 1985, staying true to his political principles (Ahluwalia and Zegeye, 2010: 38-39). Throughout the decade-long reign of his successor, Ali Hassan Mwinyi, neoliberal policies were rapidly introduced (Mwapachu, 2018: 372). This period has come to be known as the *Ruksa* (Swahili for *do your own thing*) years, denoting a diversion from former means of development in post-independence Tanzania (Hyden, 1999: 144).

Tanzania's first post-liberalisation change in development policy came in 1999, when the third phase government of President Mkapa introduced the country's new development plan, The Tanzania Development Vision 2025 (URT, 1999). The document set the course for the nation's development in the next quarter century in line with recent reforms of economic and political

liberalisation (Samoff, 1994), and highlighted five main attributes that the nation should be imbued with come 2025: i) high quality of livelihood, ii) peace, stability and unity, iii) good governance, iv) a well educated and learning society, and v) a competitive economy capable of producing sustainable growth and shared benefits (URT, 1999: 2-5).

The influence of neoliberalism became particularly prominent in descriptions of a liberalised Tanzanian economic part of the global market, standing in sharp contrast to Nyerere (1967) and his emphasis on community development:

“It [education] must also prepare young people for the work they will be called upon to do in the society which exists in Tanzania – a rural society where improvement will depend largely upon the efforts of the people in agriculture and in village development” (Ibid: 8).

While much of Nyerere’s African socialism was abandoned as neoliberalism gradually took root in Tanzania, core aspects of his development discourse of *maendeleo* endured:

“A nation should enjoy peace, political stability, national unity and social cohesion in an environment of democracy and political and social tolerance. Although Tanzania has enjoyed national unity, peace and stability for a long time, these attributes must continue to be cultivated, nurtured and sustained as important pillars for the realisation of the Vision” (URT, 1999: 3-4).

Despite seeing changes in the nation’s development goals as well as economic sectors and markets, elements of the *maendeleo* development discourse remained at the core of the Tanzanian government’s envisioned development and policies regarding development facilitation. By being thoroughly integrated into the Tanzanian national identity since the early days of independence, *maendeleo* endured as a relevant development discourse in the face of neoliberalism.

The neoliberal shift in Tanzania and the nation's new development vision soon made its mark on the country's education sector. Government funding towards education decreased as one effort to reduce public spending, which over time had a negative effect on both enrolment and the quality of education (Vavrus, 2003; 2005). Simultaneously, the liberalisation of the education sector caused a corresponding increase in private initiatives. In total, this caused an increase in educational costs for students and their families (DeJaeghere, 2013: 504). Also, as education became gradually more privatised, the influence of stakeholders outside of the Tanzanian authorities like NGOs, social entrepreneurs and corporations grew considerably (Mundy, 2006). The 1990s also saw reforms within educational policy as the *Tanzania Education and Training Policy* (MoEVT, 1995) replaced the *Education for Self-Reliance* policy (Nyerere, 1967). Introducing human rights, democracy and globalisation as topics into the curriculum, the Tanzanian educational authorities tailored the educational content for the nation's new political reality (MoEVT, 2005).

The neoliberal tendencies in Tanzania's development have, however, changed over time. The government gradually recognised several of the country's neoliberal policies, and particularly those involving privatisation, as foreign and a diversion from the nation's envisioned development as described in the *Development Vision 2025* (URT, 1999; Mwapachu, 2018: 37). Hence, the nation revisited its founding socialist values, retracting from the foreign landscape of neoliberalism. Public primary education has again become fee-free (Nyirenda, 2021), and the moral component of the nation's social science subject at primary level was recently strengthened to 'enable the pupil to respect and value for the community' and develop 'virtues like responsibility, resilience, integrity and peace maintenance' (MoEST, 2020: 2). Maintenance of a unifying Tanzanian identity continues to be an educational objective of highest priority. Based on the development discourse of *maendeleo*, the country's national identity has allowed for and contributed to a local, tailored version of neoliberalism based on values and principles from *maendeleo* such as equity, unity, and collectivism. As a result, Tanzania has found herself in a

unique position of political stability, national unity, and with both a collective approach to and understanding of development within the neoliberal domain.

Conclusion

The formation and instalment of one, unifying, national identity has been the main educational objective from the early days of independent Tanzania (Abdi, 2008). Further, Tanzanian education has continuously been closely linked to prevailing development objectives. By incorporating a political discourse of development, conceptualised through *maendeleo*, into Tanzanian national identity, education has contributed to the formation of a Tanzanian nation with a population rooted in values and principles from its socialist past. These prevailing values have contributed to alternative interpretations and a local version of the neoliberal economic paradigm.

The Tanzanian experience provides valuable perspectives in the area of development education. The incorporation of a local development discourse in national identity formation has proven effective in resisting more extreme aspects of neoliberalism. In contrast to the neoliberal ideology with its individualistic focus and prioritisation of the market, development as *maendeleo* reminds us of the importance of collectivism and people-centredness. In the spirit of Nyerere's *maendeleo*, development education should inspire students to serve the common good rather than pursue personal prosperity.

References

- Abdi, A (2008) 'Democratic Development and Prospects for Citizenship Education: Theoretical Perspectives on Sub-Saharan Africa', *Interchange*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 151-166.
- Abdi, A (2015) 'Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education. Critical Reflections on the Epistemic Intersections of Location, Knowledge, and Learning' in A Abdi, L Shultz and T Pillay (eds.) *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Ahearne, R (2016) 'Development and progress as historical phenomena in Tanzania: "Maendeleo? We Had That in the Past"', *African Studies Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp.77-96.

Ahluwalia, P and Zegeye, A (2010) 'Multiparty democracy in Tanzania. Crisis in the Union', *African Security Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 35-47.

Allred, N (2022) 'Development education and neoliberalism: Challenges and opportunities', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 34, Spring, pp. 112-123.

Anderson, B (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Bailyn, B (1970) *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

Bjerk, P (2015) *Building a peaceful nation: Julius Nyerere and the establishment of sovereignty in Tanzania, 1960-1964*, Rochester, New York: University of Rochester Press.

Block, L (1998) 'The Political Process of Education' in M Hodd (ed) *Tanzania after Nyerere*, London: Printer Publishers Limited.

Blommaert, J (2014) *State Ideology and Language in Tanzania. Second and revised edition*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bracken, M (2020) 'The Power of Language and the Language of Power: Exploring Discourses on Development Education in Policies Underpinning Adult and Community Education', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 31, Autumn, pp. 55-76.

Buchert, L (1994) *Education in the Development of Tanzania 1919-1990*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Cogan, J (1998) 'Citizenship education for the 21st century: Setting the context' in J Cogan and R Derricott (eds.) *Citizenship for the 21st Century: An International Perspective on Education*, London: Kogan Page.

Collins, V and Rothe, D (2019) *The Violence of Neoliberalism: Crime, Harm and Inequality*, New York: Routledge.

Decker, C and McMahon, E (2021) *The Idea of Development in Africa: A History*, Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

DeJaeghere, J (2013) 'Education, skills and citizenship: an emergent model for entrepreneurship in Tanzania', *Comparative Education*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 503-519.

Delors, J (1998) *Education for the Twenty-First Century: Issues and Prospects*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Freire, P (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Fukuyama, F (2015) 'Nation Building and State Building' in J Hall, O Korsgaard and O Pedersen (eds.) *Building the Nation: N. F. S. Grundtvig and Danish National Identity*, Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queens University Press.

Gellner, E (1964) *Thought and Change*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, A (1990) *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA*, London: Macmillan.

Haugen, A (2022) '60 Years of Freedom and Unity through Schooling: Exploring the Shifting Purposes of Citizenship Education in Tanzanian Nation-Building', unpublished manuscript.

Hicks, D and Townley, C (eds.) (1982) *Teaching World Studies: An Introduction to Global Perspectives in Curriculum*, Harlow: Longman Publishing.

Hyden, G (1999) 'Top-Down Democratization in Tanzania', *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 142-155.

Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) (2019) *Code of Good Practice for Development Education: User Guide*, available: <https://sloga-platform.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Code-User-Guide-FINAL-April-2021.pdf> (accessed 18 September 2022).

Irish Aid (2021) *Irish Aid Global Citizenship Education Strategy*, Government of Ireland, available: <https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/publications/Global-Citizenship-Education-Strategy.pdf> (accessed 18 September 2022).

Kaiser, P (1996) 'Structural Adjustment and the Fragile Nation: The Demise of Social Unity in Tanzania', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 227-237.

Kimambo, I, Maddox, G and Nyanto, S (2017) *A New History of Tanzania*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Lal, P (2015) *African Socialism in Postcolonial Tanzania*, Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Lugalla, J and Ngwaru, J (2019) *Education in Tanzania in the Era of Globalisation: Challenges and Opportunities*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Malipula, M (2021) 'Building a Nation, Suppressing Ethnicity: The Case of Post-independence Tanzania' in A Nhemachena, J Kangira and B Chiripanhura (eds.) *From #RhodesMustFall Movements to #HumansMustFall Movements: African Liberation Movements in the Age of the Transhumanist Geographies of Death*, Oxford: African Books Collective.

Masanya, C, Reweta, W, Magere, D, Temba, L and Macha, D (2018) *Drivers of Economic Growth in Tanzania, Bank of Tanzania Working Paper No. 14: May 2018*, available: <https://www.bot.go.tz/Publications/Other/Working%20Papers%20Series/sw/2020021122482890233.pdf> (accessed 5 September 2022).

McCloskey, S (2020) 'COVID-19 has exposed neoliberal-driven "development": How can development education respond?', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 30, Spring, pp. 174-184.

Mercer, C (2002) 'The discourse of Maendeleo and the politics of women's participation on Mount Kilimanjaro', *Development and Change*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 101-127.

Miller, P and Rose, N (2008) *Governing the Present: Administering Economics, Social and Personal Life*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

MoEST (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology) (2020) *Civic and Moral Education Syllabus for Primary School Education. Standard III–VII*, available: <https://www.tie.go.tz/uploads/files/Syllabus%20for%20Civic%20and%20Moral%20Education%20STD%20III-VII%20Nov.%202020.pdf> (accessed 5 September 2022).

MoEVT (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training) (1995) *Civics Syllabus for Ordinary Secondary Education. Form I-IV*, available: <https://www.tie.go.tz/uploads/files/Syllabus%20for%20Civics%20O%20Level%20Form%20I-IV-23-1-2018.pdf> (accessed 5 September 2022).

MoEVT (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training) (2005) *Education and Training Policy*, Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

Msekwa, P (1995) *The Transition to Multiparty Democracy*, Dar es Salaam: Tema Publishers Company.

Mundy, K (2006) 'Education for All and the New Development Compact' in J Zajda, S Majhanovich and V Rust (eds.) *Education and Social Justice*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Mutahaba, G, Bana, B and Mallya, E (2017) *Reforming Tanzania's Public Sector: Assessment and Future Direction*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.

Mwapachu, J (2018) *Tanzania in the Age of Change and Transformation*, Dar es Salaam: E&D Vision Publishing.

Ndegwa, S (1998) 'Citizenship amid economic and political change in Kenya', *Africa Today*, Vol. 45, No. 3/4, pp. 351-367.

Nyerere, J (1967) *Education for self-reliance*, Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

Nyerere, J (1968) *Freedom and Development*, Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

Nyirenda, C (2021) 'Addressing social inequality in Tanzania: Aspects of continuity and change in social policy between 1961 and 2020', *Tanzania Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 56-78.

O'Connell, C, Mallon, B, Ní Cassaithe, C and Barry, M (2021) 'Addressing the Complexity of Contemporary Slavery: Towards a Critical Framework for Educators', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 32, Spring, pp. 10-32.

Osler, A (1994) 'Introduction: The Challenges of Development Education' in A Osler (ed) *Development Education: Global Perspectives in the Curriculum*, London: Casell.

Osler, A and Starkey H (2005) *Citizenship and Language Learning: International perspectives*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.

Samoff, J (1994) *Coping with Crisis: Austerity, Adjustment and Human Resources*. London: Cassell Tycooly Publishing.

Saronga, F (2019) 'Education policy and Practice in Tanzania: A Critical Conversation' in J Lugalla and J Ngwaru (eds) *Education in Tanzania in the Era of Globalisation*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Smith, W (1971) *We Must Run While They Walk: A Portrait of Africa's Julius Nyerere*, New York: Random House.

United Nations (2015) *RES/70/1: Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, UN General Assembly, 21 October, available: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html> (accessed 5 September 2022).

United Nations (2020) *World Social Report 2020: The challenge of inequality in a rapidly changing world*, available: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/02/World-Social-Report2020-FullReport.pdf> (accessed 5 September 2022).

United Republic of Tanzania (1999) *The Tanzania Development Vision 2025*, Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

Vavrus, F (2003) *Desire and Decline: Schooling Amid Crisis in Tanzania*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Vavrus, F (2005) 'Adjusting Inequality: Education and Structural Adjustment Policies in Tanzania', *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 174-201.

World Bank (2022) *The World Bank in Tanzania: Overview*, available: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/overview#1> (accessed 5 September 2022).

Anders Daniel Faksvåg Haugen is completing his Doctorate thesis at the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, exploring education as a tool for nation-building in Tanzania after the nation's introduction of multiparty democracy. Haugen holds a Master of Social Science in Education and has been teaching citizenship education and human geography in teacher education at the NLA University College, Dar es Salaam University College of Education and the University of Zambia in addition to the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. Prior to his PhD studies, Haugen practised as a primary school teacher. E-mail: adfh@hvl.no.