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Abstract

Considering the ongoing need for post-genocide reconciliation and the lack of information available on the current status of peace education in Rwanda, this dissertation aims to identify the main peace education frameworks currently existing in Rwandan primary schools, to analyze their effectiveness, and to assess teachers’ attitudes towards them. This is all examined through the perspectives of teachers, who, despite experiencing the same psychological consequences of the genocide, have been charged with the social responsibility of building a peaceful future through Rwanda’s youth – a responsibility which they may be unwilling or unprepared to fulfill. This study recognizes the importance of teachers’ attitudes in the effective implementation of peace education at the grass-roots level, and it is hoped that teachers’ proximity to students and familiarity with the curriculum might provide valuable insight into the current status and potential effectiveness of peace education in rural Rwanda.

This dissertation employs a case study approach and consists of semi-structured interviews with primary schools teachers, as well as a preliminary content analysis of primary school textbooks. Results indicate that Rwanda’s main peace education framework – the Social Studies curriculum – has the potential to be effective at promoting peace and reconciliation, but that teacher training and preparedness is wholly lacking and that language barriers are a major hindrance to its effectiveness. However, results also indicated that Rwandan teachers are generally very supportive of peace education. Key conclusions include a need to extend teacher training to rural areas, to assess language issues within the Rwandan curriculum, and to examine complementary community-based efforts at peace education in the wider community.
Chapter 1

An Introduction: Peace Education and the Context of Rwanda
1. History of a Genocide

In 1994, Rwanda experienced a ‘neighbourhood genocide’ (Hatzfeld, 2005: 60) that wiped out 800,000 people in just twelve weeks, displaced another two million (Arnhold et al. 1998), and left at least 45,000 children as head of households (Obura, 2003). Sadly, the rapidness of the killings can be attributed to the fact that ‘the killers did not have to pick out their victims’ because they ‘knew them personally’ (Hatzfeld, 2005: 60). In addition to the massive loss of life and the physical and psychological trauma suffered by many Rwandans throughout the ‘neighbourhood genocide’, the state also suffered from the devastation of social institutions and infrastructures; the education system came to a complete halt as teachers and children were either killed or fled and infrastructure deteriorated. Many people flocked to school buildings in search of safety and refuge, but schools soon became large massacre sites; perpetrators targeted schools and teachers began to kill other teachers, students, and neighbours (Obura, 2003).

One such massacre occurred at Ecole Technique Officielle (a secondary school in Murambi), where 40,000 people were killed in only three days (National Museum of Rwanda, 2004). In another village, Ntarama, a local teacher confirmed that ‘’the principal and the inspector of schools in my district participated in the killings with nail studded-clubs. Two teachers, colleagues with whom we used to share beers and student evaluations, set their shoulders to the wheel, so to speak’’ (Hatzeld, 2005: 62). With eyewitness reports of these widespread massacres, the 1994 genocide eventually made headlines. But the truth is that ethnic conflict in Rwanda had existed long before 1994, and many argue that it still exists today.
Systematic ethnic killings began in Rwanda in 1959, when 300 people (mostly Tutsi) were murdered by Hutu-extremists during the transition period to independence (Prunier, 1998). When the Belgian colonists arrived in 1916, they began to institutionalize an ethnic division between Hutu and Tutsi, favouring the Tutsis as social elites and feeding them into the prestigious priesthood (Gourevitch, 1998). In 1959, ethnic tensions began to grow as Rwanda prepared for independent rule and the oppressed Hutu group began rallying for majority rule against the Tutsi minority (Gourevitch, 1998). As a result, the Belgians, while preparing to withdraw colonial rule, redirected their political support to the Hutu majority, replacing Tutsi chiefs with Hutu ones and allowing them to persecute and burn down Tutsi homes (Melvern, 2004: 7). Hutu extremists began ‘organizing themselves, usually in groups of ten led by a man blowing a whistle, to conduct a campaign of pillage, arson, and sporadic murder against Tutsis’ (Gourevitch, 1998: 59). These were the first incidents of systematic ethnic violence in Rwanda, and they continued to spread sporadically throughout Rwanda for decades, until the widespread massacres of Tutsis and moderate Hutus made headlines in the genocide of 1994.

2. Collective Memory

The longevity of the ethnic conflict in Rwanda is important for one reason: collective memory. Collective memory occurs when, after the first outbreak of violence, the two sides ‘rival’ for so long that part of their identity is formed around the rejection or negation of the ‘other’; each group’s memories and associations are formed through negative interactions with the ‘other’, and then become institutionalized over time, passing from generation to generation (Bar-Tal, 2003: 78). In Rwanda, although the two ‘rivaling’ sides still share the same geographical
region, culture, language, and religion, the ethnic identities of each side are particularly strong due to the extremity of the conflict:

In the case of violent, intergroup conflict, even when those killed are not personally known, the personal relevance of the human losses is intensified. The killed and/or wounded are perceived as compatriots, kin, as group members, who have been harmed. That is, in these cases, the physical violence is perceived as a group matter and group members view the losses as group losses, with the victims acquiring a social identity within the group’s perception of the events.

Bar-Tal, 2003: 70

Collective memory, therefore, is formed through the group identity of each rivaling side, and increases proportionally with the level of violence. In Rwanda, the collective memories of both ethnic groups are no doubt quite strong because both ethnic groups suffered systematic killings (Prunier, 1998). It is therefore likely that today’s younger generations are still highly influenced by collective memory –a major hindrance to sustainable peace.

3. The Need for Peace Education

With the strong influence of collective memory, the need for peace education in Rwanda is ongoing. Rwanda experienced a rapid, wide-scale genocide that affected everyone in the population, and has since been marked with a 'deep ethnic polarization' (Gasana et al., 1999: 165): relationships have remained ‘superficial’ and are characterized not by open tension, but rather by a mutual ‘feeling of mistrust’ (Gasana et al., 1999: 165).

However, cases of overt ethnic tension are often reported in the media. In 2008, for example, the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) published an article about a study carried out by the Rwandan government to assess the prevalence of ethnic hatred in twenty-three schools
throughout the country. The article reported the findings of this study, which concluded that
that ethnic hatred was still ‘rampant’ in Rwandan schools (Mutagoma, 2008). The article
included a quote from one secondary school Headmaster who asserted the ongoing existence of
ethnic tension in Rwanda’s schools: ‘”We first discovered the problem [of ethnic hatred] when
we saw writing on the toilet walls saying Tutsis are bad and they should be killed”’ (Mutagoma,
2008). The article also reported that although government officials had been repeatedly called
into schools to deal with ethnic hatred, graffiti, and harassment of Tutsis, the harassment
continued, and often included ‘putting rubbish in the beds of genocide survivors, tearing their
clothes, destroying their school books, mattresses and kit bags’ (Mutagoma, 2008). More
importantly, the report also found that some teachers in these schools had been teaching from
old textbooks that promoted ethnic divisions.

Also in 2008, an article from Rwanda’s New Times reported that two primary school girls
(aged fifteen) had been jailed in 2008 for calling their Tutsi classmate a ‘cockroach’, and then
threatening to kill her (Ngabonziza, 2008). Similar incidents were reported in other schools.
More recently, in May of 2010, the New York Times published an article about ongoing ethnic
tension at the National University of Rwanda in Butare; according to the article, ten students
were arrested in 2009 for ‘a wide range of verbal slurs and provocative writing’ and a further six
for ‘damaging a genocide survivor’s clothes’ (Kron, 2010). The article also described how ethnic
tensions on the university campus are strictly controlled and repressed by the government’s
‘reconciliation policy’, which ‘criminalizes certain types of speech’ and forces students to ‘live in
a surreal state of imposed silence, never talking about the one thing on their minds: each other’
(Kron, 2010). Students were quoted saying that although ethnic background is ‘losing
importance’, ‘if you have an ideology, you hide it’, and that the only way through the ongoing
tension is to ‘pretend and move on’ (Kron, 2010). These feelings of ‘mutual mistrust’ have likely
only deepened with the recent public accusations that the current (Tutsi) President Paul Kagame has been ordering the secret assassinations of critics, journalists, and political opponents (Howden, 2010), and has been maintaining a very strict hold over the media (Magombe, 2010).

With ongoing ethnic tensions in schools and strong public and international accusations against Rwanda’s government, peace education in Rwanda needs to be taken seriously. While most Rwandans cannot personally control the political forces that lead to genocide, they can control their own actions if and when violence breaks out, and this is where peace education plays an important role.

4. Education and Conflict

Education plays a highly influential role in both conflict proliferation and prevention, either through the omission or mismanagement of educational curricula or by contributing to a ‘continued acceptance of war’ (Davies, 2004: 5). In Rwanda, racist and discriminatory education in primary schools may have contributed significantly to the outbreak of the 1994 conflict and the widespread participation of children in the killings; the pre-genocide education system had promoted racist ideologies by teaching children about the ethnic ‘superiority’ of Tutsis (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000: 20), while rationalizing ethnic quotas and regional preferences in schools (Obura, 2003).

Children had been long exposed to institutionalized racist ideologies in the education system and when violence broke out in 1994, the education system –perceived to have favoured the Tutsi minority (Obura, 2003) –was specifically targeted by genocide perpetrators and brought to a complete halt: schools were destroyed, teachers –who were regarded as social
elites —were murdered (Obura, 2003), and many children began to join in the killings (Save the Children Federation, 1996). Although direct causality cannot be established between the discriminatory pre-genocide education system and the active participation of children in the killings, it can be argued that the omission of a holistic and values-laden education is detrimental to the social and personal development of children (Hawkes, 2003), making them more susceptible to blind obedience.

5. The Research Problem

In 1994, The Ministry of Education (MOE) immediately committed to reforming the ‘racist’ education system, removed all discrimination from the curriculum, and asserted their goal to train people to be ‘free of ethnic, regional, national and religious prejudices, conscious of human rights and responsibilities ... [and] conscious also of their membership in the international community’ (MOE, as quoted in Obura, 2003: 66). While they had begun to reconstruct the ethos of the Rwandan education system, they admittedly shied away from including the teaching of national history and reconciliation, and their first attempts at non-formal peace education in the late 1990s were met with difficulty because the Rwandan people were not yet ready to confront the horrors of the genocide (Obura, 2003).

While significant progress has been made towards peace education in Rwanda through the inclusion of human rights, ‘civics education’, and ‘social studies’ in the education system, the MOE has been unsuccessful at eradicating genocide ideologies from schools, as studies show that ethnic tensions still remain. Although today’s youth did not experience the genocide first-hand, they are likely very aware of their own ethnic identity, as the collective memories of their ethnic group (and thus their negative perspective of the ‘other’) would have been ‘institutionalized’ and ‘imparted’ to younger generations (Bar-Tal, 2003: 78). Education in
Rwanda needs to be specifically tailored towards achieving a peaceful society because although people naturally identify with groups that define their culture, (e.g. groups related to ethnicity or religion), the group identity can sometimes override an individual identity and become a powerful tool for group activism or violence (Stewart, 2008) – a phenomenon that Davies (2004: 77) refers to as 'a disturbing force'.

Education systems provide a place to teach not only about alternative solutions to armed conflict (Davis, 2004), but also to promote the process of reconciliation and confront underlying ethnic tensions in order to prevent future conflicts (Smith & Vaux, 2003). One such method is to include a formal peace education framework within school curricula, so that children are systematically taught about conflict, peace, and reconciliation from an early age, and are therefore forced to challenge preconceived collective identities that have been formed outside the classroom; the rationale for such an education is that, 'ethnic attitudes are formed early', and that, 'once positive or negative prejudices have been formed, they tend to increase with time' (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000:3).

A study on the development of racism and racist attitudes among children in the US, for example, found that not only were children as young as three years of age able to identify and label other races with derogatory terms, but that, 'early learning includes race and ethnicity as crucial interactive and interpretive tools for children' (Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001: 214), but that, 'Racial-ethnic concepts inform much of children's social activity – from how children perceive themselves, to how they select friends, to how they explain social life, to the ways they develop understandings of social hierarchies and power' (Van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001: 214). Considering that the ethnic conflict in Rwanda was so widespread, it is likely that five and six year olds in Rwanda do indeed have some understanding of ethnicity, and if young children are
not taught about the genocide in school (where it has the most potential to be taught objectively), there is a high risk that genocide ideology will linger.

The need for peace education in Rwanda has long been acknowledged by the MOE, but due to a lack of resources and commitment, the MOE has been slow to develop and implement a formal peace education framework (Obura, 2003). The progress that has been made, however, has been made in the form of the ‘Civics’ and ‘Social Studies’ curricula, of which the effectiveness (in relation to the goals of peace education), is unknown. Very little research has been done on the progress of peace education, and previous efforts by NGOs such as UNICEF were abandoned without explanation. As is the case with Holocaust education, peace education in Rwanda needs to keep up with the pace of progress made in genocide research (Gross & Stevick, 2010: 22), and little research has been conducted to ensure that this is achieved.

This study, therefore, aims to assess the current status of peace education in Rwanda, its content, and the major obstacles to its effective implementation in Rwandan primary schools. This will be examined through the perspectives of teachers, who, despite experiencing the same psychological consequences of the genocide, have been charged with the social responsibility of building a peaceful future through Rwanda’s youth—a responsibility which they may be unwilling or unprepared to fulfill. This study recognizes the importance of teachers’ attitudes in the effective implementation of peace education at the grass-roots level, and it is hoped that teachers’ proximity to students and familiarity with the curriculum might provide valuable insight into the current status and potential effectiveness of peace education in rural Rwanda.

The next chapter (Chapter 2), provides an overview of the existing literature on peace education, and attempts to create a model for effective programme design and implementation
in post-conflict societies such as Rwanda. Chapter 3 draws upon this model in a discussion on the research design and methodology for the Rwanda study; the chapter demonstrates how the Rwanda research project was designed through semi-structured interviews with teachers and a supporting curriculum content analysis. Chapter 4 then presents the results of the interview and secondary data, and discusses the implications of the findings as they relate to both the model peace education framework and the specific context of Rwanda. The final chapter (Chapter 5), brings together the findings of this study with the existing literature on peace education and its role in Rwanda.
Chapter 2

Peace Education: Towards a Model Framework
Peace Education: Towards a model framework

1. Introduction

As outlined in the Introduction, this paper addresses the continuing need for an effective peace education programme in Rwanda, and the need to assess the opinions of those most responsible for its implementation –those of teachers. This chapter provides a general overview of the existing literature on peace education while focusing particularly on issues most pertinent to Rwanda –teacher attitudes and training and reconciliation. More specifically, this chapter addresses the following issues: the contested definition of peace education; the various peace education topics included in different programmes and contexts; the different types of peace education frameworks (formal versus non-formal); the role of teachers and the importance of teacher training for peace education; and different types of peace education implementing bodies (governmental and non-governmental). By focusing on these issues, this chapter ultimately aims to create a model peace education framework for post-conflict societies that serves as a foundation for the Rwanda research project discussed in the proceeding chapters.

2. What is Peace Education?

In order to work towards this model, however, it is necessary to first address the contested definition of peace education, which appears to be somewhat of a grey area in the literature. While there is some variation regarding its exact definition, scholars generally agree on the general aims and goals of peace education; generally speaking, peace education refers to the teaching of peaceful values in a specific social context, usually within the formal education
system (Richards, 1986); in this sense, peace education ‘aims at constructing the students’ worldviews (that is, their values, beliefs, attitudes, motivations, skills and behavior patterns) in a way that reflects the reality of the peace process and prepares them to live in an era of peace and reconciliation’ (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004: 31). Overall, there is a consensus that the goal of peace education is to address the problems of conflict on different levels and explore the path to a peaceful future (Hicks, 1988).

For the purpose of this particular study, peace education will be broadly defined (in line with the general consensus), as a subject designed specifically to promote peaceful attitudes, prevent future conflict, and facilitate reconciliation in a particular context (Smith & Vaux, 2003), usually through a national education system (Richards, 1986). The following discussion, focusing heavily on peace education in the post-conflict context, will demonstrate how the content of peace education frameworks, while always aiming to promote peace and prevent conflict, should be tailored to fit the needs of a particular context.

3. Peace Education Content

Peace education content refers to the topics that are included in peace education frameworks, such as ‘war’ or ‘conflict resolution’, and is important because a programme’s content is the vehicle through which a society’s specific peace education goals are achieved (Kremer-Hayon, L., 1997). The exact content of peace education programmes therefore vary, because the topics covered in each programme must be unique to the needs of the target group. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) framework, for example, was originally designed for conflict-ridden Kenyan refugee camps, where disagreements between refugees were accentuated by the politics of the home country (UNHCR, 2001). The content of this framework, therefore, was particularly relevant to the complex political context
of refugee camps and emphasized effective modes of communication and ‘critical thinking’ as a means for settling disputes (UNHCR, 2001: 5).

A. Culturally Relevant Content

In his book *Militarism and Peace Education in Africa*, Tandon (1989), similarly argues that the content of peace education in developing African countries should be very different from that of peace education in Western societies; he is highly critical of the Western concept of peace education and argues that it is irrelevant—and sometimes even oppressive—to many African countries. He argues that ‘disarmament’, ‘cultural’, and ‘development’ education are only relevant for a ‘northern’ audience, and instead calls for a type of peace education that is about ‘liberation’—emphasizing the independence of African nations and the rights, duties, and responsibilities of African citizens—particularly in conflict-ridden and poverty-affected areas (Tandon, 1989: 59). Peace education in the African context, he argues, should focus particularly on human rights, individual responsibility, equality, and the law, and should frame these topics in the post-colonial context.

Most scholars and peace educators generally agree that peace education frameworks in post-conflict societies (and particularly those in developing countries) should include content about human rights, citizen duties, justice, and the law, (Smith & Vaux, 2003), so that individuals understand their role in society and how society works, and so that they can work with others towards a peaceful future (Ray, 1994). While each of these topics is very important in post-conflict societies and should ideally all be included in peace education programmes, the proceeding discussion will focus heavily on the issue of reconciliation in post-conflict Peace Education programmes, as this topic seems to be most relevant to the specific context of Rwanda.
B. Reconciliation

Reconciliation, an essential component of post-conflict peace education, can best be described as the ‘complex process through which deeply divided societies recover the ability to function normally and effectively after violence’ (Cole, 2007: 1). The concept of reconciliation is extremely important in Rwanda and in any other society where ethnic or ‘protracted conflict’ exists between parties, as is the case in Northern Ireland. Protracted conflicts, which ‘concern existential issues [such as religious or ethnic affiliations] for the rivaling parties’ last for at least a few decades and are particularly resistant to sustainable peace (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004: 13). Reconciliation, therefore, is arguably the most important topic in societies that are experiencing or have experienced ‘protracted’ or ethnic conflict (such as Rwanda) because reconciliation ‘goes beyond conflict resolution and addresses the cognitive and emotional barriers to normalization and stabilization of peace relations’ (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004: 4); in other words, although conflict resolution ends direct violence and brings life back to a state of physical normality, it does not address the psychological remnants of a protracted conflict.

In Rwanda, where practically every person was either physically or psychologically affected by the genocide, the concept of reconciliation is still a very sensitive topic, and the government’s reluctance to include it in the curriculum has hindered progress towards peace (Obura, 2003). Bar-Tal and Bennink (2004) argue that reconciliation is necessary when rivaling groups from a protracted conflict continue to live in the same geographical region because they must learn to co-exist peacefully as one nation after the conflict has ended. Reconciliation is important for the future of such a society because the societal beliefs of each ‘rivaling’ group are often ‘formed in the course of conflict, disseminated to society members, maintained by social institutions, and supported by collective memory’, thus perpetuating the conflict (Bar-Tal &
Bennink, 2004: 13). In other words, it is highly possible that each rivaling group in a protracted conflict, although sharing a geographical region, culture, and language, (as is the case in Rwanda), could maintain a negative societal ethos toward the other, and thereby hinder progress towards peace.

i. **Reconciliation in Existing Programmes**

Existing peace education programmes in other post-conflict societies have already recognized the importance of reconciliation and have made various attempts to include it in the curriculum. In South Africa, where national history is marked years of ethnic division, the post-apartheid government recognized that reconciliation was essential for the future of the country, and made a commitment to promote reconciliation through the new constitution (Bray & Joubert, 2007). Since then, educators have also prioritized reconciliation in schools as a means for discussing national history and developing informed and responsible citizens (Bray & Joubert, 2007). In other post-conflict societies, reconciliation has been prioritized through various different methods; Northern Ireland, for example, has combined a peace education curriculum with an integrated approach to schooling, whereby students from the two rivaling groups attend school together in specially designated integrated schools in order to foster reconciliation (McGlynn, 2007). While peace education efforts vary slightly between different societies and contexts, almost all post-conflict frameworks have asserted the importance of reconciliation.

ii. **Confronting the Conflict**

Although it is not always considered to be a necessary component of reconciliation, the teaching of history is almost always included in peace education programmes in post-conflict
societies; scholars and peace educators usually agree that in order for peace education – and particularly reconciliation – to be effective in post-conflict societies, the curriculum needs to include a history of the conflict, meaning that children need to be taught what happened during the conflict (Kelman, 2004). Case study evidence has shown that if a difficult past is not acknowledged or objectively discussed in a curriculum, and if ‘amnesia’ is chosen immediately after the conflict, the past often becomes ‘more contested’ in future generations (Cole, 2007: 7).

In Northern Ireland, where the ethnic conflict is ongoing, a ‘model’ history curriculum has been adopted that educators have called ‘good practice’ for other societies emerging from conflict (Kitson, 2007: 123). This is considered a model curriculum for two reasons: 1) it includes Irish history within the British framework; and 2) it requires an ‘enquiry-based’ approach to teaching, where students engage with each other and their teachers to cover the topic from different angles (Kitson, 2007: 123). However, while the curricula does include Irish history, the primary school history curricula is ‘outward looking’ and does not attempt to connect current day issues with the controversies of the past – an essential component of post-conflict history curricula (Barton & McCully, 2003: 113); although the curriculum strongly emphasizes current concerns in Northern Ireland, many teachers have admittedly shied away from encouraging pupils to connect historical understandings of the conflict with present-day issues (Kitson, 2007).

Another issue with the Northern Ireland curriculum is that it does not seem to cover modern Irish history soon enough, leaving students to learn about current issues from other (and potentially more biased) sources, such as the media. Although students do not learn about the controversial political makeup of Northern Ireland until the last few years of secondary school (Barton & McCully, 2003), a study found that many students in their first and second year already knew about topics that had not yet been covered in the curriculum. The study showed
that they had learned about modern Irish history from the media, peers, and relatives. One boy who was interviewed said, 'if you're taught history in school, then you get both sides of the view; if you're taught it outside of school, you're going, "Well, the protestants do this and the Protestants do that, and this is why we're doing it", and "The Catholics are bad people, the Catholics are doing this, and that's why they're doing it", and that's the whole story' (Barton & McCully, 2003: 118). As demonstrated by this study, students do realize that there are different sources of information, and that in this case, information about the conflict learned outside of school is usually more biased. A study on children’s attitudes conducted towards the end of the Vietnam war (Tolley, 1973), also found that parents often provide biased accounts of war: ‘parents influenced their children’s' opinions of war, but not their understanding of or knowledge about it' (Myers-Walls, Myers-Bowman, & Pelo, 1993: 66). These studies suggest that it is necessary for schools in post-conflict societies to address current and historical accounts of war as early as possible, and to teach them as objectively as possible.

The rationale for including history (and modern history) in the curriculum of post-conflict societies is that it is essential for the process of reconciliation. During conflicts, the international community often places more blame on one side than on the other, which sometimes encourages the society to overlook or forget the crimes committed by the other side (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). It is therefore important that peace education and/or the history curriculum is ‘balanced’ (Kitson, 2007: 132), and that it fully attributes the correct responsibility to each and every group for the outbreak and continuation of the conflict (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). A society’s curriculum content can create and sustain social relations, and, as Smith and Vaux (2003: 46) argue, ‘repairing damage to the social fabric implies coming to terms with the legacies of conflict in social and emotional terms’. In post-conflict societies especially, schools
provide a perfect space for teaching objective accounts of the conflict so that peace and reconciliation can actually become a reality.

C. A Content Framework for Post-Conflict Societies

While the teaching of national history and the promotion of reconciliation have been prioritized by many peace education scholars, it is also widely recognized that these should be accompanied by a broader peace education curriculum, allowing students gain a holistic understanding of peace education. Smith’s (2003) content framework for post-conflict societies provides an excellent example of a broad, holistic curriculum, arguing that post-conflict peace education programmes should always involve:

- Explaining to children what happened during the conflict
- Multiple perspectives on the conflict, personal stories
- Media involvement in reporting the conflict
- Dealing with the legacies of conflict, how it is still present
- The dead and injured, the bereaved, the disabled
- Issues about remembrance, commemoration
- The participants in violence, amnesties, prisoner releases, members of security of armed forces, demobilization
- The role of justice, reparations, new safeguards
- The concept of reconciliation – issues of forgiveness, expressions of regret, apology, symbolic events
- The ‘preventative’ role of ‘new’ education programs, human rights, civics education, democratization of education.

Smith (2002), as quoted in Smith & Vaux (2003: 46)

Smith’s exhaustive content framework addresses a wide range of post-conflict issues, but most notably calls for peace education programmes to fully confront what happened during the conflict – i.e. the role of the media, the loss the lives, the violence, etc. – a subject matter that is highly sensitive and complicated in post-conflict societies. He emphasizes the importance of reconciliation but also recognizes that the issues of justice, human rights education, and law are also extremely pertinent to post-conflict societies and the prevention of future conflicts.
Smith’s approach is both ‘analytical’ and ‘holistic’, providing opportunities for students to not only analyze the conflict, but also to discuss the path toward a peaceful future (Reid, 1990: 13). This detailed framework is ideal for post-conflict societies such as Rwanda, and it is from this framework that the peace education study in Rwanda has been designed; in consideration of all the literature previously discussed, the recommended peace education content for programmes in post-conflict societies should ideally include the teaching of each of the following: 1) reconciliation –including an emphasis on history; 2) respect for the self and others (e.g. human rights education); 3) justice and the law; and 4) how to work towards a peaceful future (e.g. civics or moral education, including citizen duties and responsibilities). These four elements comprise the recommended content of post-conflict peace education programmes, and will be discussed further in the proceeding chapters with regards to peace education in Rwanda.

4. Mediums of implementation: School-based and community-based programmes

While the role of relevant educational content in preventing conflict and promoting peace is widely recognized, the strategy for implementing a peace education programme is less clear. Generally, most international organizations with peace education programmes have advocated a multi-faceted implementation approach, which includes both school and community education components. The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE: 2005) for example, argues that peace education requires a community-based component in addition to any school-based implementation because, ‘for children to be involved in a programme that their parents did not understand, [was] not a way to foster better communication and co-operation’ (UNHCR, 2001: 2). Similarly, the recent development of a
'moral education' curriculum currently being implemented in all Burundian schools has recognized that, "a child does not belong to one person" but to the community’, and has included a ‘school-home partnership’ component in the school-based curriculum in order to encourage community participation in peace education (Rwantabugu, 2010: 348). Although community education is an important part of any peace education programme (Harris, 1943), and should always be implemented to provide extra support to peace education curricula within the wider society, this paper will focus only on the implementation of peace education in schools – that is, the school-based medium of implementation. Ideally, post-conflict societies such as Rwanda should also implement a community component to peace education, but further research is required for discussing community-based programmes, and unfortunately such research is outside the scope and scale of this study.

5. Types of frameworks: Formal and non-formal education

While the focus of this paper is limited to the school-based medium of implementation, there are a variety of ways in which this medium can be used. Most peace educators, however, argue that formal education (the inclusion of peace education content in the school curriculum) is the most effective method for implementing peace education in schools because it includes definitive content and a structured timeframe by which to measure student progress (World Bank, 2005). However, formal peace education may exist in one of two ways: 1) as a separate ‘Peace Education’ subject; or 2) as part of the curricula of an existing subject. As a separate subject, peace education is given a ‘visible space in the timetable’, which helps teachers to achieve particular goals and objectives (Whitaker, 1988: 30). As part of the curricula of an existing subject, on the other hand, peace education can more easily slot into the school
timetable, but risks sacrificing the amount of time necessary for skill and attitude building (Whitaker, 1988: 30).

Non-formal education, on the other hand, occurs when topics related to peace education (e.g., war, peace, and reconciliation) are excluded from the school’s formal curriculum, but are taught either casually during class or outside of the classroom. Ideally, however, if a school is not limited by time or funding, it is generally argued that peace education should exist formally as a separate curriculum subject (INEE, 2005). Given the financial constraints of schools in many developing countries, it is argued that any type of structured formal education (whether a separate subject or not), would still be more effective than a non-formal approach to peace education simply because, ‘there are not enough elements of peace in the ‘hidden’ curriculum (even in the most open curriculum) to offset the effects of an increasingly violent society’ (UNHCR, 2001: 7).

A. Formal education

The rationale for using formal education rather than simply integrating peace education content into other school activities or adopting a peace education ethos (non-formal education), is that without a structure, children have much more difficulty in ‘building the concepts’ (INEE, 2005: 9), and therefore, in post-conflict societies, face difficulty in reforming their attitudes and collective identities to be more peace-oriented (Kelman, 2004). The structured curriculum approach seems almost necessary in post-conflict societies, as a primary goal for peace education in such societies is to help each rivaling group to change a part of their identity –to negate their rejection of the ‘other’ (Kelman, 2004: 120). The process of reconciliation in post-conflict societies is very slow because individuals need to alter their sense of group identity, and only a formal curriculum approach provides the structure necessary to do this. According to
Kelman (2004: 122), there are five conditions for reconciliation in post-conflict societies: ‘1) mutual acknowledgment of the “Other’s” Nationhood and Humanity’; ‘2) development of a common moral basis for peace’; ‘3) confrontation with history (“an essential component of any reconciliation effort”); ‘4) Acknowledgement of Responsibility (both sides)’; and ‘5) establishment of patterns and institutional mechanisms of cooperation’. The very first stage, ‘mutual acknowledgment of the “other’s Nationhood and Humanity”, is a prerequisite for reconciliation and requires each rivaling group to reject the part of their identity that views the ‘other’ as inferior; this identity change takes time, and a structured, objective framework is arguably the best way to achieve it. The conditions for reconciliation are very specific, and formal education can provide the tools necessary for attitude building and reformation in post-conflict societies.

B. Non-formal education

Nonetheless, some scholars and peace educators have argued for a cross-curriculum (non-formal) implementation of peace education, claiming that this method has the potential to reach all children and teachers (Reid, 1990). Harris (1943: 83), for example, created a table to demonstrate how teachers might informally incorporate topics of peace education into school activities: in typing classes, students could type articles related to peace or send letters to government officials about community violence; in music, students can analyze how contemporary videos and song represent peace and violence; in physics, students can discuss the power of nuclear weapons; and in mathematics, students can make calculations about defense costs and the loss of human lives in conflicts. Harris also recognizes, however, that this
creates a burden for teachers because it requires constant awareness of peace education and subject matter.

The other problem with non-formal peace education, or ‘hidden curriculum’ approaches, is that these strategies ‘are extraordinarily difficult to implement and presuppose an unlikely measure of cross-staff agreement and readiness to participate’ (Reid, 1990: 8). Moreover, there is a risk that highly complex topics will not be covered ‘adequately’ if they do not have a clearly defined focus or a reasonable time allotment in the school curriculum (Richards, 1986: 2). If schools have separate courses for peace education or include formal peace education in the existing curriculum in some way, it is much easier to reach the students in a constructive way (Harris, 1943).

C. An Example: Formal Peace Education

In Nigeria, where rioting and inter-ethnic conflicts are ongoing, the government has formally implemented peace education in schools through the national Social Studies curriculum (Aladejana, 2007). The government’s formal approach to peace education is based on the theory that Social Studies is a program of study that teaches students the knowledge, attitudes, values, and skills that are most pertinent to their society and its relationships with other societies (Kissock, 1981); the goal of the Social Studies curriculum, then, is to draw knowledge and skills from different subjects and combine them to teach students about social issues and guide attitudinal development (Aladejana, 2007).

The Nigerian government institutionalized this approach and in 1971, re-designed the curriculum to formally include many components of peace education in the Social Studies
curriculum. A recent content analysis of this Social Studies curriculum (JSS) showed that many aspects of peace education were indeed evident in the curriculum; 25.81 percent of topics related to peace education were found in JSS I, 33.33 percent were found in JSS II, and 23.81 percent in JSS III (Aladejana, 2007: 177). The peace education 'related' topics found in JSS I included, 'the social environment, cooperation and conflict responsibility, civil rights, civil obligations, the nonfulfilment of obligation, and culture' (2007: 177). In JSS II, they included, 'cultural patterns, historical origin, social and cultural integration, the sociocultural aspect of change, and culture' (2007: 177). In JSS III, the related topics were found to be about racial differences, racism, cooperation, conflict and socialization. The Nigerian Social Studies curriculum was intentionally loaded with peace education content, and therefore serves as a good example of how formal peace education can be integrated into the existing curricula of a particular subject.

D. An Example: Non-Formal Peace Education

In Bosnia, on the other hand, a non-formal approach to peace education was adopted. The Bosnian Education for Peace (EFP) pilot programme began in 1999 and can be defined as an 'integrated' (non-formal) approach to peace education; the EFP emphasizes a 'worldview' ethos of peace, and argues that this ethos should be represented in every subject and school activity so that it engages the 'other' in every step of the process (Danesh, 2007). This approach encourages whole populations of individuals, victims, and perpetrators to face their psychological trauma together (and therefore facilitate reconciliation), by working in a culture of peace in every aspect of their lives (Danesh, 2007).
While this approach has been found to be ‘well received’ by Bosnian authorities, teachers, and students, the effectiveness of this approach is very difficult to evaluate because it has no formal structure (Danesh, 2007). Moreover, because the EFP does not provide a structured curriculum for teachers, its implementation (and hence, its effectiveness) is left up to the enthusiasm of individual teachers, making it extremely difficult for wide-scale evaluation (Smith & Vaux, 2003). Because the effectiveness of non-formal peace education programmes are often dependent upon each individual teacher, it is unlikely that many will make any sustainable or far-reaching impact on post-conflict communities; in many developing countries (and especially in post-conflict societies), teachers often only receive basic training, and are therefore not always capable of diverging from the set curriculum to include peace education in a relevant or constructive manner (UNHCR, 2001). It is for this reason, (and the reasons discussed prior) that scholars and peace educators advise against non-formal peace education programmes. Post-conflict peace education programmes require a formal structure because they deal largely with reconciliation –a sensitive topic that requires careful lesson planning, ample time, and effective teaching strategies.

6. Teacher Training

Although peace educators argue for formal approaches to peace education over non-formal approaches, a formal curriculum is not the only condition necessary for an effective programme. The Nigerian study discussed above found that although peace education is formally included in the Social Studies curriculum, the goals of peace education (to promote peaceful attitudes among students and facilitate critical thinking and skill-building), are not
necessarily achieved in Nigerian schools because many teachers only use the lecture-style format.

A. Pedagogical training

Aladejana (2007) found that in Nigeria, very teachers use role play, drama, group activities, or discussion to help students internalize the lessons learned. Only six of twenty teachers interviewed said they agreed with the statement 'I teach Social Studies in a way whereby my students are actively involved in the learning activities', and even fewer said that they used poems, songs or the media to help teach students the lessons (Aladejana, 2007: 178). Bar-Tal (2002: 33) identified 'experiential learning' (building on the learners' experiences) and 'participatory methodologies' (using role plays and the media) as two of the most important strategies for teaching peace education, and these strategies were absent in Nigeria. It is essential that teachers are trained to use these strategies because pedagogy matters in peace education; peace education is a process, not a delivery of skills (Njoroge, 2007). As Richards (1986) states, peace education is more than just teaching the curriculum with facts and figures, it is about teaching skills (such as critical thinking), attitudes, and values. Moreover, teachers cannot rely on textbooks because a textbook (whether designed well or not) is 'only as important as the degree to which it is used by the teacher' (Cole, 2007: 17). If teachers are not adequately trained in peace education, the curriculum will not serve its purpose and peace education will be ineffective.
B. Content and Attitudinal Training

In addition to pedagogical training, teachers also need to receive training to help them internalize the values and attitudes that are central to peace education. In post-conflict societies this is particularly important, as teachers will often have experienced the conflict first hand, or have been influenced by collective memory. In post-apartheid South Africa, for example, the government recognized that in order for reconciliation to be effective in South African schools, teachers first needed to internalize the concept of equality so they could be good role models to their students. (Bray & Joubert, 2007).

The INEE School Peace Education programme has strongly emphasized the need for teacher training, and has designed a training programme that helps teachers to internalize peaceful and positive attitudes before they begin to teach Peace Education. In addition to training teachers in methodology, constructive classroom management, and the developmental psychology of children (particularly important in post-conflict societies where many children suffer from post-traumatic stress), the INEE programme encourages the 'attitudinal development' of teachers, based on the assumption that 'teachers need to have the opportunity to internalise the concepts and skills of peace themselves before they can develop these skills and attitudes in the students’ (INEE, 2005: 12).

In Rwanda, attitudinal training for teachers is arguably the most important issue surrounding peace education. Attitudinal training has been considered 'of paramount importance' in Rwanda today and scholars have argued for a complete teacher training reform in order to address this issue (Njoroge, 2007: 219). The problem in Rwanda is that many pregenocide teachers were inadequately trained (or unqualified) and lacked a sense of professionalism, and therefore fell to hate ideology very quickly (Njoroge, 2007); Teachers,
school inspectors, school directors and academics were active participants in the genocide and helped to organize killing squads and carry out massacres (African Rights, 1995). Moreover, many teachers killed students in their own classes (Obura, 2003). Today however, teachers are expected to be role models, and, without having received any psychological counseling or attitudinal training, they are assigned the burdensome task of ensuring a peaceful future in Rwanda (Njoroge, 2007).

The Institute of Education in Kigali has acknowledged this problem, and has implemented a new peace education programme for all of its trainee teachers. The Institute realizes that, ‘teachers, like all people, cannot be transformative if they are not liberated from the prejudgmental cave of hate, discrimination, and ordering of other persons as superior or inferior’ (Njoroge, 2007: 219), and have consequently designed a course which helps teachers ‘examine themselves as individuals in order to recognize and address their own inadequacies’ (Njoroge, 2007: 219).

The programme is basically a ‘reconstruction of the teacher’s psyche’, and it aims to reorient teachers’ perception of others by confronting the past. After all, teachers cannot be expected to pass on attitudes that they themselves do not possess or understand. The implementation of this programme is an important step for peace education in Rwanda because it directly addresses the fact that many Rwandan teachers experienced the genocide first hand. Access to the programme, however, is likely unequal, as 90% of urban teachers in Rwanda were considered qualified in 1997, compared to a mere 25% in rural provinces (Obura, 2003:48). If the goal of this programme –to reconstruct the teacher’s psyche –is going to make a widespread impact in Rwanda, such training will need to be made available for every teacher.
7. The Scope of Peace Education and its ‘Implementing Body’

It is assumed that the goal of the ‘reconstruction of the teacher’s psyche’ programme in Kigali would ideally be to reach every teacher in Rwanda, as all teachers (both rural and urban) were affected by the 1994 genocide. However, such a task would require a high level of commitment, support, and resources that may not be available from its current implementing body - The Institute of Education in Kigali. Although non-governmental organizations [and research institutes] have typically been at the forefront of human rights education, Cardenas (2005) argues that the role of the state in human rights and citizenship education should not be ignored. The role of the state is particularly important in large-scale peace education initiatives (initiatives that aim to reach an entire population affected by conflict) because such initiatives require both a high level of commitment and a guaranteed availability of resources in order to prevent the transmission of genocide ideology to new generations; in reality, as Smith and Vaux (2003) argue, this level of commitment is difficult to secure from international [and non-governmental] organizations.

A. An Example: Large-Scale Initiatives

As an example, let us consider Pathways into Reconciliation (PIR) – a peace education programme that was designed to teach students in participating schools in Israel, Palestine and Jordan about the Israeli-Arab conflict with the hope that they would pass on what they had learned to the wider community. Although PIR was highly committed to implementing and monitoring its formal peace education programme in participating schools, having developed a formal curriculum and trained teachers in the new content (Darweish & Nedal, 1997), it was unsuccessful in reaching its goal to achieve a ‘spill-over’ effect into wider society simply because it did not have the capacity or resources to do so (IPCRI, 2005); in 2005, the PIR stated that
although they had created the most successful and largest peace education programme in the region, they had not achieved the desired ‘spill-over’ effect into society, as all their success had been limited to the participating schools (IPCRI, 2005). While the PIR were committed to reaching their goal (to reach wider society), they simply did not possess the resources required to achieve it.

B. An Example: Small-Scale Initiatives

On the other hand, peace education programmes can still be ineffective even if the implementing body has the capacity to implement the full scope of the initiative. The INEE framework, for example, unlike the PIR programme, only aims to reach small communities at a time, as participation is voluntary and is based on local need. However, an evaluation of this framework found that the effectiveness of the INEE programme varies between communities depending on the level of commitment of those running the programme (INEE, 2005). The evaluation concluded that even if all of the implementation tools and resources are provided, the programme will not be effective unless there is commitment (INEE, 2005). The INEE ultimately concluded that ‘it is vital to have ongoing specialist support (e.g. a national or NGO consultant/adviser)’ and that the programme ‘can only be truly effective with consistent monitoring and evaluation’ (INEE, 2005: 20).

As evident by these two cases, the implementing body of peace education programmes, regardless of the scope of the framework, needs to be both logistically capable and highly committed to implementing, monitoring, and sustaining the framework in order for the initiative to be effective. When the need for peace education is national (and therefore large in scope), peace education frameworks are more likely to be effective at achieving national reconciliation if they are implemented at the national level and by a capable and committed body (such as the
government), so that the effects can be both ‘wide-reaching’ and sustainable; large-scale peace education programmes are more likely to be effective if they are implemented by governmental authorities, as non-governmental efforts at peace education have proven to be narrower in scope and smaller in scale (Smith & Vaux, 2003).

8. Towards a Model Peace Education Framework

In consideration of all the peace education issues discussed in this chapter – content, implementation, scope, and teacher training – a model peace education framework has been developed to summarize the findings of this literature review and to define the characteristics of current effective peace education frameworks. This model, (see Table A on the proceeding page), is a summary of the conclusions drawn from this chapter, and provides the basis for the peace education study in Rwanda that will be discussed in the following chapters.
Table A: Model Post-Conflict Peace Education framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of a Framework</th>
<th>Model Framework Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Scope of the Peace Education initiative**   | **Matches the scope of the conflict**  
Conflicts that affect an entire country call for national Peace Education initiatives, while localized conflicts only require local initiatives |
| (international, national, local)              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **The Implementing body**                     | **Possesses the resources and level of commitment required to implement and sustain the full scope of the Peace Education initiative**  
National initiatives usually require a level of commitment that can only be guaranteed by national governments |
| (governments, NGOs, churches, etc.)           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Medium of Implementation**                  | **Reaches all demographic groups affected by the conflict**  
Schools should be used to reach children, while community centres should be used for reaching out-of-school children and adults |
| (school-based, community-based, etc.)         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Type of framework**                         | **Requires structured learning and lesson plans**  
This is best achieved through Formal Education, where Peace Education concepts are formally included in the curriculum or lesson plan |
| (formal or non-formal education)              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Content**                                   | **Includes the teaching of each of the following:**  
1) Reconciliation (including history)  
2) Respect for the self and others (i.e. Human rights education)  
3) Justice and the law  
4) How to work towards a Peaceful future (i.e. Moral Education or Civics Education, including citizen duties, rights, and responsibilities) |
| **Teacher/Leader training**                   | **Prepares teachers and leaders specifically for needs of Peace Education**  
This is an essential part of a Peace Education framework, and includes psychological and pedagogical preparedness, as well as Peace Education content training |
|                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
9. The Context of Rwanda

The literature discussed in this chapter (as summarized in Table A), suggests that in order to be effective, post-conflict peace education frameworks need to be: a) implemented on a scale that matches the scope of the conflict; and b) implemented by a governing body that is capable of and committed to monitoring and sustaining the scope of the whole programme. Moreover, the literature also seems to suggest that peace education in post-conflict societies should be implemented formally (rather than non-formally), that it should ideally exist in both community and school-based programmes, and that its content should include the teaching of each of the following: 1) reconciliation; 2) respect for the self and others; 3) justice and the law; and 4) how to work towards a peaceful future. Perhaps more importantly, however, the literature demonstrates why peace education requires thorough teacher training and preparedness on both pedagogy and content.

This study on Rwanda attempts to analyze how current peace education in Rwanda relates to the model framework, how it is different, and how it may be improved. Additionally, this study also aims to analyze teachers’ values and attitudes towards peace education because, as the literature points out, peace education efforts in Rwanda must confront the fact that many teachers were either victims or killers during the 1994 genocide. As argued by Njoroge (2007), teachers are no different from any other human being; Rwandan teachers experienced the same genocide and suffered the same consequences, except that they are formally assigned the task of teaching children about peace and reconciliation.

Given their close proximity to the post-genocide reality in schools, teachers’ opinions and perspectives on peace education are particularly valuable in Rwanda, and it is hoped that
their perspectives on this issue will shed some light on the current status and implementation of peace education in Rwanda. The proceeding chapter will discuss how exactly the study in Rwanda was both designed and executed, and an analysis of the findings will follow in Chapter 4.
Chapter 3

The Research Design
The Research Design

1. Introduction

As discussed in the previous chapters, the aim of this study is to assess the status of peace education in Rwandan primary schools, to identify the major obstacles to peace education implementation, and to assess how teachers’ attitudes and opinions might influence the effectiveness of a peace education framework. This chapter discusses the methodology used to achieve these aims, from the initial design to data analysis. More specifically, this chapter will address the following issues: the research question and sub-questions; small-scale research methodology and case selection; the use of interviews and secondary data; the fieldwork process; ethical considerations of the research; limitations of the study; and finally, methods for data analysis.

2. The research question and sub-questions

First and foremost, it may be useful to explicate the research question in order to clarify the purpose of the study and set the stage for the proceeding discussion. The research question, therefore, as paraphrased in previous chapters, is:

How has the need for primary peace education in Rwanda been addressed on the grass-roots level, and how does the role of teachers affect the implementation of peace education frameworks?

In order to address this broad question, the study was divided into two parts: 1) an analysis of the current peace education framework (in accordance with the model framework); and 2) an assessment of teachers’ opinions of and attitudes towards peace education. The first part, an
analysis of existing peace education frameworks in Rwanda, was analyzed according to the peace education model formulated in the previous chapter, and was further divided into three research sub-questions in order to facilitate discussion. The sub-questions for the first part of the study are:

1) What is the nature and scope of any existing peace education frameworks, and who or what is the main implementing body?

2) How has peace education been implemented in Rwandan Primary Schools (formally or non-formally), and what topics does it include?

3) How (if at all) have teachers been trained in peace education?

Each of these sub-questions attempts to use the valuable perspectives of rural teachers to analyze the different elements of peace education frameworks that were identified in the model, all from the valuable perspectives of teachers, and Appendix A (see page 80), demonstrates how this was achieved. It is hoped that such an analysis will help identify effective elements of the current peace education framework in Rwanda (as defined by the literature), while also identifying elements that can be improved in the future.

Then, the second part of the study –a brief analysis of teacher attitudes towards peace education –was assessed through the following two research sub-questions:

4) What are teachers’ opinions of peace education?

5) How do teachers think peace education should be taught and whose responsibility do they think it is to teach these values?

These sub-questions aim to identify how teachers feel about peace education, how strongly they believe in it, and whose responsibility they believe it is to teach it. It is hoped that their responses will shed some light on the status of teacher attitudes towards peace education and
reconciliation so that future peace education efforts in Rwanda will both consider and address the opinions of those closest to the reality of grass-roots implementation. Both parts of the study – the peace education framework analysis and the teacher attitudes assessment – were conducted through the use of semi-structured interviews and a case study approach.

3. Definitions

First, however, it is important to define what is meant by peace education in this study, as its definition can change in different contexts. For the purposes of this particular study, therefore, ‘Peace Education’ refers to the teaching of the following four concepts: 1) respect for others; 2) reconciliation; 3) justice and the law; 4) how to work towards a peaceful future. It is important to note that these four elements can be taught either formally or non-formally, and in order to demonstrate this, a peace education rubric was put together as a reference for participants\(^1\). This rubric was designed to give examples of how these four elements of peace education might be manifested in both the formal and non-formal curriculum, and is not exhaustive by any means. The use of this rubric during interviews helped ensure that each participant understood the same definition of peace education, and therefore also helped to ensure consistency in the data collection.

4. The School-Based Framework

While there are different ways to teach the four elements of peace education listed in the rubric (either formally or non-formally), there are also different mediums through which they can be taught in order to reach different audiences. As demonstrated by the model

\(^1\) See Appendix B, pp.81.
framework in the previous chapter (See Table A on page 33), target audiences such as school-aged children can be reached through school-based mediums, while adults are usually reached through community-based mediums. It is important to note, therefore, that due to the time and scope limitations of this research, the only peace education frameworks analyzed in this study are those that have been implemented in schools, as the aim of the study is to assess the status of peace education in primary schools specifically. This design is based on the principle that a ‘life-world of communication [on wider social issues] indeed can be found in schools’ (Fredericksen & Beck, 2010: 4), and that the everyday situation in grass-roots schools can be an indicator of broader policy issues. An assessment of community-based frameworks –although useful in the formation of broad peace education frameworks –would require extensive further research that unfortunately is outside the scope of this school-based study. The following section on methodology will discuss how and why the study was limited to a school-based peace education analysis.

5. Small-Scale Studies

As discussed in the literature review and preceding sections, peace education and reconciliation are still sensitive issues in Rwanda. While a large-scale quantitative study may have been the best method for assessing the status of peace education efforts nation-wide, the time constraints of the M.Sc. course, combined with the difficulties of research access and resources in Rwanda, deemed such a large-scale study impossible. Instead, a small-scale qualitative approach –which is concerned with an in-depth analysis of a particular phenomenon, and which ‘entails the detailed and intensive analysis of a single case’ (Bryman, 2008: 52) –was chosen as an alternative. Such studies are usually the method of choice for researchers when ‘the phenomenon under study is not readily distinguishable from its context’ (Yin 2003: 4), and
in the complex post-genocide context of Rwanda, an intensive, in-depth analysis of peace education on a small-scale provided the opportunity to conduct a preliminary study of its status and contribute to a theory framework that could be developed through further research. The small-scale approach was also appropriate for analyzing peace education in Rwanda because it recognized the sensitivity and complexity of the issue in its current context.

6. Case Selection

The school case selection process was based on the need to select a ‘typical’ or ‘representative’ case (Bryman, 2008: 56), which aims to ‘capture circumstances and conditions of an everyday or commonplace situation’ (Yin 2003: 41); because the livelihoods of 90% of Rwandans are ‘linked to land’ (REMA, 2009) a ‘typical’ case referred to a rural, grass-roots case, where people are forced to rely on ‘trickled down’ policies and resources. Due to difficulties in access, the school selected for this study was not selected randomly, but through opportunity sampling (i.e. through personal contacts in Rwanda). Opportunity sampling is often used to study ‘covert or hard-to-access groups’, and in some cases, ‘may be the only viable technique from which to create a sample’ (Jupp, 2006: 206). In this study, opportunity sampling was necessary in order to gain access to the rural, Kinyarwanda-speaking sample that was sought; opportunity sampling was the only viable way to get around the language barrier and gain access to this hard-to-reach sample.

Although Bereday (1964) was right to recommend that research in foreign areas require knowledge of local language, it was not possible in this case to learn Kinyarwanda in preparation for the fieldwork: Kinyarwanda is such a narrowly-spoken language that no learning materials or
resources are readily available outside of Rwanda. In this case, opportunity sampling not only yielded access to a hard-to-reach sample, but even benefited the research process as a whole: in addition to helping with fieldwork logistics (e.g. accommodation and transportation), the mere presence of local contacts also eased language barriers significantly and thereby accelerated the trust-building process with locals while refining the cultural sensitivity and understanding required to conduct ‘outsider’ research. Ultimately, the ‘opportunity’ sampling method employed made this study possible with the desired rural, Kinyarwanda-speaking sample within the time limit of the M.Sc. course.

7. Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were the method of choice for this study, and the only criterion for participation was that interviewees were teachers at the selected school, as the aim of the study was to ‘capture’ the valuable perspectives of teachers in relation to peace education, including their ‘experiences’, ‘concerns’, and ‘expectations’ (Patton, 2002: 341). Both straight-forward and open-ended questions were developed\(^2\) in preparation for the fieldwork, and, in accordance with ethical guidelines, none of the questions made any reference to the genocide. In order to ensure that no interview led to an explicit discussion about the genocide, the questions were structured into 2 main sections: 1) Peace education policy efforts, which aimed to identify and name any implementing bodies, and the content of any existing peace education frameworks; and 2) teachers’ values and attitudes toward peace education, which aimed to analyze how teachers’ personal attitudes might influence the design, implementation, and maintenance of peace education frameworks. Most of these questions were open-ended, \(^2\) See Appendix H, pp.87.
and as is the case with semi-structured interviews, different questions were prompted in different interviews, depending on the participant’s response.

Interview participants were chosen randomly from the selected school, and although all twenty-three teachers were considered for participation, only ten were selected. As a result of random sampling, teachers of the following subjects are represented in the interview data: mathematics, English, Kinyarwanda, COCA, and Social Studies. After the selection process, each participant was then invited to a meeting in the school’s computer lab that afternoon, where they were told (through the use of a translator) what the research was about. Participant information sheets3 in their native language, Kinyarwanda, were also distributed. The selected teachers were then invited to ask questions, after which all ten teachers agreed to participate. The participants were then each interviewed over a period of two weeks, with each interview lasting about 45 minutes to an hour. The interviews took place during school hours in the school’s computer lab, and were conducted in Kinyarwanda through the use of a local translator. Before each interview began, each participant was asked to read and sign the consent form4 (which included permission to use a translator), to reaffirm their consent to be audio-recorded, and to refer to the Peace Education rubric5 (which had been translated into Kinyarwanda) throughout the duration of the interview. No difficulties or unforeseen challenges were faced during the interview process, and only one participant refused to be audio-recorded. Detailed notes were also taken throughout each interview.

---

3 See Appendices D and E, pp.83 & 84.
4 See Appendices F and G, pp.85 & 86.
5 See Appendix C, pp.82.
8. Ethics

A. Ethical Guidelines and Approval

Given the sensitive nature of peace education and the post-conflict context, potential ethical issues with this research project were carefully considered and addressed prior to the commencement of fieldwork in Rwanda. First and foremost, in order to ensure good ethical practice, the study framework and interview questions were designed in line with the British Educational Research Association (2004) and Social Research Association (2003) guidelines. Then, in order to gain constructive feedback, an ethics workshop was attended at the Oxford University Education Department on 12\textsuperscript{th} January. After the workshop, ethical approval was then applied for from the Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC). Reviewer comments from the ethics committee stated that, ‘it appears that the study is a low risk study (adult participants and “non-sensitive” topic), as it does not venture into questions about genocide’, and after the reviewers’ requested researcher risk assessment was completed, ethical approval was granted\textsuperscript{6} on 16\textsuperscript{th} March, 2010.

B. “Outsider” Research and Trustworthiness

Although ethical approval had been granted to begin the fieldwork process, ethical issues were still present throughout the duration of the fieldwork. Perhaps the largest ethical challenge faced by this study was the fact that the topic under analysis constituted ‘outsider’ research. The ethics of ‘Outsider’ research is complicated because the very definition of ‘researcher’ always deems the research to be an ‘outsider’ to a certain extent. However, the

\textsuperscript{6} See Appendix I, pp.90.
question is not ‘can researchers understand others’ experiences and provide an accurate representation’, but rather, ‘can researchers attempt to share the participant’s understanding of an experience in a way that is ethical and meaningful?’. Bridges (2002: 73), argues that because it is impossible even for two insiders to have the exact same understanding (as one’s own understanding of an event is often already very inconsistent and multi-layered), ‘outsider’ research cannot be dismissed solely because the researcher does not have the same understanding as the ‘insider’. Instead, what is important is that the researcher commits to portraying the insiders’ understanding in a way that is objective and accurate.

In order to portray an insiders’ understanding accurately, however, the ‘insider’ (participant) must first provide the researcher with both truthful and accurate data – a process that requires a relationship of mutual trust and respect between participant and researcher. Pendlebury and Enslin (2002: 62) reaffirm that ‘trust is necessary for research to thrive’ and it is upon this principle that the fieldwork was conducted.

In order to gain access to the participants required for this study, it was essential to build a relationship of trust with the local population, and my personal contacts in the village provided a good foundation for this; rather than staying alone at the local church parish (like most visitors do), I lived, dined, and socialized with three teachers from the local secondary school. These teachers quickly became close friends of mine, and each one of them helped significantly with everyday translation and cultural adaptation and sensitivity. These friends also introduced me to other teachers and village locals, many of whom I befriended. Although the research site was not located in this particular village, it was very close by, and my close interaction with local Rwandans and teachers helped significantly in the development of cultural understanding, sensitivity, and trustworthiness among locals before the fieldwork began.
My trustworthiness as an ‘outsider’ was also established by the fact that I sought permission from ‘third party’ gatekeepers (Homan, 2002: 23) before gaining access to the field: I met with both the Minister of Education for the District and the Vice Mayor of the District to seek informed consent. During the meetings, these officials were briefed on the purpose of the research and the nature of the fieldwork. They both seemed supportive of the research, and the Vice Mayor gave me permission to contact the selected school to begin the fieldwork. Also present at these meetings were local friends from the village who had agreed to help me with translation, and whose presence undoubtedly also helped secure my cause as trustworthy.

9. Study Limitations

A. The use of a translator

Another potential limitation of this study is the claim that the language translation from Kinyarwanda to English might negatively affect the reliability of data collected during interviews. While the reliability of translated data is a legitimate concern, one of the main purposes of the research – to select a typical grass-roots school – deemed the use of a translator necessary, as the majority of Rwandans living in rural areas do not speak much English. Without the help of a translator at the rural research site, it would not have been possible to contact the selected school for a preliminary visit, to hold a participant information session, to facilitate a question and answer session, to conduct interviews, or to provide important documents (such as the participant information form) in a language that participants actually understood.

Moreover, the use of a translator in this case actually seemed to accelerate the process of establishing a trusting relationship with each of the participants; the fact that the translator
was also a teacher and somewhat of a local—and therefore more of an ‘insider’—seemed to put participants at ease. If the translator had not been present during the fieldwork, not only would the participants not have understood what was being said, but they would have perceived me as a sole ‘outsider’ without any local affiliation. With regards to the standard of the translated data, I am confident that the translator, who was hired on a professional basis and spoke five different languages fluently, delivered as accurate and as reliable as possible data from each of the interviews; I was given no reason to doubt the reliability of the translated data. It is for these reasons that the reliability of the translated data can be successfully defended.

**B. Generalizability**

The third potential limitation of this study (and the one that is perhaps more general to the whole research design), concerns the generalizability of case studies. This limitation is based on a criticism of case study research in general, and claims that the findings of case studies, derived from in-depth analyses of a particular phenomenon in one single case, are useless for generalization and therefore cannot be applied to any other case. It could be argued, for example, that because the issue of peace education is nation-wide in Rwanda, a larger, more quantitative study would yield more generalizable results, and therefore be more influential for policy implications. However, this argument falsely presupposes that the purpose of this study is to make a ‘statistical generalization’.

As Yin (1994: 30) argues, it is necessary in research to distinguish between ‘statistical generalization’ and ‘analytical generalization’: a ‘statistical generalization’ is when ‘an inference is made about a population (or universe) on the basis of empirical data collected about a
sample’, while an ‘analytical generalization’ occurs when ‘a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study’, and when multiple case studies are shown to support or develop the same theory. Moreover, the ultimate aim of analytical generalization is to contribute to theory building, a contribution that every study should make regardless of its size and scope. Case study research should therefore been seen not as lacking statistical generalization, but as contributing significantly to theory development; an in-depth analysis of one single case can provide a highly specific framework for theory development, which can then be applied to other cases. The issue of peace education and reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda is highly complex, and this study aims to scientifically analyze the issue through a thorough, intensive study on a single case, so that its preliminary findings may contribute to theory development and later be analyzed on a larger scale. The use of case study methodology, therefore, does not limit the generalizability of the findings of this study.

C. Secondary Data

While the main research method of this study was indeed a case study approach, a secondary source of data was found to support the interview data: government-prescribed Social Studies curriculum textbooks. A brief analysis was conducted on the content of three of these textbooks (which were written in English) using the model framework from the previous chapter as a peace education content guide. However, because these books were only available for two days before being returned to the school, and because there was no photocopy machine or scanner available, the only analysis conducted on these books was done in the form of brief, hand-written notes.
While the analysis of these textbooks could have been more systematic and thorough, and a full content analysis would have been very useful in its own right, textbook content analysis was not part of the original research design and was therefore not central to the data of this study. The secondary data that was collected, therefore, should be seen not as a weakness of the study, but as a well-seized opportunity to make use of access to additional resources in the field.

10. Data analysis

All data collected in the field (both primary and secondary) was stored either on blank cassettes or in a personal notebook, and nobody other than myself had access to this material. The interviews were transcribed on a personal, secured laptop, and were coded thematically by hand, as the number of transcripts was few enough that no coding software was necessary. The data was first coded according to 'units of general meaning' and was then further coded into 'units of meaning relevant to the research question' (such as 'formal education' or 'non-formal education'), in which major themes were identified and contextualized (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007: 370). The following chapter will present an analysis of this contextualized data as it relates specifically to the context of Rwanda.
Chapter 4

An Analysis of Peace Education in Rwanda
Introduction

This chapter presents the interview and secondary data collected in the field in an attempt to answer the main research question and sub-questions of the study. The results will be analyzed according to the two parts of the study described in the previous chapter: 1) the Peace Education Framework; and 2) the Teacher Attitudes analysis. The findings and results for the first part of the study will be divided into three sections, according to the three research sub-questions developed for this part of the study in the previous chapter. The results from the second part of the study will follow and will be similarly discussed in sections according to each of the two research sub-questions described in the previous chapter.

Part 1: The Peace Education Framework

1. Research Sub-Question #1: What is the scope of any existing school-based peace education frameworks, and who or what is the main implementing body?

Main Results and Analysis

The findings for this research sub-question were rather straightforward and consistent across all interviews. The interview data showed that the most concrete peace education framework currently existing in Rwanda has not only been implemented nationally (and therefore reaches every primary school in Rwanda), but that it has been implemented through the education system by the MOE—an implementing body which had previously been described
in the literature as extremely ‘reluctant’ to include history and reconciliation in Rwanda’s schools. All participants credited the MOE with initiating and implementing the most concrete current peace education framework in Rwanda: when asked to describe any efforts that had been made by the government to implement peace education in primary schools, all participants immediately pointed to the recently developed Social Studies curriculum and accompanying government-prescribed textbooks as the government’s main contribution to peace education. No other governmental efforts were mentioned by participants.

Then, when participants were asked to identify any other peace education efforts made by NGOs, charities, or church groups, the majority of participants said that there had been none, stating, for example, that, ‘NGOs might provide books... but they don’t help directly and they don’t help in peace education’ (Interviewee 5). One participant, however, said that there had been efforts made by church groups and NGOs to implement a peace education framework, claiming that a Catholic Church group called 'Noah’s Disciples', used to come to the community and teach ‘education for peace’. A few other participants also claimed that efforts had been made by ADRA (a U.S.-based Adventist Church group), CARE International, and the Catholic Church, and one participant claimed that they have been effective in promoting reconciliation efforts in the community:

*CARE International helped in 2001 and 2002... ADRA helped in 2007 and 2008. They were effective because before them, people were not friendly to each other and were suspicious of each others’ ethnicity after the genocide. Now people act differently to try to teach others.*

-Interviewee 9

According to these participants, however, the efforts made by these groups were mostly community-based, as interviewee 7 asserted: ‘ADRA did a lot ... they trained illiterate people in the district and did teaching of some of those [peace education] values’. Another teacher
clarified that CARE International had implemented a 'Tree Planting Project', but this was primarily for the purpose of teacher training (not peace education teaching), which will be discussed later on in this chapter. Therefore, while these efforts may have been somewhat related to peace education, they do not answer the specific research question posed by this study, which concerns school-based peace education frameworks; because none of the participants knew of any other school-based peace education efforts aside from the Social Studies curriculum, the interview data ultimately suggests that the only school-based framework known to exist on the grass-roots level is this curriculum, for which the implementing body is the MOE.

**Further Analysis**

It is highly encouraging to see that the main school-based peace education framework in Rwanda is national in scope, and that it is implemented by a sustainable governing body – the Ministry of Education. As argued in the literature review and accompanying model framework, the scope of an effective school-based peace education framework in Rwanda (i.e. one that effectively facilitates national reconciliation and prevents future conflict), should match the scope of the conflict; in other words, because the need for peace and reconciliation in Rwanda is nationwide (due to the magnitude of the 1994 genocide), peace education frameworks should ideally be implemented on a national scale, and with regards to school-based frameworks, the Social Studies curriculum seems to be the main vehicle through which this is currently being achieved.
The fact that peace education is being implemented governmentally (and on a national scale) is important because, as one teacher pointed out, access to non-governmental resources in Rwanda is unequal:

_I have been teaching for 2 years here [in the village]. Before, I was in Kigali and there the Catholic Church gave materials and bibles. There is a kids newspaper made by the Catholic Church [which contains] stories about Peace Education values ... we can get those here but we have to buy them._

-Interviewee 6

This teacher raises an important point concerning the disparity of resources between rural and urban schools in Rwanda; because urban schools are more privileged in terms of access to resources, peace education frameworks can only have a far-reaching impact if they are implemented centrally through the national government, as ‘four out of five Rwandans live in the countryside’ (Hatzfeld, 2005: 6). For these reasons, it is encouraging to see that the main framework in Rwanda has been implemented nationally through the education system, and that it has been implemented by the Ministry of Education.

2. Research Sub-Question #2: How has peace education been implemented in Rwandan primary schools (formally or non-formally), and what topics does it include?

With peace education found to have been formally implemented through the Ministry of Education’s Social Studies Curriculum, this section will focus heavily on the content of this curriculum and how it relates to the model framework developed in the previous chapter. Additionally, because this study also aims to identify other ‘hidden’ or ‘non-formal’ peace education initiatives that might exist in schools, this section will also explore how other
approaches to peace education (both formal and non-formal) have been implemented in primary schools.

A. Formal Peace Education: The Social Studies Curriculum

Main Results and Analysis

As the main peace education framework under analysis in this study, the content of the Social Studies’ curriculum (a type of formal education) was the main topic of inquiry during all participant interviews. However, only two participants were Social Studies teachers, and the majority were unable to specify exactly which elements of peace education were included in the curriculum, although almost all said they believed that ‘Respect for Others’ and ‘Reconciliation’ were included.

Secondary Data: Main Results and Analysis

Because the exact content of the Social Studies curriculum was difficult to decipher from the interviews, a copy of the government-prescribed textbooks from the fourth, fifth, and sixth levels of primary Social Studies was obtained, and a brief content overview was conducted. This brief analysis found that each of the four elements of peace education described on the rubric was indeed formally included in the curriculum. The content of each of these textbooks was briefly scanned for relevance to the four elements of Peace Education: 1) respect for others; 2) reconciliation; 3) justice and the law; and 4) how to work towards a peaceful future.

---

7 The first three levels of the primary Social Studies curriculum were not consulted as they are all taught in Kinyarwanda.
A preliminary content analysis of the ‘Primary Social Studies Book 4’ (Bamusananire et al., 2006a), showed that ‘Respect for Others’ (and also ‘respect for the self’) is included in the form of human rights and equality education, as the book includes different chapters on the following topics: ‘Children’s Rights in our district’; ‘Gender in our District’; and ‘Equality in Our District’. The chapter on children’s rights, for example, lists all the general rights of the child, (including food, care, shelter, education, clothing, rest, and play), while also discussing different types of child abuse, how to prevent it, and who to go to for help (Bamusananire et al., 2006a: 73).

The Level 5 textbook (Bamusananire et al., 2006b) then goes into even more detail on human rights, children’s rights, and equality. A chapter called, ‘Children’s Rights in Our Province’, for example explains the right to health, the right to ‘vaccination and a balanced diet’, the ‘right to be protected’, and ‘the right not to be raped’ (2006b: 63). The chapter on ‘Equality’ also goes into more detail than the previous level, and describes how the constitution guarantees equality for all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, etc. In the Level 6 textbook (Bamusananire et al., 2006c), the inclusion on ‘Respect for Others’ is evident in chapters with titles such as, ‘Co-operation’, which focuses on working together and building and maintaining good relationships with others. There does, therefore, seem to be a significant amount of peace education content related to ‘Respect for Others’ throughout the Social Studies curriculum. Nonetheless, a more structured and systematic content analysis would be required in order to identify the exact amount of content related to this broad element of peace education.
ii. ‘Reconciliation’

With regards to the ‘Reconciliation’ content of peace education, the first Social Studies textbook under analysis, Level 4, (Bamusananire et al., 2006a), contains a chapter called ‘Things everyone can do to maintain peace in the district’. The chapter discusses how peace is not just the opposite of war or fighting, and also contains some classroom activities to engage student participation. There is also a section specifically titled ‘Reconciliation’ (2006a: 63), which presents a hypothetical quarrel between two neighbours with some questions that students are asked to respond to. A classroom activity is also provided, and this requires students to make up and act out a play about a quarrel, to discuss how anger was involved, and to decide how the situation should be reconciled (2006a: 63). The Level 5 textbook (Bamusananire et al., 2006b), introduces the first discussion about the specific need for reconciliation in Rwanda, but only briefly describes the concept of the ‘Unity and Reconciliation Commission’ that is operating throughout Rwanda, and does not mention the genocide (2006b: 55).

The genocide is not actually mentioned until the Level 6 textbook (Bamusananire et al., 2006c), where the history of the conflict is addressed for the first time and more detail is provided on the ‘Unity and Reconciliation Commission’. This textbook describes the basic history of colonization and the effects of colonization, and also tells how the first instance of ethnic division came about, stating, ‘colonialists encouraged cattle-farmers and farmers to think of themselves as different ethnic groups’ (2006c: 48). The history of this ethnic divide is then briefly traced up to the 1994 genocide, over the course of a few chapters. One chapter, called ‘Colonisation and Conflict’, for example, describes the ‘Hutu Manifesto’ (2006c: 55) and the political situation of Rwanda leading up to the genocide, while the proceeding chapter on ‘The Genocide’ describes the ‘interhamwe’, how they ‘targeted Tutsis’, and how ‘government radio
encouraged ordinary Rwandans to join in the massacres' (2006c: 62). Moreover, it describes how 'Young boys were killed along with their fathers and grandfathers' and 'women were raped and tortured', while also defining terms such as 'massacre', 'genocide', 'pogom' and 'traumatization' (2006c: 59-61). The language used in this chapter is quite complex, and a lot of new terms are introduced.

iii. ‘Justice and the Law’

In terms of addressing 'Justice and the Law', the Social Studies curriculum appears to include a reasonable about of information on the Constitution (introduced in Level 4), the ‘Gacaca’ traditional justice system (introduced in Level 5), and different levels of individual, group, and community responsibility and accountability (Bamusananire et al., 2006b: 54-56). In Level 6, (Bamusananire et al., 2006c), the new constitution from 2003 is described in more detail, and a chapter on 'Government' describes the 3 branches of government, and how the 'judiciary' system works through the primary, intermediate, high, and supreme courts (2006c: 69). As a narrower topic of peace education, however, ‘Justice and the Law’ does not seem to crop up in the textbooks as much as some of the other elements, such as 'Respect for Others', which is seemingly interwoven into different topics and issues throughout the curriculum.

iv. ‘How to Work towards a Peaceful Future’

The final element of peace education, 'How to Work towards a Peaceful Future', however, is perhaps the most recurring theme throughout the Social Studies Curriculum. In the Level 4 textbook (Bamusananire et al., 2006a), the following topics are emphasized: the importance of democracy; citizen duties (such as paying taxes); obeying rules; working together; and respecting other peoples' property. A chapter on ‘Factors of Harmony and Disharmony in
the District’ also discusses how ‘everybody’ has a ‘responsibility to keep the peace in the district’ (2006a: 68-69). In Level 5, a chapter called ‘Maintaining Peace and Harmony’ describes how children can work towards a peaceful future through activities such as sports and music (Bamusananire et al., 2006b: 57-58). Then, in Level 6, there is an emphasis on ‘Unity’, the meaning of the national flag, the national anthem, and the importance of building and maintaining good relationships between people (Bamusananire et al., 2006c: 113). There are also chapters in Level 6 on ‘Co-Operation’, ‘Dangers to Unity, Co-Operation and Development’, and ‘Working towards Unity, Co-operation, and Development’ (Bamusananire et al., 2006c). These chapters address how hatred and jealousy can affect communities (2006c: 23) and how conflicts should be resolved and managed (2006c: 127). Given the prevalence on these topics, the overall tone of the Social Studies curriculum seems to be forward looking, as a great deal of other current issues are also covered with a strong emphasis on co-operation and social responsibility, such as the environment, energy resources, economic development, and health issues such as AIDS and malaria.

Further Analysis

Overall, the preliminary content analysis of these three levels of Social Studies textbooks demonstrates that each of the elements of Peace Education is in fact included in the formal curriculum, and that the history of the conflict is also confronted. ‘Reconciliation’ – perhaps the most important peace education topic in the context of Rwanda – is introduced early on, and the historical details of the genocide do seem to be adequately covered in the Level 6 textbook. As stated in the previous chapter, however, these findings are only preliminary and a more systematic content analysis is necessary.
One of the most striking observations that came from reading these textbooks, however, is that the use of language in the Level 6 textbook is quite sophisticated for primary level, non-native speakers; Kinyarwanda is the native language of most Rwandans, and considering the recent abrupt change in the language of instruction in the education system, it is surprising that the language used in some of the chapters in Level 6 is so complex. The following quote is an excerpt from ‘The Genocide’ chapter in Level 6, and demonstrates the style of language used throughout the textbook:

The first republic began when Rwanda became independent in 1962 and ended when Kayiband was deposed in 1973. The new President was the defense Minister, General Juvenal Habyarimana, a soldier from Gisenyi. He set up a committee for Peace and National Unity, which in 1975 became a political party, the MRND. The racist policy that set Hutu against Tutsi continued during the Second Republic. Many Tutsi were massacred during this period.

Bamusananire et al., 2006c: 60.

Although it is a clear and concise summary of the historical background to the genocide, the language seems relatively complex for its intended audience (non-native speakers in the sixth year of primary school). Given the nature of this surprising observation, the five remaining interviews were used to ask teachers about the level of English language in these textbooks.

The results were clear. Each of the five remaining teachers who were interviewed said that language was one of the biggest obstacles to peace education in Rwanda, agreeing that children’s comprehension of the Social Studies curriculum was hindered by the fact that it is taught in English. Moreover, not only did the teachers feel that the language was perhaps too complex for their students, the majority also felt that it was difficult for them to teach because they themselves had not yet mastered the language. One teacher said, for example, that language was the primary obstacle for teachers in regards to peace education, and another
participant agreed, saying that language was in fact the only obstacle for teachers. When asked whether the students might understand the curriculum content better if it was taught in Kinyarwanda rather than English, interviewee 7 explained, 'Yes, it would be better... I used to teach Level 6 [Social Studies] but I am French-speaking so it was difficult. Both teachers and kids had difficulty'. While this teacher believed the curriculum would be better taught in Kinyarwanda (as the first three levels of primary school are), another teacher was more indifferent, simply stating that although it would be more effective to teach in Kinyarwanda, 'we have to follow government policy' (Interviewee 10). Although the issue of language was not originally considered for analysis in this study, these preliminary findings have highlighted one of the most important issues facing not only peace education in Rwanda, but also the whole education system.

B. Other Formal Peace Education Frameworks

Main Results and Analysis

Aside from the Social Studies curriculum, there was no other formal peace education framework initially identified by any of the teachers. However, when participants were specifically asked to refer to the peace education rubric and assess how peace education might be formally embedded in other curriculum subjects, participants primarily focused on a subject called 'COCA'. Participants explained that COCA is a subject that combines 'music', 'religion', 'sports', and 'woodwork/crafts/arts', and half of them identified COCA as being an important subject for teaching children about the values of peace education, arguing that the inclusion of
religion covers the peace-related topic ‘respect for others’, while the inclusion of sports provides the opportunity to promote co-operation and practice conflict resolution techniques.

One teacher then clarified that there is neither a set curriculum nor a designated teacher for COCA; teachers teach COCA to their own "homeroom" class and have the freedom to teach whatever they like. When asked what was generally included in COCA classes, most teachers said that music and songs are often used to promote messages about reconciliation, and according to one teacher, also about ‘love’, ‘patriotism’, and ‘respect’. Then, when asked to clarify how religion was taught, one teacher explained, ‘every teacher delivers anything they want based on their own religion ... if the teacher is Muslim, they teach Islam’ (Interviewee 1). This teacher added, however, that because most of the teachers in the school are Catholic, they all mostly teach the same religious values. One participant also added that although there is no formal curriculum for religion, the Catholic Church sometimes provides guidance and curriculum materials for religious education (Interviewee 7). Overall, participants agreed that the inclusion of religion and other COCA subjects in the curriculum does contribute to the goals of peace education because as one teacher said, COCA teaches about ‘respect’ and ‘working together’.

In terms of teaching 'history', the subject does not currently exist in the school curriculum, except as a brief component of the Social Studies curriculum, as discussed above. Language studies, however, (English and Kinyarwanda) do exist as separate subjects. When asked how (if at all) these subjects cover the elements of peace education described by the rubric, two English teachers said that the curriculum mainly only covers grammar, but that group work in the English classroom is important for promoting these values. Qureshi (2006), argues that in order to challenge one’s assumptions and values of other cultures and lifestyles, students should 'read more literature', but when asked if the Rwandan English curriculum uses
literature to promote multiculturalism and tolerance, one English teacher said that although English language classes ‘should’, they ‘do not teach about other cultures’ (Interviewee 6). A Kinyarwanda teacher responded similarly, stating that Kinyarwanda classes really only teach grammar and that peace education is mostly taught through non-formal education (i.e. mediating and resolving everyday conflicts between children).

Further Analysis

Aside from the Social Studies curriculum discussed earlier, there does not seem to be any other formal peace education framework currently existent in the primary school curriculum. Although COCA is highly regarded by teachers as an important place for teaching the values of peace education, there is no set curriculum for this subject, which makes it hard to analyze for peace education content. Ultimately, the level of peace education content included in COCA classes (including Religion, Sports, and Music) is at the disposal of each individual teacher. Although it is encouraging to see how highly teachers value the COCA subject for promoting peace education, it is unfortunate that there are no set curriculum guidelines or designated teachers for this particular subject. Moreover, because COCA, like Social Studies, is taught in English in the final three years of primary school, the same English languages issues that occur in the Social Studies curriculum likely persist in the teaching of COCA. Language teachers seemed to believe that English and Kinyarwanda classes do have the potential to promote formal peace education (through the inclusion of relevant literature), but the majority seemed to agree that non-formal peace education currently plays a bigger role.
C. Non-Formal Peace Education

Main Results and Analysis

The majority of participants agreed that non-formal peace education occurs on a regular basis in the classroom. One teacher said that they work to promote the values of peace education by encouraging ‘self-esteem’ and promoting ‘open discussions’ among students (Interviewee 8). A few other teachers added that non-formal peace education is used when there is a conflict between students in the classroom, and the opportunity arises to teach the value of conflict resolution in front of the whole class. A couple of teachers also mentioned that peace education is promoted in the classroom through small group discussions, which force students to work together and co-operate. One teacher specified that ‘Justice and the law’ is mainly taught to through non-formal education, as teachers often teach their own students about the role of the police and ‘who to call if they are raped or have any other problem’ (Interviewee 3). While no other teacher listed specific examples of non-formal peace education in the classroom, there was general consensus among teachers that non-formal education has a very prominent role in the promotion of peace education in their school.

In regards to non-formal education outside of the classroom, the majority of teachers specifically referred to the role of extracurricular student clubs as important spaces for teaching peace education. One student club, called ‘Tuseme’, was specifically mentioned in a few of the interviews. This club, according to interviewee 2, means ‘speak out’ in Swahili and was originally a ‘girls-only’ club designed to encourage the exchange of ideas and discussion of health issues. Now the club also has male members and uses drama and public shows to ‘speak out’ about different youth issues, which, according to one teacher, often include discussion about peace and reconciliation (Interviewee 6). A few teachers also mentioned that there is an anti-AIDs club
at the school, and one such teacher said that it is effective at teaching students about child
rights. These clubs are run by teachers, and are held ‘during school or after school hours, but
not every week’ (Interviewee 8). One teacher mentioned that there are plans to start a ‘Unity
Club’ at the school, but no other details were known.

In regards to teachers’ opinions of these clubs, every teacher agreed that the clubs are
very important for peace education. One teacher said that sometimes genocide ideology comes
up in club discussions, and this allows other club members to tell teachers before conflict breaks
out. The majority of teachers argued that clubs are important for ‘exchanging values’ and
‘promoting forgiveness’ in an informal way –a way in which (according to one teacher) some
students prefer to learn. Another teacher added that these clubs are effective because even
although students are not required to participate, students enjoy them and they ‘teach about
respect, helping each other, and children’s rights’ (Interviewee 4). Overall, teachers considered
these clubs to be very important in the promotion of peace education and reconciliation.

Further Analysis

Although the literature advises against non-formal peace education programmes, there
is significant evidence in this study that non-formal education does play an important role in the
promotion of reconciliation and peace; all teachers agreed that the extra-curricular school clubs
are important places for discussing youth issues (such as genocide ideology in schools) and for
practicing the peace education values that are taught in the classroom. While the ‘school ethos’
approach to peace education might not be the most effective method for teaching children
about peace and reconciliation (for reasons discussed in chapter two), it seems to be an
important method for complementing the values learned in formal peace education. Moreover,
because formal peace education in Rwanda is currently facing large language barriers, non-
formal peace education may be more important than ever and should maintain an important role in Rwanda’s education system.

3. Research Sub-Question #3: How (if at all) have teachers been trained in Peace Education?

One of the most important findings of this study is that the teachers in this rural school have little to no training in peace education or English language training, both of which are essential for ensuring that peace education is effective. Of the ten teachers asked, nine responded to the question ‘What are the biggest obstacles to Peace Education’ with some sort of acknowledgment that teacher training needs to be improved, and prompted by a discussion about language issues, the last five teachers interviewed also specified that English language training for teachers was absolutely crucial.

Main Results and Analysis

Of the nine teachers asked, ‘Do Social Studies teachers receive any training?’, seven said that there was no training, one said that they was unsure, and the other simply said, ‘Social Studies teachers know the values [of Peace Education]... they can get information about those values on the radio’ (Interviewee 9), but reaffirmed that all teachers would benefit from language training. When asked about how one becomes a Social Studies teacher, one participant explained, ‘there is no training for Social Studies, you just teach when you say you are capable’ (Interviewee 5). This participant added that in order to teach Social Studies, the teacher simply reads the textbook, and then begins teaching when he or she feels comfortable with it.
In terms of support for more teaching training, all nine teachers asked agreed that there should be more training for all Social Studies teachers, with some arguing that such training is necessary to ‘help teachers interact with students more comfortably’. Moreover, a majority of the participants also added that all teachers, not only Social Studies teachers, should receive training in peace education; one teacher said that this is important because all teachers occasionally have to mediate and resolve student conflicts within the school grounds, while another argued that it was important because ‘teachers switch subjects and need to be prepared’ for teaching Social Studies (Interviewee 10). Overall, there was a significantly high level of agreement between teachers that all Social Studies teachers (and even teachers of other subjects) should receive formal peace education training.

While there did not seem to be any specific peace education training for Social Studies teachers, there did, however, seem to be some general training available for ‘all teachers’, (according to some participants), and this was mostly found to have occurred through short-term teacher training camps. However, participant responses to questions about teacher training camps and their effectiveness were varied. One teacher said, for example, that the national government sent up ‘solidarity training camps’ for teachers, where teachers gathered in groups and were taught about the values of education for peace. According to this teacher, the camp lasted about one month, was country-wide, and was in fact helpful in training teachers to teach the values of peace education. Another teacher mentioned a similar camp that took place ‘one or two years ago’, which was ‘required for all teachers’, lasted for about three weeks, and trained teachers how to teach topics such as ‘history’, ‘forgiveness’, and ‘how to prevent genocide’ (Interviewee 4). Three other teachers mentioned that teacher training camps took place, but the participants had mixed feelings about the effectiveness of such camps: one teacher said that the camps were not sufficient for training teachers in peace education, while
another teacher claimed that they ‘got a lot from the camps’, and that they tried to practice what they had learned at the camps by teaching the kids about it. A different teacher, however, disagreed that all teachers participated in these camps, saying that there ‘used to be some teachers who went ... but they never transferred [what they had learned] to the staff that didn't go’ (Interviewee 10).

Aside from the formal teacher training camps run by the Ministry of Education and/or the local District, some teachers mentioned other non-formal sources of peace education teacher training. One teacher talked about ‘District Tournaments’, where teachers of different schools come together and play sports as a means for promoting and practicing the values of peace and co-operation. Another teacher also mentioned the District Tournaments, and added that after each match, there was a meeting between the two teams to discuss ‘reconciliation and human rights’. Other potential sources of peace education training for teachers included ‘lectures’, whereby, according to one teacher, the District would send a speaker to different schools to lecture about ‘child rights, law, justice, and HIV prevention’ (Interviewee 7). According to this teacher, these school lectures were beneficial to both teachers and students.

In terms of non-governmental teacher training programs, the same teacher mentioned that CARE International had contributed to teacher training in peace education by introducing their ‘Tree Planting Project’ in 2002; the project taught teachers about ‘respect for others’ and ‘how to approach people on the issue of peace’ (Interviewee 7). This teacher said that the Catholic Church had also been influential in peace education training for teachers, and that in 2003 they held a seminar in the Northern Province for school Head teachers, where they promoted the teaching of ‘civics education’, ‘African sociology’, and ‘religion’. Another teacher mentioned that village meetings were also a source of peace education training –where village
members get together and talk about the values of peace education amongst each other. However, they claimed that village meetings alone were not a sufficient method for training teachers in peace education. No other peace education teacher training programs were mentioned by the participants.

**Further Analysis**

As discussed above, one of the biggest findings of this study is that teachers feel unprepared to teach curriculum subjects in English, and that out of those asked, each one said they would like more English language training. However, aside from the issue of language training, there also seems to be a lack of peace education training. Although a study in Sri Lanka has shown that short-term training camps on peace education can positively influence long-term attitudinal change in a protracted conflict context, (Malhotra & Liyanage, 2005), the data suggests that not all Rwandan teachers have access to these camps, as teachers disagreed over the accessibility and level of participation in teacher training camps. Moreover, the data also suggests that there currently does not exist any sustainable or structured training program for teachers, such as those provided by a university or educational institute: all of the teachers asked said that Social Studies teachers do not receive any content or pedagogical training for Social Studies at all. The only training that was found to exist, therefore, was the short-term teacher training camps that not all teachers had attended.

This lack of training in the content or pedagogy of Social Studies teaching, combined with the fact that most teachers are not yet comfortable teaching in English, also seems to force a reliance upon textbooks, of which only one kind is available (the Ministry-prescribed books). One teacher explained, 'we rely on textbooks... we need different types of books, more variety, and different resources... and there needs to be a qualified teacher for every subject'
(Interviewee 5). When asked about the need for more resources and materials, another teacher, who had previously taught in Kigali, said ‘we should get more books... In Kigali there are more books and materials than in any of the villages’ (Interviewee 6). Four other teachers agreed that the lack of resources and textbooks is one of the bigger obstacles to both Peace Education and pedagogy in general. The data suggests that there is a large rural-urban disparity in resources for peace education, and that there may even be a similar disparity in access to teacher training programs.

It is surprising to discover that none of the Social Studies teachers had received any content, pedagogical, or language training. Some of the teachers in this school had attended the short-term camps on peace education, and while this may have been beneficial for the purpose of non-formal education, none of them had been prepared to teach the Social Studies curriculum, which contains many controversial and sensitive topics that are central to the purpose of peace education. Moreover, the fact that the COCA subject has no formal curriculum means that the content of that class is entirely at the disposal of the teacher, who, in the case of this particular school, likely has received little to no training. Every teacher who was asked said that they would like more training (in both English and in peace education), and given the psychological trauma likely experienced by many teachers, it seems extremely important that teachers are prepared psychologically, attitudinally and pedagogically in order for peace education to be effective.
Part 2: Teacher Attitudes and Values

4. Research Sub-Question #4: What are teachers’ opinions of Peace Education?

As one of the most important research questions of this study, the main findings for this particular sub-question were quite surprising, given the sensitive nature of the topic under investigation: when beginning fieldwork in Rwanda for the first time, it was expected that a sensitive research topic such as this one might be met with slight resistance from the participants. However, most participants openly stated their support for peace education, and every teacher agreed that it is 'very important' to teach kids about the four elements of peace education listed on the rubric.

One teacher argued that it is necessary for kids to be taught peace education when they are young, because then they can grow up to be 'good citizens' and 'develop the country'; another teacher agreed that teaching peace education is, 'very important, considering the past and history of Rwanda', and added, '[Rwandans] need to be good citizens and need to be able to set goals' (Interviewee 8). Other teachers said that peace education should be a 'priority', and one teacher explicitly expressed support of peace education as a tool for ending ongoing ethnic tension in Rwanda: '[peace education] will contribute to the unity of students and chase away genocide ideology about ethnicity' (Interviewee 10). In regards to teaching history (as a supposedly essential part of reconciliation), teachers generally agreed that it is a very important subject to teach, given the post-conflict context in Rwanda. One teacher said, for example, 'it is important, but we have to rewrite [the history curriculum] because before the genocide, it was twisted' (Interviewee 9). Only one teacher disagreed with the fact that history is important, and said, 'it is better to avoid talking about what happened here, for the better of the future' (Interviewee 1). Teachers were consciously aware of the continuing need for peace education,
and the majority of teachers agreed that this also involves the teaching of genocidal history.
Their enthusiasm towards peace education was overall highly encouraging.

5. Research Sub-Question #5: How do teachers think that peace education should be taught and whose responsibility do they think it is to teach these values?

Main Results and Analysis

Teachers had split opinions over the best way to implement peace education in schools. One teacher said that effective peace education requires both a formal and non-formal approach: this teacher argued that individual ‘teacher initiatives’ were very important, and that ‘[teachers] need to teach at break time and monitor behaviour’, while also stating that, ‘if the Ministry designed a separate curriculum to teach reconciliation, peace, and self-esteem, it would be very effective’ (Interviewee 1). Another teacher agreed that subject separation might be beneficial to the goals of peace education, arguing that the Social Studies curriculum combines too many topics, and that large topics such as history, geography, and civics should be split up into separate subjects.

With regards to their preference of formal peace education over non-formal peace education, the majority of teachers seemed to insist on the importance of formal peace education (and the need for separate subjects), while simultaneously reaffirming the need for non-formal peace education as well. Although one teacher argued that ‘classes are more important [than clubs]’ and another teacher agreed that ‘most [peace education] values are covered in class’, the majority seemed to agree that the school clubs and everyday non-formal education were also effective in teaching children the values of peace education. As one teacher
stated, ‘clubs complement what [children] learn in class... they are all important’ (Interviewee 8). Therefore, while some teachers explicitly stated that formal peace education was more effective that non-formal peace education, the majority simply stated that non-formal peace education was also important for complementing what is learned in the classroom.

When asked about whose responsibility they thought it was to teach peace education to children (either parents or school teachers), participants also had split opinions. Only one teacher said that parents would be more effective (than teachers) at providing peace education to their children, arguing that ‘families would be better [than schools] because they set the fundamentals of life –teachers do not teach whole value sets’ (Interviewee 3). Half of the participants, however, said that both teachers and parents are important educators of peace, saying that a school education should ‘complement’ what is learned at home.

The remaining four, on the other hand, argued that teachers (as opposed to parents) are better suited to be peace educators for a number of reasons, one of which being that ‘children spend more time with teachers’ (9 months of the year) than with their parents. One of the teachers raised an interesting point on this issue, arguing that teachers have more of a responsibility because many adults (particularly in the villages in rural Rwanda) are ‘illiterate’ and, ‘parents need to understand the values [of peace education] before they can teach it’ (Interviewee 5). Similarly, another teacher added that if children learn about peace education in school, they can then pass on what they have learned to their parents; teachers seemed aware that parents have been among those accused of promoting genocide ideology, and a couple of teachers argued that adult peace education is also important. Nevertheless, all teachers agreed that the school does have a responsibility to teach the values of peace education to children.
Further Analysis

This brief analysis of teacher attitudes towards peace education and its role in the education system showed quite conclusive results: all teachers recognized the importance of peace education and the current need to teach about peace and reconciliation in schools, and all teachers believed that the school does have a responsibility to teach these values. The support for peace education was generally very high, and teachers seemed enthusiastic and supportive about the need to improve peace education in their school, either through formal curriculum development or through improved teacher training. One of the main purposes of this study was to determine if (and to what extent) teachers felt comfortable teaching the sensitive topics of peace and reconciliation, given the magnitude and recentness of the 1994 genocide. The results were promising, as all the teachers asked said that they would feel comfortable teaching peace education, but that they would like more training. Overall, the teachers seemed to be ready and willing to improve the status of peace education in their school.
Chapter 5

Final Words
Final Words

As a preliminary study on the implementation of primary peace education in Rwanda, this research has yielded valuable insight into the perspectives of Rwandan teachers, who have been charged with the primary responsibility of driving grass-roots peace education efforts in Rwanda. Although the Ministry of Education has implemented a formal peace education framework through the national Social Studies curriculum, the lack of English language training available to teachers has forced a reliance on non-formal education and individual teacher initiatives, and has thereby increased the importance of the role of teachers in Rwanda today.

Luckily, teacher support and enthusiasm for peace education is generally high, and teachers do seem to feel a personal responsibility to teach the values of peace education to their students. Although the majority of teachers are lacking in any kind of pedagogical or peace education training, the ‘Reconstruction of the teachers’ psyche’ programme set up by the Institute of Education in Kigali has acknowledged the need to assist in the post-genocide professional development of Rwandan teachers, and has hopefully set the stage for many other similar programmes to emerge. Currently, this training is only available for a small number of teachers in Rwanda, and the large rural-urban disparity likely means that many rural teachers are disadvantaged in terms of their access to such training. All of the teachers interviewed said that they would like more training, but capacity-building for teacher training must now be the focus so that programmes such as that provided by the Institute of Education can reach every teacher. Cadernas (2005) argues that non-governmental organizations have long been at the forefront of human rights and peace education, but now it seems imperative that the MOE takes the lead in order to provide this training for all teachers.
Rwanda and the Model Framework

With improved teacher training and support, the Social Studies curriculum could eventually be an effective peace education framework in Rwandan primary schools because overall, the Rwandan framework does seem to exemplify the model characteristics laid out in the framework: the scope of the peace education initiative is national (as it is implemented through the education system); the implementing body – the MOE – is both committed and capable of implementing the main peace education framework; the framework exemplifies formal education rather than non-formal education; and the content of the main framework includes each of the four elements of peace education identified by the rubric. All in all, the main framework of peace education in Rwanda (the Social Studies curriculum) fits many of the characteristics of ‘effective’ peace education programmes; the only characteristic that is wholly lacking is ‘teacher training and preparedness’, and this primarily includes the need for English language training, as it seems that the language of instruction has been permanently switched to English. Nevertheless, with regards to school-based peace education efforts, Rwanda fares quite well compared to the model framework. An appropriate next step would be to prioritize English language and peace education training for all teachers, and to apply this preliminary model framework to other cases for comparison and development.

Another appropriate step would now be to assess the status of community-based peace education programmes in Rwanda, as this study has demonstrated how such programmes complement school-based efforts in order to achieve a ‘spill-over’ effect into wider society; given the finding that many adults in rural Rwanda are illiterate and have been accused of promoting genocide ideologies at home, community-based peace education seems more important than ever. The goal of achieving national reconciliation is very large and school-based
programmes will be ineffective if the values that children learn in school are not reinforced within the wider community. As an important component of the model framework, community-based peace education efforts also warrant analysis, and a prompt examination of such efforts in Rwanda would no doubt benefit progress towards national reconciliation.
Appendices
## Appendix A: Model Framework with Research Sub-Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of a Framework</th>
<th>Model Framework Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of the Peace Education initiative</strong>&lt;br&gt;(international, national, local)</td>
<td>Matches the scope of the conflict&lt;br&gt;<em>Conflicts that affect an entire country call for national peace education initiatives, while localized conflicts only require local initiatives</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Implementing body</strong>&lt;br&gt;(governments, NGOs, churches, etc.)</td>
<td>Possesses the resources and level of commitment required to implement and sustain the full scope of the peace education initiative&lt;br&gt;<em>National initiatives usually require a level of commitment that can only be guaranteed by national governments</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium of Implementation</strong>&lt;br&gt;(school-based, community-based, etc.)</td>
<td>Reaches all demographic groups affected by the conflict&lt;br&gt;<em>Schools should be used to reach children, while community centres should be used for reaching out-of-school children and adults</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of framework</strong>&lt;br&gt;(formal or non-formal education)</td>
<td>Requires structured learning and lesson plans&lt;br&gt;<em>This is best achieved through Formal Education, where Peace Education concepts are formally included in the curriculum or lesson plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Includes the teaching of any of the following:&lt;br&gt;5) Reconciliation (including history)&lt;br&gt;6) Respect for the self and others (i.e. Human rights education)&lt;br&gt;7) Justice and the law&lt;br&gt;8) How to work towards a Peaceful future (i.e. Moral Education or Civics Education, including citizen duties, rights, and responsibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher/Leader training</strong></td>
<td>Prepares teachers and leaders specifically for needs of Peace Education&lt;br&gt;<em>This is an essential part of a Peace Education framework, and includes psychological and pedagogical preparedness, as well as Peace Education content training</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B: Peace Education Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Elements of Peace Education</th>
<th>Curriculum Topics (Formal Education)</th>
<th>Social Environment (Informal Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Others</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Ensuring that children interact with each other in a respectful way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion/Moral Education</td>
<td>Encouragement of extra-curricular activities (eg. Volunteering, helping the sick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Religion/Moral education History</td>
<td>Intervening when children have conflicts with each other and encouraging a process of forgiveness and reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice and the Law</td>
<td>The Constitution and the law</td>
<td>Establishing classroom rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement of the law</td>
<td>Enforcing classroom rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences of breaking the law</td>
<td>Helping children understand the concept of obedience and societal order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to work towards a Peaceful Future</td>
<td>Citizenship Education (minority rights, voting, co-operation, freedom of speech, and non-violent conflict resolution, individual duties)</td>
<td>Fostering a peaceful and positive classroom environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging children to be active in the community and engage with community efforts in a peaceful way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BIMWE MU BIGIZE UBURERE MBONEZAMAHORO

Wifashishe izi ngingo enye ziri mu bigize uburere mbonezamahoro mu gsubiza ibi bibazo bikurikira:

a) Kubaha bagenzi bawe  
b) Kubabarira n'ubwiyunge  
c) Ubabarera n'amategeko  
d) Guhora duharanira amahoro ejo hazaza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibiri mu burere mboneramahoro</th>
<th>Ibiri mu nteganyanyigisho</th>
<th>Uko byashyirwa mu bikorwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kubaha bagenzi bace          | Uburenganzira bw/kiremwanuntu  
Iyobokamana/Uburere nyamuntu   | Kugenzura neza n'aba abana  
bubahana mu byo bakora byose.  
-Gushyira ingufu mu bindi  
bikorwa byuzuzanyana n'amasomo  
bubahwa mu ishuri.  
(ubukorerabashake, gushasha abarwayi) |
| Umuco wo kubabarira n'ubwiyunge. | Iyobokamana/Uburere nyamuntu | Kuganira n'aba abana  
bashyamiranye ubashishikariza  
umuco wo kubabarira no  
kwiyunga.  
-gushinga amatsinda akemura  
amakimbirane. |
| Ubabarera n'amategeko         | Amateka  
Itegekoniisinga n'andi mantegeko  
Kwimakaza umuco wo kubaha  
amategeko  
Inguruka zo kwica itegeko  
Uburere mboneragihugu(byo  
umuntu asinziwe gukorera  
igihugu na bagenzi be) | Gushyiraho amategeko mu  
Ishuri  
Gushimangira umuco wo  
kubaha itegeko mu ishuri  
Gushasha abana kumva icyo  
kubaha no koroherana bimaze  
muri sosiyeti (cyangwa  
umuryango w'abantu) |
| Guhora duharanira amahoro ejo  
hazaza. | Uburere mboneragihugu  
(Amategeko arengera abasigaye  
inyuma, amatora, uburacanganzira  
bwo gutanga ibitekerezo  
byawe, Gukemura impaka mu  
mutuzo, Ibyo buri wese  
asinziwe gukora) | Gusharanira kugira ishuri  
ritekanye.  
Gushishirixa abana gutanga  
ingero nziiza muri sosiyeti no  
gufatanya na bagenzi babo mu  
byahateza imbere mu mahoro. |
Appendix D: Participant Information Form (English text only)

The Role of Teachers and their Perspectives on the Implementation of Peace Education in Rwandan Primary Schools: A Case Study

My name is _________ and I am a graduate student at the Department of Education at Oxford University. I would like to invite you to participate in a study called “The Role of Teachers and their Perspectives on the Implementation of Peace Education in Rwandan Primary Schools: A Case Study”. This research is interested in your personal opinions about a Peace Education Curriculum in Rwanda, and how your values and opinions on this topic relate to your role as a teacher.

You have been invited, along with other teachers in your school, to participate in this research because your school has been selected for a case study.

For the study, you will be asked to participate in an interview in which I will ask you for your opinions about current efforts to include peace education in Rwandan primary schools. I will also read you some hypothetical stories about issues related to peace education and ask you to respond to them. For example, I might read two similar stories about children playing together in the park, and ask you to respond about the children's' behaviour in each story. The interview will not take any longer than one hour, and it is completely voluntary. All of your responses will be anonymous and will be kept confidential. The interview will take place at a time and place that is convenient to you, and with your permission, will be audio-recorded. An interpreter will be used so that the interview can be conducted in your native language. The interpreter will sign a form of confidentiality and will not have access to the interview recordings.

All of your responses will be kept highly confidential, and will be stored securely on a password-protected computer. Only myself and my supervisor (______) will have access to the interview recordings. I will use your responses for the purpose of my dissertation, and neither your name nor school will be mentioned anywhere in my writing.

If you participate in this study, your perspective on peace education (as a teacher) may be highly valuable to researchers and policy-makers in understanding if and how to make progress on a peace education curriculum in your country. You can stop the interview at any time if you no longer wish to participate and you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to.

This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee.

I would really appreciate your participation in my study. If you have any further enquiries about the study, please feel free to contact me via telephone (______), email (______) or my supervisor (__________).

Yours Sincerely,
Appendix E: Participant Information Form (Kinyarwanda)

Urhare rw’abarimu mu bo mu mashuri abanza yo mu Rwanda mu ishyirwa mu bikorwa ry’uburezi mboneza mahoro n’uko babona byakorwa.


Kuko ikigo cyanyu cyatoranjwe mu bizakorerwamo ubu bushakashatsi, twishimiyi kubatumira hamwe n’abandi barimu musangiyi umurimo, gutanga inkunga yanyu kuri ubu bushakashatsi.

Ku hyeheheranye n’uburyo wafasha usabwa gusa kigirana ikiganiro nanjye, usubiza ibihazo bitanduka k’ibuye kana n’ibikorwa ubu kugirango dusakaze urbure mboneza mahoro mu mashuri abanza yo mu Rwanda. Muri icyo kiganiro nshobora kuzagusora nk’inkuru nhimbiye ziyanye n’uburere mboneza mahoro ukaka wagira icyo uzivugahvo mu bwisanze rwose.

Nk’urugero, nshoboro nko kugusora inkuru ziyajaga z’abana baro gukina hamwe mu kibuga, nkaba nakubaza ibihazo bitandukanye ku myitwarine y’abo bana muri hari ni kuru. Bitezimagije ko ikiganiro t’ubwari k’ubina kandjo, ikinci biturikije bwisanze n’ubushako byawe rwose. Ibisubizo byawe kandi ni ibanga, izibibika ku buryo bwinariye.

Ikiganiro kizabera ahantu huse wumva hakorohye kandi n’igihie wumva kitakubangamiye, ukaka kandi ubinyengereye nabasha no gufata amajwi ku kugirango tubike neza ibisubizo uduhaye.

Hazakoreshwa umunwumi, kigira ngo ubase gutanga ibitekerezo byawe mu unurimi gamondo rwose. Umunwumi azasinya amasezerano yo kutatangaza ibisubizo watanze, nta n’ubwo kandi azabo yemerehe kubika amajwi yafashwe mu kiganiro.

Hifashishijwe ikoranabuhanga rihaniye mu byo kubika amajwi n’inyandiko, ibisubizo n’ibitekerezo byanyi bizabikwa kuri mudasoza, kandi ni njewo gusa n’umuyobozi w’ubushakashatsi bwanjye (Dr. David Johnson) niwe twentyime dashobora gukoresha ibygo bisubizo byanya.

Nzakena ibyo bisubizo byanyi mu nyandiko y’ubushakashatsi ariko nta zina ranyu cyangwa ry’ikigo wigishamo ririzera rigarugara muri iyo nyandiko.

Kudufasha kwaabe muri ubu bushakashatsi nk’umurezi bizafasha abashyiraho gahunda za leta n’ubushakashatsi ku rebera hamwe icyakorwa mu kunomonzora integanyanyigisho y’uburere mboneza mahoro mu Rwanda.
Appendix F: Participant Consent Form (English text only)

The Role of Teachers and their Perspectives on the Implementation of Peace Education in Rwandan Primary Schools: A Case Study

This study aims to analyze teachers’ opinions of a “peace education” curriculum in Rwandan primary schools, and to analyze the specific role of teachers in implementing this type of curriculum.

This is a study undertaken by________, an MSc student at the Department of Education, University of Oxford. You can contact this researcher using the address above, or via telephone number (____), or email (________).

Please read the following text carefully:

- I have read and understood the information about this study as provided by the information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask questions and get satisfactory answers about this study.
- I understand that I can withdraw from the study without any consequences at anytime simply by informing the researcher of my decision.
- I understand who will have access to the identifying information provided and what will happen to the data at the end of this project.
- I understand that this project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee.

I agree to participate in this study.

Signed

____________________________________________________________________________
Print name (block capitals)

___________________________________________________________________
Date _____________________

Signed by researcher

___________________________________________________________________
Print name (block capitals)

___________________________________________________________________
Date _____________________
Appendix G: Participant Consent Form (Kinyarwanda)

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

15 Norham Gardens, Oxford OX2 6PY
Tel: +44(0)1865 274024 Fax: +44(0)1865 274027
general.enquiries@education.ox.ac.uk www.education.ox.ac.uk
Director Professor Anne Edwards

Uruhare rw'abariimu mu bo mu mashuri abanza yo mu Rwanda mu ishyirwa mu bikorwa ry'uburezi mboneza mahoro n'uko babona byakorwa

Ubu bushakashatsi bugamije gusesengura ibitekerezo bitandukanye by'abarimu ku neganyanyigisho y'uburere mboneczzamazono mu mashuri abanza no guzuzuma uruhare rwabu mu kayishyira mu bikorwa.

Ubu ni bushakashatsi buri gukorwa na -------- amanyeshuri mu cyiciro cya gatatu cya kaminuza ya Oxford mu ishami ry'uburezi. Ukeneye kugira ibindi bisobanuro kuri iyi nyigo waboriza kuri ici aderese zikurikira:

Telefonzi: --------
Email: --------
Usabwe gusoma witonze ibi bikurikira:

• Nasomye kandi nsobanukiwa n'ibirukiye mu nyandiko isobanura ibyerekeranye n'ubu bushakashatsi, mpabwa n'umwanya wo kubaza ibibazo nezezwa kandi n'ibirubizo nahawe.

• Nzi neza ko mbimenyesheje nyirubushakashatsi, nshobora, igihie icyo aricyo cyose, ntata nkurikizi lyo ariyo yose, kurekira amho gutanga umusanzu wanjye kuri ubu bushakashatsi.

• Nzi neza icyo amakuru ntanga azaamara muri ubu bushakashatsi n'uyafiteho uburenganzira.

• Nzi neza ko ubu bushakashatsi bwasubiwemo kandi bukanononisorwa na komite ya kaminuza ya Oxford ishinzwe bushakashatsi.

Nemeye gufasha muri ubu bushakashatsi.

Umukono

Amazina (mu nyugutu nkuru)

__________________________

Ituriki _________________________

Umukono w'umushakashatsi.
Appendix H: Sample Interview Question Template

**Interview Questions**

(Participants are asked to refer to rubric throughout the duration of the interview)

The term 'Peace Education', for the purpose of this study, is defined by four specific goals:

1) To educate about respect for others
2) To educate about forgiveness and reconciliation
3) To educate about justice and the law
4) To educate about how to build a peaceful future

**Part 1: Peace Education Policy Efforts and Frameworks**

- What efforts has the government made to formulate a policy for including these 4 elements of 'Peace Education' in primary schools?
  Eg. Reports, and public statements, and policy drafts
  - Which of the four elements of Peace Education do they address?
  - Which do they not address?
  - Have these policy efforts been successful?
    - Has legislation been passed?

- What efforts have been made by NGOs to create a policy for educating children about these four categories?
  - Which of the four elements of Peace Education do they target or include?
  - Which elements are not included?
  - Have these policy efforts been successful?

- How familiar are you with UNICEF’s ‘Education for Peace' pilot program in Rwanda?
  - What do you know about it?
  - Why do you think it was not implemented when it was created in 1995/1996?
  - Do you think it should be implemented now?

- What efforts have been made by your school or your local educational authorities to create a policy that addresses the 4 issues listed on the rubric?
  - To what extent have these policies been implemented?
  - How successful do you think they are?
Appendix H: (continued)

Curriculum Questions

- Is there a national curriculum for teaching each of the four topics listed on the rubric?
  o Does the national curriculum include formal peace education?
  o Does it include non-formal peace education?

  o If there is no formal curriculum, do you take it upon yourself to teach these topics to the children in your class (whether formally or non-formally)?
    ▪ If so, how do you do it?
    ▪ Do you teach it more informally (ensuring that children show these values) or formally (teaching them directly)?
    ▪ Do you think there should be a set curriculum?

  o What other subjects in the curriculum teach these values?
    ▪ Which ones are effective at teaching those values?
  o How is religion taught?
    ▪ Does religion include the teaching of these four values?
  o How is history taught?
    ▪ Does history include history of the conflict?
  o How are the 4 topics on the rubric included (if at all) in most subjects (if at all)?
  o Is peace education included in the teaching of languages? How so?
  o Is reconciliation included in any subjects?
    ▪ Is it included non-formally?

- Are any of these topics covered in the history or religious education curriculum?
  o How so and to what extent?

Teacher Training

- How comfortable do you feel/would you feel teaching these 4 topics of peace education?

- Have you received any teacher training for peace education?
  o When, where, and for how long? What did it consist of?
Appendix H: (continued)

**Teacher training (continued)**

- Have you received any training for your particular subject?
- How comfortable do you feel answering children’s questions about these 4 topics? Eg. Questions about justice, reconciliation?
- Would you like more training? If so, what type of training?
- Do you think there should be more or better teaching training for peace education?
- Do you feel that there is adequate support for teachers to teach these topics? (eg. Is there sufficient information available of teaching methods or strategies?)

**Part 2: Teacher Values and Attitudes**

- How important do you think it is that children understand the value of ‘respect for others’, ‘forgiveness and reconciliation’, ‘justice and the law’, and ‘working towards a peaceful future’?
- Do you think that these values can be taught through the education system?
- Do you think they are more effective if taught formally or non-formally?
- Do you think that the school has a responsibility to teach these 4 topics, regardless of whether or not it is national policy?
- Do you feel a personal responsibility to teach these values to your students?
- How important do you think it is to teach children about the conflict in Rwanda?
- Have you observed in your classroom a need for children to be taught these values? Ie. Do they behave in a way that shows they understand these values?
- Do you think these values are better taught at home or in school?
- What are the biggest obstacles to peace education?
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