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ABSTRACT
The evidence shows that the Tanzanian and Zambian university students representing the African by origin overwhelming majority of the countries' population are generally tolerant towards their compatriots of the non-African (European and South Asian) origins. However, the evidence also gives reason to argue that the level of tolerance among the Zambian students is higher than among Tanzanian. The examination of a number of factors that supposedly could lead to the Zambian educated youth's higher level of tolerance has shown that the most significant among them are those related to the two nations' history since the pre-colonial time, the memory of it, and the use and abuse of this memory by the post-colonial states. From the historical point of view the greatest essential difference between the two cases lies in the existence since pre-colonial time of the Swahili culture and language and of the minimal number of expansionist centralized polities on the contemporary state's territory as the background for autochthonous peoples' unity in Tanzania and lack of such a background in pre-colonial Zambia.

INTRODUCTION
In this article I discuss the results of a recent comparative research among university students in Tanzania and Zambia, two neighboring African countries which are independent states now and used to be British possessions in the past. In both countries the overwhelming majority of the population (over 99 per cent) is formed by peo-
ple of numerous local ethnic groups who co-exist with compatriots of different non-African origins, whose communities, although small in number, are well visible in Tanzania's and Zambia's economic and social life. My goal was to study the attitude of the most advanced, educated and, hence, socially prospective part of the African youth, that is university students, to those non-African minorities that formed in the time of and due to colonialism – to the so-called ‘Europeans’ and ‘Indians’. The particular problem I was concerned with is whether African university students consider and are eager to perceive their compatriots with completely different ethno-cultural backgrounds and group histories, as well as a specific position in contemporary society, as parts of the Tanzanian and Zambian nations. Thus, I trace not only how the minorities' present position in the respective societies influences the students' attitude to them, but also the way the historical memory of the pre-colonial and colonial past, its image in the young people's minds, formed not without participation of its canonic interpretations within the framework of the postcolonial states' ideologies, influence their attitude to the diasporas that would have hardly ever formed in a situation other than colonial.

METHODS
In the course of research a questionnaire was distributed among students of the largest, most prestigious and definitely the best higher education institutions of the two countries – the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania and the University of Zambia based in the capital city of Lusaka (see Appendix 1). The students represented a great variety of the Universities schools and departments, from Engineering to Sciences to Social Sciences to the Humanities. In Zambia the questionnaire was available in English, the country's only official language and the language of instruction at the University, while in Tanzania it was offered in English and Swahili (both of which are used in many spheres of life, including education). As a result, 167 questionnaires were filled in by the students of the University of Dar es Salaam and 146 by their peers from the University of Zambia (although, as it usually happens, not all the respondents answered all the questions). The questionnaires were processed and finally the evidence they contain took the form of three electronic databases: Tanzanian, Zambian, and integral. Their statistical analysis via the IBM SPSS Statistics 19.0 computer program paved the way for qualitative interpretation of the collected evidence.
Besides, structured interviews with university teachers, student organizations activists, etc. were conducted – 21 in Dar es Salaam and 15 in Lusaka (see Appendix 2). As it could be predicted safely, their transcripts turned out very helpful in clarifying many points of our interest.

Finally, some evidence and conclusions of the research I conducted in the 2000s on the cultural stereotypes and intercultural relations in different strata of the Tanzanian society have also appeared relevant for this study.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

My central argument is that the difference in the young educated Africans' attitude to the colonialism-born minorities in contemporary Tanzania and Zambia can be explained by significant dissimilarities in their real pre-colonial and colonial historical fortunes, on the one hand, and in the ways history is used and abused in the post-colonial state ideologies, on the other. Indeed, although our research shows that in general the attitude of both Tanzanian and Zambian students to their European and South Asian compatriots is tolerant (what is important to make clear at the outset), it is evident that some of them do not perceive these minorities as groups of people who, notwithstanding cultural differences, share the same basic national values and who live for the benefit of the same country: four per cent of Tanzanian and one per cent of Zambian students expressed negative attitude to Europeans and fourteen and four per cent, respectively, to Indians. So, on the one hand, the students' attitude to the two migrant communities is not completely the same (it is better to Europeans than to Indians in both cases, what is typical not only for students but for the local population in general [Bondarenko 2008]), while on the other hand, the attitude to each of the communities is better among Zambian students than among Tanzanian. The fact that South Asians are not always treated cordially by native Africans is quite well-known to Africanists (see, e.g., Bharati 1972: 149ff.; Brown 2006: 112–148; Bondarenko 2008; Usov 2010: 171–181), so the primary aim of the present paper is to offer an explanation to the previously undiscovered (as to my knowledge) fact that Zambian students are more tolerant to the non-African diasporas than Tanzanian, in particular that they treat better both the Europeans and South Asians. This is reflected vividly in the collected evidence – the respondents' answers to not only the direct question about their attitude to the minorities, but also to such ques-
tions as: ‘What is your attitude to the culture of the Tanzanian/Zambian Europeans/Indians’, ‘How would you react if your child marries a Tanzanian/Zambian European/Indian?’, ‘Have you any friends among Tanzanian/Zambian Europeans/Indians?’, and ‘Do you think that Tanzanian/Zambian Europeans/Indians are well integrated in the Tanzanian/Zambian society?’.

In view of these results, it may seem illogical that there are more Tanzanians than Zambians (35 vs. 21 per cent) who believe that there is really a single national culture in their country, formed and shared by all the respective countries nationals, including the European and South Asian minorities. However, the higher percent of positive answers to the question about the existence of the integrated national culture among Tanzanian respondents is interrelated with the smaller percent of those who preferred to answer that in terms of culture their country is a mere composition of separate ethnic cultures (45 vs. 59 per cent for the Zambians) than of those who agree with the argument – in fact, most unpleasant for diasporas – that a single autochthonous culture opposes the cultures of migrants: 20 per cent in each state. In other words, this result indicates that the originally non-African migrants’ inclusion in or exclusion from the Tanzanian or Zambian nation is determined by factors that are more general and inclusive than those related just to the interactions between, and mutual attitudes of the originally African and non-African citizens of the two states. One can soundly approach the situation with the non-African diasporas and discuss it as a very particular but yet a special case of a more general problem of formation of nations as supraethnic civil communities based on common cultures, especially on shared systems of values and national mythologies.

Thus, the fundamental and vitally important for African countries problem of national unity sets a context for our subsequent discussion of the Tanzanian and Zambian students’ attitude to the European and South Asian minorities in their states. In fact, the whole socio-cultural ‘space’ of the discussion, from the very appearance of migrants from Europe and South Asia in what is today Tanzania and Zambia, to the existence of universities and students there, to the problem of nation-building in the polities once created violently and artificially, is rooted directly in the colonial past. However, as it will become clear from what follows, the account of both the pre-colonial legacy of the Tanzanian and Zambian peoples and the manipulations with their historical memory by the postcolonial states are not less important for understanding
of the contemporary situation, including providing an explanation of the similarities in and differences between the attitude of the Tanzanian and Zambian university students to their compatriots of the European and South Asian origins.

The analysis has revealed that a number of factors which, according to initial suppositions, could influence the students’ attitude to the European and South Asian minorities in reality are of minor importance. These factors are the respondents’ religious affiliation (Christian or Muslim), coming from a larger or smaller ethnic groups and settlements, and perhaps, financial situation. The factor that does matter is the degree of secularism/religiosity. For testing the relation between it and the respondents’ tolerance/xenophobia, I have compared answers to the question ‘How often do you pray?’ (those not observing the dogma are regarded as people with more secularized consciousness than those who observe) with generalization of answers to the question about the attitude to European and Indian Tanzanians and Zambians. Basing on the result of the comparison, it can be argued that secularization (to some extent also meaning Europeanization, especially in Africa), related to the education growth, plays a ambiguous role in shaping the Africans’ attitude toward the originally non-African minorities: while it promotes their better attitude to the Europeans (what can be regarded as a factor of the Africans’ general preference of Europeans to Indians, specific for this social layer), it also leads to some decline in general ethno-racial tolerance. Less secularized respondents are more tolerant; of the Zambian and Tanzanian students that pray according to the dogmas only one per cent labeled as ‘bad’ or ‘very bad’ their attitude to the Europeans and five per cent to the Indians while the respective figures for the less religious students are four and fourteen per cent. My previous research (Bondarenko 2008, 2010) has also revealed that the secularization growth, related directly to raising the standard of education, leads to increase in interreligious and decrease in interethnic and interracial tolerance, as secularization makes religious commonalities and differences less important for a person by transferring his/her self- and others identification center of gravity from the transcendental and universalistic values of monotheistic religions to the ‘terrestrial’ and local ethno-cultural values.

In the meantime, I have expected less tolerance on the side of the respondents most attached to traditional culture and its values. As the indicators of the ‘degree of traditionalism’ I have considered answers to several questions, especially to the one reflecting
the very basis and key value of traditional African world outlook and religion (e.g., Fortes 1966; Bondarenko 1996; Grinker et al. 2010: 283–322): ‘Do you think that it is necessary to make offerings to the deceased ancestors’ spirits, at least on important occasions?’ As it could be predicted, there really are quite traditionally oriented young intellectuals but they are few: in average, about one-third of the respondents in the two countries, but there are more such people among the Tanzanian students. Indeed, among those not devoted to the traditional values there are still slightly more of those whose attitude to the non-African minorities is positive. So, traditionalism is a predictor, though not strong, of the autochthons’ perception of the diasporas.

In our opinion, the most significant fact explaining the differences in the students’ attitude to the colonialism-born minorities in the two post-colonial states is that contrary to Zambia, in Tanzania what today serves as the socio-cultural background common for the overwhelming majority of its population formed long before the establishment of the colonial regime (first, from 1885, German and then, in 1919–1961/63, British). This background is the Swahili culture with its written language (Prins 1967; Mazrui and Shariff 1994; Middleton 1994; Horton and Middleton 2000; Knappert 2005). Thus, the growth of national consciousness and feelings can manifest itself mainly (although not exclusively, of course) at the ethno-racial, not just ethnic level. Indeed, only in the nineteenth century, the Swahili culture and language initially belonging to even now relatively small-numbered coastal people, began to spread widely in the depth of the continental part of the country (Mainland), while before that being generally limited to the coastal stripe. Besides, it is not a completely African culture but a synthesis of an original local culture with numerous and significant Arab cultural elements.

However, today the vast majority of the Afrotanzanians irrespective of ethnic origin and religion are proud of belonging to this culture and consider it as African and pre-colonial, and hence not owing its emergence to colonialism, integrating people of different African ‘tribes’ in the Tanzanian nation atop (not instead of) their particular ethnic origins. In fact, the Tanzanians usually know the origin (not only ethnic but regional as well) of their friends, neighbors and colleagues, what some of our European and Indian respondents in both countries liked to emphasize arguing that the Tanzanian or Zambian nation is a fiction. But to know does not
inevitably mean to give priority; as a black Tanzanian professor told us, ‘We [Afrotanzanians] are ethnically blind in some sense. …If you want to lose people’s respect, repeat every time from what ethnic group or region you are. Finally, someone will dare to ask you: “So… So what?”’ For Afrotanzanians the Swahili culture, including language, is the root, source, and background of the Tanzanian nation, which hence does not owe its origin to the Europeans and European colonialism to a great extent. It is also the pledge of generally peaceful relations between different Bantu peoples of the country (Gerasimov 2008), although some of our older respondents, comparing the situation in the first decades of independence and now, argued that today ethnicity is actualizing due to economic or political reasons. During the survey undertaken in 2005, 77 per cent of our 994 respondents coming from all social layers indicated Swahili as their mother-tongue, while only six persons claimed for the Swahili ethnic origin.

These are several of many typical statements on this matter of the Tanzanians of different ages and education level: ‘There is the Tanzanian nation and it is single, as we all speak the same language – Swahili. There are more than 120 tribes in Tanzania but the Swahili language unites us all…’ (a worker in his thirties); ‘Yes, there is the Tanzanian nation. Swahili is not ethnicity. Notwithstanding if a Tanzanian is a Gogo, or Luguru, or someone else by origin, we are united by the fact that we all speak the Swahili language’ (a driver in his mid-forties); ‘To be a Tanzanian means to be able to speak Swahili’ (a college student); ‘I believe that there is a single Tanzanian nation, because we have a common language – Swahili’ (an elderly linguist); ‘We all speak Swahili, we are all brothers and sisters’ (an Anglican bishop of approximately 45 years of age). Although, as some respondents told me and what I had chances to notice myself, in the elite strata of society English can be the prestigious first language of communication, as Gromova (2008: 92) argues (and many interviews do prove that she is right), in general

…the ethno-linguistic situation in Tanzania is characterized by noticeable predominance of the Swahili language and by its use in all the key functions of communicative sphere. The languages of relatively large ethnic groups, such as the Sukuma, Nyamwezi, Haya and some others that preserve compact settlement, are not in such a threatening situation as the languages of small ethnic groups that can disappear
in the non-distant future under the influence of mobility and
dynamics of the contemporary Swahili language (see also
Yoneda 2010).

The Swahili language is spoken fluently not only by the Afro-
tanzanians but also by almost all descendents of the non-African
migrants, although it is the first language for only a small part of
them.5 Indeed, as our interviews show, a long life among Africans
has really changed some of the migrants’ habits and customs (see
also Oonk 2004). Besides, again judging by our interviews, it made
them realize the truth of the aphorism ‘When in Rome, live like the
Romans do’. Finally, several Europeans and Indians told us that pre-
cisely in most recent time their communities have become more
open to various forms of communication and co-operation with the
indigenous Africans. However, our interlocutor, a recent Indian mi-
grant to Tanzania with thus a fresh look at the situation, would be
supported by the majority of both Africans and non-Africans in her
estimation of the interrelations between particularly the ‘Indian’ and
‘Tanzanian’, that is Swahili, cultures:

The Indian and the Tanzanian cultures are of the kind that,
even if there is a blend to a certain stage, they cannot blend
completely because these are two different civilizations, each
with a long history. They [Indo- and Afro-tanzanians] live, they
work together – they are together and they will continue being
together, but I don’t think the customs can ever blend to that
extent that they could become one [culture].

The Swahili culture serves not only as substratum for formation,
but also as a means of construction of the Tanzanian nation: the offi-
cial ideology based on the ‘Ujamaa theory’ elaborated by the first
President of Tanzania Julius Nyerere, has contributed a lot to the
citizens’ vision of the Tanzanian nation as not a legacy of colonial-
ism (what, as we have stressed above, is actually the point, although
just in the colonial period the Swahili culture and language acquired
the all-regional spread, prominence and recognition):

…the nation, which in Ujamaa theory carries the national
culture transmitted through Swahili, is in fact the state.
Thus state ideology and National Culture become synony-
mous – an unjustified synonymy which has allowed the
confusion between ‘objective’ Swahili culture (the histori-
cal culture of the coastal societies) and ‘subjective’ political
Swahili culture (that of contemporary Tanzania)… (Blom-
maert 2006: 18; emphasis in the original).
The language policy is also aimed at strengthening the Swahili's positions as the official national language within the framework of state ideology (Blommaert 1999; Topan 2008). From the very birth of the independent state, Nyerere insisted on treating Swahili as the national language of Tanzania what was enshrined in law in 1967. Indeed, 

"[w]ith regard to deliberate attempts at promotion in both formal and informal areas of life and the creation of a true national and official language, the post-independence spread of Swahili among the population of Tanzania is regularly noted to be a remarkably successful example of African national language planning in a multi-ethnic context. Now, following considerable extended efforts from the 1960s onwards, Swahili is extremely widely known in Tanzania and used in education, government administration, and inter-ethnic communication throughout the country (Simpson 2008: 10).

While Tanzania is a lucky exception to the rule, Zambia, as well as most of post-colonial African states, does not have such an 'objective' – originally pre-colonial, at least partly – background for unity to build a national ideology. None of the local cultures is able to play this role; only in colonial time and due to colonialism the integration of rather different, previously often unrelated (or related loosely, or conflicting) peoples of contemporary Zambia began, so it is only the colonial socio-cultural legacy, including the English language, that can serve as the historical and cultural background for the formation of the Zambian nation. Some Zambians pointed out in their interviews that peoples of Zambia ‘have similarities in cultures and traditions’, ‘speak similar languages’ and so forth but, of course, none of them could argue that they belong to one particular autochthonous culture in the sense in which the Tanzanians coming from different ethnic groups share the Swahili culture. There should be no doubt that just the existence of the Swahili culture in Tanzania and lack of its analog in Zambia caused the difference in the percentage of respondents in the two countries who believe that there is a single integrated national culture, on the one hand, and that there are only separate ethnic cultures, on the other hand, notwithstanding the Zambian state's attempts since the 1990s to represent multilingualism (and hence multiculturalism) as an asset rather than an obstacle to nation-building (Marten and Kula 2008)."
Furthermore, from the standpoint of nation-building prospects, Zambia has at least one more disadvantage compared to Tanzania. In pre-colonial time in Tanganyika (Tanzania's continental part now called Mainland) there were no strong centralized polities except the Shambaa (Shambala) kingdom (Winans 1962; Feierman 1974) which in the post-colonial independent state could become centers of tribalistic nationalist regionalism or separatism and excite the neighboring peoples' historical memory of the former subjugation. Some of our respondents named the lack of tribalism as a sign of Tanzanian nation's existence alongside with the Swahili culture and language. In the meantime in Zambia at least four such polities rose in the pre-colonial period (of the Bemba, Chewa, Lozi, and Lunda [Langworthy 1972; Roberts 1973; Banda 2002; Macola 2002; Mainga 2010]), and the answer of a student to the question, ‘What ... must be done in the sphere of interethnic relations?’ is symptomatic: ‘[It is necessary] to improve interethnic relations by removal of the inferiority complex that certain people from some ethnic cultures have towards other ethnic cultures, for example, Bembas and Lozis’. While the Tanzanian law does not recognize the power of chiefs, the Zambian Constitution of 1996 declares the creation of the House of Chiefs which, as its member told me openly in 2010, tries its best to influence all spheres of social and political life in the country at both regional and national levels, although officially its prerogatives are limited to so-called ‘traditional issues’. Village and district chiefs are also very influential figures at their levels of competence (e.g., as we found out during our field research, they cannot be avoided when a mining company intends to start and successfully carry on business in their areas).

So, while in Tanzania the national unity has the background in the autochthonous peoples' pre-colonial cultural history (and this fact is inflated and instilled in citizens' minds via official ideology), in Zambia the background was created (unintentionally, of course) only by the colonial regime. The majority of university students belong to the part of society that professes civil values and is devoted to the idea of nation and national values. Our evidence supports the hypothesis that the Zambian students' less one-sided and actually better perception of the minorities that formed due to colonialism can be explained as a projection of their less negative attitude to the country's colonial past as to the time when (contrary to the situation in Tanzania) the foundations of national unity were laid. In particular, among the Zambian respondents as distinct from the Tanzanians (43 vs. 25 per cent) there are much more of those
who think that the foundations of the country's unity and progress were laid in colonial times; in Zambia this opinion is practically as popular as the idea that colonialism ‘did mainly harm’, while in Tanzania the latter clearly dominates. In the interviews many Zambian interlocutors told unequivocally that the Zambian nation formed or began to form in the colonial time with the country's gaining of independence as the climax point of the process. Here is a typical statement: the nation ‘formed after North-Western and North-Eastern Rhodesia were amalgamated in 1911 to form Northern Rhodesia which was declared independent Zambia in 1964. Since then the Zambian nation has existed well intact even if we have 72 ethnic groups’. In sharp contrast to Tanzania, nobody related the Zambian nation formation to the pre-colonial period, while several intellectuals (teachers and a businessman), whom we interviewed, argued that even at present there is no Zambian nation at all but only a conglomerate of more than seventy ‘tribal’ cultures.

Indeed, the more positive opinion of colonialism people have, the more tolerant to their European and South Asian compatriots they are: the percentage grows from 79 of those positive towards Europeans and 68 towards Indians among those who perceive colonialism as mainly an evil to 91 and 76, respectively, among those for whom colonialism is a source of national unity and progress. However, one should also note that the interdependence between the perceptions of the colonial past and non-African diasporas is incomplete: as I have pointed out in the very beginning, most of the respondents had expressed tolerant attitude to both diasporas, so even among those who believe that colonialism did mainly harm to the peoples of their respective countries, positive estimations of the Europeans and South Asians prevail.

CONCLUSION

So, I have tested and discussed a number of different factors that, as it was supposed initially, could shape the attitude of the African by origin Tanzanian and Zambian university students to the European and South Asian diasporas in their respective countries. Not all the factors to which consideration has been given have turned out significant; it relates to such factors as Christian or Muslim affiliation, coming from a larger or smaller ethnic group and settlement, and perhaps, the financial status. The role of secularization is important although rather contradictory. Among the significant unidirectional factors that promote a greater tolerance one can point a less negative estimation of the role of colonialism
and a lower degree of concentration on the values of traditional culture; these factors contribute to the Zambian students' higher degree of tolerance compared to that of their Tanzanian peers.

However, I attach the greatest importance to the existing since the pre-colonial times the Swahili culture and language alongside with almost complete absence of strong centralized polities as a background for the autochthonous peoples' national integration in Tanzania while in Zambia before the colonial period they lacked such a background. The importance of these facts in itself is multiplied by the states' manipulations (use and abuse) with the historical memory.

These are the historically interrelated reasons why in the process of nation-building the Afrotanzanians can feel more acutely the unity within their community and hence, exclude their non-African by origin co-citizens more often and rigidly than the Afrozambians do. Thus, the different socio-cultural backgrounds reinforced by differences in the historical memory of the pre-colonial and colonial past to some extent underpin the students' differing (at the statistical level) attitude to the colonialism-born non-African minorities, though these minorities' position in the contemporary Tanzanian and Zambian societies is quite the same, remaining very specific and in a sense ambivalent.

NOTES

1 On these communities history in Tanzania and Zambia *vide stricturn*: Don Nanjira 1976; Nagar 1996; Voigt-Graf 1998; Macmillan and Shapiro 1999; Lobo 2000; Phiri 2000, 2001; Lvova 2005; Haig 2007; Milner-Thornton 2009; Twaddle 2010. It is important to note that in reality those called Europeans can be English, Greeks, Serbs or of other origins, while Indians include people of many South Asian ethnic groups and religious communities, many of them originating not from the present-day Republic of India but from Pakistan, or Bangladesh, or Sri Lanka; however, notwithstanding all these and other sharp divisions and even splits (e.g., by caste among Hindus), Africans usually consider them just as two homogeneous communities, without making distinctions between, for example, Gujarati and Sinhalese, Hindu, and Muslim Asians.

2 For this reason we do not deal here with the students' attitude to non-African minorities that either formed in precolonal time (like the Omani core of the Arab community in Tanzania) or are forming actively nowadays, particularly the Chinese diaspora in both states.

3 It is worth noting that the Europeans played a significant part in this process. In particular, the Christian missionaries often preached in Swahili, and Swahili became the language of instruction in missionary schools (Gromova 2012: 256).

Mainly for the Omani Arabs – the oldest non-local community in the country that mixes with the Afrotanzanian majority most eagerly (Prins 1967; Lodhi 1986; Korotayev and Khaltourina 2008).


The problem of Zanzibar, the successor to the slave-trade Arab Sultanate of Zanzibar and, together with Tanganyika, a constituent member of the United Republic of Tanzania, is essentially different, although naturally has strong direct impact on the nation building process in the country (Peter and Othman 2006; Mwakikagile 2008; Shivji 2008; Demintseva 2011).

Seventy-two is the official number of local ‘tribes’ in Zambia which hence constitute the state's racial majority.
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APPENDICES

The Appendices include, as examples, the Questionnaire Form and General Plan of an Interview used in Zambia. Those used in Tanzania did not differ from them, except natural changes of names of the countries, ethnic groups and so forth. Besides, in Tanzania the questionnaire was available not only in English but also in the Swahili language.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire Form

Dear Madam / Sir,

The Institute for African Studies under the Russian Academy of Sciences in co-operation with the University of Zambia is conducting a research into the intercultural relations in Zambia. We do appreciate your help and believe that our research will be beneficial for your people and country. Please, note that the questionnaire is anonymous and is predesigned for scholarly purposes only. Be so kind as to answer the questions below:

1. Your sex: □ Male □ Female
2. Ethnic origin (e.g.: 'Bemba', 'Lozi'; if mixed, please, specify, e.g.: 'Bemba and Lozi')
3. Have you any relatives among people of other ethnic origins? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, please specify: who and of what origin (e.g.: 'wife, Bemba and Lozi'; 'cousin, Bemba')
4. Denomination (e.g.: 'Catholic', 'Anglican')
5. Place of birth: □ village □ small town □ large town (city) □ Lusaka □ outside Zambia
6. How often do you communicate with your relatives living outside your home settlement? □ at least once a month □ several times a year □ not more often than once a year □ I do not have relatives outside my home settlement
7. What is your mother tongue?
8. What other languages can you speak?
9. What is your future profession?
10. Do you think that your ethnic origin may influence your career? □ Yes, positively □ Yes, negatively □ Yes, either positively or negatively □ No
11. How can you characterise your financial situation? □ Very good □ Good □ So-so □ Bad
12. Marital status □ Single □ Married □ Divorced □ Widow(er)
13. Do you admit that a woman may have the right to disobey her husband? □ Yes □ Yes, but only in some specific situations □ No, never
14. How many children do you consider optimal for a family? ______
15. How would you react if your child marries:
   an African Zambian? □ Positively □ Negatively □ Depends on concrete person
a Zambian European?  □ Positively  □ Negatively
□ Depends on concrete person

a Zambian Indian?  □ Positively  □ Negatively
□ Depends on concrete person

16. Do you have friends among:
African Zambians?  □ Yes, many  □ Yes, a few  □ No
Zambian Europeans?  □ Yes, many  □ Yes, a few  □ No
Zambian Indians?  □ Yes, many  □ Yes, a few  □ No

17. Whom do you communicate most often in your neighbourhood with?
□ People of my ethnic group  □ People of other ethnic groups.
□ People of my and other ethnic groups on more or less equal terms.
□ People of my religion irrespective of their ethnic group.

18. Which of the statements is closer to your opinion?
□ There is no single integrated Zambian culture; there are cultures of many different ethnic groups.
□ There is no single integrated Zambian culture; the cultures of originally Zambian peoples form one culture, while the immigrants’ cultures are separate.
□ There is a single integrated Zambian culture that unites cultures of all the peoples living in Zambia.

19. Do you think that:
Zambian Europeans are well integrated into Zambian society?
□ Yes  □ So-so  □ No
Zambian Indians are well integrated into Zambian society?
□ Yes  □ So-so  □ No
Recent immigrants from other African states are well integrated into Zambian society?
□ Yes  □ So-so  □ No

20. What is your attitude to the culture of:
African Zambians?  □ Very good  □ Good  □ Indifferent  □ Bad
□ Very bad
Zambian Europeans?  □ Very good  □ Good  □ Indifferent  □ Bad
□ Very bad
Zambian Indians?  □ Very good  □ Good  □ Indifferent  □ Bad
□ Very bad

21. Do you know traditional songs and fairy tales of your people?
□ Yes, many  □ Yes, but not many  □ Yes, but very few  □ No

22. Do you think that it is necessary to make offerings to the deceased ancestors’ spirits, at least on important occasions?
□ Yes  □ No
Are such rituals performed in your family?
□ Yes  □ No

23. Whom would you consult in the case of disease?
□ A professional doctor and, if he or she does not help, a traditional doctor
□ A traditional doctor and if he or she does not help, a professional doctor
□ Only a professional doctor  □ Only a traditional doctor
□ I do not know what ‘a traditional doctor’ is
24. How often do you pray? □ Never  □ On religious holidays only  
□ Not every day  □ Every day (please, indicate how many times a day
________
25. In your opinion, which of the arguments below is closer to the
truth?  
□ Colonialism did mainly harm to the peoples of Zambia.  
□ Colonialism was nothing more than a short episode in the country
and her peoples’ long history.  
□ In the colonial time the background of the present-day unity and
progress of Zambia and her people was laid.  
26. What is your attitude to the Western mass culture? □ Very good
□ Good  □ Indifferent □ Bad □ Very bad  
27. Do you think that political organisations should unite people of
the same ethnic origin? □ Yes □ No  
28. Do you think that political organisations should unite people of
the same religion? □ Yes □ No  
29. What, in your opinion, is the attitude of the state to your ethnic
group? □ Very good □ Good □ Indifferent □ Bad □ Very bad  
30. What are your sources of information? □ Newspapers □ Televis-
ion □ Internet □ Public meetings □ Radio □ Teachers □ Friends
□ Other (please indicate: ______________________________________)  
31. What is your personal attitude to:  
African Zambians? □ Very Good □ Good □ Indifferent
□ Very Bad □ Bad  
Zambian Europeans? □ Very Good □ Good □ Indifferent
□ Very Bad □ Bad  
Zambian Indians? □ Very Good □ Good □ Indifferent
□ Very Bad □ Bad  
32. Do you think that the interethnic relations in Zambia are good to-
day? □ Yes □ No  
33. What and whom by must be done in this sphere now or in the fu-
ture? ________________________________________________________  
Thank you for co-operation!

Appendix 2

General Plan of an Interview

I. Personal questions

1. Can you describe your family? How long does it live in this city?
Do you have parents, brothers and sisters, spouse, children? Do they all
live with you? How often do you communicate with your close and dis-
tant relatives that live not in your home settlement?
2. How old are you?
3. Where have you studied?
4. What is your occupation?
5. What is your mother tongue? Can you speak any other languages? If yes, what languages?
6. What is your religion and denomination? Have you any relatives among people of other religions or denominations? If yes, who and of what faith?
7. What is the name of your people (ethnic group, tribe)? Have you any relatives among people of other ethnic origins? If yes, who and of what origin?
8. How do you feel in the first, second, and third place: ‘Zambian’, ‘Zambian African (Zambian Indian, Zambian European)’, ‘Bemba (Gujarati, etc.)’?

II. Ethnic problems
9. What are the features which, in your opinion, distinguish your people from other peoples of Zambia?
10. How do you see the role of your ethnic group in the life of Zambia in the past, now, and in the future?
11. Do you know ethnic origins of your friends, neighbours, and colleagues? People of what origins do you communicate most often with? In what situations?
12. How can you describe Zambians of African origin?
13. What do people usually say about them?
14. How can you describe Zambian Europeans?
15. What do people usually say about them?
16. How can you describe Zambian Indians?
17. What do people usually say about them?
18. Are there any peoples in Zambia the relations between which were in the past or are now typically especially friendly or hostile?
19. How do you see the interethnic relations in Zambia in the past, now, and in the future?
20. What have the state, public organizations, etc. been doing and what (else) should be done for the intercultural relations harmonization?
21. What have the state, public organizations, etc. been doing and what (else) should be done for the younger generations’ rising culturally tolerant?
22. Do you think there is the ‘Zambian nation’? Why? If yes, when has it formed? What are the distinctive characteristics of Zambian identity and Zambian culture? If no, are there prospects for its formation? Is it desirable?