REFUGEE EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN ZAMBIA: POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION

BY

EARNEST TEPA KASUTA

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

[illegible]

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

LUSAKA
JULY, 1991

D E D I C A T I O N

To my mother and my late father,
in whom I found unconditional refuge.

All rights reserved. No part of this dissertation may be reproduced or stored in any form or by any means without prior permission in writing from the author or the University of Zambia.

I, Earnest Tepa Kasuta, declare that this dissertation:

(a) represents my own work;

(b) has not previously been submitted for a degree at this or any other University; and

(c) does not incorporate any published work or material from another dissertation.

Signed: .....

Date: .....

This dissertation of Earnest Tepa Kasuta is approved as fulfilling part of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Social Work of the University of Zambia.

Examiner's Signature Date

_____ _____

_____ _____

A B S T R A C T

Refugees are involuntary immigrants, people caught up in catastrophic socio-political upheavals, and have no choice except to relocate and live in stateless conditions. The main focus of the study was on how the policies that pertain to their education and training in a host country, Zambia, are translated into services of access to institutions of learning and scholarships by three agencies, namely; the LWF/ZCRS, the UNHCR - run Refugee Services of Zambia, and the OBF. Information was collected from 70 refugees sponsored by these agencies; 10 officials from the agencies and relevant government institutions using questionnaires and unstructured interviews; books and agency documents. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics and cross tabulations with the help of a computer.

The data show that international instruments to which Zambia has acceded conjoin the socio-political environment in Southern Africa in influencing Zambia's legislation and practices in allowing refugees access to institutions of learning. The agencies have not remained only givers of scholarships; also they play a significant role in finding school places for refugees. In some cases, however, they subject refugees to I.Q. tests in addition to the public examinations which they all sit for with everybody else.

The conditions for being offered a scholarship by the agencies do not vary significantly while the nature and level of provisions do. The later is due to different levels of flexibility set in the relations of the sources of fudning with the dispensing agencies. There is no reference to the refugee's financial position as condition for the granting of a scholarship.

It was found that a large number of the students are studying for the career they want. Others say that they could have studied for something other than what they are now if only they had a chance to choose, more information about training opportunities, or a sponsor for what they want. While the refugee students expressed sincere appreciation for what they believe only their sponsors can do, they are equally convinced that their sponsors can improve their lot sometimes without putting in more money.

The study recommends to the agencies that:

(a) They introduce supplementary scholarships;

(b) Granting of scholarships and assisting refugees to secure school places should be split into two separate services;

(c) They establish a career guidance and information system either singly or collectively.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

Several people, too numerous to mention, helped me to work on the different tasks this dissertation required. I owe special thanks to Professor Kwaku Osei-Hwedie who was my supervisor right from the genesis of the idea to write this dissertation to its fruition. He provided the ingenuity that helped me clarify my own views. I wish to thank, also, Professor Elizabeth Brooks and Dr. Nsolo Mijere who helped me to organise my ideas about this study before they left the University of Zambia.

Indeed I am very grateful to the University of Zambia for offering me a Staff Development Fellowship which contributed significantly to the whole of my graduate programme. Similarly, I would like to thank the Population Council-New York for offering me a consultancy job whose proceeds supplemented my scholarship.

It is said, "No man is an Island." I am glad to record my appreciation to the following good friends who were by my side academically and socially: Richard Mukonda, Musrat and Nusrat Husain, Chendaeka, Isaac Simate, Victor Mudaala, John Simwinga, Baxter Chipango and Evans Luneta. To my wife, Beauty, who bore the brunt of the moments of strain and weariness, I say thank you for understanding and accepting my student status. I wish to thank all the refugee friends and officials who agreed to be interviewed.

My heartfelt gratefulness is due to Ms. Anayawa Mukelabai of the UNZA Rural Development Studies Bureau for skillfully typing both the draft and the final copy of this dissertation in a very short space of time. I am deeply indebted to her.

Finally, while the good advise from many people helped me clarify and improve on this work, I claim exclusive responsibility for both the views of this dissertation and whatever deficiencies remain.

E.T.K.

A C R O N Y M S

AAC	All Africa Conference of Churches
AAI	African-American Institute
ANC	African National Congress (of South Africa)
CCSS	Coordinating Committee of Scholarship Sponsors
CCZ	Christian Council of Zambia
DTEVT	Department of Technical Education and Vocational Training
DVS	Danish Volunteer Service
FRELIMO	Front for the Liberation of Mozambique
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
GCE 'O'Level	General Certificate of Education Ordinary Level
ICVA	International Council of Voluntary Agencies
IRCOZ	International Refugee Council of Zambia
IUEF	International University Exchange Fund
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
LWF/ZCRS	Lutheran World Federation/Zambia Christian Refugee Service
MNR or RENAMO	Mozambique National Resistance
MPLA	Movemento Popular de Libertacao de Angola
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
OAU	Organisation of African Unity
OBF	Otto Benecke Foundation

SADCC	Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference
SWAPO	South West African People's Organisation
UN	United Nations (Organisation)
UNETPSA	United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africans
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIC	United Nations Information Centre
UNITA	Uniao National Para a Independencia Total de Angola
UNZA	University of Zambia
WCC	World Council of Churches
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Unity
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union
ZIMCO	Zambia Industrial and Mining Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
TITLE OF DISSERTATION		
DEDICATION		i
COPYWRIGHT		ii
DECLARATION		iii
APPROVAL		iv
ABSTRACT		v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		vii
ACRONYMS		ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS		xi
LIST OF TABLES		xv
CHAPTER ONE:	BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH DESIGN	1
1.1.0	Introduction	1
1.1.1	Statement of the Problem	3
1.1.2	Rationale	4
1.1.3	Objectives of the Study	5
1.1.4	Literature Review	6
1.2.1	Analytical Framework	11
1.2.2	Hypotheses	13
1.2.3	Definition of Concepts	14
1.2.4	Procedures	15
1.2.5	Nature and Source of Data, and Instruments	16
1.2.6	Sampling	17
1.2.7	Data Analysis	19

CHAPTER TWO: REFUGEE EMERGENCE AND ASSISTANCE TOWARDS SELF-RELIANCE IN ZAMBIA 20

2.1 Introduction 20

2.2 Refugee Problem in Africa 20

2.3 Refugee Situation in Zambia 24

2.4 Refugee Integration in Zambia 26

2.5 Socio-economic Characteristics of Interviewd Refugees 29

CHAPTER THREE: THE POLICY ENVIRONMENT OF REFUGEE EDUCATION AND TRAINING 33

3.1.0 Introduction 33

3.2.1 UN and OAU Legislations 33

3.2.2 Political Relations between refugees' Country of Origin and Host Country 35

3.2.3 Perspectives in Refugee Humanitarianism 37

3.2.4 Aid Donor Policies 38

3.2.5 Zambia's Local Legislation and Situation ... 38

3.3.0 Agency Policies 41

3.3.1 UNHCR Refugee Service of Zambia 41

3.3.2 LWF/ZCRS 42

3.3.3 OBF 43

CHAPTER FOUR: THE DETERMINANTS OF REFUGEES' ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING AND SPONSORSHIP 46

4.1.0 Introduction 46

4.2.0 Access to Institutions of Learning 46

4.2.1 Government Enrolment Policy 46

47

4.2.2 Entry to Secondary Schools 47

4.2.3 Entry to Post-Secondary Institutions 51

4.3.0 Access to Sponsorship 54

4.3.1 Agencies' Policies 54

4.3.2 Knowledge and Information 56

4.3.3 Sponsorship Package 58

4.4.1 Implications 61

4.4.2 Conclusion 63

CHAPTER FIVE: THE ELEMENTS OF THE SPONSORSHIP PACKAGES .. 64

5.1 Introduction 64

5.2 Types and Forms of Provisions 65

5.3 Variations in the Provisions Offered by the Agencies 68

5.4 Reasons for the Variations 71

5.5 Implications 72

CHAPTER SIX: THE SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE AND FUNDING 74

6.1.0 Introduction 74

6.2.0 Agencies' Delivery Systems 75

6.2.1 LWF/ZCRS 75

6.2.2 OBF 77

6.2.3 UNHCR 78

6.3.0 Co-ordination 80

6.4.0 Funding and Budgeting 81

6.4.1 LWF/ZCRS 82

6.4.2 OBF 82

6.4.3 UNHCR 83

6.5.0 Implication and Conclusion 84

CHAPTER SEVEN: REFUGEE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME AND SPONSORSHIP SERVICES 87

7.1 Introduction 87

7.2 Views about Study Programmes 87

7.3 Views about Sponsorship Services 89

7.4 Implications 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY 97

1ANNEXES

i PUPILS AND STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE 101

ii AGENCY STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE 109

iii UNHCR STUDENT SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT 117

iv STATISTICS OF UNHCR-SPONSORED SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS 120

v STATISTICS OF UNHCR-SPONSORED PUPILS AND STUDENTS 121

vi STATISTICS OF LWF/ZCRS SPONSORED PUPILS AND STUDENTS 122

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Benefit Allocation Framework	133
2.	Number of Refugees in SADCC Countries	22
3.	Number of Refugees in Africa (1976)	23
4.	Nationality by Parents Residence	29
5.	Where Students and Pupils live within Zambia	30
6.	Where the refugees started School and Current level of Education	31
7.	Country of Previous Learning Institution	32
8.	Agency by Number of Interviewed Students.....	32
9.	How the refugees secured a place at Institution of Learning	49
10.	Method of Assisting Students to Obtain School Place .	53
11	Source of Information about Scholarship	58
12	Did you have another Sponsor before?	59
13	Reasons for wanting to change Sponsors	60
14	Reasons for not wanting to change Sponsors	61
15	Sources of Information about Training	67
16	Reasons for being on the course	68
17	Other Qualifications held by Students	88
18	Students' view of the sufficience of Scholarship.....	90
19	Source of extra-funding	90
20	Reasons for Wanting to Change Sponsor per category of study	91
21	Sponsor's Cooperation with Institution of Learning ..	92
22	Students' View of the sufficience of Sponsors' efforts	93
23	Services which students think should be improved on ..	94

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1.0 INTRODUCTION

After the Second World War many governmental, inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations, among them the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), were formed. Most of these organisations had, as their main objectives, peace and a more just economic order within and between nations. The international community that emerged from these groupings was based on a "series of moral imperatives calling for peace, economic development, political sovereignty and universal respect for human rights" (IUEF 1972) which includes the welfare of refugees. The first function of the UNHCR is the provision of international protection to refugees. In time and priority, this is a pre-requisite of any of the solutions to be offered to the refugees. The second function is to seek permanent solutions to the refugee problem.

The UN Convention of July 28, 1951 and the UN Protocol of October 4, 1967 define a 'refugee' as a "person who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual

residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it" (UNCHR 1979:11-23). The OAU Convention of 1969 also considers as a 'refugee' a person who, "owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence and seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality" (OAU 1975:11). In this study the term 'refugee' shall refer to a person, who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted, external aggression, occupation, or events seriously distrubing public order in his or her country of nationality is outside of that country and has been given refugee status by the Zambian Government.

The majority of current refugees come from Third World countries. They seek and find asylum in neighbouring poor countries that have little economic opportunities, resources and facilities for their own nationals, let alone for the refugees. Southern Africa has more than its share of the world's refugees. In the world as a whole one person in every three hundred and fifty is a refugee." ... in the SADCC region, one in 50 is a refugee and one in 20 is either a refugee or "displaced" (Southern African Economist 1988:5). The number of refugees in Zambia has continued to swell. There are currently more than 146,000 counted refugees (Southern African Economist 1988:12). Undoubtedly, there are many uncounted, spontaneously settled

refugees. Most refugees in Zambia reside in rural agricultural settlements at Ukwimi, Maheba and Mayukwayukwa in Eastern, North-Western and Western provinces respectively. A significant number also reside in urban areas especially in Lusaka city.

On arrival refugees immediately need food, clothes, shelter and medical care as well as international protection. Soon after settling their needs broaden to include the search for employment and education. At this stage the major task of the UNHCR, host governments and other refugee-service agencies is the search for permanent solutions. Permanent solutions entail the economic and social integration of refugees in the country that has offered them assylum or voluntary repatriation (UNHCR 1987:4; UNIC 1988:53). Education and training are part of, and facilitate, the achievement of the economic and social integration objectives.

1.1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Education is a means to self-reliance. Like any other group, refugees need education, training and, sometimes, retraining to achieve economic self-reliance and social integration into their new environment. In Zambia refugees basically can go to school at all levels available. There are also a number of agencies, including the UNHCR, that sponsor refugee pupils and students. However, due to limited places in institutions of learning, limited resources and other reasons not all refugees who are potentially eligible find a place in an institution of learning and sponsorship. The basic questions one

is prompted to ask are: Which refugee shall be educated or trained? How? For what? At whose expense? At what cost?

The main task of this study was to find out the eligibility criteria for determining which refugee recieves educational services and the nature and types of services offered by the UNHCR, Lutheran World Federation - Zambia Christian Refugee Services (LWF/ZCRS) and Otto Benecke Foundation (OBF). The study also explored the structure of service delivery and the methods of financing the services.

1.1.2 RATIONALE

Education and training are very crucial to mankind irrespective of the nationality or status of the individual or group in question. The policies that systematise the provision of education and related services and how they are implemented determine the level of achievement of the intended objectives. They should be studied, understood and continually improved upon. This study is one with such intention about refugee education and training.

The UN Convention of 1951, Article 22 'Public Education' - states that "The Contracting States shall accord to refugees the same treatment as it accords to nationals with respect to elementary education" but at higher levels refugees will be entitled to treatment "... as favourable as possible, and in any event, not less favourable than that accorded to aliens generally in the same circumstances... as regards access to studies..." (UNHCR 1979:66). Implied in this UN policy

statement, which sets the basis for most policies on refugee education, is a legitimisation of inequality of access to education and training services between refugees and citizens of host countries. This inequality of access to post-secondary education necessitates a judicious allocation of the places in institutions of learning and an optimal dispensetion of resources available to refugees. This will enable both the international community and the refugees to make the most out of the least.

Whereas a Zambian generally has many alternatives and usually a family to turn to if he/she fails to complete school, or cannot find wage employment, a refugee in most cases is circumstantially deprived of such a 'privilege.' Hence a refugee's education is sometimes a matter of life and death. Against this background, and in view of the scarcity of information on refugee education in Zambia, this study was intended to provide some information that may be of use to the concerned agencies, students of social policy and social administration and other interested groups.

1.1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to identify and analyse refugee - service agencies' policies and administration of secondary education and training by:

1. identifying and exploring the social context from which the policies emanate;
2. identifying the factors that influence refugees' access to institutions of learning and sponsorship;

3. exploring the sponsorship service packages offered by the agencies and the role they play in placing refugees in institutions of learning;
4. identifying and analysing the structure of the sponsorship service delivery system;
5. assessing the refugee students' view of the programmes they are following and the sponsorship services they receive.

1.1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

Zwingman and Amande (1973:13) argue that a responsible policy for refugees, in addition to providing food and shelter, takes measures to avoid additional problems "by retraining if desired and a generous settlement policy based on positive attitudes towards the refugees. Assistance in securing reasonably acceptable work for refugees is inevitable." Education is an inalienable right of every child, the refugee child inclusive.

In Zambia refugees go to school at all levels and follow the same curriculum with Zambians except for those refugees attending special institutions meant specifically for them (like the United Nations Institute for Namibia) which are also not run by the relevant Zambian departments. In a bid to create more places for refugees a number of institutions have been built starting as early as 1966 when Nkumbi International College was built with funds from the U.S. government to offer secondary and technical education, besides the primary schools in the settlements. Oxfam

and the Danish government also helped to build the Mkushi Agricultural Centre by 1968 (Holborn 1975:1298). In addition to the 40 per cent of the places at Nkumbi which were to be reserved for refugees, the International University Exchange Fund funded the construction of a hostel at Evelyn Hone College in return for sixty-two places to be provided to refugees at different colleges in the country (IUEF 1972:32). The later agreement was done away with in 1980 (but nobody of those interviewed in the refugee service agencies knows about that agreement except one and they all did not know exactly what arrangement took the place of that agreement except that at the moment they have other channels of getting refugees into institutions of learning). In 1986 the UNHCR and CCZ jointly formed the Refugee Counselling Centre whose objectives included the administration of a sponsorship programme to refugees and advising and assisting refugees, "where applicable, in obtaining scholarship from other refugee sponsoring agencies..." (UNHCR 1987:8).

Despite the involvement of many agencies such as UNHCR, World University Service, OBF, LWF, CCZ, Save the Children Federation - USA, African-American Institute, Danish Volunteer Services, Association of Assistance to Refugees and government ministries in refugee education, not much research has been done on the same. Most of the research conducted in Zambia on refugees socio-economic life (Hansen 1977, Lifanu and Mahdi 1983) make no special mention of education. Other studies on refugee issues in Zambia include those by Brooks (1982), Manase (1987)

and Kasuta (1987).

The study by Professor Elizabeth Brooks revealed crucial issues about the UNHCR-funded scholarship programme in Zambia. The study found that the programme was very poorly monitored: No information was available on the level of education being sought by half of the students. It also revealed that no attempt was made to establish a link between education and employment (Brooks 1982:11,18). This calls into question not only the programme objectives but also the efficiency, accountability and value of the education and training that was being supported by the UNHCR. Elsewhere, as expected, there is a positive link between the education of refugees and their employment chances (Christensen and Scott 1988:27).

Implied in the objectives and strategy of the UNHCR/CCZ refugee scholarship programme is a service delivery structure that should facilitate also referals and coordination among the agencies and some basis for determining the suitability of an applicant for scholarship. Along the same lines the International Council of Voluntary Agencies Consultation recommended that "specific consultations should be held at national and regional levels on the question of counselling with a view to enhancing cooperation and coordination between NGOs... on issues such as information sharing... programme development and implementation" (ICVA 1987:17).

The All Africa Council of Churches (AACC) Refugee Projects Committee had "expressed concern about the apparent lack of

criteria for the awarding of scholarships, about the selection and monitoring processes used, and about the appropriateness of the studies in terms of further self-reliance" (AACC 1983:114). This raises questions about the 'basis of social allocation' in and the administration of refugee assistance projects in general and education in particular.

Meanwhile the UNHCR headquarters in Geneva set the following seven-point scholarship selection criteria which states that:

The applicant must:

1. have secured a place in an institution of learning.
2. be in financial need. Only those refugees whose families or relatives cannot pay for their education will receive a scholarship. If the family can afford to cover some of the expenditure, UNHCR may agree to pay the remaining items. If you already have received a scholarship from another organisation, you are, of course, not entitled to UNHCR educational assistance.
3. be in need of further education or training. If you are already employed or have useful skills or adequate qualification to be able to find a job, you cannot be sponsored for further studies.
4. have a good educational record. Applicants are expected to provide their previous school certificates and examination results as proof that they are well qualified to undertake the course they have chosen.
5. be of the right age to follow the course they have

chosen. Age limits are not as strict with vocational or technical training as with general education.

6. have been admitted to a suitable educational institution. Not every educational institution to which a refugee finds admission is regarded as "suitable." Applicants must be admitted to a school which is recognised by the government and agreed to by UNHCR. It should have a good educational standard and offer a programme which is relevant for future employment or educational prospects. School fees should be reasonable.

7. have a plan of study that is realistic in terms of orientation and later employment prospects. Candidates who apply for vocational or technical training oriented towards specific jobs or occupations have better chances of receiving a scholarship than those wishing to pursue general or academic education (UNHCR undated:3-5).

1.2.1 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Many authors and scholars(e.g.Ponsioen1962; Titmus1969; Freeman and Sheerwood 1970; Khan 1969; Rein 1970; and Gilbert and Specht 1974) have defined the concept 'policy' differently. In this study we are concerned with the category of policies usually referred to as social policies. David Gill defined social policies as "policies which deliberately pertain to the quality of life and the circumstances of living in a society, and the intra-societal relationships among individuals, groups and the society as a whole" (Gill 1976:12, 13).

Social welfare policies are always directed at the welfare of the target group by providing them with services or income through programmes such as social insurance, public assistance, health and housing. Marshall (1955:7) includes in his description of social welfare policies programmes that deal with education and delinquency prevention. The examination of alternatives and the selection of a strategy for effecting the chosen course of action to realise policy objectives usually involves making choices among competing social values (see table 1).

The analytical framework used in this study is Neil Gilbert and Harry Specht's 'Benefit-Allocation Framework.' In the perspective of this framework social welfare policies are seen to be "choices among principles or guidelines to determine what benefits are to be offered to whom, how these benefits are to be delivered, and how they are to be financed." Gilbert and Spencht

1974:29. The following four questions express the major dimensions of choice in the framework: 1. What are the basis of social allocation? 2. What are the types of provisions to be allocated? 3. What are the strategies for the delivery of these provisions? 4. What are the methods of financing these provisions? (Gilbert and Specht 1974:29).

TABLE 1: BENEFIT-ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK

DIMENSIONS OF CHOICE	COMPETING SOCIAL VALUES
1. BASIS OF SOCIAL ALLOCATION: Eligibility criteria for determining who gets the provision. Selectivism or universalism.	Cost effectiveness versus social effectiveness
2. NATURE OF SOCIAL PROVISIONS: In-cash or in-kind(goods and services) and levels of assistance.	Freedom of choice versus social control
3. SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE: Organisational arrangements among agencies and with consumers - refugee pupils and students	Local autonomy versus centralisation. Single Service versus combined services. Coordination or never communicate.
4. METHODS OF FINANCING: Source of money and other resources and the conditions attached to them up to service delivery agency level.	Flexibility at dispensing agency level versus clear rules of dispensing from source of funding.

The above framework sets limits to and direction of assessment. It formed the basis of the major research questions (see annexes 1 and 2) and hypotheses.

1.2.2 HYPOTHESES

The study had the following (three) hypotheses:

(a) Granting of scholarships by the agencies is dependent on the refugee student having secured a place at an institution of learning and not on the student's financial position.

(b) Absence of formal channels of communication among the agencies is associated with overlaps, gaps and

contradictions in service provision.

(c) The UNHCR educational services agency is less flexible than the other two agencies.

1.2.3 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

(a) The term 'refugee' has already been defined.

(b) Education shall refer to a formal course of instruction undertaken at a government-approved institution towards the attainment of a Junior Secondary School Certificate, School Certificate or General Certificate of Education.

(c) Training shall refer to a formal course of instruction undertaken at a government-approved institution towards a qualification for an occupation, career or profession, where such a course is recognised by the appropriate regulating board in Zambia.

(d) Administration shall refer to the process of procurement, dispensation of services and the structure of relationships between the refugee sponsoring agencies, other service organisations and refugee students.

(e) Financial position shall refer to the refugee student (and his or her family)'s ability or inability to pay, partly or wholly, his or her school financial obligations.

(f) Formal channel of communication shall refer to a board or committee of persons from the refugee sponsoring

agencies that deliberate on programme strategies to provide inter-agency linkages in service provision.

(g) Flexibility shall refer to an agency's ability to plan and change part or all of a programme including redirection of funds.

(h) Gap shall refer to the provision of only tuition and boarding fees for a refugee student without any formal arrangement with the student's family or another agency who may be anticipated to pay for the other costs of the student.

(i) Overlap shall refer to the provision of financial assistance/scholarship to a refugee student by more than one agency without any formal arrangement between them to co-sponsor the student.

(j) Contradiction shall refer to the support of an education/training programme that another agency has rejected on basis other than formal allocation of programmes (to be supported) by formal channel of communication.

1.2.4 PROCEDURES

The activities that followed the approval of the research proposal by the University Senate's Higher Degrees Committee included raising money for the fieldwork. The services of a research assistant, an undergraduate refugee student, who carried out the interviews in Meheba were engaged and this also involved training him. Permission to enter the refugees 'territory' was

obtained from the Commissioner of Refugees, Ministry of Home Affairs; the UNHCR Branch Office in Lusaka; and the heads of the LWF/ZCRS, OBF, the UNHCR - Refugee Services of Zambia, and the institutions where refugee students were interviewed. This was followed by fieldwork, data analysis and writing up of this report.

1.2.5 NATURE AND SOURCE OF DATA, AND INSTRUMENTS

The refugee student population is very scattered all over the country and hardly anything is written about their sponsorship services. What exists is in form of annual reports and lists of students on assistance. Hence the survey research method was used. The study was descriptive as well as analytical.

Primary data was obtained using questionnaires administered to refugee students and sponsoring agencies' staff (see annexes 1 and 2). Officials from other agencies were interviewed using unstructured interviews. Other data was obtained from UNHCR records, University of Zambia library and other documents. Detailed interviews besides the questionnaire schedules were held with some of the senior secondary school pupils and college and university students. All students were also encouraged to write any additional information or put down their comments on additional sheets of paper that were attached to the questionnaires.

It must be noted here that the hypotheses cannot be tested statistically because a large portion of the data is qualitative.

1.2.6 SAMPLING

Student respondents were chosen from a population of over 400 sponsored by the LWF/ZCRS, OBF and UNHCR education programmes. A total of seventy (70) students were interviewed. These comprised 17 LWF/Zents and 37 UNHCR - sponsored students. Forty of these students are in secondary schools while the remaining thirty are in post-secondary (training) institutions. The samples obtained were disproportionate because:

1. the students are so scattered all over the country that in some cases only one student is studying at a far away institution,
2. the students sponsored by the three agencies are disproportionately distributed among categories of study (OBF, for one, sponsors only those in training institutions below University level), and
3. time and financial resources could not allow visiting far away places with smaller number of students.

The student respondents were drawn from eleven (11) institutions of learning - Nkumbi International College, Lusaka Trades, Nkrumah Secondary Teacher's College, Chainama College of Health Services, Natural Resources Development College, Kabwe Trades, Evelyn Hone College, University of Zambia, Kaoma Secondary School, Meheba Junior Secondary School and Mwinilunga Secondary School. They were interviewed at five catchment areas - Nkumbi, Kabwe, Meheba, Lusaka and Kaoma. Apart from those who were met while they were on vacation in Lusaka and the settlement

camps, the rest were met at their respective colleges and schools in the catchment areas.

The three agencies (LWF/ZCRS, OBF and UNHCR) were chosen because:

1. they each sponsor a larger number of refugee students than other agencies such as World University Service and Association to Aid Refugees,
2. they have other institutional involvement in refugee education and training besides only sponsorship as other agencies do, and
3. the difference in the nature of the origins of the three organisations (LWF/ZCRS is a church organisation; OBF is a government aid agency; UNCHR is an inter-governmental world organisation) suggest a possibility of the existence of different socio-political environment. This provided a basis for expecting comparable variations.

A total of ten officials were interviewed. Six of these are directly involved in refugee sponsorship services in the agencies; three were from the institutions of learning and one from the Ministry of Higher Education Science and Technology headquarters. I did not interview the number of officials (15) that I suggested in the research proposal because that number was too large for the three agencies; and the information that was needed did not require a sample that is larger than ten. The information was about institutional policies and administrative

procedures which do not vary according to characteristics of the sample.

1.2.7 DATA ANALYSIS

The data in this study were analysed mainly by using descriptive statistics, frequencies and cross-tabulations. The computer was used to process the data.

CHAPTER TWO

REFUGEE EMERGENCE AND ASSISTANCE TOWARDS SELF-RELIANCE IN ZAMBIA

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The current events in the Third world make it less doubtful that the refugee problem will continue to drag on in the future. Natural catastrophes such as drought and floods conjoin the socio-political upheavals in causing continued threat to lives. Permanent solutions also are not easy to come-by. For the asylum seekers, leaving home is untimed and, to those in peace (the hosts), the arrival of refugees is unpredictable.

This chapter examines some of the main causes and characteristics of refugees in Southern Africa and the general welfare issues in Zambia. This will set the stage for the discussion on the policy environment. The general socio-economic characteristics of the interviewed refugees will also be discussed in this chapter.

2.2 REFUGEES' PROBLEM IN AFRICA

Africa's refugee population has continued to grow at a dramatic rate despite the ceasation of nearly all of the anti-colonial wars against European powers which sparked the political turmoil that caused most refugees in modern times. In 1964 there were an estimated 400,000 refugees in Africa; by 1967 the total had risen to nearly one million and by May 1979 to around four million (Erikson, Melander and Nobel 1981:9).

The causes of the world refugee problem are many. However, history shows that the most important is political or religious intolerance. If those in power in a given political unit such as a nation are not prepared to respect the views of minorities, to listen to their grievances and discuss how they can be resolved, then the minorities will want to leave their country given the chance. That, in essence, is how the United States was founded, and why the Palestinians are stateless today. In Ethiopia drought has worked misery amid socio-political strife to cause more refugees. After a few months of intense fighting between government and rebel troops, Liberia 'sent off' ten per cent of her population to neighbouring countries as refugees (Times of Zambia, September 11, 1990:6).

Southern Africa is currently one of the world's major areas of turmoil as measured by the numbers of refugees. By February 1989 one person in every fifty of the citizens of the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) states was a refugee. This was against the world ratio of one to about three hundred and fifty. The SADCC region, whose population is one eightieth of the world's ought to have 187,500 of the world's 15 million refugees on pro rata basis. Instead it has over 1.2 million (Southern African Economist 1989:5) as shown in table 2. There are several reasons for such staggering numbers of refugees. In Zimbabwe there was a bloody anti-colonial war between blacks and white settlers that was followed by elections where the former emerged victors. Some of the refugees generated

by the liberation war did not return home after independence and after the reconciliation between the two major contesting parties of ZANU and ZAPU.

TABLE 2: NUMBER OF REFUGEES IN SADCC COUNTRIES (FEBRUARY 1989)

COUNTRY	NUMBER
Angola	96,000
Botswana	3,500
Lesotho	300
Malawi	600,000
Mozambique	400
Swaziland	11,000
Tanzania	66,000
Zambia	146,000
Zimbabwe	166,000
TOTAL	1,289,200

Source: UNHCR/Southern African Economist Vol. 2 No.1 1989

In Angola and Mozambique no proper hand-over was made by the colonial power-Portugal. When the bloody, anti-colonial wars intensified, the Portuguese regime there simply collapsed and quit. The major and stronger liberation movements of Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola (MPLA) and Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) took over the control of state apparatus apparently without satisfactory consultation with the other groups. The result was, and still is, a mess, the worst aspect of which is that the parties that took over the governments in the two countries continue to face armed challenges from the Uniao Nacional Para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA) and Mozambican National Resistance (RENAMO or

MNR), respectively. In consequence Angola and Mozambique are the current major spinners of refugees in Southern Africa. Zaire's dictatorship and South Africa's apartheid regimes are no minor contributors to the refugee problem. Malawi, the major host to Mozambican refugees, also produces refugees, mainly elites (and their families), whose ideologies appear contrary to the rulers.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the African refugee population is that they are mainly rural, and women and children are in the majority. One estimate for 1976 reported that only four per cent of recognised refugees were urban (Hansen and Oliver Smith 1982:15) (See table 3).

TABLE 3: NUMBER OF REFUGEES IN AFRICA (1976)[1]

CATEGORY	RECEIVING ASSISTANCE	NOT RECEIVING ASSISTANCE	TOTAL	PER-CENTAGE
Urban refugees	4,000	10,000	14,000	1
Rural refugees in organised settlements and camps	170,000	110,000[2]	280,000	24
Self-settled rural refugees, not in organ-ised settle-ments or camps	520,000[3]	350,000	870,000	75
TOTAL	694,000	470,000	1,164,000	100

Source: Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1982:16

1. Excluding Guinean refugees in West Africa at that time
2. Formerly assisted
3. Of these some 480,000 were Angolans from Zaire, some of whom were receiving some marginal assistance. The total volume of assistance to this category was small compared with the volume to others.

The reasons for this feature are obvious: African national populations are predominantly rural. This characteristic is accentuated in most refugee populations because of the rural location of African wars. Also "rural population in general are older than national averages and have a higher per cent of women, as people in their prime working years, especially men, are often away working in the city." "The features," argues Hansen, "are sometimes exaggerated in refugee population by the siphoning off of younger men as guerrillas (Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1982:15-16)

2.3 REFUGEE SITUATION IN ZAMBIA

"While the drought-generated refugees hold hopes of returning to their countries, once the weather conditions become more favourable," argues Kabera, "some of the politically-generated refugees still live in a dilemma" (Kabera 1988:1). Nearly all the refugees in Zambia are a result of the political turmoil in neighbouring countries, including Uganda in East Africa. Hence, many of the refugees are likely to stay on for an indefinite period of time.

Without exhausting all possible classifications of refugee causes, refugees in Zambia can be grouped into the following categories (taking note that some individual refugees might have been caused to flee by multiple reasons):

1. Refugees from Independent African countries fleeing as a result of conflicts which are a consequence of colonialism.

2. Refugees from independent African countries fleeing as a result of their ideologies being variant with the ideologies of those controlling the state apparatus.
3. Members of minority populations who have been forced to leave their countries by conflicts between groups of different ethnic, racial, cultural and tribal origins within a nation-state.
4. People who fled their countries due to civil wars and other internal disorders that erupted when a rebel movement began fighting for self-determination within a nation-state.
5. People who ran away from wars of liberation from Western colonial imperialism and could not return to their countries at independence because of one or more of the above reasons (Erikson 1981:9).

There were nearly 146,000 refugees in Zambia at the time of the study according to UNHCR estimates. The major groups are from Angola (94,000), Mozambique (30,000), Zaire (9,000), South Africa (3,500) and the others include Namibians, Malawians, Zimbabweans, Ugandans, etc. Most of these refugees live in the rural agricultural settlements in Solwezi (Meheba), Petauke (Ukwimi) and Kaoma (Mayukwayukwa) in North-Western, Eastern and Western provinces, respectively. An unknown but indeed also large number of refugees have settled themselves among the Zambian communities in boarder areas (Hansen 1977; Lifanu and Mahdi 1983; Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1983).

2.4 REFUGEE INTEGRATION IN ZAMBIA

From the outset refugee service administration in Zambia has been an organised one. In 1964 the International Refugee Council of Zambia (IRCOZ) was formed. Its members included the Christian Council of Zambia (CCZ), the (Roman Catholic) Episcopal Council of Zambia, etc. The aim of IRCOZ was to facilitate an organised involvement of voluntary agencies in refugee service. The services IRCOZ offered included education/training, establishment of settlement (Holborn 1975:1295-1297) and emergency aid.

The UNHCR directly joined refugee administration in Zambia in 1966. In addition to acceding to the Un Convention of 1951, the 1967 Un Protocol and the OAU Convention of 1969, Zambia has local legislation to govern the status of refugees in the country: the Refugee (Control) Act of 1970. Generally, this was intended to regulate the entry, reception and empower the Zambian government to deal with the problems of maintaining law and order anticipated from large influxes of refugees.

One of the permanent solutions to the refugee problem that is being offered in Zambia is that of local integration. This is being done by putting refugees in rural agricultural settlements. Other refugees, as stated earlier in the discussion, are self-settled among Zambian villagers. The later group is outside the legal or formally recognised arrangements and almost all refugees who are so settled are not registered refugees and, hence, they have no identity cards to guarantee their status.

There are a number of factors that can make local integration (like the settlements Zambia offer) a viable solution for many refugees. Kabera mentions four:

> "Firstly, the individual refugees must show the desire to be naturalised. Secondly, the communities in which the refugees live must be accommodating and be willing to accept the refugees' continual residence. Thirdly, there must be a political will by the host country to accept the refugees to naturalise. Lastly, the country of origin should not contest the course of action being taken" (Kabera 1988:1).

Refugees in Zambia are left to live freely among the border villages. Usually they settle among people with whom they share the same language, tribal and other cultural elements including some blood and marriage ties (Hansen 1977; Lifanu and Mahdi 1983). But this is only as long as there are no major complaints from the villagers. In 1968 a settlement at Lwatembo was closed due to antagonism between the local people and the Provincial Agricultural Office that allocated the land. Hence Lwatembo Settlement had to be replaced with Meheba Settlement. Also, Mozambican refugees (and Zambians) had to be forcefully moved away from the border villages in Eastern Province to the inland settlement at Ukwimi because of the security risks caused by the so-called RENAMO bandits.

Despite these good policy gestures by the Zambian Government (in conjunction with the UNHCR and other refugee service agencies) there has been no attempt made to naturalise the

refugees by way of inviting those who want to become Zambians to apply for citizenship. Regardless of the length of their stay in the country, their socio-economic integration and probably non-intention to repatriate or resettle, refugees are officially seen as 'birds of passage' in Zambia. On a number of occasions, too, countries of origin have recalled their citizens who have sought refuge in Zambia. Zimbabwe did it at independence in 1980 and the latest was the repatriation of Namibians for voting. There is no evidence to show that some of the repatriated refugees never went back or became 'internal refugees' in their home countries.

The self-settled refugees and those in the agricultural settlements are expected to live the way their rural Zambian counterparts do. For the urban refugees, emergency assistance from the UNHCR and other agencies ceases after 6 months while those in settlements are given aid up until at least the first harvest of crops from their fields when they are considered to have become self-reliant. "For the donors of aid and the international agencies which distribute it," according to Harrel-Bond, self-reliance "has implied the point when refugees have reached a stage which permits the withdrawal of aid" (Harrel-Bond 1986:2). In the settlements they are, however, provided with a number of services that are not mandatorily provided to the rural Zambian community and the self-settled refugees. These services include relatively well-managed social development services such as pre-schools, primary schools, agricultural extension services,

cooperative services, artisan skills training, etc (UNHCR 1987).

2.5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWED REFUGEES

A majority of the refugees who are in Zambian institutions of learning are Angolans. This is reflected even in the proportions of the students who were interviewed. Sixty of them are Angolans representing 85.7 per cent (see table 4). All the 30 students who have both parents living with them in Zambia are Angolans.

Table 5 shows that the number of students living with only their mothers is three times higher than that of those living with

TABLE 4: NATIONALITY BY PARENTS' RESIDENCE

COUNTRY TOTAL OF ORIGIN	PARENTS RESIDENCE					
	BOTH PARENTS IN ZAMBIA	ONLY FATHER IN ZAMBIA	ONLY MOTHER IN ZAMBIA	NEITHER IN ZAMBIA NOR HOME COUNTRY	OTHER	
ANGOLA	30 42.9	6 8.6	16 22.9	2 2.9	6 8.6	60 85.7
MOZAMBI-QUE	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	4 5.7	4 5.7
UGANDA	0 .0	0 .0	1 1.4	2 2.9	1 1.4	4 5.7
ZAIRE	0 .0	0 .0	2 2.9	0 .0	0 .0	2 2.9
TOTAL	30 42.9	6 8.6	19 27.1	4 5.7	11 15.7	70 100.0

Note: The second numbers, with decimal points are percentages.

only their fathers. Some students live by themselves while some

live with their friends or friends' parents. Fifty-one of the students live in the settlement camps (except during school term when they are in boarding) and only two live in Zambian villages.

TABLE 5: WHO STUDENTS AND PUPILS LIVE WITH IN ZAMBIA

RELATIONS THEY LIVE WITH	STUDENTS AND PUPILS	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Both father and mother	30	43.5
Father only	6	8.7
Mother only	18	26.1
Relative	7	10.1
Other	8	11.6
TOTAL	69	100.0

The ages of the interviewed students and pupils falls between 14 for the youngest, and 31 for the oldest. The age with the highest number (12) is twenty-two. There were 9 married students, representing 12.9 per cent of the total, while 85.7 per cent are single. There was only one divorced student.

Twelve students had children, with one student having 6 children. The youngest pupil who is also a parent is 23 years old. Seven of the twelve students and pupils have 2 children each. In all, there were 29 children belonging to the pupils and students.

Most of the refugees started school here in Zambia. The study found that even for the fourteen, representing about 20 per

cent of the total, who started school elsewhere, five went to school here before they were admitted to their current institution of learning. (See table 6)

TABLE 6: WHERE THE REFUGEES STARTED SCHOOLING AND CURRENT LEVEL OF EDUCATION

COUNTRY WHERE STARTED SCHOOL	CURRENT LEVEL OF EDUCATION				
	SEC. SCHOOL	TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	COLLEGE	UNIVERSITY	
ANGOLA	1 1.4	2 2.9	2 2.9	0 .0	5 7.1
MOZAMBIQUE	0 .0	0 .0	1 1.4	0 .0	1 1.4
UGANDA	0 .0	0 .0	3 4.3	0 .0	3 4.3
ZAMBIA	36 51.4	9 12.9	10 14.3	1 1.4	56 80.0
OTHER	3 4.3	2 2.9	0 .0	0 .0	5 7.1
TOTAL	40 57.1	13 18.6	16 22.9	1 1.4	70 00.0

Note: The second numbers, with decimal points, are percentages

In all, only 9 (representing 12.9 per cent of the total) entered directly into Zambian institution of learning (see table 7). Five of the nine are studying 'English as a Foreign Language' at Nkumbi International College. Forty-six did their primary education in the settlement caps while the rest did theirs elsewhere.

TABLE 7: COUNTRY OF PREVIOUS LEARNING INSTITUTION

COUNTRY	PUPILS AND STUDENTS	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
ZAMBIA	61	87.1
OTHERS	9	12.9
TOTAL	70	100.0

The UNHCR sponsors more than half (52.8%) of the students (see table 8) out of whom 25 (35.7%) are at secondary school. UNHCR also sponsors the only university student in the sample. Of the 16 OBF-sponsored students, 9 are at trade schools and the rest in colleges. LWF sponsors two of the five students learning 'English as a Foreign Language' at Nkumbi.

TABLE 8: AGENCY BY NUMBER OF INTERVIEWED STUDENTS

AGENCY	PUPILS AND STUDENTS	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
LWF	17	24.3
OBF	16	22.9
UNHCR	37	52.8
TOTAL	70	100.0

CHAPTER THREE

THE POLICY ENVIRONMENT OF REFUGEE EDUCATION AND TRAINING

3.1.0 INTRODUCTION

We have underscored in the first chapter that educational assistance to refugees assumes a special place among the areas of refugee aid that are of vital importance to the individual refugee. By their very cause and consequence refugee issues transcend national boundaries. Hence the legislations of refugee status and social welfare policies involve many interest groups, among them nation state groupings. The relationships between and among these groups provide the socio-political environment from which the policies emanate. This study found the following to be very influential in refugee education and training policies:

(a) the United Nations (UN) and Organisation for African Unity (OAU) Conventions and Protocols;

(b) the political relationship between the refugees' country of origin and the host country;

(c) Aid donor policies; and

(d) Zambia's local situations.

3.2.1 UNITED NATIONS AND OAU LEGISLATIONS

The UN Convention of 28th July 1951 relating to the status of Refugees forms the basis of most policies concerning the education and training of refugees in member states. Article 22 - 'Public Education' - of this convention states:

1. "The Contracting States shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education.

2. The Contracting State shall accord to refugees treatment as favourable as possible, and, in any event, not less favourable than that accorded to aliens generally in the same circumstances, with respect to education other than elementary education and, in particular, as regards access to studies, the recognition of foreign school certificates, diplomas and degrees, the remission of fees and charges and the award of scholarships" (UNHCR 1979:66).

Although this Article was conceived and elaborated in the context of the refugee problems arising in the aftermath of the Second World War in Europe, subsequent declarations by international bodies, including the UN and OAU, have not substantially corrected any part of it to fit the altered circumstances. The OAU Conference on African Refugee problem held in Arusha-Tanzania in May 1979 upheld, with no alteration to suit the African refugee situation, the UN Article 17 and 22 and recommended that member states should consider removing from their national legislations any discriminatory provisions excluding refugees from access to the labour market or burdening them with heavy fees for receiving permission to work. The Conference, however, recognised that the problem did not have only legal aspects but the implementation of these depended on additional

educational and employment facilities being made available. (Eriksson, Melander and Nobel 1981:25).

3.2.2 POLITICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN REFUGEES' COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND HOST COUNTRY

The OAU, of which Zambia is a member, sets the reference point on how to handle refugees in Africa. Harrell-Bond describes the basis of the OAU thus:

> "The cornerstone upon which the OAU has been built was the sanctity of borders existing on the attainment of independence as well as the principle of 'territorial integrity' and 'non-interference' in the internal affairs of member states" (Harrell-Bond 1988:19).

In principle this means that priority is given to the protection of the rights and interests of the states, that is, the ruling government. The granting of refugee status is not automatic. In the interest of interstate relations refugees are expected to be politically passive, or if they are biased, should be known to belong to that group, in their country of origin, which supports the cause that is applaudable to their host government. The later category include refugees who belong to or support liberation movements. Some liberation movements are recognised by the UN and the OAU, others are not. Each government has its own views about the presence, activities and support of members of liberation movements within the country. In general, movement members who are actively promoting the liberation cause are not classified as refugees.

Zambia recognises and supports the African National Congress

(ANC) of South Africa and South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), and so does the UN and the OAU. UNHCR assists SWAPO through multipurpose assistance at Nyango Health and Education Centre in Kaoma and two farms run by SWAPO. At the time of this study there was also a United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN) which ran a number of training programmes at its Lusaka campus. The UNIN is now closed since Namibians were repatriated. The ANC receives similar assistance from UNHCR. UNHCR also meets travel costs for the two organisations' affiliated refugee students (UNIC 1988:58-59). This particular arrangement excludes refugees whose applications for such assistance is not supported by or is not made through the two liberation movements.

The position of liberation movements regarding refugee education policy is summed up in the following recommendation by a UNHCR-sponsored workshop on primary education for refugee children, which was held in Lusaka and was opened by the then UNHCR Representative in Zambia:

> "If liberation movements are present in the host country the following guidelines should prevail: respecting the concerns, desires and aspirations of the refugee community the role of national liberation movements, as recognised by the international community and the UN, will become that of the principle interlocutor of UNHCR and the host government" (UNHCR 1988:2).

Thus, when the relationship between the host government and the liberation movement supported by the refugees is very good a

(ANC) of South Africa and South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), and so does the UN and the OAU. UNHCR assists SWAPO through multipurpose assistance at Nyango Health and Education Centre in Kaoma and two farms run by SWAPO. At the time of this study there was also a United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN) which ran a number of training programmes at its Lusaka campus. The UNIN is now closed since Namibians were repatriated. The ANC receives similar assistance from UNHCR. UNHCR also meets travel costs for the two organisations' affiliated refugee students (UNIC 1988:58-59). This particular arrangement excludes refugees whose applications for such assistance is not supported by or is not made through the two liberation movements.

The position of liberation movements regarding refugee education policy is summed up in the following recommendation by a UNHCR-sponsored workshop on primary education for refugee children, which was held in Lusaka and was opened by the then UNHCR Representative in Zambia:

> "If liberation movements are present in the host country the following guidelines should prevail: respecting the concerns, desires and aspirations of the refugee community the role of national liberation movements, as recognised by the international community and the UN, will become that of the principle interlocutor of UNHCR and the host government" (UNHCR 1988:2).

Thus, when the relationship between the host government and the liberation movement supported by the refugees is very good a

lot is done by and through the efforts of the host government to humanise the social welfare of the refugees.

3.2.3 PERSPECTIVES IN REFUGEE HUMANITARIANISM

Humanitarian organisations have assumed the role of the 'conscience of the world' or stewards of humanity's moral obligation. There always has been the wish to separate humanitarianism from politics, particularly international politics. This wish, though is at times claim to be reality is but a myth. The truth is that refugee policy is inextricably tied to a country's foreign policy and other realities of international relations.

Generally, it is not possible to avoid politics in humanitarian aid for the following reasons:

(a) Humanitarian agencies are persuaded, if not forced, to toe the foreign policy lines of their home countries before they can be allowed to solicit for financial or material donations which they would later on send to the needy foreign population (Morgan and Colson 1987:28).

(b) The growing dependence on government funding by Non-Governmental Organisation (NGOs) has great effects on the distribution of aid to refugees by the later. It is extremely difficult for a humanitarian agency that receives substantial amounts of money to act as an advocate for an oppressed group whose interests contradict those of either the donor or the host country.

The policies of the three agencies studied testify to these trends as we see later in this chapter. The Otto Benecke Foundation, for one, is wholly funded by the Federal Republic of Germany. It operates almost like a scholarship section of the FRG Embassy in Zambia, except that it sponsors refugees. Its scholarship programme policy is formulated in Germany by the donor.

3.2.4 AID DONOR POLICIES

The politics in the administration of humanitarian aid to refugees continue from the foregoing into the aims and objectives of the organisation providing the funds. The UN, for example, has a special programme - the UN Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africans (UNETPSA) - which was set up at the wish of the donors to give educational financial assistance to students from Africa's remaining white-ruled territories. Eligibility for this assistance at the time of this study was limited to applicants from Namibia and South Africa. Also the African-American Institute in Zambia sponsors African National Congress (ANC of South Africa) members or their children only while Otto Benecke Foundation (OBF) does not consider membership to a liberation movement a prerequisite to being assisted. As far as OBF is concerned, no matter whether the OBF scholarship holders are later able to return to their country, the scholarships are intended to enable refugees to acquire professional training that will help them personally and the developing country in which they will be working (OBF 1983:16, 17).

3.2.5 ZAMBIA'S LOCAL LEGISLATION AND SITUATION

The status of refugees in Zambia is governed by both domestic legislation and international conventions. The domestic legislation on refugee affairs is the 1970 Refugee (Control) Act. The manifest purposes of this Act are two-fold:

(a) It is meant to regulate the entry, reception and residence of refugees in Zambia.

(b) It is meant to provide the Zambian government with authority which would enable it to deal with expected problems of maintaining law and order following a large influx of refugees.

The 1970 Refugee (Control) Act makes no direct mention of the welfare of refugees in terms of their rights to health, housing, education and employment. In this case the rules that apply to aliens who have legal status of residence in the country are applied generally to refugees. Where and when the government sees it befitting the provisions of the UN and the OAU conventions are applied. The later is done by virtue of Zambia's accession to these international instruments on 24th September, 1969.

The study also found that other important factors in refugee education and training policy are the availability of the services and local sensitivity. Sven Hamrell describes the situation here in Africa as follows:

"The adminission of refugees into educational institutions or into employment is weighed against the available facilities (or lack of them) and the local aspirations for higher positions and promotion. The national policy as regards

refugees has also to take into account the general level and trend of development in the country. When all these opposing interests have to be combined in a general policy, it is difficult to avoid its becoming in many ways restrictive" (Hamrell 1967:37).

This quotation is an exact description of the situation in Zambia as regards refugee education, training and employment opportunities. (If this study was on employment, the policy of Zambianisation would feature among the prominent issues). Zambia runs a 'free' public school system of education and training. Majority of the private secondary schools in town offer a very poor standard of education compared to public schools. The few good private schools charge tuition and other fees that are unaffordable to most private individuals. (Their pupils are mostly sponsored by emabssies, international/multi-national organisations and big local business companies where their parents hold executive positions in these organisations.) The high fees automatically prevent refugees from seeking places in good private schools since their sponsors can not afford or justify paying for one refugee student a sum of money that could otherwise have catered for five or more pupils at a government school. Hence what remains for the refugee is only the option of competing for a place at a public school.

Over the years places in public schools have been reducing in relation to the population. Consequently, the Zambian government has introduced policy measures to regulate the admission of aliens into public learning institutions. These measures include charging

aliens higher fees and regulating the total number of aliens permissible to be admitted to institutions of learning. The ratio of citizens to aliens or actual numbers admissible vary according to the category of the institution of learning and according also to the general objective the particular institution was set up for. For example, the University of Zambia is allowed to admit only up to 6 per cent non-Zambians of its total student enrolment at undergraduate first year level. At Nkumbi International College over 40 per cent of the pupils and students are refugees; almost 100 per cent of the students at artisanal trade schools in camps are refugees; and over 95 per cent of the pupils at Meheba Junior Secondary School in Solwezi are refugees. Except for institutions whose setting up had refugees as their target group, the foregoing shows that refugees have to compete for the few places allowed for all the foreigners with legal residence status in Zambia.

3.3.0 AGENCY POLICIES

In addition to the issues in the environment of refugee education described above refugee sponsoring agencies also have their own policies which have some influence on the local conditions. The study found the policies of the three agencies to be as follows:

3.3.12 UNHCR REFUGEE SERVICES OF ZAMBIA

The policy of the UNHCR scholarship programme in Zambia is:

"to help refugees to study at vocational and technical training centres, primary and secondary schools and universities in order to enable them to make their own living

later on" (UNHCR, undated:1, 2)."

This policy originates from the Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland and it is not altered in any way at the Zambian local office. The objective of the scholarship programme implied in the policy statement is education for employment and self-reliance: "It is intended to enable refugees to acquire the skills and knowledge which they need to get a job or set-up their own business and become self-supporting" (UNHCR, undated:2).

According to both the Education Counsellor and the National Social Services Officer, who were interviewed, the scholarships are "normally tenable in the country of assylum, in this case, Zambia," and at institutions recognised by the Zambian government and agreed to by the UNHCR. University education is supported only up to first degree level except where a post-gradute degree is the recognised professional qualification as the case is with human medicine. This ties in with the UNHCR headquarters-set criteria (UNHCR, undated:2,5).

3.3.2 LWF/ZCRS

The LWF/ZCRS, also known in short as Zambia Christian Refugee Services, scholarship programme policy is:

> "To sponsor well performing refugee pupils at secondary schools through to training colleges, industrial experience, universities and non-formal training."
>
> An additional aspect of LWF/ZCRS education and training policy for refugees is to work closely with the educational committees of liberation movements and assist them in meeting

their manpower development needs (LWF 1987:23). This policy is formulated at their Zambia Field Office after receiving 'general guidelines' from the Headquarters.

According to the Administrative Assistant, who is the officer-in-charge of education, the objective of the policy is two-fold: Firstly, it is meant to equip refugees for self-reliance. She made mention of the financial assistance the organisation gives to students doing their apprenticeship to enable them obtain a full craftsman's certificate: "an excellent job qualification." Secondly, to train refugee educators. This is done by discouraging refugees from leaving their communities permanently, especially those in settlements, through giving priority to students enrolled in schools within reasonable reach of their homes and restricting assistance within Lusaka to those students already established in the capital or with families and friends in the city (LWF 1987:22). LWF/ZCRS hopes that if this policy measure does not decrease the number of jobless refugees in Lusaka it will at least deter even more youngsters leaving the settlements in a vain search for the tightly contested school places in the city. LWF/ZCRS does also sponsor refugees to institutions of learning, including universities outside Zambia.

3.3.3 OBF

The OBF refugee scholarship programme's policy is:

"to sponsor refugee students from Southern Africa to training colleges, trade schools, industrial experience and settlement-based skills training centres."

This policy originates from the Headquarters in the Federal Republic of German. The objectives of the policy are two-fold: Firstly, it is intended to help refugees acquire skills that will enable them make a living. Secondly, it is also intended to afford refugees an opportunity to contribute to the development of the country in which they will be working (OBF 1983:16).

The Education Counsellor said that the OBF does not sponsor university education in Zambia. Scholarships to such high levels are tenable only in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The creation of training facilities in Zambia is also part of the OBF refugee education and training policy. Otto Kimminiah, the President of OBF, justified this aspect of their policy as follows:

> "The creation of training facilities in assylum-granting African countries is in keeping with the wishes of the refugees themselves and the efforts of the African countries not to export their refugee problems to other continents. This is a policy that was expressed in the African Convention on Refugees adopted by the OAU on September 10, 1969" (OBF 1983:17).

In this regard the OBF has set-up a skills training centre at Ukwimi Mozambican Refugees Agricultural Settlement where the refugees are trained in tailoring, capentry, bricklaying and metal work. A majority of the students there have a low level of education which would not qualify them to enter trade schools offering the same type of training.

We have discussed six main factors that together form the

socio-political environment of refugee education and training policies in Zambia. In determining refugee welfare rights local legislation and international instruments are used both to complement and to supplement each other as the situation may demand.

The subjecting of refugees to competition for school places with other foreigners in Zambia who are not refugees is justified by and has its basis in Article 22 'Public Education'of the UN Convention of 1951 which is the reference point for most legislations on refugee welfare. The myth in this article is the notion that there are aliens who are or can be in the same circumstances with refugees. No foreigners in Africa, or elsewhere, are in the same circumstances with refugees. The truth, however, is that in Zambia most of the aliens who lawfully can (and do) take their children to school belong broadly to the following categories: diplomats; expatriates; executives of multi-national, international and intergovernmental organisations; businessmen; etc. Generally these are treated with more respect and enjoy a higher status than that of an ordinary citizen here. It is, therefore, self-deceptive to think that refugees can have a fair competition with these aliens.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DETERMINANTS OF REFUGEES' ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING AND SPONSORSHIP

4.1.0 INTRODUCTION

When a refugee starts the search for education, he disappears in the labyrinth of the legislation and regulations that apply in part to all the residents of Zambia; in part to foreigners; and to persons with recognised refugee status. This chapter examines the hypothesis that the granting of scholarships by the agencies is dependent on the refugee student having secured a place at an institution of learning and not by the student's financial position.

4.2.0 ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING

There are a number of policy and administrative issues that affect the refugees' access to institutions of learning in Zambia that this study found. These range from the government policy in general to administrative details of a specific category of study and the institutions and refugee sponsoring agencies' involvement.

4.2.1 GOVERNMENT ENROLMENT POLICY

Zambian government policy regarding the admission of refugees to institutions of learning is very much in tune with the 1951 UN Convention Article 22 'Public Education' discussed in chapter four. Refugees are given equal access to elementary education with Zambians. An exception is with refugees in settlement camps who are not allowed to go to primary schools outside their settlement. They are expected to attend primary schools within the settlement.

While Zambian children living in villages near to or within the settlements are encouraged to attend school in the settlement for reasons of cultural integration of refugees, (I was told in an interview) refugee children are not allowed to go to primary school outside the camp. The official I interviewed simply said, "it is government policy, probably for security reasons: for the good of the refugees themselves."

However, refugees living in the open society (that is, outside the settlements) are free to take their children to public schools notwithstanding the hardships they sometimes encounter because of the little awareness of the status of refugees in the country by most school administrators. Beyond primary education different situations exist.

4.2.2 ENTRY TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The data show that according to Government policy, refugees should enter secondary schools on the same basis with Zambians. There is no limit in terms of the number of refugees to be admitted. All that is required of a refugee child is to pass the public examination which all pupils sit for at the end of their seventh year of elementary education.

The marks that a grade seven child has to obtain in order to qualify for grade 8 - the first grade at secondary school - vary according to province and according to the status of the secondary school where admission is being sought. The cut-off marks are progressively higher in the following categories of public

secondary schools: basic schools, day secondary schools, boarding secondary schools, and technical secondary schools.

However, there are some procedures that are sometimes applied to refugees which affect their access to secondary schools. The data show the following: Firstly, Nkumbi International College and Meheba Junior Secondary School have a mandate to enrol a large number of refugees. They were set-up with refugee children as their main target group. Besides those refugees who may qualify by passing the public examination, the UNHCR and other refugee sponsoring agents do recommend pupils whom they want to sponsor to be taken on. These form the majority of the pupils who are sponsored by LWF/ZCRS and UNHCR who said that they qualified with assistance (see table 9). This is done especially in the second selection. The second selection takes place if the pupils who 'passed' (getting marks not below the cut-off point) the public examination are fewer than the number of places available.

Secondly, refugee pupils who seek sponsorship from the UNHCR and LWF/ZCRS at their first entry into secondary schols are subjected to special 'I.Q' tests. The UNHCR Refugee Services of Zambia take their applicants to the Ministry of Labour, Social Development and Culture's Educational and Occupational Services, where they take the 'Talent Sporting Test'. Every candidate is required to sit for the four constituent tests, namely: English comprehension-A5 99; Non-Verbal Interligence-Ravens; Abstractions-A5 25A; and General Ability Test-GAT. These tests are usually taken before te public examination results are published or before the

Grade 8 school calender begins.

TABLE 9: HOW THE REFUGEES SECURED PLACE AT INSTITUTION OF LEARNING

SPONSOR	HOW THEY SECURED SCHOOL PLACE		TOTAL
	QUALIFIED	QUALIFIED WITH ASSISTANCE	
LWF/ZCRS	7 10.0	10 14.3	17 24.3
OBF	10 14.3	6 8.6	16 22.9
UNHCR	24 34.3	13 18.6	37 52.9
TOTAL	41 58.6	29 41.4	70 100.0

The LWF/ZCRS take their applicants for tests at the Department of Technical Education and Vocational Training (DTEVT). Both agencies do also rely on the public examination results for their sponsorship selection and reference to schools. The officials from the two agencies who were interviewed said that these additional examinations serve three purposes:

1. They are used as a selection criteria to fill up places made available to or reserved for refugees.
2. They are used as a selection criteria and quality control mechanism for potential scholarship recipients.
3. They are used as a pre-screening mechanism for success in grade nine public examinations.

This, they believe, will curb the proportionately high rate of

failure (estimated at over 90 per cent among UNHCR-sponsored grade 9 pupils in 1989) among lower secondary refugee students and the consequent waste associated with it.

Thirdly, the LWF has a policy of terminating the scholarship of refugee students who do not do well in their end of term tests. This affects lower secondary school pupils more than the higher levels. The Administrative Assistant, the officer in charge of education of LWF/ZCRS, said that her agency works closely with school authorities to monitor the performance of pupils and terminate the scholarship for those who fail end of term tests for two consecutive terms. At the time of this study eight pupils were said to have left school in this manner. The majority of the LWF/ZCRS - sponsored pupils interviewed at Nkumbi expressed hate and fear of this system. Understandably, it affects the continuity of both their sponsorship and the school place.

It is explicit from the above findings that besides governemnt's generous policy, refugees' access to secondary school is affected by the sponsoring agencies involvement. By implication a refugee may lose a school place which he or she has qualified for by passing the public examination if he or she fails to meet the standards set by the agency he or she has applied to for sponsorship. Sometimes passing a public examination is not a guarantee to sponsorship or to enrolment at a secondary school. The later can be guaranteed if a refugee can sponsor himself or be sponsored by his family. It is also true that a number of refugees find school places through assistance by their sponsors.

obtained in all the subjects - commonly called 'point system.'

Apart from the University which bases its selection almost purely on computerised examination results, the lower colleges always require of the refugee applicants letters of support from the UNHCR Branch Office or refugee sponsoring agency to both authenticate their status and assure their sponsorship. Most students at these institutions have been assisted to get admitted by their sponsors as shown in table 10.

TABLE 10: METHODS OF ASSISTING STUDENTS TO OBTAIN SCHOOL PLACES

SPONSOR	METHOD OF ASSISTANCE					TOTAL
	WROTE LETTER ON MY BEHALF	APPROACHED SCHOOL AUTHORITIES	WROTE RECOMMEND-ING LETTER	HAVE AN ARRANGE-MENT TO TAKE ON REFUGEES	OTHERS	
LWF/ZCRS	2 4.1	5 10.2	2 4.2	3 6.1	2 4.1	14 28.6
OBF	1 2.0	2 4.1	7 14.3	0 .0	2 4.1	12 24.5
UNHCR	0 .0	9 18.4	2 4.1	11 22.4	1 2.0	23 46.9
TOTAL	3 6.1	16 32.7	11 22.4	14 28.6	5 10.2	49 100.0

The OBF take it as their responsibility to help refugees with relevant qualifications to get admitted to institutions of learning on courses the refugee has an interest in. The UNHCR gives assistance to schools that admit large numbers of refugees as an incentive for their good will towards refugee children. Such assistance has been given to schools such as Bayuni and Mupapa. Nkumbi International College is the main recipient of this type of assistance from UNHCR.

By implication, the chances of a refugee getting into a training institution are slimmer if he or she:

1. does not know that sponsors can help him find a place;
2. does not impress any sponsor to support his application;
3. does not impress sponsors to continue supporting him or

her after completing secondary education;

4. does not have knowledge of the trade schools or college that can accept his or her qualification.

Therefore, knowledge of the country's institutions of learning and their entry requirements and courses they offer by the refugees is as important as the dissemination of this information to the refugees by the agencies.

4.3.0 ACCESS TO SPONSORSHIP

In the discussion of the environment of refugee education and training policies in the preceding chapter we brought to light issues that will affect a refugee's access to scholarship generally as the policies of sponsors and the relations that exist among aid agencies (sponsors); host government and institutions of learning and the recognised liberation movements. In as much as it is implied in the aforesaid, the following specific factors have been found to be influencing refugee pupils' and students' access to the scholarships offered by the three agencies:

4.3.1 AGENCY POLICIES

We have outlined the policies and objectives of the three agencies in the preceding chapter. They are not very much different from each other in terms of their ultimate objectives vis-a-vis refugees' welfare. Our discussion here centres on the administrative criteria of allocating scholarships.

The practice in the three agencies - LWF/ZCRS, OBF and UNHCR - deviates significantly from the above 'standard' criteria set by the UNHCR headquarters in Geneva. First and foremost, all the

three agencies do not consider financial need to be a criteria for allocating their scholarships to refugees. They all also leave the issue of age to the institutions of learning to determine. The UNHCR - Refugee Services of Zambia consider an applicant's performance in the public examination and the Talent Sporting (I.Q.) Test to be supplementary to each other in allocating scholarships. For post-secondary levels, the verdict of the institution of learning over the student's application for admission is sufficient proof of the student's fitness to pursue that course. Granting of scholarship by the UNHCR therefore, is dependent on proof of admission to an institution of learning. The student's financial position is not important (see annex 3 for details of the conditions of UNHCR scholarships).

The LWF/ZCRS considers for a sponsorship offer, firstly, proof of admission to an institution of learning. It also takes into account the interest of the student and the standard of the institution to which the applicant is admitted and the course to be followed. When the scholarship has been granted, LWF/ZCRS does consider the students's family circumstances when allocating provisions such as clothes and blankets which they give in kind.

Applicants's previous education, proposed course, and interest are considered most when they want to assist a refugee to secure a place at an institution of learning. Usually such students are also granted scholarship by the agencies, especially OBF and LWF/ZCRS if they succeed in securing a school place. While the other agencies would continue supporting refugee students as long

as they maintain standards of learning acceptable for the institution to approve of them to proceed, LWF/ZCRS does terminate scholarships on the basis of poor performance in the end of term test. The deliberate bias by LWF/ZCRS to give preference for educational assistance to refugee students in schools with high concentration of their numbers and to those within reasonable reach of their homes is evident in the distribution of its sponsored pupils and students (see annex 6). UNHCR's more liberal allocation of scholarships (that has less regard to residence) is also reflected by the comparatively more scattered student distribution (see annexes 4 and 5).

For the OBF proof of admission is not the only factor that is considered. The initial commitment to offer sponsorship to a refugee is dependent on the course a refugee wishes to pursue and his interest. Of course this implies that the applicant should have promising pre-requisites for admission to the intended course of study.

The applicant's financial position is not considered. Unlike LWF/ZCRS which has a separate programme for ANC students, OBF and UNHCR do not have any special arrangements with any liberation movement for scholarships.

4.3.2 KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION

In as much as the agencies' practices described above are the main determinants of a refugee student's access to sponsorship, the student or his family usually make the effort to contact the agency they know about for sponsorship. The study found that none of the

agencies has any information brochure about what they can do for refugees. They all said that they give the information whenever a refugee comes forward to ask for it. They put some notices on their notice boards. OBF also communicates with individual refugees who write to them.

With the increase in number of applications for financial assistance reaching the agency offices in Lusaka, (as expressed by all the agencies' officials during interviews), chasing limited scholarships, there is a "natural temptation not to advertise scholarships when the list is beyong the agency's ability to sponsor." This implies that education counsellors would rather first try to provide for those who have already approached them (who qualify for the assistance) before telling those who do not know about the scholarships and are doing something else for themselves.

Table 11 shows the students' first source of information about their sponsors. Nearly half (47.2% or 33) of the students heard from UNHCR. This is undoubtedly so because UNHCR is everywhere where refugees are in the country unlike OBF which has no office in Meheba and Mayukwayukwa settlements where most of the students come from. OBF - sponsored students heard mainly (10 out of 16) from their friends who were or still are sponsored by the same agency unlike LWF and UNHCR - sponsored students whose majority heard from the agencies. This state of affairs implies that if the agencies do not reach out to the refugee community to tell them what educational assistance they can receive there can be, in due

course, a self-selected population of refugees who will be receiving scholarships from the agencies.

TABLE 11: SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOLARSHIP

CURRENT SPONSOR	SOURCE OF INFORMATION						TOTAL
	UNHCR	LWF/ZCRS	OBF	CCZ	FRIENDS	REFUGEE OFFICER	
LWF/ZCRS	1 1.4	12 17.2	0 .0	0 .0	3 4.3	1 1.4	17 24.3
OBF	2 2.9	0 .0	4 5.7	0 .0	10 14.3	0 .0	16 22.9
UNHCR	30 42.9	1 1.4	0 .0	2 2.9	3 14.3	1 1.4	37 52.9
TOTAL	33 47.2	13 18.6	4 5.7	2 2.9	16 22.9	2 2.9	70 100.0

Note: The second numbers, with decimal point, are percentages

4.3.3 SPONSORSHIP PACKAGE

A large number of students who have been on sponsorship for some time want to change sponsors. They often succeed in crossing from one sponsor to another during interval stages in their education such as between junior and senior secondary school and more so between secondary school and training. A majority of the students who have changed sponsors are those in training (see table 12).

TABLE 12: DID YOU HAVE ANOTHER SPONSOR BEFORE?

CURRENT SPONSOR	RESPONSE		TOTAL
	YES	NO	
LWF/ZCRS	4 5.7	13 18.6	17 24.3
OBF	16 22.9	0 .0	16 22.9
UNHCR	7 10.0	30 42.9	37 52.9
TOTAL	27 38.6	43 61.5	70 100.0

All OBF - sponsored students were formerly sponsored by other agencies, mainly the UNHCR.

Forty-nine students said they wish to change sponsors. The main reason why these students want to change sponsor is the insufficiency of the allowances they receive. This view was expressed by 35 students, representing 71.4 per cent of all those who want to change sponsors (see tables 13 and 14). Sixty-seven per cent (33) of those who want to change are UNHCR - sponsored students. UNHCR also has the highest proportion of the students under its sponsorship wanting to change (33 out of 37). This is so probably because UNHCR gives the minimum allowances among the three agencies, according to their Education Counsellor. OBF has the highest number and proportion of students not wanting to change (see table 14). The largest number of students who do not want to change is of those who think that other sponsors do not support

their course.

TABLE 13: REASONS FOR WANTING TO CHANGE SPONSORS

SPONSOR	R E A S O N S							TOTAL
	SPONSOR DOESN'T GIVE ENOUGH MUCH	DOES NOT SPONSOR WHAT I WANT	NOT CATTER FOR OTHER NEEDS	COUNSELLOR IS SHORT TEMPERED	OTHERS GIVE MORE	JUST DESIRE TO CHANGE	OTHER REASONS	
LWF/ ZCRS	2 4.1	4 8.2	0 .0	2 4.1	0 .0	0 .0	1 2.0	9 18.4
OBF	2 4.1	0 .0	2 4.1	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	3 6.1	7 14.3
UNHCR	6 12.2	7 14.3	10 20.4	6 12.2	2 4.1	2 4.1	0 .0	33 66.3
TOTAL	10 20.4	11 22.4	12 24.5	8 16.3	2 4.1	2 4.1	4 8.2	49 100.0

TABLE 14: REASONS FOR NOT WANTING TO CHANGE SPONSOR

CURRENT SPONSOR	WHY NOT CHANGE SPONSOR					TOTAL
	SPONSOR GIVES MORE	OTHER SPONSOR DON'T SUPPORT MY COURSE	COUNSELLOR IS GOOD	OTHERS GIVE LESS	OTHER REASONS	
LWF/ ZCRS	1 4.8	5 23.8	1 4.8	0 .0	1 4.8	8 38.2
OBF	1 4.8	1 4.8	1 4.8	2 9.5	4 19.0	9 42.9
UNHCR	1 4.8	0 .0	2 9.5	0 .0	1 4.8	4 19.0
TOTAL	3 14.3	6 28.6	4 19.0	2 9.5	6 28.6	21 100.0

4.4.1 IMPLICATIONS

The data support the hypothesis that "Granting of a scholarship by the agencies is dependent on the refugee student having secured a place at an institution of learning and not by the student's financial position." None of the agencies consider the financial position of a refugee to be a condition for him or her to receive a scholarship. All a refugee has to have in order to be sponsored is a place in an institution of learning that is acceptable to the sponsoring agency.

The process of securing a place is not always very independent of the sponsoring agencies. In as much as places in institutions of learning are normally granted to refugees who meet the admission requirements set by the institutions' authorities, the recommendations of the agencies for refugees' seeking admission

play a significant role. Sponsors sometimes help the refugees they have interest in sponsoring find a place. The will to sponsor can, and has helped refugees secure places in institutions of learning. This is in fact done for those refugees with good certificates "whom you would not be ashamed to lobby for a place for," said one education counsellor.

Implicitly, the agencies which subject secondary school pupils to extra examinations besides the public ones which both Zambian and alien children sit for do so to justify the selection of some among many who apply. We do not want to think that the agencies have lost faith in public examinations nor are the I.Q. tests a reasonable way of reducing risks of failure. If it was for the later reason the extra examination should have been given only to those who have not secured places by way of passing the public examination.

We suggest that granting of scholarships and helping refugees to secure places at institutions of learning be split into two separte services to be offered by the agencies. Conditions for receiving one should be different from the other. Those who want both services should be advised to state so in their applications. Sponsorship should not only be for the more intelligent refugees, even the less intelligent should be assisted. It should be based on recipients' need as well as their ability to satisfy both the admission and progressional requirements of the institutions of learning. Supplemnetary sponsorship should be considered in order to help as many as possible.

4.4.2 CONCLUSION

From the perspective of the analytical framework used in this study, the agencies are trying hard to justify the allocations of the limited provisions in a basically universalist service to the few whom the resources can cater for. They do this by using the extra examinations to eliminate some of the applicants who are basically eligible - that is, those who have passed the public examination. This only goes to show some of the problems associated with the four principles (attributed need, compensation, diagnostic differentiation and means-tested need) that form the basis of social allocation. That is,in practice the allocative principles are not mutually exclusive although their underlying premises may seem somewhat incompatible.

There is no attempt to use a means-test (student's financial position) in the allocation of scholarships and the treatment of individual scholarship holders does not vary according to the individual's circumstances, at least up to the point of being offered the scholarship. A good degree of social effectiveness does exist in the sponsorship services as all the recipients are treated as equals by their respective sponsors. The refugees themselves consider the benefits as their right. It is not uncommon for a refugee to tell an education counsellor that the money and goods are sent to them (refugees) by the UNHCR or LWF and therefore they are entitled to them.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ELEMENTS OF THE SPONSORSHIP PACKAGE

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Having discussed the allocative principles used in determining refugees' access to institutions of learning and scholarships, we will now turn to the nature of the provisions. That is, we will explore, in this chapter, the scholarship packages that are offered by the three agencies namely; the LWF/ZCRS, the OBF and the UNHCR.

Gilbert and Specht present two basic forms of social provisions. These are in-cash and in-kind. Cash benefits according to them are devided into two:

(a) actual cash benefits which, "of course, has universal exchange value, offering the most latitude for consumer choice"; and

(b) credits which have a structured exchange value within a delineated sector such as tax credits (which can be used to offset medical expenses) and food stamps (which can be exchanged for a variety of edible foods) (Gilbert and Specht 1974:82, 88).

In - kind provisions are classified into four categories: opportunities, services, goods and power. Opportunities are "sets of circumstances in which incentives and sanctions are employed to achieve desired end." Benefits in this category involve the provision of civil rights or an "extra chance. Sometimes the extra chance is built into the basis of social allocation" (Gilbert and Specht 1974:88). Service provisions include such functions as

counselling, teaching, etc - which are non-transferable in terms of their market value to recipients. Goods are concrete commodities such as food and clothing. According to Gilbert and Specht, "Power benefits involve the redistribution of influence over the control of goods and services. Often the redistribution of influence is sought through policies that require representation of the poor, clients, or often disadvantaged people on the boards of agencies that dispense social welfare benefits... the social provision is incorporated into policy decisions about the structure of delivery system" (Gilbert and Specht 1974:88, 89). Let us now see the social provisions offered by the three agencies.

5.2 TYPES AND FORMS OF THE PROVISIONS

According to the data the following types of provisions are offered by the agencies: Tuition, room and board; installation grant - school uniform and other clothing; books and equipment; medical expenses; transport money; vacation and pocket money. They also provide assistance in the securing of places at institutions of learning.

The basic provisions which include the cost of tuition, room, board and other approved instutional charges are all paid in cash. The amounts to be paid are determined by the institutions of learning to which the students are admitted. Government institutions have started charging the so-called economic rates, which have meant that refugees and other non-Zambians pay more (sometimes twice or even more) than Zambians. If no proportionate additional funds are made available to the agencies by the donors,

it will mean less students will be sponsored now than before the economic rates were introduced. To this, the Co-ordinating Committee of Scholarship Sponsors has reacted by requesting the UNHCR Representative in Zambia to negotiate with the Zambian Government for refugees to be charged the same rate with citizens. Whatever the rates are, these are payments made in cash to the institutions on behalf of the refugee students.

The other provisions that are given in cash are installation grant, medical expenses, transport money, vacation, and pocket money. Clothing, books, equipment and sometimes school uniforms are given in-kind (as concrete commodities). The amounts and quantities vary for a variety of reasons among the agencies.

Counselling is one of the services provided by the agencies. Tables 9 and 10 in chapter four show that a good number of the students were helped by the agencies to secure places in institutions of learning which they may not otherwise have found. In this respect, counselling becomes a very important element of refugee educational services. Tables 15 and 16 show the significance of information in helping refugees know what training programmes are there for them to choose from. In table 15, out of 30 students who are in post-secondary school institutions 11 (36.7%) heard about the courses they are on from friends while the agencies themselves informed only 8 (26.7%). Ten per cent got information from the advertisements by the institutions of learning in the papers. The information is usually about the name and address of the institutions, courses offered, admission

requirements, procedures and dates of application.

TABLE 15: SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT TRAINING

SPONSOR	SOURCE OF INFORMATION					TOTAL
	CURRENT SPONSOR	FRIENDS	MEDIA	CAREER MASTER	OTHER	
LWF/ZCRS	1 3.3	2 6.7	0 .0	1 3.3	0 .0	4 13.3
OBF	4 13.3	6 20.0	1 3.3	3 10.0	2 6.7	16 53.3
UNHCR	3 10.0	3 10.0	2 6.7	0 .0	2 6.7	10 33.3
TOTAL	8 26.7	11 36.7	3 10.0	4 13.3	4 13.3	30 100.0

Note: The second numbers, with decimal points are percentages

A number of people, probably the majority, would want to go for training after completing their secondary education. Refugees are not an exception. If anything, they need training very much because they usually have few or no resources to lean on as an alternative to qualifying for a job. Table 16 shows that the largest number (12=40%) of students chose the course they are on because it is the one they wanted to train in. This was followed by students who are doing the course because that is what they could qualify to do. These think that they could have enroled for higher courses than the ones they are on. Slightly more than twenty-three per cent are in colleges either just to pass time or because they have a better life on a scholarship.

TABLE 16: REASONS FOR BEING ON THE COURSE

R E A S O N S	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENTAGE
The career I wanted	12	40.0
The course I qualify for	6	20.0
Just to pass time	4	13.3
Better-off on educational scholarship than elsewhere	3	10.0
My sponsors advised me to take it	2	6.7
The only one I heard about	1	3.3
Couldn't find sponsors for what I wanted	1	3.3
Other reasons	1	3.3
TOTAL	30	100.0

5.3 VARIATIONS IN THE PROVISIONS OFFERED BY THE AGENCIES

The value of the provisions which are determined by and paid to the institution of learning do not vary according to agency, but according to the learning institution to which the particular refugee student is admitted. These are paid by all the agencies in cash. The following variations existed at the time of study: (Note: Numerical values of money were not specified by two of the agencies for undisclosed reasons).

LWF/ZCRS pay for all the institutional charges as the other two do but it is the only agency that does not give hard cash for clothing. They provide clothes and beddings from the consignments they receive for all refugees. When there is nothing in stock, or

if what is there can not fit the students, then they either purchase it for them or provide an amount upon production of a proforma invoice. They buy travelling bags, shoes, school uniforms, and school stationery which they distribute to pupils and students at the beginning of their respective school calendars and, when need arises, in the course of the year. Other provisions are made according to specific demands of the students' programmes. These include equipment and text books which are also purchased on their behalf, or the student is given the amount of money indicated on a proforma invoice. The beneficiaries are given cash pocket money and sometimes book allowance.

Except for the amounts that are institutionally dertermined, the levels of other provisions differ according to the level of qualifications being sought, what the student lacks, and the size of the students' family in the case of married students who are not in boarding institutions and are on industrial experience. This means that LWF/ZCRS does not, as a matter of policy, maintain same levels of provisions even for beneficiaries who are in the same category of study. Anything closer to this is just by way of trying to avoid contributing to the disparities that already exist.

Having paid for all institutional charges, OBF gives the same amount of money for clothing, transport, pocket money and stipend (for those on industrial experience) to all its sponsored students. They do not give clothes and books in kind. Book and equipment allowances vary according to category of study. For example, clinical science students are bought stethoscopes and some medical

textbooks which are more expensive than tracing wheels, stitch rippers and measuring tapes which are bought for tailoring students. They also provide for special needs that are of relevance to the students' studies.

The UNHCR - run Refugee Services of Zambia give cash for clothing, transport, pocket money, equipment, book-allowance and school uniform. Except for transport money which varies according to distance, the amounts for the rest of the above allocations vary according to category of study. Secondary school pupils receive the least, while university students get the most. UNHCR does not cater for industrial experience. Those who are sponsored by UNHCR to trade schools shift to LWF/ZCRS and OBF for sponsorship to their industrial training.

Students who are sponsored to private trade schools (such as private typing and tailoring colleges) that do not have residential facilities are given money for paying rent and a stipend. The same amount is given to all students in this category by UNHCR. While LWF/ZCRS will provide for such students according to their family needs - that is family of procreation - UNHCR will not provide extra assistance from the scholarship allocation. Instead such UNHCR - sponsored students usually have their special needs (such as allowances for their dependent children) met from the subsistence allowance, which is a separate emergency assistance programme for urban refugees. When bales of clothes and blankets are received at UNHCR, students who are around and in need are given just like any other refugees.

5.4 REASONS FOR THE VARIATIONS

The UNHCR Education Counsellor said that her agency is the lowest paying sponsor to students in terms of the numerical values of the scholarship money. This was confirmed by the amounts the students sponsored by the three agencies mentioned and also by the agencies. The UNHCR does not provide items in kind because, for them, that is taking on extra responsibilities. They believe that refugees can and should take care of themselves and learn to make priorities. Non-educational family problems should be solved through other means. For this reason, "there is no reason to pay for things that are not part of education." This probably explains why their provisions are the same for all students in each category of study. The Education Counsellor also pointed out that UNHCR budget for education once approved cannot be altered to cater for changes in prices or individual refugees' circumstances. "You only have to give the money that was allocated to the programme. That is the only money you have."

The OBF gives, first of all, the same amounts of money to all of their students for transport, pocket money, clothing and stipend. "All of them are students who should be treated equally," said the Education Counsellor. The variation in book allowance is justified because, "students in different colleges take different courses for which you need a different amount of money. These amounts are based on our experience with particular institutions." This is what the OBF Education Counsellor said. However, when special need arise they are assisted because as an agency that

sponsors refugees OBF has accepted responsibility to care for them.

LWF/ZCRS provides for the needs of refugee students in kind because that is the sure way of meeting the needs of students. One official at LWF/ZCRS said, "We all know what the needs of a student are." This explains why they make sure their pupils and students are provided with what they think are the basics. LWF/ZCRS denied trying to create a uniform standard for all its students. The purpose of their scholarships, they explained, is to provide for what the student needs to make their learning feasible and comfortable. Beyond this, individual students and pupils will use their pocket money that they receive from the sponsors and the parents. The other reason is that educational facilities are scarce in Zambia like many other essential commodities. It is easier for the sponsor to purchase them in bulk from the local suppliers or outside the country than for individual refugee students or their parents. Understandably this would cost more and may also be difficult for refugees in the settlements.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS

The varying degrees of flexibility in both the forms and levels of the scholarship provisions are understandable in the light of the policy objectives and strategies each agency set for itself. Also at play is the degree of leverage which the individual sponsoring agencies are given by their funders.

Much as the argument that in-cash benefits give unlimited freedom of choice to the beneficiary and subsequently ensures customer satisfaction, this does not seem to be the argument for

in-cash benefits at UNHCR. Instead, it is because UNHCR cannot give recipients more than the amounts reflected in the approved budget even when the prices of the goods intended to be purchased have gone up above the budget estimates at the time of submission. This is not the case at OBF because they can, with relative ease, adjust upwards when need arises.

However, the argument for providing in-kind benefits seems to be in line with the traditional argument that "this form of social provision allows for the control of consumption patterns. Thus, benefits such as free clothing,... can be designed and distributed so that the full impact of the provision is centred upon the socially defined needs of the target population" (Gilbert and Specht 1974:83). The values of social control and social effectiveness are eminent in LWF/ZCRS arguments.

Numerical equality, that is, "the same treatment of everyone - to all an equal share" (Gilbert and Specht 1974:40), tends to predominate more in UNHCRs' basis of social provision within different learning categories of the students than the other agencies. Proportional equality - "same treatment of similar persons (to each according to his merit or virtue)" (Gilbert and Specht 1974:40) - is applied between learning categories. The main concern of LWF/ZCRS and OBF is adequacy.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE AND FUNDING

6.1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we will discuss the service delivery system, which, according to Gilbert and Specht (1974:108), "refers to the organisational arrangements among distributors and between distributors and consumers." We will also discuss the sources of funds, the procedures used by the agencies to secure the funds, the conditions which the sources of funds impose on the agencies and the effects of these conditions on the service delivery structure. By doing this we will be examining the two hypotheses that:

1. Absence of formal channels of communication among the agencies is associated with overlaps, gaps and contradictions in service provision.
2. The UNHCR educational services agency is less flexible than the other two agencies.

In discussing the structure of service delivery system Gilbert and Specht present coordination as a delivery strategy that aims at the development of an integrated, comprehensive social service system through either centralisation or federation of service agencies. Other options in choosing a strategy include choices between local autonomy and centralisation, and between single service and combined services (Gilbert and Specht 1974:108-116). To test the two hypotheses we will centre our discussion on issues that pertain to the concepts of formal channels of communication, overlaps, gaps, contradictions and flexibility - as defined in

chapter 1.

6.2.0 AGENCIES' SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM

The structure for administering assistance to any group of people has a number of important implications which include the possibility of stigmatisation, fragmentation, inaccessibility, and unaccountability. All these are detrimental to the clients' dignity and welfare. Harrell-Bond describes one of the possible situations with refugee aid agencies as follows:

> "The structure of administering assistance to the uprooted within a particular state has important implications. It may reinforce the dominant top-down approach, and exacerbate the process of institutional destruction while permitting outside agencies to gain greater control over policies and practice. It may not enhance the capacity of local government institutions or refugee-based agencies" (Harrell-Bond 1988:30).

We have already looked at the main elements in the relationships of the agencies with the students when we discussed factors that affect refugees' access to school places and scholarships. We will now focus on what the data show on the other aspects of the delivery structures.

6.2.1 LWF/ZCRS

The educational sponsorship programme of the LWF/ZCRS is administered from their National Office based along Longolongo Road in the Thornpark Light Industrial area of Lusaka. The agency is headed by a National Director who oversees all the work of LWF/ZCRS

in the country, of which the programme under study is just a part. The LWF/ZCRS is involved in the implementation of UNHCR - funded projects in Maheba and Ukwimi Refugee Settlements. These include sinking of boleholes for water, agriculture extension services, distribution of emergency supplies to new settlers, construction of primary schools and other structures at Ukwimi.

The official who is directly responsible for educational assistance to refugees holds the title of administrative assistant. According to her, she is the education project co-ordinator. This is unlike the other two agencies where the title of education counsellor is used. The Administrative Assistant at LWF/ZCRS is assisted by the senior secretary who acts as project assistant. This Senior Secretary acts in the Administrative Assistant's position when the later is out of town and generally shares the tasks with here whenever need arises. The person who was the Administrative Assistant at the time of the study had the 'qualification' of having been on a University course up to third year level where she dropped out and had worked for the Lutheran World Fedration for ten years. The refugees do not take part in decision making, either about education or other services that the agency offers.

This agency has a close working relationship with the Christian Council of Zambia (CCZ). This is because it is partly funded by the World Council of Churches (WCC) to which CCZ belongs as national representatives of member churches. The data demonstrated that LWF/ZCRS has no relationship with any other

agency to co-sponsor a refugee student. Decisions made by the Administrative Assistant which need the approval of higher authority are simply passed on to the Director next door for approval. The Administrative Assistant makes decisions about the education programmes to be supported; the number of beneficiaries for each programme; budgeting and strategies for programme implementation and monitoring. LWF/ZCRS sponsors refugees to all levels of education except pre-school. With LWF/ZCRS it is the responsibility of the students to find for themselves the services which they (LWF/ZCRS) do not offer.

6.2.2 OBF

The sponsorship programme of the OBF is called Scholarship Programme in Developing Countries. It is administered from OBFs' only office in Zambia based in Lusaka. The agency is headed by a representative and it deals with refugee education only. OBF supports the artisanal skills training centre in Ukwimi where refugees are taught tailoring, knitting, embroidery, metal fabrication and brick-laying.

An Education Counsellor is directly responsible for the allocation of scholarships to refugee students and assisting them to find places. Under the supervision of the Representative, the Education Counsellor is responsible for recruitment, counselling, placement of students, budgeting, development of strategies for programme implementation and monitoring the welfare of students. Like the Administrative Assistant at LWF/ZCRS, the OBF Education Counsellor is assisted by a secretary. The Education Counsellor

has a Bachellor of Social Work degree and had been serving in the agency for five years and four months at the time this data was collected.

Like with LWF/ZCRS and UNHCR, refugees are not part of the decision making team. All educational assistance planning decisions are done by the Education Counsellor under the guidance of the Representative. While LWF/ZCRS supports Liberation Movement - tailored programmes and university education in Zambia and elsewhere, OBF does not. OBF sponsorship for University education is only tenable in German to German-speaking candidates. OBF is a member of the CCSS to which the other two agencies also belong. OBF too, does not have any arrangement to co-sponsor students. As far as the Education Counsellor knows, they "provide everything."

6.2.3 UNHCR

The UNHCR Refugee Services of Zambia is situated along Bombay Street in the second class shopping area of Lusaka. The agency administers a number of welfare services to both rural and urban refugee services. It is the national social service dispensing centre for UNHCR in the country and education is one of the many projects. The agency is headed by a Project Coordinator who supervises a number of counsellors of whom the Education Counsellor is one. The Education Counsellor is responsible for arranging for placement of refugees, counselling, recruitment, budgeting and development of strategies for implementing the programme. In the absence of the Education Counsellor, usually one of the other counsellors is assigned to take on education as an additional task

till the incumbent of the office comes back.

At the time these data were being collected the person occupying the post of Education Counsellor was a teacher by profession. She has a Bachelor of Arts (Education) degree and had served the agency for one year and two months in the same position. The Education Counsellor has her work plan approved by the National Social Sciences Officer or UNHCR Representative with the knowledge of the Project Coordinator who is the immediate supervisor. Much of the activities that are carried out at the UNHCR - Refugee Services of Zambia are an implementation of programme decisions that originate from or have been approved by the Head Office in Geneva or the Branch Office in Lusaka. All significant ideas that originate from the agency have to be forwarded to the Branch Office to be approved or for forwarding to Geneva for approval. The Education Counsellor said that they do refer students to other agencies when they think that other agencies can meet the students' need which UNHCR would not meet either as a matter of policy or because of a resource defficiency.

The idea of incorporating service users into the decision-making process was applaudable to all the three agencies. This, too, was emphasized by the UNHCR Representative in Zambia who expressed the view that refugees should be part of and encouraged to participate in making decisions that affect them. However, no refugee, student or parent to any of those interviewd, has ever sat on any of the committees that deliberate on issues affecting their welfare.

6.3.0 CO-ORDINATION

In 1985 the Co-ordinating Committe of Scholarship Sponsors (CCSS), which used to exist before was revived with a view to co-ordinate the efforts of all agencies that were involved in giving educational assistance to refugees. This is the only existing formal arrangement for co-ordination among the agencies. It draws membership from all refugee sponsoring agencies, representatives from such government departments as Ministry of Home Affairs - Refugee Commission Office, the two Ministries of Education, DTEVT and UNHCR Branch Office. Before the functioning of the CCSS, according to all the agencies' officials who were interviewed, there were quite a number of refugee students who used to hold two scholarships at once.

The CCSS was founded with a view to tackle together the problems that member agencies faced in their administration of educational assistance to refugees. According to the Education Counsellors, the 1985 revival of CCSS had the following objectives:

1. To standardise the scholarship
2. To form a single and united basis for assisting institutions of learning where refugees are with acquisation of equipment.
3. To follow up issues of interest with the Government together.
4. To have a central pool of applications to choose from and allocate students accordingly.

In 1986 "the CCSS appinted a sub-committee which reviewed the

allowances of the students in the light of the economic situation prevailing in Zambia and recommended new levels of allowances which were accepted by all members of the CCSS" (LWF 1986:17). Two Education Counsellors told me that this was not implemeted and still is difficult to hope for because of different levels of funding. At the time these data were being collected, refugees wishing to shift from one sponsor to another were required to bring a letter of consent from their current sponsors to the agency they want to change to. This was in a bid to curb the holding of more than one scholarship by students.

However, the agencies themselves have performed very poorly in terms of information sharing. Despite their proximity and being located in one town, Lusaka, none of them had even an old list of the names of the students sponsored by any of the two other agencies. Paradoxically, refugee aid agencies vow to share information with each other as exemplified, for example, by the following resolution of a UNHCR-sponsored workshop held in Mogadishu in November 1987:

> "Sharing of information, budgetary detail, project documents, etc between all partners and at all levels should take place as a matter of routine" (UNHCR 1987:11).

6.4.0 FUNDING AND BUDGET

This section of the chapter discusses the sources of funding in terms of the budgeting procedures and the conditions that the providers attach in compliance with the goals and strategies of the programmes they support. We will also be looking at the degree of

flexibility that the dispensing agencies (LWF/ZCRS, OBF and UNHCR Refugee Services of Zambia) have.

6.4.1 LWF/ZCRS

The Zambia Christian Refugee Service is operated by the Lutheran World Federation (Department of World Service) on behalf of the WCC/ACCC and in consultation with CCZ. That is why this agency is refered to as LWF/ZCRS. It started supporting refugee education in 1977.

The money to run the LWF/ZCRS comes from the WCC and the LWF Headquarters. All of it comes through LWF Headquarters. The Administrative Assistant makes the budget for the educational assistance programme in consultation with the Director, who approves it at local level. This budget is submitted to the Headquarters where money comes from. The money is given for the stated purpose, but the details and strategies of implementation are worked out by the local agency. The agency Headquarters does not put any conditions for receiving or dispensing of the funds except the good faith that the local agency staff were able to carry out the project in the best of their ability for the welfare of refugees. Whenever there are unavoidable significant changes in the programme the Headquarters is notified, either just for information, or for extra funding. This has enabled LWF/ZCRS to adjust to the realities of the economy in Zambia. These data were obtained from an interview with the Administrative Assistant and agency reports (LWF 1981, 1986, 1987).

6.4.2 OBF

The OBF began to operate in Zambia in 1978. The FRG felt the need to help the Zambian Government in the provision of scholarships to refugees. All the OBF money comes from the government of West Germany.

The German government does not put conditions for the utilisation of the funds and other provisions they give to OBF in Zambia. This is because for OBF all educational programmes to be supported are initiated either in Germany or by their Representative who sends them for approval. For this reason, all the money and other resources they send to their oversease office in Zambia is for what has already been approved. The yearly current expenditures are planned by the local office staff (Education Counsellor and the Representative) which seem to be doing well in taking care of the inflation in the Zambian economy. OBF is also not limited to time of the year to submit new programmes for funding.

6.4.3 UNHCR = REFUGEE SERVICES OF ZAMBIA

The budgetary procedure for this agency is very different from the other two agencies. The UNHCR budget, where the funds come from, is formally acted upon once in a year. In this way a stamp of approval is placed on policies reflected in the proposed expenditures. "No contributing government can subsequently influence the intended programme short of the extreme expedient of refusing to pay" (Buehrig 1971:53). Each year the counsellors in the different programmes of the agency submit their proposed budget and activities to the Branch Office where they are discussed and

the final documents put into a consolidated UNHCR Branch Office budget. This is sent to UNHCR Headquarters where it will then be approved after possible alternations have been made to it. The programme is expected to be implemented in the form that has been approved.

The other thing about UNHCR Education programme is that the policy is set by the Headquarters and not by the agency. Several elements are involved in how UNHCR policy is determined. These include the General Assembly's constituent resolution, the implementing agency's annual reports, the political organ attached to the agency consisting of selected representatives from host-government institutions and the local UNHCR secretariat (Buehrig 1971:53). Hence any change in the programme expenditure has to go through the same lengthy budgetary/programming procedure. The condition is that you have to operate within what has been approved and all expenditure has to be for the items they were meant for on the budget.

6.5.0 IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

From the data that have been presented above and the discussion, we can deduce that there are varying levels of flexibility among the three agencies. The most flexible agency is LWF/ZCRS while UNHCR - Refugee Services of Zambia is the least flexible. This has been demonstrated by the fact that LWF/ZCRS plans and budgets originate from the local office in Zambia. They ask for money from their Headquarters to implement their local plans. The Headquarters does not specify the form in which this

money should reach the students. The local agency staff decide what to give in cash and what to buy for the students and also what to supplement using the general emergency consignments for refugees.

OBF has more authority at the local office. The dispensing agency is the same as the national authority. There is no other link between the agency and the Headquarters. UNHCR on the other hand can not alter anything. If they must purchase uniforms for the pupils, Branch Office has to approve and that has to be within the budget. This is why they cannot even do a little more for a refugee if that will mean extra cost because there is always no extra-money. "Every ngwee is marked." Therefore our hypothesis that the UNHCR education service agency is less flexible than the other agencies is accepted.

The data discussed above demonstrated that a formal channel of communication exists. This is the Coordinating Committee of Scholarship Sponsors (CCSS). It is true that when the CCSS was non-existent there were overlaps. There are no longer overlaps to the knowledge of the agencies because they usually ask for clearance from current or former sponsors whenever a student applies for a scholarship.

The agencies policies and practices are such that each student has a "full scholarship." This rules out the existence of gaps. While there are no gaps, there are also no formal arrangement to let parents know that they still have an obligation to support their children in ways they can. The data showed that the

scholarships are a private arrangement between the child and the agency - where the pupil or student use their initiative through knowledge they obtain from friends or the agency to seek educational assistance. Parents are not involved. What was observed as a possible result of this kind of arrangement is that pupils and students do not live with their parents or guardians during vacations. They come to Lusaka for their holidays from all over the country at the expense of sponsors and live on vacation allowances or at Makeni Refugee Transit Centre. I suggest that sponsors get the parents involved in the training of the children.

The CCSS does not allocate programmes to the constituent agencies. Programmes are supported on the basis of what the agency policy is. These policies, as the data have shown, originate from the agencies' headquarters and local office. UNHCR policies originate from Geneva while OBF come from West Germany. LWF/ZCRS receive general guidelines from their Headquarters but the specific policies are formulated locally to suit local environment. The presence or absence of a formal channel of communication does not affect the programmes that an agency takes on. Therefore, the hypothesis that the 'absence of formal channels of communication among the agencies is associated with overlaps, gaps and contradictions in service provision is not supported by the data and hence is rejected.

CHAPTER SEVEN

REFUGEE STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMMES AND SPONSORSHIP SERVICES

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the views of the refugee students and pupils about the educational programmes they are on and the services they receive from their respective sponsors. Issues that will be discussed centre mainly on the adequacy and appropriateness of the programmes and the scholarship packages. The term student in the title of this chapter includes also the refugees in the learning category normally called pupils.

7.2 VIEWS ABOUT STUDY PROGRAMMES

Out of the 70 pupils and students, forty of these are in Secondary School (see table 6). All of the secondary school pupils who were interviewed said that they were happy to be at school. However, the students had different reasons for taking the courses. Of the thirty, who are on training, less than half (40 per cent) are satisfied with the course because they are training for the career they really wanted. Twenty per cent (6) are just on courses because those are the courses they heard about which they could qualify for while 4 said that they were just passing time because they had nothing else to keep them occupied (see table 16).

While the sponsors are spending resources on the students in the hope that after training they will be able to fend for

themselves, a number of students are in fact not on training for the first time. For two students this is the third course they are on (and they completed the first two); Seven are doing their second courses of whom one is studying for an advanced certificate after losing a job in the same career. The poor fellow lost the job because the employer said there were many Zambians with that qualification at the level he had attained. In all 9 students had other qualifications.

Table 17 shows that five of those qualifications which refugees in training already had were in fact obtained in Zambia.

TABLE 17 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS HELD BY STUDENTS

COUNTRY OBTAINED	LEVELS			ROW TOTAL
	Certificate	Advanced Certificate	Diploma	
Mozambique			1	1
Uganda	2	1	1	4
South Africa			1	1
Zambia	4	1		5
Column Total	6	2	3	11

This goes to underscore the fact that if after obtaining some qualifications for a job a refugee still remains jobless or can not find a stable job, he or she may want to train for another careeer. Sometimes the job search becomes so frustrating that a refugee can opt for other source of livelihood. This source can be a

scholarship as indicated by 10 per cent of the students (see table 15). Thus being on a scholarship, for some refugees, is a coping strategy. This option, however, is frustrating to refugee students who have children to look after if they have to be taking on one course after the other to just get the sponsorship money to enable them look after their children.

In as much as we appreciate the retraining of refugees to suit the job market of their country of asylum we equally would appreciate seeing them benefit from, at least, their first training in the country of asylum. Else, more money will be spent on the re-sponsoring of one person. The personal developments that the student could have attained are also delayed or avoided all together by prolonged student status. As they grow it is natural that their demands become more wide and consequently more expensive and more difficult to satisfy. There is likely to be a gap between what the sponsors think is sufficient for a student and what the student thinks a person of his/her age should have.

7.3 VIEWS ABOUT SPONSORSHIP SERVICES

We have already discussed the variations in the types and levels of provisions in Chapter 5. Students gave the same reasons as the agencies for those variations (see 5.3 and 5.4 above). Two students, however, mentioned that one's relationship with the agency official responsible for allowances also matters if they have to 'get good treatment', especially with non-cash provisions.

TABLE 18: STUDENTS' VIEW OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCHOLARSHIP

SPONSOR	SUFFICIENT	INSUFFICIENT	ROW TOTAL
LWF/ZCRS	2	15	17
	2.9	21.4	24.3
OBF	0 .0	16 22.9	16 22.9
UNHCR	1 1.4	36 51.4	37 52.9
COLUMN TOTAL	3 4.3	67 95.7	70 100.0

Only 3 students said that their scholarships are sufficient (see table 18). The rest said the provisions are insufficient. They have to get supplementary funds from their parents (54.3 per cent) and other sources. In fact 2 students get supplementary assistance from other agencies besides their sponsors (see table 19). Even the 3 students who said that the scholarship is

TABLE 19 SOURCE OF EXTRA FUNDING

SOURCE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENTAGE
Parents	38	54.3
Other Agencies	2	2.9
Other sources	30	42.8
Total	70	100.0

sufficient get some assistance from other sources, probably from

their parents. Those who think that the money or other form of assistance that they get from their sponsors is too little and that things can be better with other sponsors would want to change.

Table 13 and 14 show the reasons why students would want or not want to change their sponsors. Table 20 below shows the reasons for wanting to change sponsors by category of study.

TABLE 20 REASONS FOR WANTING TO CHANGE SPONSORS PER CATEGORY OF STUDY.

CATEGORY OF STUDY	REASON							ROW TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Secondary School	7 14.3	9 18.4	6 12.2	5 10.2	2 4.1	2 4.1	1 2.0	32 64.3
Technical Institutes	3 6.1	0 .0	1 2.0	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	1 2.0	5 10.2
College	0 .0	2 4.1	5 10.2	2 4.1	0 .0	0 .0	2 4.1	11 22.4
University	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	1 2.0	0 .0	0 .0	0 .0	1 2.0
Column Total	10 20.4	11 22.4	12 24.5	8 16.3	2 4.1	2 2.1	4 8.2	49 100.0

Codes for reasons:

1 = Sponsor doesn't give enough money
2 = Sponsor doesn't support the course I want to do
3 = Doesn't cater for other needs apart from school requirements
4 = Counsellors are too short tempered
5 = Others give more money
6 = I just want to change
7 = Other reasons.

The table shows that 65.3 per cent (32 of the 49 students and pupils) who want to change are those still in secondary schools.

This figure (32) also represents 80 percent of secondary school pupils while the 17 who want to change among those on training represent 56.7 per cent of that group.

The relatively high affinity to change by secondary schools pupils is also because they still have one more stage to go, that is training, where they can change. Similarly, this works against OBF-sponsored students. They all were once sponsored by other agencies (see table 13) and the majority (9 out of 16) do not want to change (see table 14). None of OBF students thought that other sponsors give more than OBF (see table 12) although 2 said that what they are given is not enough.

According to the pupils and students, the sponsors do relate to the institutions of learning in some way and they appreciate this. Table 21 below shows this:

TABLE 21: SPONSOR'S COOPERATION WITH INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING

SPONSOR	Sends my School report to my sponsors	Receive my allo wance via school	Participates in disciplinary matters	Got School place with sponsor's assistance	Other
LWF/ZCRS	15	3	11	10	3
OBF	14	1	9	6	0
UNHCR	32	10	23	13	6
TOTAL	61	14	43	29	9

All of the three agencies ask institutions of learning to send them the progress reports of the students they sponsor. Very few

receive their allowances through their institutions. It is either the agency sends the money to students or they have to come to Lusaka to collect it. For this and other reasons the students and pupils, alike, think that the sponsors are not doing enough to ease their life.

TABLE 22: STUDENTS VIEW OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF SPONSORS EFFORTS

SPONSOR	SUFFICIENT	INSUFFICIENT	ROW TOTAL
LWF/ZCRS	3 4.3	14 20.0	17 24.3
OBF	2 2.9	14 20.0	16 22.9
UNHCR	1 1.4	36 51.4	37 52.9
COLUMN TOTAL	6 8.6	64 91.4	70 100.0

Table 22 shows that only 6 students think that what is being done for them is sufficient. The rest do not think that way especially those sponsored by UNHCR, where, despite being the largest group (52.9 per cent of total) only one thinks that what is given is enough.

TABLE 23 SERVICES WHICH STUDENTS THINK SHOULD BE IMPROVED ON

SPONSOR	Provisions		
	Counselling	Amount of Allowances	Method of allocating allowances
LWF/ZCRS	14	17	15
OBF	4	15	6
UNHCR	29	36	30
TOTAL	47	68	51

Table 23 shows that students would want to see improvements in all fields but they put their priority on allowances and the way they are distributed. UNHCR sponsored students are the least satisfied, (see tables 22 and 23). This ties with their Education Counsellor's intimation that UNHCR was the lowest paying agency amongst the three.

These were a lot of additional comments from the pupils and students. The problems which the pupils and students face more often were mentioned by the number of complainants indicated in brackets as foolows: 1. Late sending of allowances by agencies (21), especially by UNHCR which recorded 13; 2. Poor official relations between students and agency (15); 3. Suspicion over the distribution of allowances, especially in kind benefits (11); 4. Students' are not well looked after when they come to Lusaka for their allowances (9); 5. Sponsors do not attend to students private problems that affect their studies (10); and 6.

Termination of scholarship for poor performance in end of term test (6).

The comments of pupils over the termination of scholarships because of poor performance were very emotional, understandably, because it makes them "live in fear and not study well". One grade 12 pupil wrote the following comment "... These young boys and girls are just from primary school. They do not understand the english spoken by some of our teachers here and it is their first time to live very far away from their parents. They have a lot of worries because they are not used. I feel bad. LWF should allow them to settle down so that they pick up. They are not really dull, already they passed grade 7. It is better they reach even form 2 so that they get a Certificate to qualify even for a tailoring course." These are understandable reasons. However, the sponsors, too, have their reasons for doing what they do: "terminate sponsorship if he fails tests consistently." But whichever side one takes the consequences are the same: frustration, poor performance and failure. No one benefits from these.

7.4 IMPLICATIONS

Refugee students' views are very diverse, just like their personal characteristics are, and sometimes they are contradictory. The later is indicated, for example, by responses such as of those who at one moment said the services are sufficient but later said they want more money.

There are many reasons, which have been discussed in this

chapter and chapters 4 and 5, why more complaints have been directed at UNHCR than the other two agencies. Some of the complaints have little or nothing to do with money. Probably the officers there are more caught up in rules of Inter-governmental bureaucracy. Agencies hope that through extra tests they will be able to select refugees who will not fail their studies and at the same time convincingly turn away those who do not get selected and those who get pushed off the scholarship list in due course. This has not pleased even the winners. They are also concerned for their fellow refugees. While the pupils and students still wish that some things were improved, they hail the agencies and institutions of learning for all the assistance they receive.

Setting up of an effective outreach counselling service that has up to date information on training programmes could reduce the numbers of students who end up on programmes they regret having taken. It is evident from the data that students come to know more about available courses which they can qualify for when they have already started a course they do not like. We recommend such counselling services. They will serve agencies' resources and benefit more refugees, too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACC (1983); Handbook for Refugee Works. Nairobi, AACC

Buehrig, E.H (1971); The UN and the Palestinian Refugees: A study in Noneterritorial Administration. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Christensen, H & Scott, W (1988); Survey of the Social and Economic Conditions of Afghan Refugees in Pakistan. Geneva, UNRISD.

Erikson, L-G, Melander, G & Nobel, P. eds (1981); An analysing Account of the Conference on the African Refugee Problem - Arusha, May 1979. Uppsala, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Freeman and Sheerwood (1970); Social Research and Social Policy. Englewood Cliffs-N.J., Prentice-Hall Inc.

Gilbert, N & Specht, H (1974); Dimensions of Social Welfare Policy. (Englewood Cliffs-N.J., Prentice-Hall Inc.

Gill D.G. (1976); Unravelling Social Policy. Cambridge-Ma: Schenkomum Publishing Co.

Hamrell, S. ed (1967); Refugee problems in Africa. Uppsala, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Hansen, A. G. (1977); Once the running stops: The Socio-Economic Resettlement of Angola Refugees (1966-1972) in Zambian Boarder Villages. PhD Thesis, Cornell University.

Hansen, A & Oliver-Smith, A. eds (1982); Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The problems and Responses of Dislocated People. Boulder, Westview Press, Inc.

Harrell-Bond, B.E (1988); "Breaking the Vicious Circle: Refugees and other dislocated persons in Africa." Paper presented on the African Social Situation at the African Centre for Applied Research and Training in Social Development 26-30 June, 1988.

Harrel-Bond, B.E. (1986); Imposing Aid: Emergence Assistance to Refugees. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Holborn, L W. (1975); Refugees: A problem of our time. Metuchan-N.J., The scarecrow Press, Inc.

ICVA, (1987); Consultation on Uprooted Peoples in Southern Africa: Report. Lusaka-Zambia, 8-12 June 1987.

IUEF (1972); "Ten years of Assistance to African Refugees through International Coorporation." (Other details missing).

Kabera, J.B. (1988); "Potential for Naturalisation of Refugees in Africa: The case of Uganda." Paper presented at the Silver Jubilee Conference of the African Studies Association of U.K. held at Cambridge University. 14-16 September, 1988.

Kasuta, E. T. (1987); "Progress Towards Self-Reliance in an Urban Refugee Project: A research report" UNZA-SDS, unpublished.

Lifanu, N.L. & Madhi, A.A.(1988); The Socio-economic survey of Spontaneously settled refugees in Kalabo, Senanga and Sesheke districts of Western province. Lusaka, UNZA-IHR.

LWF (1988, 1985, 1986, 1987); LWF/ZCRS Annual Reports. Lusaka, LWF.

Manase, E (1987); "The Social and Economic Status of REfugees in Zambia Law Obligatory Essay Research Report." Lusaka, UNZA.

Marshall, T.H. (1955); Social Policy. London, Hutchnson University Library.

Morgan, S & Colson, E eds (1987); People in Upheaval. New York, Centre for Migration Studies.

OAU (1975); African and its Refugees. Addis Ababa: Bureau for the Placement and Education for African Refugees.

OBF (1983); A-K Journal: The Otto Benecke Foundation. Born, OBF.

Pensioen, J.K. ed (1962); Social Welfare Policy - Contributions to theory. The Hague-Netherlands, Mounton and Company.

Rein, M (1970); Social Policy: Issues of Policy and Change. New York, Random House, Inc.

Southern African Economist Volume 2 Number 1, Feb/March 1989

Times of Zambia, Tuesday September 11, 1990.

Titmuss, R. M. (1969); Commitment to Welfare. New York, Panthem Books.

UNHCR (1979); Handbook on procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status Under the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Geneva, UNHCR.

UNHCR (1987 a); Primary Education Workshop Report. 23-29 November, 1987. Mogadishu, Somalia.

UNHCR (1987 b); "Refugees and Refugee Assistance in Zambia." General information paper No. 2 Lusaka, UNHCR.

UNHCR (1988); Report of the Regional Workshop on primary Education for Refugee Children. 26-30 September, Lusaka. Lusaka. UNHCR.

UNHCR (Undated); "The UNHCR Scholarship Programme information Brochure" Geneva, UNHCR.

UNIC (1988); The United Nations in Zambia: A profile. Lusaka, UNIC.

Zwingman, C.A. & Pfisto-Ammande, M (1973); Uprooting and After. New York, Springer Verlag.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS AT SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND TRAINING INSTITUTIONS.

PERSONAL DATA

1. Age: ..... years Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

   Place of birth: Town ..... Country .....

2. Marital Status: 1. Married ( ) 2. Single ( )
   3. Divorced ( ) 4. Widow/Widower ( )

3. Country of origin .....

   Year of entry into Zambia: 19 ....

4. How many are you in your family? .....brother ....sisters.

5. How many children do you have? List their ages and tick ( ) if they are in Zambia.

Boys		Girls	
Age	In Zambia	Age	In Zambia
.....	( )	.....	( )
.....	( )	.....	( )
.....	( )	.....	( )
.....	( )	.....	( )

6. Are your parents:

   1. Both in Zambia ( )
   2. Father only in Zambia ( )
   3. Mother only in Zambia ( )
   4. In country other than of origin or Zambia? ( )
   5. Other (specify) .....

7. If answer to 6 (1), (2), or (3) is yes, fill in the appropriate name of place where they live.

   1. .....settlement camp since 19 .....

   2. .....Town/city .....compound/township

   3. In a village in ..... district since 19 .....

8. Who do you live with in Zambia?

   1. Father ( )

   2. Mother ( )

   3. Guardian/relative ( )

   4. Alone or with my wife/husband and children ( )

   5. Other (specify) .....

EDUCATION

9. Name of current institution of learning .....

10. Name of current sponsors .....
    1. LWF/ZCRS ( ) 2. OBF ( ) UNHCR ( )

11. When did you start school? 19 .....

12. Where?

1. Angola	( )	2. Zimbabwe	( )
3. Mozambique	( )	4. Uganda	( )
5. South Africa	( )	6. Namibia	( )
7. Zambia	( )	8. Others	( )

13. What school/institution did you go to prior to being admitted to your current programme?

    .....1. Primary 2. Secondary 3. College
    4. University.

14. In Zambia

    1. Yes ( ) 2. No. ( )
    3. In town? ( ) 4. In settlement camp ( )

15. How did you secure a place in this secondary/training school?

    1. I qualified ( )
    2. Iqualified but had to be helped to get a place ( )

16. Name the agency which helped you (if any)

    1. LWF/ZCRS ( ) 2. OBF ( ) 3. UNHCR ( )
    4. Other (specify) .....

17. Did your sponsors help you to find a place at your current institution of learning?

    1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

18. If they did, in which of the following ways did they?

    1. Wrote an application letter on my behalf ( )
    2. Approached the school authorities on my behalf ( )
    3. Attached a letter of recommendation to my application ( )
    4. Have a written (standing) arrangement with the institution to accept refugee students ( )
    5. Other (specify) .....

19. Have you ever been sponsored by an agency other than the current one

    1. Yes ( ) 2. No. ( )

20. How many agencies sponsored you in your current programme?

    Name them: 1 ..... 2..... 3 .....

21. What does each of these agencies provide you with?

Agency	Type of Assistance
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....

NOTE: Questions 22 to 32 are only for those taking training; not secondary school level.

22. What qualification level are you training for?

1. Certificate ( ) 2. Diploma ( )
3. Intermediate Certificate ( ) 4. Advanced Certificate ( )
5. Degree ( ) 6. None Certificate

23. From what source did you hear about the college programme you are on?

1. My current sponsors ( )
2 Friends who have/have not been on the programme ( )
3. News paper/radio advertisement ( )
4. Secondary school career master ( )
5. Other (specify) .....

24. If answer to 23 is not 1, did you get any more information from your sponsor about the course before applying for it?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

25. If, what information?

1. Name and address of institution ( )
2. Courses offered ( )
3. Admission requirements ( )
4. Procedure of application ( )
5. Dates of application ( )
6. Scholarships/sponsorship available ( )
7. Other means of support and services accessible to you( )
8. Uses and usefulness of the course ( )
9. What course(s) I can get admitted to given my qualifications ( )

26. What other qualification do you have? .....

27. From which country did you obtain these?

1. Angola ( ) 2. Zimbabwe ( ) 3. Mozambique ( )
4. Uganda ( ) 5. South Africa ( ) 6. Namibia ( )
7. Zambia ( )
8. Other (specify) .....

28. Why do you not use these qualifications?

1. No jobs ( )
2. I have no certificate for the skill ( )
3. It is not what I wanted to do ( )
4. Other (specify) .....

29. Would you want to train for something different from what you are doing now?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

30. Why are not training in what you want to?

1. Lack of qualification for entry. ( )
2. It is difficult for a refugee to take that course ( )
3. I did not know how to go about applying for it ( )
4. Other (specify) .....

31. Are you satisfied with the type of training you are getting?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

32. Why did you choose the training you are undergoing? (You may give more than one answer)

1. It is the only one I heard about ( )
2. It is the career I always wanted ( )
3. It is the course I could qualify for ( )
4. You are better off an education sponsorship than elsewhere ( )
5. To just pass time ( )
6. It is what the sponsors told me to take ( )
7. My sponsors would not support a different programme ( )
8. I could not find sponsors for what I wanted to do ( )
9. Other reasons (specify) .....

SPONSORSHIP

33. Which agencies have helped you in your education/training apart from your current sponsors? List them.

1. LWF/ZCRS ( )
2. OBF ( )
3. UNHCR ( )
4. Other (specify) .....

34. From whom did you hear about the scholarships offered by your current sponsors?

1. UNHCR Branch office ( )
2. LWF office ( )
3. SCF ( )
4. OBF ( )
5. CCZ ( )
6. School Careers Master ( )
7. Refugees Officer ( )
8. Friends ( )
9. Other .....( )

35. Method

1. Scholarship booklet ( )
2. Agency notice board ( )
3. Education officer/counsellor ( )
4. Other (specify) ..... ( )

36. What type of assistance to your sponsors give you?

1. Tuition fee ( )
2. Boarding/accommodation fee ( )
3. Transport money ( )
4. Clothing allowance ( )
5. Vacation allowance ( )
6. Pocket money ( )
7. Book allowance ( )
8. Other (specify) .....

37. Do they give you the same amount always?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

38. If no, what causes the differences in allocations at different times?

1. It depends on the problems you present to them ( )
2. It depends on what the school wants you to have that term. ( )
3. If they have more money at the office they also gave more to students. ( )
4. Other (specify) .....

39. Do your sponsors give the same amount of money to all students?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

40. If no, what determines how much each student should get?

1. Level and type of qualification being sought ( )
(those in higher classes get more)

2. Personal needs - what the student lacks ( )
3. Number of people a student looks after what ( )
the institution requires of student
4. The cost of living of a particular institution ( )
5. Other reasons (specify) .....

41. Is the assistance you get from your sponsors sufficient?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

ii) What is the deficit, in monetary terms? K .....

42. Where do you get extra assistance from?

1. Parents .....
2. Other agencies (specify) .....
3. Others (specify) .....

43. Given a chance now would you change to a different sponsor from the ones who are assisting you at the moment?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

44. If (answer to 43 is yes) why would you want to change?

1. The current sponsors don't give enough money ( )
2. They dont sponsor the course I want to do ( )
3. They don't cater for other needs apart from school requirement ( )
4. The counsellors are too short-tempered ( )
5. Others give more money ( )
6. I just want to change ( )
7. Other (specify) .....

45. If answer to 43 is no, why not?

1. The current sponsors give enough money ( )
2. No other sponsors support the programme I could love to follow. ( )
3. The counsellors/directors are very wise people, I am used to them ( )
4. Others give less money ( )
5. Other (specify) .....

46. In what matters do your sponsors and institution coorporate? (You may check ( ) more than one)

1. Learning institution sends my school/academic reports to sponsors ( )
2. I receive my allowances through the school/institution's administration ( )
3. Sponsors are made to be aware of or participate in resolving matters at school. ( )
4. I got the place through the effort of the sponsors ( )
5. Others (specify)

47. Do you think what your sponsors are doing for you is enough?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

48. What service(s) do you think they should improve on?

1. Counselling ( )
2. Amount of allowance ( )
3. Method of allocating allowance ( )
4. Other (specify) .....

49. What more do you think they could do for you?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

50. What comment or observation have you to make concerning:

i) Your programme .....

.....

ii) Scholarship services being offered by your sponsors?

.....

.....

iii) Refugee scholarship services in Zambia: .....

.....

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP.

ANNEX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCY STAFF

SECTION I

1. (i) Name of agency .....

   (ii) Designation .....

2. (i) Gender: Male ( ); Female ( )

   (ii) Marital Status: Married ( ) Single ( )
   Divorced ( ) Widow/Widower ( )

3. (i) Academic Qualification .....

   (ii) Professional Qualification .....

4. (i) Period of service in the agency .....years .....months

   (ii) Period held the current position ....years .....months

   iii) Other positions held in the same agency .....

   .....

SECTION II

5. What kind of services does your agency offer refugees in Zambia?

   1. ..... 2. .....

   3. ..... 4. .....

   5. .....

6. What is the policy of your agency concerning refugee education and training in Zambia?

   .....
   .....

   .....
   .....

7. Where does this policy originate from?

1. Agency headquarters ( )
2. Regional office ( )
3. Branch/field office in Zambia ( )

4. Other (specify) .....

8. What are the policy objectives?

1. ..... 2. .....

3. ..... 4. .....

9. What are the strategies for achieving the objectives?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

10. For how long has your agency been supporting refugee education and training in Zambia?

Since 19 .....

11. How many members of staff deal with education/training in your agency? ..... Please indicate:

Position	Role in education/training
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....

12. What are your responsibilities in relation to refugee education and training?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

13. What factors do you consider in an applicant for a scholarship?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

SECTION III

14. What education/training programmes do you support? How many students are in each programme?

Programme	Number of Students
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....

15. What are your reasons for supporting the programmes?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

16. What other agency/agencies sponsor students on similar programmes as those you do? What programmes are these?

Agency	Programme
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....

17. Which agencies sponsor refugee students on programmes that you do not?

Agency	Programme
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....
5.	.....

18. From the following , tick the programmes you do not sponsor students to and indicate (the number for) your agency's reasons for not supporting the programmes. You may give as many reasons as there are.

Programme		Here are the reasons:
1. Lower secondary	( )	1. It is our agency policy not to.
2. Senior Secondary	( )	2. Lack of funds
3. Non-certificate courses	( )	3. No jobs for these who complete.
4. Technical/Vacational courses	( ) .... ( )	4. We agreed with other agencies to support programmes and leave the rest to others.
5. University level	( )	5. Refugees do not need agencies' support for such.
6. Other trainings such as teaching, nursing, etc.	( )	6. Our funders agreed to support only the programmes we currently sponsor.

SECTION IV

19. From the list below indicate which one/ones is/are:

1. Very important; 2. Important;
3. Not important but considered;
4. Not considered; when prcessing an application for a scholarship by your agency. Please put the number of your rating in the brackets provided.

1. Age ( )
2. Qualification being sought ( )
3. Interest of student ( )
4. Proof of admission to an institution ( )
5. Standard of the institution where studies will be taken ( )
6. Nationality ( )
7. Student's financial position ( )
8. Other (specify) .....( )

20. What kind of support do you give to the students you sponsor?

1. Tuition fees ( )
2. Stipend ( )
3. Transport money ( )
4. Clothing allowance ( )
5. Pocket money ( )
6. Other (specify) ..... ( )

21. Do you give the same amount of money to all the students whom you sponsor?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

22. If not, what determines how much you should give to each student? (You may tick as many as is the case)

1. Level/type of qualification being sought ( )
2. Personal needs - what student lacks ( )
3. Family size (student's dependants) ( )
4. Provide according to what the institution requires students to have and pay ( )
5. Gender ( )
6. Money available for distribution to students ( )
7. Other (specify) .....( )

23. Are there any provisions for which you give the same amount of money to all or categories of students?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

24. Do the amounts for the following differ according to categories or levels of education/training?

Type of provisions	1. Yes	2. No
1. Clothing allowance	( )	( )
2. Transport money	( )	( )
3. Pocket money	( )	( )

4.	Stipend	( )	( )
5.	Book allowance	( )	( )
6.	Other specify	( )	( )

25. Do you have students who are sponsored by your agency together with another agency?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

If yes, what support does ache agency provide?

Agency	Type of support
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....

26. Do you have any formal arrangement to co-support students?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

If yes, please explain briefly .....

.....

.....

.....

27. Whose responsibility is it to find for the students you sponsor the services that your agency does not offer which may be offered by other agency?

1. Our agency's ( )
2. Student's ( )
3. Other agency's ( )

28. Which of the following items of information do you have about the programmes you sponsor student's on? Indicate the numbers of item of information against your programmes. (information: 1. name and address of institution offering the course, 2. Courses offered, 3. Admission requirements, 4. procedure of application, 5. Dates of application, 6. Scholarships available, 7. Usefulness of the course).

Programme	Information available
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....
4.	.....
5.	.....

29. Do you make this information available to students?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

30. If you do, when do you pass on the information to students?

1. In advance of date of application ( )
2. Whenever they come to ask for the information ( )
3. Other (specify)..... ( )

31. What method/methods do you use for passing on the information?

1. Agency notice boards ( )
2. Notice boards at (or officials of) settlement camps ( )
3. Leaflets/brochures distributed to refugees ( )
4. Other (specify) ..... ( )

SECTION V

32. Does your agency belong to any commitment that deals with refugee education/training?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( ) 3. I don't know ( )

33. If yes, list the committee(s):

1. ..... 2. .....

3. ..... 4. .....

34. What are the functions of each of the committee?

Committee No.	Functions
1.	.....
2.	.....
3.	.....

4. .....

35. Who, in your agency, sits on the committee?

Committee	Agency Representative(s)
1	.....
2	.....
3	.....
4	.....

36. From the following areas of planning, tick where you participate in:

1. Education programmes to be supported ( )
2. Number of beneficiaries for each programme ( )
3. Budgeting for the programme ( )
4. Scouting for funds from donors ( )
5. Strategies for programme implementation and monitoring ( )

37. At what level are decisions made concerning the above areas of your refugee education.training programmes? (Decision levels are: 1. implementing agency; 2. national office; 3. regional; 4. headquarters). Put the number representing your choice.

Programme	Decision level
1	.....
2	.....
3	.....
4	.....

38. What is/are the source(s) of your funding?

1. Charitable organisations/Foundations ( )
2. Individual donors ( )
3. Government ( )
4. Own generated funds ( )
5. Other (specify) ..... ( )

39. Through what means do you obtain the funds?

1. Headquarters scouts for money and sends some to us ( )
2. We make project proposals and submit them to possible funders ( )
3. We are on a Government budget ( )
4. We make appeals through the media ( )
5. We make our own foundation/enterprise* where we draw money from ( )
6. Other (specify) ..... ( )

40. Do some or all of your funders put conditions for you to receive and (how to) use the money?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

41. If yes, what are the conditions?

1. .....

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

42. In what ways do you help your students when they are through with:

1. Secondary education? .....
.....

.....

2. Training? .....

.....

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP.

---

* delete whichever is not applicable.

ANNEX III: UNHCR STUDENT SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT

Dear .....

STUDENT SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT

I am pleased to inform you that the UNHCR Branch office in Zambia has on behalf of the UN High Commission for Refugees accepted your application for educational assistance for a study programme

leading to .....

..... at .....

1. Your sponsorship is for the academic year ..... only and may be continued in subsequent sessions subject to availability of funds and upon receipt of periodic progress reports from the head of your school.

2. You are expected to abide by the rules and regulations of your school and generally show a good example.

3. Students who are sponsored by the UNHCR shall not at the same time applu for or enjoy scholarship funds from other agencies, persons or organisations without prior approval of the UNHCR Branch office in Zambia.

4. The sponsorship is tenable only for the school and training programme indicated above. It is therefore not transferable to any other school, or training programme without prior approval of the sponsor.

5. Your annual entitlements under this sponsorship shall include the cost of tuition, room, board and other approved institutional charges plus the following personal allowances only:-

	Item	Amount
1.	Installation Grant/Unifrom	.....
2.	Books	.....
3.	Pocket money	.....
4.	Transport	.....
5.	Vacation	.....
6.	Equipment	.....
7.	Other	.....

6. Should you fail to achieve satisfactory performance in your school work or be dismissed, suspended from school, or maintain irregular attendance, the sponsor or his authorised agents shall have the right to automatically cancel and withdraw this sponsorship.

7. If you acept this offer of sponsorship, and the conditions specified above, please sign and return one copy of this

agreement to the UNHCR Branch Office at the address shown above or forward to the same address through the head of your school

SIGNED .....

NAME .....

On my behalf this .....

day of ..... 19 .....

SIGNED .....

NAME .....

On behalf of the UNHCR Branch Office, Lusaka, Zambia.

This ..... day of .....

19 .....

ANNEX IV STATISTICS OF 1989 UNHCR - SPONSORED SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS

NAME OF SCHOOL	PROVINCE	GRADES					TOTAL
		8	9	10	11	12	
Nkumbi Int.	Central			11	10	14	35
Maheba Jnr	N/Western	10	45				55
Kaoma	Western	15	24		1		40
Mwinilunga	N/Western	6	1		1	3	11
Solwezi	N/Western	2	1	1	2	1	7
"Several"	N/Western	2	2	2	3	1	10
"Several"	Western	1	1	2			4
Nambala Basic	Central		1				1
Mupapa	Copperbelt	1	1				2
"Several"	Lusaka	2	1	4			7
Chikankata	Southern		1				1
Mpatamatu	Copperbelt						1
Total		39	78	20	17	20	175

Note: There were 133 boys and 42 girs.

Of the 57 in grades 10, 11 and 12 only 8 were girls.

ANNEX V: STATISTICS OF 1990 UNHCR-SPONSORED PUPILS AND STUDENTS

(a) Pupils

NAME OF SCHOOL	PROVINCE	GRADES					TOTAL
		8	9	10	11	12	
Nkumbi Int.	Central				11	10	21
Maheba Jnr	N/Western	64	31				95
Kaoma	Western	5	2	1	1		9
Mwinilunga	N/Western		3	1	1	2	7
Solwezi	N/Western		3			2	5
"Several"	N/Western		4		1	1	6
"Several"	Western	1	3	1		1	6
"Several"	Lusaka	5	1	4			10
Mporokoso	Northern			1			1
Total		75	47	8	14	16	160

(b) Students

Name of Institution	Student No.
Copperbelt University	3
University of Zambia	1
Evelyn Hone College	4
Luanshya Trades	1
Kabwe Trades	1
Livingstone T.T.C	1
Chizela Bible Institute	2
Capital Trades	1
Success Technical College	1
Lusaka Trades	1
Total	16

ANNEX VI: STATISTICS OF 1990 LWF/ZCRS-SPONSORED PUPILS AND STUDENTS

(a) Pupils

Name of School	Province	Grades						Total
		8	9	10	11	12	EFL*	
Nkumbi Int.	Central	32	10	15	3	2	3	65
Lewanika	Western				1			1
Mwininlunga	N/Western				2	2		4
Solwezi	N/Western				1			1
Munali	Lusaka		1		1			2
Total		32	11	15	8	4	3	73

*EFL = English as a Foreign language.

(b) Students

Name of Institution	Students No
Salvation Army	1
Theological College	1
Livingstone Trades	1
Kasama Trades	1
Evelyn Hone College	2
Zambia Agric. College	1
On Industrial training	5
Total	12

(c) **ANC pupils and students**

Name of Institution	Number of candidates
GCE - UNZA	6
GCE - Evelyn Hone College	2
Evelyn Hone College	2
NIPA	2
UNZA - Post graduate	1
on Industrial training	1
Dzitandizeni Trades	1
Makeni Ecumenical Centre	1
ZBIT	1
Total	17

UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
D