

## References

Lotz-Sisitka H. (2012/2013), Conceptions of Quality and 'Learning as Connection': Teaching for Relevance, *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 29, p. 25 - 38

## From Languages in Competition to Languages in Complementation: Accounting for Language-in-Education Policy Formulation and Implementation in Zambia 1964 - 2014

John Simwinga

University of Zambia, Zambia, j.simwinga@unza.zm

### ABSTRACT

*This paper outlines the history of language-in-education policy in Zambia from 1964 to 2014. It examines some of the major factors which informed language-in-education policy formulation and implementation in the country in relation to four landmark phases: the 1966 proclamation of English as sole official language at national level and as language of classroom instruction from Grade One to the highest level of education; the 1977 education reforms recommendations; the 1996 language-in-education policy; and, finally, the 2014 declaration and implementation of the policy prescribing the use of familiar languages for instruction in initial literacy and numeracy from Grade One to Grade Four. The paper concludes that though English has remained the sole official language at national level over the years, there has been increasing recognition of the role of local languages as languages of classroom instruction. As a result, the early top-down and monolingual approach to language-in-education policy formulation and implementation, premised on the principle of languages in competition, has since given way to the bottom-up and multilingual approach, guided by the principle of languages in complementation. In order to consolidate the gains scored over the years, the paper argues for a comprehensive operationalisation of the current language-in-education policy through formulation of a comprehensive language development plan and the production of sociolinguistic surveys at both national and community level to aid teachers in determining which language or languages to use as media of classroom instruction in a given locality.*

### BACKGROUND

#### 1.1 Introduction

The concept of language-in-education refers to the use of language in the education system as medium of instruction to facilitate teaching and learning. In this regard, language in education policy refers to the framework which stipulates the specific language or languages

to be used for teaching and learning at various levels of the education system. The importance of language-in-education has been stressed by Halliday (1973:18) who states that “Bernstein has shown that educational failure is often, in a very general and rather deep sense, language failure. The child who does not succeed in the school system may be one who is not using language in the ways required by the school.” This statement is supported by Whiteley (1971:4) who points out that “among the most powerful devices for implementing language policy is the educational system, particularly if the most widely desirable rewards are given to those who pass through it.” It is the case, therefore, that education remains the major domain where language policies are formulated and implemented in Zambia. Since independence, the Ministry of Education has constantly recognised the role of language in education when formulating and reviewing national education policies as evidenced in the 1966, the 1977, the 1996 and the 2014 education policy statements and documents. It is in view of this central role of language in the education system that the present study sought to establish some of the key factors which had contributed to language-in-education policy formulation and implementation in Zambia over the years. The exercise was done by examining three major landmarks: the 1966 Education Act and the parliamentary debates which preceded it; the 1977 Education Reforms Recommendations, the 1996 education policy document, *Educating Our Future*, and the 2014 decision approving the use of familiar languages for initial literacy and numeracy. In order to appreciate the context in which language-in-education policies have been formulated and implemented over the years it would be instructive, as a starting point, to reflect on what obtained during the colonial era.

## 1.2 Language-in-education policies before independence

Prior to independence, language policies pursued in present day Zambia were characterised by the imposition of the colonial language as official language at national level and the selection of some of the local indigenous languages as official languages at regional level. This was done in order to develop the human resource required to serve the colonial administration in such areas as clerical work, interpreting and other communication needs. Prior to independence, present day Zambia experienced two types of administration: the first as a territory under the British South Africa Company (BSAC) and the second as a protectorate under Britain. During its reign, the BSA Company introduced English as the official language and as the medium of instruction in some of the schools which were directly under their control (cf. Chanda, 1998). According to Manchishi (2004), the company also

established the Barotse National School at Kanyonyo in 1907, following an agreement between the then Litunga (chief) of Barotseland and the company and that the Company followed the Missionaries’ language policy of using the local language, Silozi, as medium of instruction from Sub A to Standard Four at the school. This, he observes, was a clear testimony of the resolve by the company to promote local languages especially in the lower primary school classes.

As stated earlier, the British South Africa Company (BSAC) administered the territory until 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1924 when it became a British Protectorate, governed by Britain. During this period, English remained the official language and medium of instruction in some schools as had been the case under the BSA Company. However, as a result of the recommendations made by the Phelps-Stokes Commission, that local languages were to be used for the preservation of national values and for self identity on the part of the African (Manchishi, 2004), the British went further and formally recognised four main local languages: Cibemba, Cinyanja, Citonga and Silozi as regional official languages (ROLs) to be used in government schools as media of instruction for the first four years of primary education. This is recorded in the Annual Report on Native Education for the year 1927 (p.12) as follows:

*“The Advisory Board on Native Education has agreed to the adoption of four principal native languages in this territory for school purposes namely Sikololo (Lozi) for Barotseland; Chitonga-Chiila for the rest of Northwestern Rhodesia;*

*Chibemba for Northeastern Rhodesia... and Chinyanja for Eastern Rhodesia....”*

This declaration constituted a landmark in language-in-education policy formulation for the territory as it gave legal status to, and acknowledgment of, the role of local indigenous languages in education.

Eventually, the British Government settled for a compromise on the roles of English and local languages in education based on complementarity. Manchishi (2004:2) reports that in 1943, the British Government recommended that initial teaching during the first few years of a child's learning should be carried out in vernacular while “English was to be taught as a subject in the fourth year in the primary school and to be used as a medium of instruction in some subjects thereafter.” He reports further that “by 1950, the language policy in African schools was that the mother tongue was to be used as medium of instruction during the first

two years of primary education and a dominant vernacular to be used up to standard Five and thereafter English was to replace the local languages” (Manchishi, *ibid*).

It is the case, therefore, that as at 1950, there was a three-tier language-in-education policy for the territory, guided by the principle of complementarity. It was possible, at the time, for a pupil to be taught in the local language most commonly used in the locality for the first two years of primary education. Thereafter, the pupil would be taught in one of the regional official languages (Silozi; Chitonga-Chiila; Chibemba or Chinyanja) for another two years and then in English from the fifth year onwards (Chanda, 1998:63; Kashoki, 1978:26).

## 2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

While it is common knowledge that soon after attaining independence Zambia adopted English as sole official language at national level and as sole language of classroom instruction from Grade One to university and the arguments for taking this position have been documented, there is lack of information on why, as at 2014, a full reversal of the initial stance has taken place.

## 3. AIM

The aim of the study was to establish the arguments which had brought about a shift from the English-only medium of classroom instruction at all levels of education to a combination of local languages and English in initial literacy and numeracy and to postulate the over-riding principle governing these arguments.

## 4. OBJECTIVES

- (i) To identify the specific arguments presented in favour of the adoption of English as language of classroom instruction over local languages;
- (ii) To identify the specific arguments presented in favour of the adoption of local languages as languages of classroom instruction over English;
- (iii) To identify the specific arguments in favour of the adoption of a combination of local languages and English as languages of classroom instruction in initial literacy and numeracy; and
- (iv) To postulate the general principles which have guided the choice of language of classroom instruction since independence.

## 5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- (i) What are some of the specific arguments which were presented in favour of the adoption of local languages as languages of classroom instruction over English?;
- (ii) What are some of the specific arguments which were presented in favour of the adoption of English as language of classroom instruction over local languages?;
- (iii) What are some of the specific arguments presented in favour of the adoption of a combination of local languages and English as languages of classroom instruction in initial literacy and numeracy?; and
- (iv) What are the general principles which guided the choice of language of classroom instruction since independence?.

## 6. RATIONALE

While there is substantial literature on the need for every multilingual state to have a language-in-education policy and while all multilingual states have come up with language-in-education policies of one form or another, studies meant to explore the basis of such policy decisions are rare. The present study sought to investigate this aspect of language-in-education which has not been given sufficient attention in studies on language in Zambia. It was expected that the study would provide valuable information on the specific arguments which guided the formulation and implementation of the language-in-education policy for Zambia over the years as well as the general principles on which the arguments were based. It would also provide information on implementation challenges and why there had been a complete shift in policy between 1964 and 2014 and suggest a way forward in terms of taking advantage of the new policy dimension. These pieces of information were considered to be directly relevant to policy makers as well as teachers in the classroom.

## 7. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of language-in-education policy is a subset of the concept of language policy in general which, as stated by Bamgbose (1991), quoted in Mwape (2002:66), is “a programme of action on the role or status of a language in a given community.” As a follow up to the definition, Bamgbose identifies three types of language policy as: those relating to languages recognized by the government and for certain purposes; those relating to languages recognized by educational authorities for use as media of instruction and as subjects for study

## **8.2 Data collection**

In qualitative design data are usually collected through interviews, observation or document analysis. In this particular study, data were collected through document analysis. The specific documents analysed were: the *Education Act No. 28 of 1966*; the *1977 Education Reforms*; the *1996 Educating our Future* as well as *Zambia National Assembly Hansard 5/6 1965/66*; *Zambia National Assembly Hansard 7, 1966*; *Zambia Hansard No.2, 1965* and *Zambia Hansard No.4, 1965*.

## **8.3 Data analysis**

The documents listed in 8.2 above were subjected to content analysis in order to identify the specific policy statements as well as the specific points which were raised in support of one policy dimension against another. Both the policy statements and the supporting points were categorised in terms of the over-riding principles or philosophical framework of *either languages in competition or languages in complementation* and appropriate conclusions drawn.

# **9. FINDINGS**

## **9.1 The 1966 Language-in-Education Policy**

In 1964, Zambia attained independence from Britain. Shortly thereafter, the issue of language of classroom instruction or language-in-education was debated extensively in the Zambian parliament. This was particularly so with regard to the status of English and the local languages in the education system, each with a fair share of justification. The status of local languages as both media of instruction and subject for study was particularly supported on a number of grounds. Luangala (2012:29) identifies the following as the major arguments presented in favour of local languages:

“that English is a threat to the African culture and personality; that it weakens the general spirit of nationalism as the mannerisms that it induces in the local speakers conflict with the national ideological aspirations; that it is not good, let alone easy, for a people to stand by and watch their whole past disappearing down the drain of modernization; and that mother tongue development is a firm and sound base for a child’s future intellectual advancement.”

The argument that English would pose a threat to the African culture and personality was passionately stressed by Mr. M.M Sakubita, Nominated Member of Parliament as early as 1965 when, in stressing the need to produce books in local languages, he argued as follows: “I do not see how a culture of the people and how we can claim to advance our culture if there are no books written in our own languages” (Zambia National Assembly Hansard 4, 1965:1353) adding that “... we cannot claim to be a nation if we do not have literature in our indigenous languages” (ibid: 1354). This point reflects the view expressed by the Phelps-Stockes Commission of 1925 which considered indigenous languages as “part of the cultural heritage of Africans and as a chief means of preserving whatever is good in African customs, ideas and ideals, and above all, for preserving the self-respect of Africans” (quoted in Ohannessian and Kashoki, 1978:278). Another senior government official at the time, Mr. Simon Kapwepwe is quoted as having described the policy of teaching in the medium of English at the outset of primary education as “tantamount to robbing Zambian children of their cultural heritage and alienating them from their parents” (Serpell, 1978:145). It is the case, therefore, that although the above may not have been the official view of government, the general atmosphere at the time seems to have favoured the use of local languages as media of instruction.

The pedagogical role of local languages is fully acknowledged and recognised in the 1977 educational reforms document which states that “the teaching of Zambian languages as subjects in schools and colleges should be made more effective and language study should have equal status with other important subjects” (GRZ, 1977:33). It is re-iterated in the 1996 Educational Policy *Educating Our Future* which states that the use of English as medium of instruction from Grade One has impacted negatively on the performance of the children who “have been required to learn how to read and write through and in this language which is quite alien to them” (MOE, 1996:39).

Despite all the arguments in favour of using local languages as media of classroom instruction and their teaching as subjects presented above, Zambia opted for English as sole medium of instruction from Grade One to University. Luangala (2012: 29-30) lists the major arguments in favour of English as:

“that the choice of any one local language to replace English is likely to cause tribal conflicts and disunity, which is detrimental to the effort at national building; that English seems to work as a better unification tool since the division it has brought about in the nation cuts across tribal lines; that the heterogeneous composition of the teaching staff and the classes in all the schools makes it almost impossible to conveniently use local languages as media of instruction; that most of the teachers in some institutions are expatriates who speak none of the local languages; that English has been used as the medium of instruction for a long time before, except in the first four years of primary school....; that, generally, Zambian people have a negative attitude towards local languages...; and that since English is the language for official communication locally and in contact with the outside world, the pupils would master it all the better by learning all the other subjects through it.”

The view that English had been used as the medium of instruction for a long time was particularly emphasized by Mr. R.E. Farmer, Member of Parliament for Copperbelt Central, who argued that “English is the language of the country and we cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of children growing up with a sound knowledge of the English Language. We have handed down to us the vast and rich heritage of literature going back four or five hundred years and I should like to be assured that the children are growing up and are being taught that rich heritage of literature” (Zambia National Assembly Hansard 7, 1966:226-227). This view suggests that practically it would take a lot of resources to produce and distribute the required literature to facilitate the use of local languages as media of classroom instruction.

Arising from the arguments presented above, English remained the sole official language of communication at national level as well as the official language of classroom instruction from Grade One to the highest level of education. A closer analysis of the arguments shows that the decision to adopt English was made on the basis of *languages in competition* rather than *languages in complementation*. It was guided by the perspective of which language, between English and local languages, would be more widely accepted, had more prestige, enough teachers enough teaching materials and longer history of use for educational purposes. The answer was English which, in this regard, had competed more effectively against the local languages.

The Education Act No.28 of 1966, the earliest, in the post-independence period, does not specify the language of instruction. However, Section 32 (1) of the Act states that “The Minister may make regulations prescribing and regulating the language or languages to be used as the medium of instruction in schools” (p.248), and the practice has been to use English as language of instruction from Grade One to university. Since then, there have been three major developments in language-in-education policy formulation in Zambia. The first took place in 1977 under the educational reforms while the second and the third took place in 1996 and 2014 respectively as part of the national education policy review process. Each of these is summarised and examined below.

## 9.2 The 1977 language-in-education policy

The 1977 educational reforms recommendations contained in the *GRZ Ministry of Education (1977), Educational Reforms: Proposals and Recommendations* publication stipulate the role of education as ensuring that “every child can master the essential learning skills on which he can build as he proceeds with further education or as he joins the life of work. The school should therefore assist him to develop intellectually, socially, emotionally, physically, morally and spiritually; he should be enabled to acquire learning and practical skills so that he is able to apply knowledge intelligently. The school should also assist in shaping his attitudes and values” (GRZ, 1977:16). The reforms identified three important areas of learning in which language skills would be directly involved:

- 1) Speech and listening where “pupils should be able to express themselves and communicate through speech and writing”.
- 2) Reading where “pupils should be able to develop the art of reading well and communicating effectively”; and
- 3) Writing where “pupils must develop the skill to write properly and without mistakes in order to communicate accurately” (pp 16-17).

While recognising the benefits of using the mother tongue in the realisation of the areas of learning identified above, the document disapproved the use of the mother tongue as medium of instruction stating as follows: “Although it is generally accepted by educationists that learning is best done in the mother tongue, this situation has been found to be impracticable in the case of every child in multilingual societies such as the *Zambian society*”

(GRZ,1977:32). The reasons advanced for this view were not different from those raised in the 1965/66 debates. Three of the major reasons identified in the 1977 document were:

- (1) that in cases where the mother tongue was not a means of communication outside the home, such a decision might result in confusion between policy and practice;
- (2) that a decision in favour of local languages would be too costly if too many languages are to be used; and
- (3) that there may not be enough teachers to teach in a variety of local languages.

On the basis of the arguments presented above, the government defended the continued use of English as mode of instruction from Grade One arguing that “Although English may be taught as a subject in Grade 1 while the medium of instruction could be a different language, the fact of the matter is that, even in the use of English as medium of instruction, the child *has the opportunity* (writer’s italics) to learn and improve his language ability and thus using English as a medium of instruction is also an aid to learning English as a subject” (ibid). The ambivalence in this statement suggests a certain degree of lack of conviction on the part of decision makers regarding what would have constituted the best approach in dealing with issues relating to language in education. In our view, being availed *the opportunity to learn* cannot be equated to learning. The use of language-in-education in practice is to facilitate the passing on of knowledge and skills from the teacher to the learner.

Following the arguments listed above, the government recommended that:

- (a) “The present policy, where English is a medium of instruction from Grade 1 should continue; but if a teacher finds that there are concepts which cannot be easily understood, he may explain those concepts *in one of the seven official languages, provided the majority of the pupils in that class understand the language*” (italics mine); and
- (b) “The teaching of *Zambian languages* as subjects in schools and colleges should be made more effective and language study should have equal status with other important subjects” (GRZ, 1977:33)

The two recommendations presented above lack clarity in a number of respects resulting in potential implementation problems. The first recommendation states that a teacher might have to explain concepts in *one of the seven official languages* disregarding the practical

difficulties which tend to arise from linguistic zoning. In some cases, people speaking one language have been placed in a zone where, officially, another language is used. In addition to disregarding the practical difficulties on the ground, the policy statement contains a proviso, or a clawback clause, *provided the majority of pupils in that class understand the language*. The proviso is acknowledgement of the fact that some of the pupils (whether in the majority or in the minority) will not understand the official language for a given linguistic zone. Despite the acknowledgement, the policy statement remains silent on how such a scenario might be handled.

The second recommendation relates to the teaching of Zambian languages as subjects in schools and colleges which “should be made more effective and language study should be given equal status with other important subjects”. The recommendation acknowledges that hitherto the study of Zambian languages had not been accorded equal status with other important subjects but does not suggest how the status of these languages can be elevated in the education system. In addition, it does not state how the teaching of Zambian languages should be made more effective.

On the whole, the 1977 document re-iterates the 1966 position but only introduces a proviso which is difficult to implement because it constitutes a prescription which did not reflect reality. The re-iteration of the 1966 position was guided by the principle of languages in competition whereby English was still considered to be more widely accepted, had more prestige, enough teachers enough teaching materials and longer history of use for educational purposes.

In 1992, *Focus on Learning* indicated that English alone was not sufficient to facilitate meaningful learning and that children had continued to acquire knowledge and skills through rote learning. A study commissioned by Britain's Overseas Development Administration and undertaken by Ed Williams in 1993, carried out a study comparing reading levels by Zambian and Malawian children in Chichewa and in English. The findings of this study indicated that Children in Malawi read at a far much more acceptable level in both English and Chichewa (Nyanya) because they had been exposed to the skills of reading and writing in Chichewa, the familiar local language than those in Zambia who had been exposed to the skills of reading and writing in English, a foreign and unfamiliar language. Further, a study

conducted under the auspices of the Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) in 1995 showed that in Zambia only 25% of Grade 6 pupils could read at defined minimum levels and only 3% could read at defined desirable levels. All the research initiatives into the medium of classroom instruction conducted between 1977 and 1996 continued to indicate that children learnt better and faster only and only when material was presented in a familiar language which they relate with on a daily basis.

### 9.3 The 1996 Language-in-Education Policy

The 1996 Language in Education Policy is contained in the publication: *GRZ Ministry of Education (1996) Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education. Lusaka: ZEPH*. Commenting on the quality of the basic education provision, the document states that “school leavers find it difficult to communicate confidently in speech or writing, be this in a Zambian language or in English” (GRZ, 1996:27). This statement suggests that the language in education policy formulated in 1966 and reiterated in 1977 that English be used as sole medium of instruction from Grade One to university might not have yielded the expected results.

The policy acknowledges that the use of English as medium of instruction from Grade One has impacted negatively on the performance of the children who “have been required to learn how to read and write through and in this language which is quite alien to them” (ibid:39). This practice is said to have contributed to children's inability to read competently and is said to have promoted rote learning since from the outset the child has difficulties in associating the printed forms of words with their real, underlying meaning.

The policy also acknowledges research findings that support the use of local languages as media of classroom instruction. It states that “children learn literary skills more easily and successfully through their mother tongue and subsequently they are able to transfer these skills quickly and with ease to English or another language. Successful first language learning is, in fact, believed to be essential for successful literacy in a second language and for learning content subjects through the second language” (ibid:39). Kelly (1977) and Kashoki (1985) also subscribe to the view that the child learns more quickly through the medium of his or her mother tongue than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium.

In recognition of the critical role of the mother tongue in facilitating education, the 1996 document states that:

“...all pupils will be given an opportunity to learn initial basic skills of reading and writing in a local language; whereas English will remain the official medium of instruction...” (ibid:39-40).

The policy adds that: “in order to foster better initial learning, to enhance the status of Zambian languages , and to integrate the school more meaningfully into the life of local communities each child will be required to take a local language from Grade 1 onwards” (ibid:40)

The specific policy Statement is contained in Section 8 which states that “Officially, English will be used as the language of instruction, but the language used for initial literacy learning in Grades 1-4 will be one that seems best suited to promote meaningful learning by children” (ibid:40).

It is evident that the 1996 language in education policy contains far much more progressive statements on the use of existing linguistic resources in education than both the 1966 and the 1977 policy recommendations. The 1996 document acknowledges the shortcomings of both English and local languages as media of instruction and settles for a compromise where the strengths of each should be exploited for the benefit of the learner. It gives official recognition to and endorsement of the medium of instruction which teachers, particularly in rural areas, have been using all along: a combination of both English and local languages. Each of the two has been performing specific roles at different stages and in different circumstances in order to enhance effectiveness and efficiency in teaching and learning.

The 1996 policy also places emphasis on community languages rather than on the seven officially recognised languages as was the case with the 1977 policy. This approach is further recognition that the teacher is best placed to decide on the specific language to be used as medium of instruction in Grades 1 to 4 in a given area. It is only the teacher who would be in the best position to determine which language “seems best suited to promote meaningful learning by children”. As stated earlier, the 1977 policy stipulated the use of one of the seven officially recognised languages as medium of instruction where teachers needed to explain complicated concepts in a local language.

Another positive and progressive aspect of the 1996 policy is that it is more specific in terms of how the status of Zambian languages is to be enhanced stating that “each child will be required to take a local language from Grade 1 onwards”. However, it is not clear as to whether the language to be taken by the child from Grade 1 onwards will remain “one that seems best suited to promote meaningful learning by children”, the community language or one of the seven officially recognised languages for a given zone. It might be necessary to clarify this particular aspect of the policy.

Overall, the 1996 Language-in-Education Policy, as articulated in *the Ministry of Education (1996) Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education* document, is far more positive and progressive than the 1977 one. It recognizes the complementary rather than competing roles of English and local languages. It also specifically gives room to and due recognition of community and minority languages.

Following the pronouncement of the 1996 Language-in-Education Policy it was expected that full implementation would commence immediately with mass production of teaching and learning materials as well as teacher preparation and deployment. However, this was not the case. Instead the Government introduced the Primary Reading Programme (PRP) through the Breakthrough to Literacy (BTL) initiative which got to full implementation in 1999 after successful piloting. The thrust of the programme was to serve as intervention in the enhancement of reading competence at each of the seven primary school grade levels. Piloted over a one-year period, the initial literacy course offered in each of the seven official Zambian languages was described as having had significant success. The evaluation report on the pilot programme carried out in Kasama during 1998 states: “Children in *Breakthrough to Literacy (BTL) classes* were reading and writing at a level equivalent to Grade 4 or higher than those in in non-BTL classes” (Kotze and Higgins 1999:4) as quoted in Linehan (2004) who has chronologically documented the piloting phases of the use of familiar or local languages as languages of classroom instruction. The pilot phases proved that children taught in a familiar language were breaking through to literacy in the local language. The expectation was that having broken through in a familiar language, the children would be able to transfer the skills to English. In order to facilitate the eventual transfer, the following steps were taken:

- (i) introduction of *Pathway to English* in Grade 1 to enable children learn spoken English;
- (ii) continuation of *Pathway to English* in Grade 2, to consolidate oral English competence;
- (iii) introduction of *Step In To English* (SITE) in Grade 2 to enhance further the development of oral English; and
- (iv) introduction of *Read On* for Grades 3 to 7 to continue the on-going development of oral English while at the same time facilitating bilingual literacy.

#### 9.4 The 2013 Language-in-Education Policy

In 2013, the Government of the Republic of Zambia finalized the formulation of the *Zambia Education Curriculum Framework* as well as the *National Literacy Framework*. Informed by learning theories, research findings on the role of familiar languages in facilitating teaching and learning as well as by the success stories of the piloted Primary Reading Programme the Government, through the Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education re-affirmed and resolved to implement the language of instruction policy recommendations which had been made several times between 1997 and 1996. These related to the use of familiar languages for literacy and numeracy. The decision is backed by the principle that in a multilingual setting all the available languages constitute a resource and can be used for both teaching and general communication in complementation to each other rather than in competition. The decision, officially and publicly announced at the beginning of 2014, reverses the 1966 proclamation of English as sole language of classroom instruction and settles for the use of familiar languages for initial literacy and numeracy with the gradual introduction of English first as ordinary subject and much later as language of instruction. The specific policy statement as captured in the *National Literacy Framework* (2013) document reads "To support early literacy and late, English literacy instruction, MESVTEE will introduce instruction in a familiar language so as to learners' arsenal for learning to read in other languages as well as learning content subjects" (p.5). The document outlines in detail the policy implementation framework in relation to subject content areas. In summary, the policy will be implemented as follows:

- (i) from Grade 1 to Grade 4, a familiar language will be used as language of classroom instruction in all subjects;
- (ii) from Grade 2 Term 1, Oral English is introduced through *Pathway to English 1*;
- (iii) from Grade 2 Term 2, Oral English is consolidated through *Pathway to English 2*;
- (iv) from Grade 2 Term 3 Literacy is introduced through *Pathway to English 3* and continues side by side with oral competence until Grade 4; and
- (v) finally, in Grade 5, English is introduced as language of instruction in all subjects while both English and familiar local languages continue as compulsory subjects until Grade 12.

## 10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 10.1 Conclusion

The study has shown that there has been a complete turn-around in the formulation and implementation of the language-in-education policy in Zambia from total rejection of the use of local languages as media of classroom instruction in the 1960's to the reluctant partial recognition of the use of local official languages in the 1970's, to the formal recognition of the use of community languages in the 1990's and, finally in 2014, to the actual implementation of the policy decisions which had been eluding Government over the years. The decision provides for the possibility of a three-tier language-in-education policy for Zambia comprising English at the topmost tier, followed by any of the seven regionally officially recognised local languages at the middle tier and community languages or languages of the immediate community at the bottom tier. The policy decision is founded on the philosophy or principle of languages in complementation taking into account the strengths and limitations of the available languages at different levels and domains of use to ensure that these languages are used in complementary to each other rather than in competition as has been the case in the past. The policy reverses the elitist top-down approach to language policy formulation and implementation, premised on the principle of *languages in competition*, and replaces it with the bottom-up approach, premised on the principle of *languages in*

*complementation*, which recognises the relative strengths of the available languages as resource for the promotion of teaching and learning.

## 10.2 Recommendations

The implementation of the use of familiar language for literacy and numeracy instruction policy requires, eventually, the formulation of a comprehensive language development plan whose objective would be to facilitate the development of local languages to the extent where they can be used more effectively in the dissemination of information, including information of a scientific nature. This would involve, among other things, corpus development of the local languages. The implementation process would also require undertaking sociolinguistic surveys at both national and community level in order to identify more precisely and objectively the specific community of familiar languages that can be used as languages of classroom instruction in cases where none of the seven regionally designated local languages enjoys the status of familiar language. In this regard, it would also be helpful if both serving and trainee primary school teachers could receive some basic training on how to carry out basic sociolinguistic surveys at community level. Teachers would also require orientation or re-orientation in teaching methodology and materials production.

## REFERENCES

- Bamgbose, A. (1991) **Language and the Nation. The Language Question in Sub-Saharan Africa**. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean (1998) **Language Wars and Linguistic Politics**. Oxford: OUP.
- Chanda, V.M. (1998) *LiCCA Country Report for Zambia*. In Mekacha, R. and S. D'holt (eds.) (1998) **Prospects for Sociolinguistic Research in Africa Research paper No. 6 Languages in Contact and Conflict in Africa (LICCA) Country Reports**. Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg: Duisburg.
- GRZ **Zambia National Assembly Hansard 5/6 1965/66**. Government Printers, Lusaka
- GRZ **Zambia National Assembly Hansard 7, 1966**. Government Printers, Lusaka
- GRZ **Zambia Hansard No.2, 1965**. Government Printers, Lusaka
- GRZ **Zambia Hansard No.4, 1965**. Government Printers, Lusaka
- GRZ **Education Act No. 28 of 1966**. Government Printers, Lusaka
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) **Explorations in the Functions of Language**. London: Edward Arnold.
- Kashoki, M.E. (1978) *The Language Situation in Zambia*. In Ohanessian, S. and M.E. Kashoki (ed.) (1978) **Language in Zambia**, OUP, IAI, London.
- Kashoki, M.E. (1985) *Language, Education and the African University: Towards the Linguistic Liberation of Africa*. In **Zambia Educational Review**, Volume 6, Number 1, University of Zambia, Lusaka.
- Kelly, M.J. (1977) *Education for Development*. In **ZANGO: Zambia Journal of Contemporary Issues**. Number 2, University of Zambia, Lusaka.
- Linehan Shay (2004) **Language of instruction and the quality of basic education in Zambia**, A paper for UNESCO
- Luangala, J.R (2012) **Second Language Teaching Methodology (in press)**. Lusaka: Mwajionela.
- Manchishi, P.C. (2004) *the Status of the Indigenous Languages in Institutions of Learning in Zambia: Past, Present and Future*. **The African Symposium** Vol. 4 No. 1 March 2004.
- McNab, C. (1989) **Language Policy and Language Practice: Implementation Dilemmas in Ethiopian Education**. Institute of International Education, University of Stockholm.

Ministry of Education (1996) **Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education**. Lusaka: ZEPH.

Ministry of Education (1977) **Educational Reforms: Proposals and Recommendations**. Government Printer, Lusaka.

Ministry of Education (1996) **Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education**, ZEPH, Lusaka.

Mwanakatwe, J.M. (1968) **The Growth of Education in Zambia Since Independence**. Lusaka, OUP.

Northern Rhodesia Government (1928) **Report Upon Native Education for the Year 1927**, Lusaka, Government Printer.

Mwape, F.A. (2002). **An Investigation of the Sociolinguistic Aspects of Communities in Border Areas: The Case of Nakonde on the Zambia-Tanzania Border**. Ph.D Thesis, Graduate School of Integrated Studies in Language and Society. Osaka University of Foreign Studies.

National Literacy Framework (2013) **Curriculum Development Centre**, Lusaka.

Ohanessian, S. and M.E. Kashoki (ed.) (1978) **Language in Zambia**, OUP, IAI, London.

Serpell, R (1978) *Comprehension of Nyanja by School Children in Lusaka*. In Ohanessian, S. and M.E. Kashoki (ed.) (1978) **Language in Zambia**, OUP, IAI, London.

Whiteley, W.H. (1971) **Language Use and Social Change: Problems of Multilingualism with Special Reference to Eastern Africa**. London, IAI. OUP.

Zambia Education Curriculum Framework (2013) **Curriculum Development Centre**, Lusaka.

**A comparative study of survival strategies used by the aged in rural and urban areas: A case of Chongwe and Lusaka Districts.**

Hendrix Chama Chanda<sup>1</sup> and Wangwa W. Chakanika<sup>2</sup>

1. University of Zambia, Zambia.
2. University of Zambia, Zambia, wchakanika@unza.zm

**ABSTRACT**

*For many years, studies to do with the aged and how they survive 'economically,' were enshrined in mystery and stereotype. As a result of that, many old people in Zambia have been subjected to abuse and destitution; which is partially attributed to lack of systematic studies that would elucidate facts about the aged. It is for this reason that this study was instituted. The study comprised of 97 senior citizens who were purposively selected from Chongwe and Lusaka Districts. 84 senior citizens were subjected to a structured interview, while 13 participated in the two focus group discussions. Therefore, structured interview guides and two focus group discussions were used to collect data in Chongwe and Lusaka Districts. The study established that several types of survival strategies were used by the aged in rural and urban areas. The findings revealed that senior citizens in Chongwe and Lusaka Districts were involved in trade men and women. Others depended on their extended family members for support and care. This was the case for majority of the respondents from Chongwe District compared to their counterparts in Lusaka. There were a number of senior citizens who were also assisted financially and materially by local churches, charitable organizations and well wishers within and outside their communities. Although majority senior citizens were business men and women, their businesses, according to the findings, were not capital intensive, hence less lucrative. Consequently, majority senior citizens in the two Districts resorted to eating once or twice in a day in order to conserve food for subsequent days. The situation was exacerbated further in Lusaka, as opposed to Chongwe, because senior citizens there had a lot of dependents. As a result and except for a few, most of the aged scraped a living on less than a dollar per day in the two districts*