

The Replacement of Swahili Medium of Instruction by English from Grade 5 in Zanzibar: from Complementary to Contradictory

Haroun Ayoub MAALIM
Rhodes University, South Africa

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of the recent change of language of learning and teaching from Swahili to English in Grades 5 to 6 in primary schools in Zanzibar. For decades, since the independence of Zanzibar in 1961, the language of learning and teaching for primary schools was Swahili, the mother tongue of Zanzibaris. This study critically explores language practice, language beliefs, and language management in relation to the new policy and its consequences. The findings confirmed a number of drawbacks due to the change of policy, in terms of human and material resources as well as cognition. Finally, the findings revealed that the implementation of the new language policy is shaped by teachers' beliefs that content subjects are learned better in the language of the students. In terms of Spolsky's (2004; 2009) language policy framework the implementation of top-down English-only policy in Grade 5 and 6 in primary schools in Zanzibar will always be in conflict with teachers' beliefs and their practice in the classroom.

Keywords: mother tongue, language of learning and teaching, primary school, Zanzibar

1. INTRODUCTION

The adoption of language-in-education policy which prohibits the usage of pupils' mother tongue has been extended up to Grade 5 in primary schools in Zanzibar. In this article I focus on the recent language-in-education policy change that has resulted in an English-only language-in-education policy from Grade 5 in primary schools in Zanzibar for mathematics, science, and information and communications technology (ICT). The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training in Zanzibar (MoEVTZ) has changed the language of instruction policy by replacing Swahili with English in 2014 (MoEVTZ, 2006). Surprisingly, this change has taken place in the context where Swahili is the mother tongue of both teachers and learners and for more than four decades this language has been used as a language of learning and teaching all through primary schools for all subjects except languages other than Swahili.

The promulgation of this new policy overtly contradicts convincing evidence from a growing base of research that mother tongue instruction enhances pupils'

learning (Brock-Utne, 2012; Wolff, 2011; Benson, 2009, 2005). Added to that, mastery of the mother tongue is a springboard for learning a second or foreign language (Cummins, 2005, 2000). Likewise, evidence from research conducted in Zanzibar indicates that many teachers and students in secondary schools in Zanzibar lack adequate English proficiency required for teaching and learning purposes (Maalim, 2014; Babaci-Wilhite, 2013; Halai and Rea-Dickins, 2013; Babaci-Wilhite, 2012; Clegg and Afitska, 2010). While secondary students who have learned and used English as medium of instruction for many years still have not mastered that language, one can have reservations about how feasible this policy might be for primary school pupils. Against this backdrop, I critically explored language practices, language beliefs, and language management in relation to this new policy and its consequences.

The language policy framework advanced by Spolsky (2004, 2009) guided this study. This framework constitutes language beliefs, language practices, and language management. Language beliefs refer to a people's set of ideologies about the suitability of language practices. This leads people to judge which language is appropriate in their society. Language management refers to deliberate efforts which are intended to modify or regulate language policy (Spolsky, 2004) while language practices refer to actual language use which is observable irrespective of the policy laid down (Shohamy, 2007). This framework was used alongside Ruiz's (1984) orientations to language planning which affirms language as a right, language as a problem, and language as a resource. Regarding his orientations, language as a problem means poor English proficiency is equated to "poverty, handicap, low educational achievement, and little or no social mobility" (Ruiz, 1984: 19). While language as a right refers to the individual right to choose to use a language, that is, every individual has a right to use his or her mother tongue; language as a resource means language is a tool that can be used to eradicate or alleviate tension, contradiction, and challenges that emerge from language as a right and language as a problem. Both Spolsky's and Ruiz's frameworks guided data collection, and were subsequently used as interpretive as well as explanatory tools of the data.

2. RESEARCH ON EDUCATION IN MOTHER TONGUE

Despite Zanzibar intensifying the use of English as a language of learning and teaching at different levels of education, research conducted in the African context and globally indicates that the use of the mother tongue as a medium of instruction enhances learning (Save the Children, 2011; UNESCO, 2010, 2005; Greenfield, 2010; Ipara and Mbori, 2009; Alexander, 2007; Trudell, 2007). The tendency of using languages other than mother tongue, for example, ex-colonial languages, exists in many African countries since the policymakers persist to ignore the reality that these languages impede children's learning (Kagwesage, 2013, 2012; Clegg and Afitska, 2011; Wolff, 2006; Cummins, 2000, 2005).

Babaci-Wilhite (2012) conducted a study in Zanzibar that critically analysed the new curriculum with respect to non-mother tongue language policy and its consequences for provision of quality education. Analysis from her study revealed detrimental effects that impeded the provision of quality education. First, the introduction of the use of English as language of learning and teaching from Grade 5 has not come at the right time. The adoption of the use of English requires intensive preparation. Although the switch to the English medium was declared some years before taking effect, sufficient preparation for the implementation of that policy was not made. Analysis in Babaci-Wilhite's study (ibid) further showed that teachers who were supposed to teach those subjects in English were not prepared and subsequently claimed the likelihood of that change aggravating learners' performance. In line with other researchers, for example, Maalim (2014) and Brock-Utne (2012), Babaci-Wilhite (2012) laments that since Zanzibar is a Swahili-speaking monolingual island, the linguistic situation of that island favours the use of Swahili in education. Unlike the use of English or any other foreign language, the use of Swahili leads to no communication barrier for both learners and teachers. Likewise, Babaci-Wilhite's (2013) study conducted in Zanzibar revealed similar results that the use of foreign language as a language of learning and teaching was an impediment for the provision of quality education. The problem of mismatch between language of learning and teaching with teachers' and pupils' mastery of English was also reported as a common problem in Tanzania. The use of English in the classroom created communication barriers in the classroom and subsequently both teachers and learners disobeyed an English-only policy by opting to use Swahili alongside English (Maalim, 2014; Qorro, 2003, 2009; Rubanza, 2000).

Research on language of instruction in Uganda demonstrates that the use of local languages was powerful in teaching and learning. Local languages are the languages of learning and teaching for basic education in Uganda especially in rural areas; and indeed those languages seemed to enhance pupils' learning (Altinyelken, Moorscroft and van der Draai, 2014). Interestingly, it was an undisputed fact for teachers about the appropriateness of local language policy for provision of education. However, parents in Uganda protested against the use of local languages in education and they pressurized teachers not to enforce the policy of using local languages. Likewise, the findings reported by Spernes (2012), who conducted research in a public primary school in Kenya, revealed that local languages in education were marginalized resources. According to Spernes (ibid), English and Swahili were used as languages of learning and teaching while pupils' local languages were marginalized. When English and Swahili were used, children looked nervous and seemed not to understand. In contrast, during lessons in Nandi, the indigenous language of pupils, all pupils became active and seemed to understand. Surprisingly, in English or Swahili medium subjects when pupils were using their mother tongue alongside English or Swahili they were prohibited from doing so and sometimes they were

punished. Considering the literature reviewed above, one can conclude that in many African countries the use of mother tongue or familiar language is a discarded resource.

Along similar lines, Brock-Utne and Merce (2014) show their reservations about the provision of quality education, which is the common agenda of international agencies. The United Nations (2013) affirms that everyone should have access to quality education; while surprisingly the language of instruction and language of assessment are paid little attention in the provision of the quality education (Brock-Utne and Merce, 2014). According to these researchers, the provision of quality education is subject to the use of learners' mother tongue. In addition, they echo that Education for All which is advocated by international agencies such as the World Bank (2005) is unlikely to be achieved since the trend of school drop-outs as well as learners' underachievement is rising due to inappropriate language education policies.

The importance of education language policy which is feasible and subsequently achieves the intended objective is also advocated by Plüddemann (2015: 188) who posits that '[p]olicy is more than text...'. As such, education language policy can be interpreted and implemented contrary to the policy document due to the people's ideology. I assert that since the mother tongue facilitates learning, resourceful teachers always find ways to escape unworkable language policy. Teachers' violation of language education policy echoes a bulk of research which shows the importance of the mother tongue as a language of learning and teaching regardless of its status (see Benson, 2013; Heugh and Skutnabb-Kangas, 2010; Ouane and Glanz, 2011). The tendency of teachers to compromise with policy is reminiscent of Lo Bianco (2001) who asserts that teachers have a crucial role to play as the main agents of language policy though they are underrated.

The mother tongue as an indispensable resource not only facilitates learning content-area subjects but also fosters learning of second and foreign languages (UNESCO, 2014; Cummins, 2000, 2005). UNESCO's (2014) report confirms that teaching in children's home language and subsequently introducing a second language all through primary education boosts performance in second language and in other subjects. Added to this, the use of the mother tongue, the language which is familiar for both teachers and students facilitates effective teaching pedagogies (Save the Children, 2009). As such, teachers and learners can interact freely and subsequently experience a learner-centered approach to teaching (Maalim, 2014). In contrast, the use of unfamiliar language in the classroom shapes learners as passive recipients of knowledge in that they become anxious and reluctant either to ask or answer questions (Brock-Utne and Alidou, 2006).

Based on the related literature reviewed above, one can find that the use of non-mother tongue as language of instruction has detrimental effects in a range of contexts. As such, one needs to understand the beliefs of teachers of Zanzibar about the replacement of Swahili by English as a language of learning and

teaching, the strategies they employ in implementing and –or contesting the new education language policy, and its consequences. This study answered the following two research questions:

1. What are teachers' beliefs about the replacement of Swahili medium of instruction policy by English medium of instruction from Grade 5 in primary schools in Zanzibar?
2. How do teachers and pupils implement or contest the new education language policy?

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

For in-depth understanding of teachers' beliefs on the new policy, and implementation and/or contest of that policy and its consequences, I used a qualitative and ethnographic research design which entailed multiple data collection instruments (Silverman, 2010). For better understanding of teachers' beliefs, individual and group interviews were used. To uncover teachers and pupils' implementation and/or contest of the policy, and its consequences I used individual and group interviews as well as classroom observations. I carried out 12 interviews with 12 teachers and two group interviews with the same teachers. I observed twelve teachers for a total of 36 observations. Each of the 12 teachers was observed three times, so that in the second and/or third observations they would be natural as they were familiar with me. I used unstructured interviews with mostly open-ended questions for detailed understanding.

3.2 STUDY CONTEXT

This study was conducted in two government primary schools in Zanzibar. One school was in town (urban) and another one was on the outskirts of town (peri-urban). I chose the schools for my convenience of getting to the site, and also where there were teachers whom I knew, in that they were willing to take part in this study. Both schools had Grade 1 up to Grade 6, but the focal classes were Grade 5 and Grade 6, the grades where English is the language of learning and teaching for science subjects, mathematics and ICT.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

12 teachers who taught in Grades 5 and 6 from two primary schools were invited to take part in this study. I used purposive sampling to for all 12 teachers. I used purposive sampling first, to get teachers who were willing and interested to participate in my study (Gobo, 2008). Second, purposive sampling helped to get participants who had at least five years of working experience. I expected that teachers who had at least five years of working experience would be more relaxed and natural during observations as they had already experienced classroom observations during the period of their teaching.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

Observation field notes were read twice and others thrice and important emergent themes were highlighted and categorized by annotating at the margin of the field notes. To analyse individual and group interview data, I transcribed the interviews by summarizing the answers and identified the emergent themes. Spolsky's (2004, 2009) framework of language planning and Ruiz's (1984) orientations of language planning served as lenses in analysing and interpreting the data. These guided me to uncover the teachers' beliefs of language of instruction policy change, teachers' and learners' implementation and contest of the new language policy, and the consequences of that policy. For easy interpretation, I used Miles and Huberman's (1994) model to display the data.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This article reports the findings of this research by answering the two research questions mentioned above. Responses of research questions are discussed under the two headings; first, teachers' beliefs about new language policy and second, implementation and contest of the new policy.

4.1 TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT NEW LANGUAGE POLICY

This section will answer the first research question: What are teachers' beliefs of the replacement of Swahili medium of instruction policy by English medium of instruction in Grades 5 and 6 in primary schools of Zanzibar? Grades 5 and 6 teachers' beliefs regarding the new language of instruction policy were shared by the majority of them. Many teachers showed their beliefs that the new language of instruction policy is unworkable in the government primary schools. A number of reasons were expounded to confirm its unworkability.

First, many teachers admitted that they were not capable of teaching in English due to their poor proficiency in that language; as did their learners. They expressed their reservations that if they were required to strictly comply with that policy they would unintentionally cheat the pupils rather than teach them. Surprisingly teachers also believed that most primary schools in Zanzibar lacked teachers who could communicate in English even for everyday matters. Teachers' responses seemed to support the findings of the previous research for example (Babaci-Wilhite 2013, 2012; Brock-Utne, 2012). In the conversation during the group interviews, teachers claimed that they spent too much time planning their lessons because of lack of mastery of English rather than concentrating on the content of the subjects they were required to teach. Despite spending much time preparing their lessons, the teacher had the perception that they could not offer effective and authentic teaching.

In addition, teachers believed that they were not prepared for the change of that language policy. Thus, lack of thorough preparations of teachers for the implementation of the new policy aggravated teaching of those important subjects. Five teachers asserted that they had taught the same subjects in Swahili for more than 20 years. For them, teaching these subjects in English after only two weeks of preparation meant working under disastrous conditions. When asked what could be done so that they could adequately implement the policy, they showed their beliefs that they needed at least one year of intensive preparation. During the group interview one teacher stated:

When I joined the teacher training college for a certificate course, the programme took two years. We were equipped with methods and techniques of teaching different subjects and different topics in Swahili. Surprisingly, now we are given only a two week crash programme of teaching the subjects by using foreign languages. If we are serious the training should take at least one year.

The teacher's response above underscores the importance of thorough preparation for any implementation of the new policy to remotely succeed.

Another teacher expressed her beliefs that failure to prepare teachers and pupils for the new policy resulted in a violation of that policy in that both teachers and pupils used Swahili during lessons. While teachers admitted that they were not able to cope with the new policy, they further showed that their learners did not master even the foundation of English. This finding seems to support many studies conducted in Africa for example (Altinyelken, Moorscroft and van der Draai, 2014; Spernes, 2012). As such, no matter how high the level of proficiency the teacher could have, effective teaching and learning could not occur since learners seriously face the same problem. Using Spolsky's language policy framework as an interpretive tool, the stipulated English-only policy seemed to remain on paper due to the teachers' beliefs that the policy is inappropriate.

Furthermore, teachers showed their fundamental beliefs that using text books written in Swahili to teach in English made the new language education policy unworkable. This was a common belief as 10 out of 12 teachers I interviewed recurrently raised this concern. It was pointed out that translating textbooks from Swahili to English was a task on its own and, teaching was another task of its own. Moreover, the task of translation of books needed skills and competency which most of teachers did not have. As it has been discussed elsewhere in this article, teachers did not have adequate English for communication; unsurprisingly they could not translate text books from English to Swahili. On this basis, many teachers showed their reservations that if textbooks for primary schools were not issued immediately, textbooks which had been written in English for secondary schools would be used to teach primary school children for similar topics despite the difference in depth and breadth of the topics.

Along similar lines, teachers had beliefs that the new language education policy brought detrimental effects such as learners' underachievement. They also highlighted that policymakers had to accept responsibility of underachievement. It was recurrently brought up in the interviews that learners' underachievement because of the use of English was evidenced. In the group interviews many teachers highlighted this belief; one of them said:

Many of our learners bear the brunt of underachievement because the new education language policy doesn't consider their background. The new policy confuses children ... the teachers; for example, have to teach them [pupils] content at the same time the teachers have to help them with English. The previous policy is much better as children learnt in Swahili throughout primary school.

This supports the growing body of research that the use of second or foreign languages in the provision of education is the primary reason for learners' underachievement (Brock-Utne, 2012; Ipara and Mbori 2009; Save the Children, 2009; Alexander, 2007; Brock-Utne and Alidou, 2006).

Based on the teachers' beliefs presented and discussed above, an English-only policy that has been introduced in 2014 for primary schools in Zanzibar is not compatible for teachers and children and it was the children who mostly paid the price. In contrast, looking through the lenses of language policy framework advanced by Spolsky (ibid), teachers' language beliefs seemed to link Swahili with appropriate language of instruction in primary schools in Zanzibar.

4.2 IMPLEMENTATION AND CONTEST OF THE NEW LANGUAGE POLICY

This section responds to the second research question by showing language policy practices, that is, implementation and contest of that policy by teachers and pupils in the classrooms. It also uncovers consequences of the

implementation of that language education policy in Grades 5 and 6 in Zanzibar. A top-down English-only policy is inappropriate for all learners and most teachers. As a result there are several consequences that were observed in this research. The classroom was a battleground of language management and practices due to the beliefs of practitioners, that is, learners and teachers. Since both teachers and learners perceived they had the same beliefs that English-only policy could not be implemented, this espoused language as a problem orientation (Ruiz, 1984), and they opted for a bilingual option that included Swahili and English. In oral communication, code-switching was a common norm in the classroom for both teachers and learners. Added to this, teachers tended to translate almost every English word and sentence into Swahili during the lessons. This use of Swahili mainly espoused language as a resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984). In all classroom observations I carried out learners were interacting with teachers in a manner that they used Swahili that included one or two English words and the English words were mainly terminology for examples, *triangle*, *nutrition*, and *acceleration*.

Teachers selecting some topics from a syllabus and ignoring others was a common practice since the introduction of the new language-in-education policy. Many teachers claimed that for some topics, it was very difficult if not impossible for them to teach without frequent use of Swahili. According to the teachers the topics that needed higher-order cognitive skills were ignored. The main reason was that when head teachers and other education officials tended to monitor the implementation of the policy, teachers had no full freedom of the frequent use of Swahili in the classrooms, thus they omitted to teach some topics in order to avoid embarrassment. As such, they decided to skip the topics which were of an abstract nature. Thus one can claim that teachers experiencing difficulty in thorough explanation of some topics while they understood the subject matter and that this situated their teaching within the 'language as a problem' orientation (Ruiz, 1984).

Along similar lines some teachers asserted that if there were text books printed in English for those grade levels, at least they would alleviate that problem by teaching through reading the books. Surprisingly, teachers themselves admitted that teaching by closely reading a book would neither be effective nor authentic and consequently it would not help the learners for effective learning. Similar finding were reported by Hu, Li, and Lei (2014) in China that due to limited English proficiency during the lessons instructors were opening the textbooks and were reading what was written. This finding paints a more complex picture that although efforts would be made to get books published in English for Grades 5 and 6, effective teaching would not take place as teachers would closely read the books to pupils instead of spontaneous and authentic language use in interaction with pupils in the classroom.

In wrestling with the mismatched English-only policy, Grades 5 and 6 teachers highlighted superficial teaching as a prevalent practice among many teachers for those grade levels in primary schools of Zanzibar. This is the

consequence of implementing that policy discussed above. Teachers tended to teach superficially as they sometimes did not enjoy the freedom of using Swahili frequently in the classroom due to the pressure from the management. A similar problem was observed by Qorro (2003) and Rubanza (2000) that teachers in Tanzania were not able to use English for effective teaching. However, on the other side of the coin, the teachers contended that even if they could have adequate English proficiency for teaching, the problem would be for their pupils. Based on this finding I argue that an English-only policy introduced in 2014 for primary learners in Zanzibar denies learners' opportunities for learning and if it occurs it is ineffective learning which is brought about by superficial teaching.

The new policy has led learners to opt for a rote learning style as a last resort to cope with that policy. Teachers confirmed that their learners were overwhelmed by regurgitating information from the lessons. This is consistent with Save the Children's (2011) observation that learners memorized what they heard from their teachers and everything they read from the textbooks. Teachers showed their opinions that since learners could not explain anything in English; memorizing information was the last resort. Teachers admitted that regurgitating information was not a good learning style since it was time consuming, tiresome, and also did not facilitate genuine and deep learning. However, due to the new policy this strategy was inevitable. One of the science teachers stated:

In my subject learners memorise all definitions, meaning of concepts and characteristics or features of everything they learn. When I ask them direct questions about the topic I have taught them, they give answers in English as if they have understood. I understand that they have just memorised rather than understood. This style of teaching and learning is kind of cheating ourselves.

Teachers admitted students' regurgitating information from what they heard from teachers or read from books was not an advisable way of learning on the one hand; surprisingly they allowed their learners to opt for that learning style on the other hand. On this basis, I argue that replacement of Swahili medium of instruction by English from Grade 5 in primary schools of Zanzibar has turned the learning and teaching environment from complementary to contradictory.

The incompatibility of an English-only language policy compelled teachers to employ a teacher-centred approach in their teaching. Due to the communication barrier that consistently occurred when English only or little Swahili was used in the classroom, teachers were bound to dominate the class through all stages of lessons. In classroom observations I found prolonged teacher monologue, and multiple repetition as common features when teachers tried to use English. In addition, no pupil was willing to answer questions without being nominated, and teachers failed to probe pupils' understandings. Teachers' domination of the class as an impact of using an unfamiliar language as a language of learning and teaching was also experienced in Botswana and

Tanzania (Arthur, 2001), in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Meeuwis, 2013), in South Africa (Greenfield, 2010) and in Brunei (Saxena, 2009) to mention a few. Learners were assumed to remain as passive recipients of the knowledge from the teacher although the likelihood of receiving the knowledge was minimal because of the language barrier. However, teachers showed their understanding that learner-centred approach entails discovery learning through learners' interaction with teachers and among themselves, and this is highly recommended as it yields efficient learning. This research, however, demonstrates that an English-only policy was an impediment for these recommended teaching and learning approaches. During the group interview, one teacher stated:

It is really frustrating to ask learners any question in English apart from those questions which their answers have been memorised for example definitions of the terms. We [teachers] unfairly blame learners that they don't revise their lessons but absolutely they don't understand even if they regularly revise their lessons. They get nothing other than memorising a few parts of the lessons. During the lesson, I pose a number of questions but I end up answering them by myself because the learners don't understand what they are being asked and subsequently how to answer them in English.

Furthermore, this research demonstrates that the policy which denies Grade 5 pupils the use of Swahili, their mother tongue, when learning most of their subjects weakened pupils' literacy in both Swahili and English. Many teachers pointed out that Grade 5 pupils still needed to improve their language skills in Swahili. During the focus group discussions I learnt from the participants that pupils' reading skills were distorted by English since the introduction of an English-only policy. Teachers recurrently maintained that pupils needed to improve their Swahili reading skills by reading different texts of different subjects as a strong foundation in the mother tongue assists learning of a second or foreign language (Cummins, 2000, 2005). In this regard, teachers showed reservations about Grade 5 pupils in primary schools in Zanzibar having a strong foundation of their mother tongue to facilitate second or foreign language learning due to the intervention of the new language policy.

4. CONCLUSION

This article provides an ethnographic picture of the current situation of language of learning and teaching that is occurring in Grades 5 and 6 in primary schools in Zanzibar. What this study has demonstrated is that in terms of an English-only language-in-education policy, this policy is contested rather than implemented. Likewise, Cooper (1989) and Corson (1999) claim language policy in schools can be contested as well as implemented. The uneasiness with

this policy was largely influenced by teachers' beliefs about language of instruction. As Spolsky (2004, 2009) argues language beliefs or ideology motivate language practices, and many teachers showed their fundamental beliefs that an English-only language-in-education policy is an unworkable policy for both teachers and pupils in primary schools in Zanzibar. Several factors were highlighted as responsible for that policy being unfeasible. First, teachers perceived that they could not offer authentic teaching and as a consequence that policy undermined pupils' learning. This research also demonstrates that top-down policy did not consider that the promulgation of that policy could need intensive preparation for teachers, and pupils as well as learning and teaching materials. In any event, while teachers were aware that the use of English as a language of learning and teaching was problematic, they used Swahili, the mother tongue as a resource to resolve that problem (Ruiz, 1984).

Observations made in this study confirmed that classrooms in Grade 5 and 6 were a battleground between an English-only language policy and bilingual practices which included Swahili and English. The use of code switching and translation was a common accepted practice as teachers and pupils were not able to adhere to the stipulated policy. Despite violation of the stipulated policy, my findings reveal that an English-only language-in-education policy denied pupils' learning and this was evidenced as follows. First, some teachers tended to skip some topics in the syllabus due to their limited English proficiency and the nature of the topics. Topics which entailed abstract ideas were sometimes skipped. Another problem was that some topics were superficially taught for the same reason that teachers' English proficiency was inadequate for elaborating some issues in their lessons. Students' memorization of information from the lessons, and teachers' domination of the classrooms during the lesson was the common norm in the classroom. All these factors impacted and undermined pupils' learning and consequently pupils' achievement.

This research shows that teachers' beliefs about language of instruction were in contradiction with the stipulated policy. This was shaped by linguistic forces (Spolsky, 2004) that teachers and pupils did not master English adequately for use as a language of instruction. For many years Grade 5 and 6 in all primary schools in Zanzibar did not experience such problems as Swahili was the stipulated language of learning and teaching for all primary classes in Zanzibar. This implies that language planners did not consider Ruiz's (1984) orientations to language planning when they unilaterally introduced an English-only policy in Grades 5 and 6 in primary schools in Zanzibar. According to the teachers the use of English only for teaching and learning was a problem for teachers and pupils, while for both of them the use of Swahili was a resource. In addition, the use of Swahili, the mother tongue, in the classroom for both teachers and pupils was their right (Cummins, 2000; Ruiz, 1984). On this basis I argue that the replacement of Swahili medium of instruction by English from Grade 5 in

primary schools in Zanzibar in 2014 has put in place a system where learning and teaching has moved from complementary to contradictory.

Important recommendations that emerge from this study advocate for the restoration of the policy of using Swahili as a language of learning and teaching all through primary schools in Zanzibar. This will lead to all learners to have access to quality education, instead of only a privileged few as stated in Article 28, UN Convention on Rights of Children (United Nations, 1989). Teachers and pupils' cognizance of the use of Swahili as a resource in learning and teaching while the use of an unfamiliar language such as English is seen as problematic is a huge breakthrough that can help emancipation from the use of ex-colonial languages to the use of African languages. To intensify the changes from the view that African languages are incompatible in some domains like education, teacher training colleges and universities should address language as a right, language as a problem and language as a resource orientations (Ruiz, 1984) against the backdrop of the prevalent ideologies. This will consolidate teachers' beliefs that the use of mother tongue in education is a resource rather than a deficit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is funded by grants from the National Research Foundation (NRF) SARChI Chair in the Intellectualisation of African Languages, Multilingualism and Education, Rhodes University. The opinions expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, N. 2007.
Linguistic diversity in Africa in a global perspective. In: N. Alexander and B. Busch (eds.), *Literacy and Linguistic Diversity in a Global Perspective: An intercultural exchange with African countries*, pp. 13–22. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Altinyelken, H.K., Moorcroft, S. and van der Draai, H. 2014.
The dilemmas and complexities of implementing language-in-education policies: Perspectives from urban and rural contexts in Uganda. **International Journal of Educational Development** 36: 90–99.
- Arthur, J. 2001.
Perspectives on educational language policy and its implementation in African classrooms: A comparative study of Botswana and Tanzania. **Compare** 31(3): 347–362.

Babaci-Wilhite, Z. 2012.

A human rights-based approach to Zanzibar's language-in-education policy. **World Studies in Education** 13(2): 17–33.

2013 *Local Languages of Instruction as a Right in Education for Sustainable Development in Africa.* **Sustainability** 5: 1994–2017; DOI: 10.3390/su5051994.

Benson, C. 2005.

The importance of mother tongue-based schooling for educational quality. Commissioned study for EFA Global Monitoring Report.

2009 *Designing effective schooling in multilingual contexts: The strengths and limitation of bilingual models.* In: A. Mohanty, et al., (eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local*, pp. 40–83. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

2013 *Towards Adopting a Multilingual Habitus in Educational Development.* In: C. Benson and K. Kosonen (eds.), *Language Issues in Comparative Education*, pp. 283–299. Rotterdam: Sense.

Brock-Utne, B. 2012.

Language policy and science: Could some African countries learn from some Asian countries? **International Review of Education** 58(4): 481–503.

Brock-Utne, B and Mercer, C. 2014.

Languages of instruction and the question of education quality in Africa: a post-2015 challenge and the work of CASAS. **Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education** 44(4): 676–680; DOI: 10.1080/03057925.2014.911979

Brock-Utne, B. and Alidou, H. 2006.

Experience II – Active Students – Learning through a Language They Master. In: H. Alidou, et al. (eds), *Optimising Learning and Education in Africa – The Language Factor*, pp. 101–117. Working Document. ADEA, GTZ and UNESCO Institute for Education. ADEA Biennial Meeting, Libreville, Gabon, 27–31 March 2006.

Clegg, J. and Afitska, O. 2010.

Teaching and learning in two languages in African classrooms, EdQual research programme consortium on implementing education quality in low income countries.

2011 *Teaching and learning in two languages in African classrooms.* **Comparative Education** 47(1): pp. 61–77.

Cooper, R. 1989.

Language planning and social change. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Corson, D. 1999.

Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Cummins, J. 2000.
Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Clevedon [England] Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- 2005 *A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom.* **Modern Language Journal** 12(7): 585–592.
- Gobo, G. 2008.
Doing Ethnography. Los Angeles; London: SAGE.
- Greenfield, D. 2010.
When I hear Afrikaans in the classroom and never my language, I get rebellious’: linguistic apartheid in South African higher education. **Language and Education** 24(6): 517–534.
- Halai, A. and Rea-Dickins, P. 2013.
Learners’ Participation in Multilingual Classrooms in Tanzania: Case for a policy and practice dialectic. Paper presented at the UKFIET International Conference on Education and Development – Education and Development Post 2015: Reflecting, Reviewing, Re-visioning. Oxford, 10–12 September 2013.
- Heugh, K., and T. Skutnabb-Kangas 2010.
Multilingual Education Works. Hyderabad: Orient Black Swan.
- Hu, G., Li, L. and Lei. 2014.
English-medium instruction at a Chinese University: rhetoric and reality. **Language Policy** 13: 21–4.
- Ipara, I. and Mbori, B. 2009.
The role of Swahili in enhancing the potential of science and technology. **The Journal of Pan African Studies** 2(8): 139–150.
- Kagwesage, A.M. 2012.
Higher education students’ reflections on learning in times of academic language shift. **International Journal for the scholarship of teaching and learning** 6(2): 1–17.
- 2013 *Coping with Learning through a Foreign Language in Higher Education in Rwanda.* **Linköping Studies in Behavioural Science** 173. Linköping University.
- Lo Bianco, J. 2001.
Policy literacy. **Language and Education** 15(3): 212–227.
- Maalim, H.A. 2014.
Exploring the relationship between an English-only language-in-education policy and bilingual practices in secondary schools in Zanzibar. Grahamstown: Rhodes University (Unpublished thesis – PhD).
- Meeuwis, M. 2013.
Language in education and the media in the evaporating state of the DR Congo. In: P. Cuvelier et al. (eds), *Multilingualism for empowerment.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. 1994.
Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) 2006.
Education policy. Stone Town: Zanzibar.
- Ouane, A., and C. Glanz 2011.
Optimising Learning, Education and Publishing in Africa: The Language Factor. Hamburg and Tunis: UIL-UNESCO & ADEA.
- Plüddemann, P. 2015.
Unlocking the grid: language-in-education policy realisation in post-apartheid South Africa. **Language and Education** 29(3): 186–199.
- Qorro, M. A. 2003.
Unlocking language forts: Language of instruction in post-primary education in Africa with special reference to Tanzania. In: B. Brock-Utne et al., (eds.), *Language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA)*, pp. 187–196. Dar es Salaam: E & D Publishing Limited.
- 2009 English only versus Bilingual Education in Africa: with a Focus on Tanzania. In: B. Brock-Utne and K.K. Prah (eds.), *Multilingualism an African Advantage: a Paradigm Shift in African Language of Instruction Policies*, pp. 219–236. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASA).
- Rubanza, Y. 2000.
The Question of Medium of Instruction. In: Galabawa, J, Senkoro, F.E.M.K. and Lwaitama, A.F. (eds.), *The Quality of Education in Tanzania. Issues and Experiences*, pp. 121–134. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
- Ruíz, R. 1984.
Orientations to language planning. **Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE)** 8(2): 15–34.
- Save the Children. 2009.
Steps towards learning: A guide to overcoming language barriers in children's education. London: Save the Children. Available: http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/54_7939.html.
- 2011 *Closer to Home: How to Help Schools in Low-and Middle-income Countries Respond to Children's Language Needs*. CfBT Education Trust.
- Saxena, M. 2009.
Construction & deconstruction of linguistic otherness: Conflict & cooperative code-switching in (English/) bilingual classrooms. **English teaching: Practice and Critique** 8(2): 167–187.
- Shohamy, E. 2007.
Language tests as language policy tools. **Assessment in Education** 14(1): 117–130.

- Silverman, D. 2010.
Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Spernes, K. 2012.
I use my mother tongue at home and with friends—not in school! Multilingualism and identity in rural Kenya. **Language, Culture and Curriculum** 25(2): 189–203.
- Spolsky, B. 2004.
Language policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2009 *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudell, B. 2007.
Local community perspectives and language of education in sub-Saharan African communities. **International Journal of Educational Development** 27(5): 552–563.
- UNESCO. 2005.
EFA Global monitoring Report; Education for all: The quality imperative.
- 2010 *Why and how Africa should invest in African languages and multilingual education: An evidence and practice-based advocacy brief*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute of Lifelong Learning.
- 2014 *Education for All*. Global Monitoring Report 2013/4.
- United Nations. 1989.
Convention on the Rights of the Child, June. Available: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm> [Accessed 15/06/2015].
- 2013 *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development*. Final Report of the UN High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda May 30. New York: United Nations.
- Wolff, H.E. 2006.
Background and history – language politics and planning in Africa. In: ADEA. *Optimizing learning and education in Africa – the language factor: A stock-taking research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa*, pp. 26–56. Available: http://www.adeanet.org/adeaPortal/adea/downloadcenter/Ouga/B3_1_MTBLE_en.pdf [Accessed 19/11/2013].
- 2011 Background and history – language politics and planning in Africa. In: A. Ouane and C. Glanz (eds.), *Optimising Learning, Education and Publishing in Africa: The Language Factor*, pp. 49–102. Available: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002126/212602e.pdf> [Accessed 09/80/2014]
- World Bank. 2005.
In their own language: Education for All. In: *Education Notes*, June. Available: <http://www.worldbank.org/education/> [Accessed 17/05/2014].

About the author: *Haroun Ayoub Maalim*, PhD Rhodes University is currently a Postdoctoral Research Fellow under the NRF SARChI Chair in the Intellectualisation of African Languages, Multilingualism and Education in the School of Languages, Rhodes University, South Africa. He is a member of African Language Association of Southern Africa (ALASA). His research interests lie in language policy and planning, bi/multilingual education, and language learning and acquisition.