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Executive Summary

This review of the literature on the integration of education and peacebuilding forms part of the work of the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, an ongoing partnership between the University of Amsterdam, the University of Sussex, Ulster University and UNICEF’s Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) programme.

1. The review provides a succinct overview of key literature on the contributions that education (as part of social service delivery) can make to peacebuilding. It summarises findings from three existing reviews and then synthesises the findings from a literature search of 171 documents, resulting in 79 publications for closer review. It concludes with a number of key messages for policymakers in terms of the integration of education and peacebuilding.

2. Existing Literature Reviews on Education, Conflict and Peacebuilding. Existing literature reviews highlight how service delivery in fragile and conflict affected states can contribute positively and negatively to state building and peacebuilding (Ndaruhutse S. Et al, 2011), and how expectations to deliver education are focused strongly on the state. Equitable service delivery is particularly important given education’s pivotal role in unlocking wider social and economic benefits. Exclusion from education has been a key grievance cited in a number of conflicts.

3. A review on the role of education in peacebuilding (Smith et al, 2011) highlighted three broad discourses that have emerged in the last decade: ‘education in emergencies’, ‘conflict sensitive education’ and ‘education and peacebuilding’. The review suggests that education for peacebuilding goes beyond ‘do no harm’, by placing a more explicit emphasis on conflict transformation. The review also concluded that education does not feature strongly in the priorities of the Peacebuilding Architecture and does not appear to feature strongly in UN planning and assessment processes.

4. A rigorous literature review (Burde et al, 2015) found that in the context of acute or protracted crisis there is evidence that community based education increases access to education, especially for girls at
the primary level and that there is a gap in the literature on how best to increase access to schooling in countries or regions affected by disaster. The review also finds that in the context of acute conflict, there is evidence to support community negotiations to protect schools, students and teachers from attack. The review also identified a number of gaps in the literature relating to groups of learners in conflict or crisis affected areas, specifically, girls, youth, children with disabilities, and refugees.

5. Three Theories of Change for the Role of Education in Peacebuilding. Research literature examining the contribution of education to peacebuilding at the global level remains limited. This current review is structured around three main rationales for the integration of education and peacebuilding: delivering peace dividends, strengthening social service sector governance, and providing first entry points for longer term peacebuilding.

6. Education as a Peace Dividend: According to the theory of change, by quickly restoring social services such as education people see the benefits of peace through restoration of confidence in the state by demonstrating its capacity to provide social services. There are a number of key messages from the literature. Firstly, speed and visibility of restoration of education services is important in terms of a ‘peace dividend’. However, speedy restoration of education is only likely to contribute positively to peacebuilding if it is seen to benefit all, particularly where there have been inequalities, discrimination against or marginalisation of certain regions or groups. The peacebuilding key is that these injustices are seen to be addressed quickly. Thirdly, visibility is important, but it will only contribute to confidence in the state if it is provided in a way that generates trust between the state and all its citizens. This means that education needs to be provided in a way that is not perceived as political manipulation or patronage. The literature also raises questions about the extent to which education provision that is insensitive to local context may be perceived as an imposition by government, and whether the use of non-state providers may undermine confidence in the state and have a negative impact on peacebuilding.

7. Education Governance and Reform: The second theory of change is that good governance across sectors can create conditions to constructively manage conflict and
to overcome horizontal inequalities among groups. The broad conclusion from the literature is that impact is highly context specific and success is dependent on a thorough understanding of the political economic processes that shape society. Although donor agencies have invested in political economy analysis tools, they have struggled to ensure the impact on policies and practice. From a peacebuilding perspective these may include structural changes to the education system itself as well as administrative changes related to more inclusive participation, representation and recognition of various interests in education governance and decision-making.

8. The literature also shows that the effects of policies relating to redistribution and decentralisation in post-conflict contexts may be an important element in (re)legitimising the state, but it may also be a source of conflict and needs to be managed sensitively. Community participation can lead to improved education outcomes, but the evidence on its impact on social cohesion is less clear. Decentralisation is another dominant reform promoted by the international aid community. However, qualitative research reveals that it can have varying impacts at different levels of society, with important consequences for state legitimacy and long term peacebuilding. The key message from a peacebuilding perspective seems to be that decentralisation policies need to be carefully implemented and monitored to ensure that the overall impacts do not result in greater politicisation of the education sector. It is important that decentralisation results in the reduction of education inequalities and greater inclusion, rather than exclusion based on locality or identity factors. The key from a peacebuilding perspective may be a careful balance between centralised and decentralised powers and functions, rather than total centralisation control or complete decentralisation of the education system.

9. Education as an Entry Point for Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding: The third theory of change contends that social services can provide entry points that begin to address underlying causes of conflict. The evidence in relation to four aspects of education policy and programming was examined: protection, addressing inequalities, social cohesion, and reconciliation. These issues can still be addressed through education policies even when it not possible to make explicit reference to peacebuilding.

• Protection: There is an increasing literature related to attacks on education and protecting children from violent conflict and creating safe and secure learning environments. Girls’ safety is a particular concern during violent conflict with negative impacts on their education. Education policies and programmes can address violence against children,
which is extremely important as a foundation for peacebuilding, but underlying causes of violence also need to be addressed.

• Equity and redistribution: There is now an established body of research examining inequalities in access to education, particularly in relation to gender. However, this literature largely fails to take into account the quality of learning or the need for other forms of disaggregation where inequalities may exist, for example along the lines of ethnicity, religion, geographical location or language.

• Social cohesion: There is a broad ranging literature on the concept of social cohesion and its relevance for peacebuilding generally relates to levels of trust between citizens and government, and between different groups in society. The literature includes research related to a number of education policy areas such as segregated schooling, intergroup contact programmes, peace education and language of instruction policies. Evidence on the impact of these approaches on social cohesion tends to be highly context specific and there is a general critique that social cohesion programmes may have little impact if they focus on interpersonal relations when the underlying causes of conflict are institutional and systemic.

• Reconciliation and transitional justice: Education may have an important role in longer term post conflict development. Two education policy areas in this regard concern the curriculum, and in particular the way in which history education can contain values that either promote division or encourage peaceful management of diversity, and the extent to which education has a role in contributing towards reconciliation following recommendations from Formal Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs). It is common in countries that have been affected by conflict to point to a role for education in promoting longer-term reconciliation as a means of preventing recurrence of violent conflict. However, it is often an area that is not prioritised as part of education policy development.

10. Future research outputs will build on the framework of this literature review to examine policies, priorities and financing currently available for education and peacebuilding; policy frameworks and approaches at the global, regional and country level; and an analysis of the extent to which indicators proposed for Education (Goal 4) and Peace (Goal 16) as part of new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), support the integration of education and peacebuilding.
1. Introduction

This review of the literature on the integration of education and peacebuilding forms part of the work of the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, an ongoing partnership between the University of Amsterdam, the University of Sussex, the University of Ulster and UNICEF’s Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) programme.

Over the course of the programme the Consortium is working with in-country partners to produce much needed evidence and learning on the issue of education and peacebuilding in the following four countries: Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, and Uganda. More specifically, it focuses on three key thematic areas:

1. The integration of education and peacebuilding at global, regional and country levels
2. The role of teachers in peacebuilding in conflict contexts
3. The role of education in peacebuilding initiatives and youth agency

In recent years there has been increased interest in the role that education can play in contributing to processes of social transformation following conflict. The United Nations Secretary General’s report (2009) on Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict listed the provision of administrative and social services among the five recurring priorities for peacebuilding. In 2011 two key reports also recognised the role education has to play. The UNESCO Global Monitoring Report (2011) argued that education should be prioritised throughout all conflict phases and for increased funding of education programmes through the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). The World Development Report (2011) recognised the important contribution to peacebuilding that education can make once security and political goals have been met.

A number of reviews of the academic literature related to issues of peacebuilding, statebuilding, education and fragility already exist. Section two begins with a summary of three significant reviews of existing research that have been completed in the last five years (2011-2015). Section three
then presents an analysis of three theories of change by which education can contribute to peacebuilding. It applies the framework provided by (McCandless, 2012) in relation to the contribution of social services to peacebuilding to examine the evidence underpinning these theories of change in relation to education. The paper concludes highlighting the key messages for policymakers in terms of the main rationales and areas of focus for the integration of education and peacebuilding.

**Methodology**
This report is based on a wider literature review that combined systematic search of academic databases and the grey literature with snowball sampling.

**Academic Literature Search**
A series of key words were developed in relation to the key search terms, namely education (11 search terms) and peacebuilding (8 search terms). These formed the basis of word threads that were entered as searches in the following international databases: Scopus, Eric, Web of Science, British Education Index, Australian Education Index, Science Direct and Google Scholar. Searches were limited to articles that have been published since the year 2000, English language articles, and peer-reviewed articles.

**Snowballing**
The traditional approach to searching academic literature was complemented by snowball sampling. In particular a ‘backward snowball’ approach was adopted. This involved drawing up a list of key documents and examining the reference lists of those publications in order to identify relevant publications on the same topic. This was necessary given the importance of non-academic literature to the field.

**Grey Literature**
As mentioned above, literature relevant to the field of education and peacebuilding is often located outside of the traditional channels. A search was undertaken of the databases of key networks and agencies including the United Nations Development Policy and Analysis Division (DESA), the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States, the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the OECD, the World Bank, International Rescue Committee, UNESCO-IIEP and UNICEF.

**Selection Criteria**
The initial searches resulted in 171 which were downloaded into Mendeley. A two-stage approach to screening was adopted. All studies were first assessed on the basis of their titles and abstracts. The remaining studies were screened using the full text. Literature was included for review if it satisfied the following four criteria:

1. Relevance to education (both formal and non-formal)
2. Relevance to peacebuilding
3. Relevance to one of the three theories of change identified in the framework
4. Relevance to education and peacebuilding outcomes

This process yielded 79 studies for in-depth review. Appendix 1 indicates the categorisation of these references.
2. Existing Literature Reviews on Education, Conflict and Peacebuilding

The following section provides a summary of the three most recent reviews of existing research that have been completed in the last five years (2011-2015).

2.1 State-Building, Peace-Building and Service Delivery in Fragile and Conflict Affected States (Ndaruhutse S. et al 2011)

This review was conducted as part of a DFID research programme into the concepts of statebuilding, peacebuilding and service delivery in fragile and conflict-affected states. It examines the key concepts and provides an overview of the literature related to linkages between service delivery in education, health, sanitation and water sectors and state legitimacy. Key findings include:

- Service delivery can contribute positively and negatively to state-building and peacebuilding. The literature contains numerous examples of the impact of education programming in these circumstances. For example, the literature indicates that what is taught in schools, as well as who has access to education, can reinforce ethnic or political divisions within a country. Community involvement in education management may help build local ownership and accountability. School level governance is susceptible to elite capture and to the perpetuation of existing unequal power relations (UNESCO, 2009). The review argues that these represent several logical assumptions and hypotheses, but there is a lack of comprehensive evidence.

- Citizens’ expectations of service delivery vary in different sectors, but in education the emphasis is strongly on the role of the state. This remains the case even where it is provided by a range of non-state actors. If the legitimacy of the state is said to rest on meeting expectations, there is a need to understand the nature of these expectations more clearly. There is also a need to better understand the impact of non-state actor provision (such as during a humanitarian crisis, for example) on state legitimacy.
• Equitable service delivery is important across all sectors, but particularly so for education given its pivotal role in unlocking wider social and economic benefits. Exclusion from education has been a key grievance cited in a number of conflicts, for example in the case of Sierra Leone.

• The need to focus on both service delivery and statebuilding is challenging. In many contexts there is a pressure to focus on immediate service delivery, but building effective systems of transparency and accountability are long term endeavours. During crisis there is a tendency for education to be provided by non-state actors or communities themselves, with less attention paid to advocacy and accountability. There is a need for research into the short and long routes of accountability and the balance required to most effectively build state legitimacy.

2.2 The Role of Education in Peacebuilding: Literature Review (Smith et al. 2011)

This review was completed for UNICEF and involved the analysis of 520 academic, research and programming documents on the issue of education, conflict and peacebuilding. The main findings are presented below.

• The review identifies three broad discourses that have emerged during the past decade. The first area concerns ‘education in emergencies’, which prioritizes a concern for the protection of children and a response to the negative impacts of conflict on their education. Such programmes are mostly framed in terms of humanitarian response. A second area of literature emphasizes the need for ‘conflict-sensitive’ education that ‘does no harm’, for example, by making sure that education does not reinforce inequalities or fuel further divisions. A third area relates to ‘education and peacebuilding’, and is often framed in terms of a development role for education through reforms to the education sector itself and by contributing to political, economic and social transformations in post-conflict society. The report suggests that education for peacebuilding goes beyond approaches that ‘do no harm’ and are more explicit about contributing to peacebuilding through post-conflict transformation.

• The report highlights an important gap between theory and practice. It found that the theoretical literature on peacebuilding draws an important distinction between ‘negative peace’ (the cessation of violence) and ‘positive peace’ (structural changes that address social injustices that may be a cause of violence). Peacebuilding theory also suggests the need for education to support transformation processes related to changes in security, political institutions, economic regeneration and social development within post-conflict societies. However, programme literature was much more focused on protection and reconstruction than on transformation.

• Most education programming in post-conflict contexts is not being planned from an explicitly peacebuilding perspective. The report also highlights the weak evidence base on the impact of education; only a small number of documents identified an explicit theory of change. If peacebuilding logic is applied, it is often done so retrospectively.

• Peacebuilding requires more attention to education sector reform. It involves a greater level of intervention and therefore organisations should give careful thought to the implications of a more explicit commitment to peacebuilding. This includes an awareness of how their actions sit within broader security and global peacebuilding activities.

Education does not feature strongly in the priorities of the Peacebuilding Architecture. As part of the UN integration agenda, there
is a commitment to develop a more integrated strategic framework for the UN presence within post-conflict contexts and a variety of assessment and planning tools such as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). However, there is little agreement on, or firm guidance to practitioners about which to use, as well as a lack of coordination on the ground in developing shared analysis. Education does not appear to feature strongly in these UN planning and assessment processes. Analysis of the PBF allocations indicates that education programming does not feature strongly in PBF funding. An additional challenge is that PBF funding engages early, within two or three years after a conflict, but education is rarely seen as a high priority at this stage – even though it would make sense to prepare for and initiate longer-term education development processes as early as possible in the post-conflict period.

2.3 What Works to Promote Children’s Educational Access, Quality of Learning and well-being in crisis-affected contexts? (Burde et al. 2015)

This rigorous literature review is an analysis of the evidence on what works to improve educational access, quality of learning, and wellbeing in crisis-affected and post-crisis settings. Its aim is to provide an evidence base for those responsible for service delivery in fragile and conflict affected states. A total of 192 studies were included in the review. The main findings are presented below under the categories of programmes that aim to impact access, quality of learning, and well-being.

Access:

- In the context of acute or protracted crisis there is evidence that community-based education increases access to education, especially for girls at the primary level. Other successful approaches include provision of female teachers, girls-only schools, accelerated learning programmes, and approaches to distance learning for primary, over-age, and secondary students.

- There is a gap in the literature on how best to increase access to schooling in countries or regions affected by disaster.

- In stable developing countries, there is strong evidence regarding the effectiveness of early childhood development and of conditional and unconditional cash transfers in improving access for primary and secondary school students.

- Rigorous studies of the effects of retrofitting school structures with gender segregated latrines (with a focus on girls), community monitoring, and school vouchers also have some positive effects on access.

Quality:

- Strong evidence supports the use of community-based education and community participatory monitoring to increase academic achievement at the primary school level. Additional promising interventions include: tailored training for teachers with limited qualifications, and mobile phone technology and radio to deliver lessons/lesson plans.
• In protracted or post conflict settings inter-group contact affects attitudes and perceptions positively in the short term. Negative stereotypes and values present in the history curriculum can contribute to underlying conditions for conflict. Equal educational access and greater national levels of educational attainment may limit participation in militancy or extremism

• Robust evidence from stable, developing countries shows the importance and effectiveness of early childhood development programmes in improving children’s cognitive and behavioural outcomes.

Well-being:
• In the context of acute conflict, there is evidence to support community negotiations to protect schools, students, and teachers from attack

• There is strong evidence that creative arts and play therapies, early childhood development, and provision of extra services to the most vulnerable (especially girls and younger children) improves wellbeing. Emerging evidence also suggests that conflict-affected children and youth respond less well, and sometime adversely, to therapies that focus on trauma rather than on daily stressors. Evidence also suggests school routines can have a positive impact on mental health and resilience.

• Robust evidence from stable high-income countries shows that a positive classroom environment and peer-to-peer learning have positive effects on wellbeing.

The review also identified a number of gaps in the literature relating to specific groups of learners in conflict or crisis-affected contexts.

• Girls: Although many studies disaggregate findings between boys and girls, none of the studies included in the review explicitly focused on girls. There is evidence that community-based education improves girls’ access to education, while the results on the impact of mental health interventions on girls’ well-being are mixed.

• Youth: Very few studies conducted in crisis settings focused explicitly on youth, and the literature that does focus on youth is concentrated in the field of violence and peace education. More research is needed on access to secondary school and vocational training for youth.

• Children with disabilities: None of the studies included a focus on children with disabilities.

• Refugees: Although there is strong emerging evidence on how to provide psychosocial support to refugee children and youth, there is limited evidence on the best ways to improve access.
3. Three Theories of Change for the Role of Education in Peacebuilding

A commonly cited challenge in the literature on the role of social services in peacebuilding is the lack of rigorous research regarding its contribution. This report has identified 79 papers for review. The literature spans a wide range of academic disciplines including political science, education, public health, as well as grey literature from organisations involved in peacebuilding at the global level.

Broadly speaking, the literature related to the contribution of health reform to peacebuilding (or more often than not, statebuilding) is currently more substantial than that of other sectors such as education. With regards to the education literature there is a greater tradition of research in the areas of access and curriculum than on reform directly related to peacebuilding processes. Furthermore, despite a few key reports, the literature examining the contribution of education to peacebuilding at the global level remains limited.

One important contribution to the research is a United Nations report on the role of administrative and social services in peacebuilding (McCandless 2012). The multi-sectoral report presents three theories of change for the way in which programmes in public administration, education, health and food security are thought to impact peacebuilding.

1. **Delivering peace dividends:**
   The provision of tangible services by the state can reduce social tensions, increase incentives for nonviolent behaviour, and assist statebuilding efforts at critical junctures in peacebuilding processes.

2. **Strengthening social service sector governance:**
   Conflict sensitive governance across sectors can create conditions to constructively manage conflict and to overcome horizontal inequalities among groups. This improves state-society relations and contributes to long-term sustainable peace.

3. **Providing first entry points for longer-term peacebuilding:**
   This dimension refers to programmes that lead to joint action around programmes designed to address underlying conflict drivers and support
This section builds on the framework provided by McCandless (2012) to examine the evidence underpinning these three theories of change in relation to education.

3.1 Education as a Peace Dividend

One of the most prominent theories of change by which education is thought to contribute to peace is as a peace dividend. UNESCO states that, ‘education can play a pivotal role in peacebuilding. Perhaps more than in any other sector, education can provide the highly visible early peace dividends on which the survival of peace agreements may depend’ (2011: 14). Access to equitable education can provide tangible benefits of peace for populations often far removed from peace negotiations. Generally viewed as the main provider of education, the state also gains from demonstrating its capacity to provide services for its citizens. Thus according to this theory of change, by quickly restoring social services people see the benefits of peace in two main ways: i) it can redress grievances and ii) it can restore confidence in the state.

Lack of effective and equitable education provision is a common grievance in conflict affected contexts. In the case of Sierra Leone, for example, exclusion in the education system was a significant grievance in the lead up to the war (cited in Novelli 2011). Research also indicates that it is one of the top priorities for communities affected by conflict. A study by Gladwell and Tanner (2014) asked affected populations in the Masisi region of North Kivu, in the DRC and the Dollo Ado refugee camps in the Somali region in Ethiopia about their top three priorities. In total, when all preferences were accounted for across all respondent groups and both countries, education was the most highly prioritised sector, at 30%, followed by food at 19%. For the 132 children in the DRC, education was the top priority representing 35% of responses, followed by food and health, both 17%. The 38 children in Ethiopia placed education top with health at 26% followed by food at 20%. In the DRC, food and education for their children were parents' highest priorities, at 28% and 27% respectively. In Ethiopia education was fourth for parents with 15% of responses after water (34%), food (21%), and shelter (19%). Two further studies identified education as a top concern for parents from Sudan, South Sudan and Syria (IOM 2006, Eidelson and Horn 2008).

Further evidence exists to support the notion that supplying education can have a minimising effect on the incidence of violence. It is based mainly on research by Collier and Hoeffler (2000, 2004), who used three main proxies to measure the opportunity cost of participating in civil conflict across a number of countries. The first two proxies were mean income per capita (a population with high income may have more to lose from conflict) and growth rate of the economy (with high growth there are more employment opportunities). The third proxy indicator was the male secondary school enrolment rate. Collier and Hoeffler argued that young males are the group from which rebels are most recruited, the number of years of secondary education affects earning potential, and therefore having more years of schooling is likely to affect the opportunity cost of participating in conflict. Other studies have found similar results regarding this protective nature of secondary education (Barakat & Urdal, 2009; Thyne 2006).

It is common practice among donors and international agencies to support skills training programmes in the aftermath of conflict, often as part of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programmes, with a view to ending incentives for violence. It is assumed that these programmes will not only pre-occupy ex-combatants but also lead to the recreation of livelihoods in a way that contributes to social transformation towards an economically active and integrated population (Ellison 2014). However, this theory of change appears to rest largely on assumptions rather than tested linkages. A number of criticisms have been levelled at the types of trainings provided. The programmes are...
often too short to provide any meaningful acquisition of skills and the quality of the training varies greatly depending on which non-governmental organisation (NGO) it had been contracted out to (Ellison 2014). In the case of Sierra Leone, for example, some observers have also questioned the relevance of the skills provided, citing a severe lack of data on the needs of the labour market (Ginifer 2003). From a peacebuilding perspective, the critical issue is whether this leads to increased prospects for employment. While some may argue the benefits of an approach that contributes to negative peace by occupying the time of those ‘who otherwise have very little to do’ (Lyby 2001: 247), without recreation of livelihoods there is no transformative effect.

A recent study tests some of the assumptions on which post-conflict training programmes are often based (Blattman and Annan 2015). The authors examine a programme in Liberia that targeted ‘high risk individuals’ in order to reduce incentives for engaging in illegal income generation activities (such as diamond mining, logging and rubber tapping) and future recruitment by armed groups. The programme was run by the non-profit organisation Action on Armed Violence (AoAV) from 2009-2010 and had four components: several months of residential agricultural training; counselling and life skills classes; relocation assistance; and startup materials worth $125. The authors find that participants shifted their hours of work away from illicit resource extraction towards farming by roughly 20%. However, rather than completely stopping their involvement in illicit work, they shifted their portfolio of occupations in order to modestly increase their overall income. As a result, they were about $12 a month better off.

The study also finds that participants were 24% less engaged with mercenary recruitment when war broke out in neighbouring Côte d’Ivoire. This impact seems to be particularly significant when future payments are dependent on behaviour. However, the programme had little effect on peer networks, hierarchical military relationships, aggression, participation in community life and politics or attitudes to violence or democracy. The authors conclude that there is evidence that incentives for crime and mercenary work respond to a change in the returns to lawful work. However, there is little evidence to support a link between employment, incomes and socio-political behaviour.

The literature therefore provides some evidence that education provision can respond to citizens’ immediate desire for the service and can contribute to lesser incidence of violence, at least in the short term. The question of whether these efforts contribute to greater confidence in the state is more difficult to answer. The rationale reflects a strong tradition in the statebuilding literature that services are a key element in building state legitimacy. In fact, the idea of a direct causal link between service delivery and state legitimacy is so widespread that it has been described as received wisdom in aid policy (Carpenter, Slater, and Mallet 2012). Studies of the attitudes and priorities of conflict-affected people have concluded that the degree to which states meet citizens’ everyday needs is an important component of their subjective assessment of it (Robins 2013: 4). In this line of thinking, it is feasible that positive experiences of direct contact with service officials might build faith in the state, particularly in cases where it might previously have been a source of mistrust.

However, research on the impact of education services on restoring faith in the state and its legitimacy are limited. The rather limited evidence relies on perception surveys which are an important addition to administrative data, albeit notoriously open to manipulation. An independent survey among ex-combatants in Sierra Leone found that many ‘now hold positive perspectives on the activities of the current [sic] government and prosperity of the country’ (Humphreys and Weinstein 2004: 4). However, the wider literature holds lessons that are relevant for those responsible for planning education activities in immediate post-conflict
Firstly, evidence indicates that it is not necessarily the objective measures of service outputs that matter, but rather citizens’ subjective opinions of quality and effort. In particular, it is more effective to focus on highly visible improvements in service delivery rather than long term systemic reform. For example, in the context of Colombia, Guerrero (2011) finds that a quick upgrading of basic services (infrastructure, health, education) in the city’s less favoured districts improved political support for and trust in government. The power of the ‘quick win’ is also apparent in the use of universal access to education as a key electoral promise in numerous contexts including Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda (Alubisia 2005).

Secondly, the dominant discourse in aid policy is that provision of services by non-state providers undermines the peace dividend and confidence in state legitimacy as it reduces state visibility. This neglects the fact that citizens’ expectations are locally formed and highly context specific. In some cases it is not expected that a particular service be provided by the government, although education is nearly universally seen to be the responsibility of the state. In other cases mistrust of the government is so high that any efforts to provide services are viewed as an intrusion into their everyday lives (see for example the case of the DRC cited in McLoughlin 2014). This highlights the point that there is no steadfast rule as to the form that service provision should take. Rather it is more appropriate to ask if a particular form of delivery is suitable to that context. In many cases, services provided to war-affected populations can address fear-driven decision-making, provide emerging foundations for optimism, confidence and collaboration, and extend planning horizons. These outcomes are of value in and of themselves and do not need to be visibly connected to the state to benefit wider society.

Finally, the literature highlights that citizens’ expectations are not static, but rather shift over time. In the case of education this trend can be seen in the shift from a focus on universal access to a more recent attention to quality of learning. In the optimistic event that all education goals are met, the literature suggests that attention will move on to another sector such as health or sanitation. This underlines the point that ‘Just as expectations are a something of a moving target for the state, the effects of meeting them on state legitimacy may likewise be temporary’ (Mcloughlin 2015: 348).

Overall, what makes the peace dividend theory of change effective - speed and visibility - is also what causes concern for sustainable and long term peacebuilding efforts. As many authors demonstrate, often the breakdown of the social contract has occurred long before the outbreak of war (De Herdt, Titeca and Wagemakers 2010). In this case repairing relations in the short term through improvements in one sector is unlikely to respond to the longer term issues of statebuilding. Indeed the attractiveness of education and its inclusion in peace agreements as a peace dividend rests in its ability to be seen as an apolitical service; it can be used as an entry point to engage a wide variety of stakeholders in peace negotiations. However, if education is to be used to effect change in line with peacebuilding goals then it becomes extremely political.

3.2 Education Governance and Reform

The second theory of change is that good governance across sectors can create conditions to constructively manage conflict and to overcome horizontal inequalities among groups. In this view service delivery not only has a positive effect on state legitimacy, but this in turn increases the state’s capacity to rule. McLoughlin (2014: 343) provides a summary:

‘The DFID (2010), for example, portrays a scenario in which states that respond to public expectations, including for basic services, set in motion a “virtuous circle” of state-building. In the DFID model, responsive services lay the basis for
a more inclusive political settlement, strengthened state–society relations, and, over the long term, can address the underlying causes of fragility or conflict (DFID 2010). In the OECD’s (2008) version of the virtuous circle, states with the requisite capacity to provide services in line with expectations are rewarded with increased citizen compliance with its laws and rules—crucially, tax compliance—which over time boosts state capacity to deliver services more effectively and, in turn, generates more legitimacy. In this way, the cycle of capacity, legitimacy and citizen compliance becomes self-reinforcing’.

McLoughlin (2014) argues that this institutional understanding of the state is at the heart of donor aid policy. It reflects the view that the state is ‘a set of institutions that can be built’ and explains the difficulties donors face in moving beyond capacity building. It also divorces the state from the political, economic and social processes in which it is embedded. However, the overwhelming conclusion from research under this theme is that impact is highly context specific and success is dependent on a thorough understanding of the political economic processes that shape society.

For example, education governance programmes often involve some level of community participation and there is evidence that this can lead to improved education outcomes (see for example Jimenez & Sawada 1999; Di Gropello and Marshall 2011; and Barr et al 2012 in Burde et al. 2015). Research analysing the impact of community participation on social cohesion is less clear-cut. One study of community based education in Bosnia found that increased parent and teacher participation did not decrease ethnic tensions (Burde 2004). The author concludes that this is due to the fact that communities are largely homogenous and isolated. Evidence from Nepal indicates that community participation can increase social and political tensions. A study by Pherali (2013) highlights the way in which unsuccessful decentralisation policy and weak local governance has led to political corruption at all levels of the education system including education management and bureaucracy, teacher recruitment and redeployment, school upgrades. In particular, the power of School Management Committees (SMCs) to make decisions regarding school financing, and therefore the opportunities to gain both financially and in social credibility, have increased. The result is that ‘SMCs have become more politicised and political parties have mobilised support for elections to these bodies based on ideological commitment rather than on educational policies that serve the best interests of children’ (2012: 62).

In contrast, the numerous actors with a stake in negotiating school fees in the DRC appear to have created a semblance of social equilibrium and stability. There are questions, however, to what extent this ‘peace’ contradicts long-term sustainable peacebuilding. De Herdt, Titeca and Wagemakers argue, ‘This is perhaps the most negative side effect of the negotiated arrangement between state and non-state actors, and among state actors themselves: the ‘equitable’ distribution of school costs among all actors concerned in effect paralyses the normal functioning of accountability relationships within the state apparatus and between state and non-state actors. Even parents’ associations have a share of the school costs paid by parents. Everyone has an objective interest in maximizing the number of pupils—who bring in resources—but this comes at the cost of paralysing the checks and balances needed to guarantee a minimum level of educational quality’ (2010: 24).

Redistribution may also be a key education policy, particularly in post-conflict contexts where the legacies of horizontal inequalities remain. However, this can be a very complex and challenging undertaking involving strong skills in the art of political negotiation. In some cases redistribution may even result in a decrease in state legitimacy, depending on the position of the winners and losers. For example, Brinkerhoff, Wetterberg, and Dunn (2012) note that in the case of Iraq the redistribution of services to previously excluded groups in
the postwar period diminished the state’s overall legitimacy gains. This recalls the fundamental importance of understanding whose views count in the assessment of the state’s performance.

Decentralisation is another dominant reform promoted by the international aid community. However, qualitative research reveals that it can have varying impacts at different levels of society, with important consequences for state legitimacy and long term peacebuilding. A study of post conflict education policy in Macedonia indicates that it has empowered political elites from the ethnic Albanian minority at the central level, with important progress made on the highly sensitive issue of Albanian-language university teaching. At the same time however, local government was not able to cope with its increased powers in relation to primary and secondary education. ‘Ethnically mixed municipalities faced serious problems in running and managing secondary schools, due to interethnic youth violence and lack of resources for accommodating the demands and wishes of students and parents. Thus ethnic violence between high school students in Struga in 2008 and 2009 resulted in a separation of students into different ethnic shifts’ (Koneska 2012: 42).

Research in this area thus underscores the importance of undertaking political economy analysis. Political economy approaches started to inform donor planning cycles in the early 2000s partly influenced by the UK Department for International Development’s Drivers of Change (DOC) approach (2004). A number of actors and agencies have since developed their own approaches to conducting political economy analysis including the Dutch Strategic Governance and Corruption Assessment, ODI (2005), the EC (2007) and the World Bank (2008). In broad terms political economy analysis can be undertaken at macro (national) level, be sector specific, or take a problem based approach (for example, why certain education policies are not having desired outcomes). The EU has invested in country case studies and the development of guidance for political economy analysis. DFID has also recently commissioned two literature reviews on political economy analysis of education systems in developing countries (Kingdon et al. 2014) and in the context of conflict (Novelli et al. 2014). There is broad consensus within the literature that donors have struggled to define the operational implications and relevance of the findings of political economy analysis and to change their programming as a result (Warrener, 2004). In particular there are political sensitivities around the extent to which the analyses can be shared with other donors, or indeed governments, and acted upon.

3.3 Education as an Entry Point for Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding

The third theory of change is that social services can lead to programmes that can help to build relationships and begin to address underlying drivers of conflict. This section examines the evidence in relation to four areas of education programme and policy that can act as entry points for transformation: protection; addressing inequalities; social cohesion; and reconciliation.

**Protection**

Research highlights that the changing nature of conflict means education is increasingly seen as a legitimate target of attack (UNESCO 2011, O’Malley 2010). Children are often forcibly recruited as soldiers (United Nations 2010) and the threat of rape and sexual violence stops children from attending and travelling to school, particularly where the school is located at some distance from home. In cases where girl’s education is targeted, it directly reduces the number of girls that attend school (GCPEA 2014). Fear for girls’ safety has led to parents withdrawing their daughters from school in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Papua New Guinea (UNESCO, 2014).

Advocacy and dialogue are key to reducing attacks on education. At the international level the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA)
is an inter-agency coalition formed in 2010 to address the problem of targeted attacks on education during armed conflict. It focuses on monitoring and reporting attacks on education; promoting preventative education policies and programmes; encouraging adherence to existing international law and combatting impunity for attacks on education by promoting a range of accountability measures (GCPEA website). Most recently GCPEA has drafted the Lucens Guidelines to support the application of international humanitarian and human rights laws related to education (GCPEA, 2014). There is a key gap in the literature regarding research that examines the effectiveness of high-level advocacy efforts related to these four areas of focus.

At the local level community ownership and partnership provides some level of protection. This may be because community schools are not as readily identified as symbols of the state. Anecdotal evidence from the West Bank for example, suggests that schools constructed from materials such as mud brick and old tires appear to be at reduced risk of demolition by Israel authorities and have therefore supported access to education in remote Bedouin communities (Burde et al. 2015: 65). Community schools also often tend to be located at a closer distance which reduces the fear of encountering violence on the journey to school. A study by Burde and Linden (2012) found that for each additional mile between a child’s home, school enrolment falls by 16% and test scores decrease by .19 standard deviations.

Evidence indicates that ‘Schools as zones of peace’ (SZOP) has been a successful model used in the context of Nepal to ensure the physical protection of students and teaching time was increased. The process of preparing codes of conduct was found to empower communities to negotiate with political groups who threaten the quality and safety of schools. However, the need for parties to the conflict to seek social legitimacy as part of the SZOP model means that it has been difficult to replicate in other countries.

The Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) has also long argued that education can mitigate the psychosocial impact of conflict by creating stability, structure and hope for the future. Research finds that psychosocial programmes in primary schools can decrease psychological distress and restore optimism (Gupta & Zimmer 2008). Based on a review of thirteen studies of psychosocial interventions it was concluded that these initiatives can help to improve aspects of psychosocial functioning in children and that the evidence is strongest for group interventions focusing on normalisation (IASC 2007).

There is evidence that education policies and programmes can address violence against children, which is extremely important as a foundation for peacebuilding. There is also some evidence that mobilisation around these issues of protection may contribute to increased social cohesion and support networks, as shown for example through the SZOP model. However, from a peacebuilding perspective, underlying causes of violence also need to be addressed. This is the point emphasized by Shah (2015) in his analysis of two education interventions in Palestine that promote children’s resilience. The author finds that both programmes reduced acute symptoms of conflict such as nightmares. Both programmes also provided participating children with a set of enduring skills that they could use to adapt to the context of constant adversity they live in. However, the limitations of these programmes became apparent when violence broke out again in mid-2014 and the Gaza Strip experienced the most significant destruction to the region since 1967. In this context Shah
argues that a focus on resilience is wholly unsatisfactory and a restoration of the status quo or the effective adjustment of these individuals and institutions to a new state of normalcy is ineffective and unsustainable. Therefore from a peacebuilding perspective a key shortcoming of both of these resilience-focused interventions was that they lacked the capacity or willingness to impact on structures of inequity and injustice within and outside of education.

**Addressing inequalities**

There is now an established body of research examining inequalities in access to education, particularly in relation to gender. For example, investment in basic facilities (Kazianga et al., 2012), increasing the number of female teachers (Guimbert, Miwa and Nguyen 2008) and community-based schooling (Burde and Linden 2013) have also proved successful in increasing access to education for girls. Evidence also reveals better indicators of gender equality from Alternative Learning Programmes, particularly in relation to young mothers who appreciate the flexibility of ALP and the proximity of classes to their homes (Save the Children 2012, IBIS 2012).

However, this literature largely fails to take into account the quality of learning agenda or the need for other forms of disaggregation where inequalities may exist, for example along the lines of ethnicity, religion, geographical location or language. This last point is particularly important as the literature indicates that unequal access to education between groups is related to an increased chance of civil war in cases where populations value education as a means of social mobility and economic opportunity (Stewart 2008). The hypothesis is that conflict is generated out of grievances based on ‘horizontal inequalities’ between cultural groups (Stewart 2008). Similar results were found by Gurr (1993) and Barrows (1976) who found evidence of a positive relation between horizontal inequalities (HIs) and political instability. Studies in other conflict-affected countries have also shown a relation between HIs and the intensity of a conflict, see for example Magdalena (1977), Murshed and Gates (2005), Do and Lyer (2007). In terms of the implications for education, this suggests that attention should be paid to equality issues between groups within society, especially in terms of access to education, resource inputs, and actual and perceived benefits to different groups in terms of education outcomes.

It is also important to understand the social significance of education for different communities. Stewart (2008) highlights that the social significance can lie either in an element’s innate value or in its instrumentality for achieving other goals, such as incomes and wellbeing. This point seems particularly relevant with regards the role of education. Evidence indicates that the political economy of the post-conflict context can directly impact the instrumental value of education. For example, analysis of the 2007 Iraq Household Socio-Economic Survey (IHSES) indicates that the school enrolment rate has dropped to 72.3% (Shafiq 2013). Household opinions suggest that a key reason for not enrolling is a lack of interest among children and households. Further analysis of adult labour force participants suggests this lack of interest in schooling is due to weak employment prospects for educated youth. One reason may be the increase in major contractors that provide low-skill jobs in construction to young men at relatively high wages.

More recent research has been commissioned by UNICEF PBEA to better understand the relationship between equity and conflict through historical statistical analysis and case studies of South Africa and Uganda (FHI 360, 2015a). The global report uses the Education Inequality and Conflict (EIC) Dataset and the Subnational Education Inequality and Conflict Dataset (SEIC) to examine the impact of inequality at national and subnational levels on the likelihood of violent conflict. At the national level it finds a statistically significant relationship between ethnic and religious inequality on the likelihood of conflict in the 2000s. Specifically, the report finds that ‘a one standard deviation increase in horizontal inequality
in educational attainment more than doubles the odds that a country will experience a conflict in the next five years’ (2015a: 15). In addition, the report finds that subnational educational inequality is a strong predictor of civil war regardless of the time period.

The FHI 360 report acknowledges that it is not possible to determine causality, i.e. that education inequality between groups is the cause of violent conflict. However, it argues that there is significant evidence from the literature to suggest possible avenues by which education inequalities may directly or indirectly lead to conflict. Firstly, the linkages between education and future economic activity are well established. ‘Increased access to education by all helps middle- and lower-income groups realize the full potential of their talent, increasing the level of productivity, innovation, and investment in society and, by inference, increasing the level of welfare of its population’ (Rutaremwa and Bemanzi 2011: 2).

Other authors highlight the importance of education for social cohesion and a sense of national identity (Smith 2011, Davies 2004). Education can therefore be used both as a means for managing diversity or to fuel tensions based on group allegiances. Perhaps the most intriguing result is that the relationship between inequality and conflict is significantly lower in earlier decades (1970-1990), indicating that the effect has become more pronounced in recent years. Despite the fact that horizontal inequalities in education were much higher than they were in the 2000s, it does not appear to have been sufficient reason for grievance in the 1970s and 1980s when ‘intergroup inequality was commonplace and access to education not construed as a universal right’ (2015a: 30). The last decade has seen many changes, including mass expansion of the universal right to education and the need for higher levels of schooling in order to enter the job market. Consequently, ‘high levels of inter-group inequality in educational attainment may signal greater levels of disempowerment and systematic exclusion of some groups from future economic opportunities. It may also be perceived as one way that the nation-state is failing to meet its basic responsibilities to provide social services. All of these factors mean that one ethnic or religious group could perceive educational inequality as an injustice, or a reason for discontent’ (2015a: 28).

UNICEF PBEA has also invested in two case studies. One examines the relationship of investments in educational equity and in social capital on social cohesion in South Africa (2015b). It finds that despite strong commitment to equity and social cohesion as part of post-apartheid education policy, strong separation continues along the lines of poverty and race. It examines the issue of equity driven approaches to school financing whereby schools in the poorest two national wealth quintiles (determined by indicators of community poverty, i.e. income, unemployment and education) were designated as no-fee schools. The report finds clear evidence of impact on the levels of resources available to schools serving the poorest students, the majority of whom are black. At the same time, however, the existence of fee-paying schools has led to a re-stratification of students along socioeconomic lines on top of race, while the gap between no-fee schools and fee-paying schools in the top quintile remains large. The research also finds evidence of a pervasive culture of violence, use of drugs and a breakdown in the moral fabric of society. The report concludes, ‘What remains so far beyond the reach of government efforts is the persistent pattern of poverty and violence that plagues predominantly black and coloured communities, much of which is rooted in the structural legacies of apartheid, with its de facto residential segregation and high levels of unemployment’ (2015b: 3).

A second study examines the impact of investment in educational equity and peacebuilding in Uganda (2015c). It draws conclusions in relation to four main areas of policy and programming: school financing; teacher recruitment and deployment; language of instruction; and peace education programmes.
Overall, it found that approaches to school financing such as the Universal Secondary education (USE) policy were insufficient to impact inequality. In relation to teachers, central recruitment and deployment at the secondary level may have some impact in terms of strengthening equity in the quality of instruction, and creating a national character to education through exposure to cultures and ideas from beyond their local community. However, there was strong indication that teaching positions in northern regions, particularly Karamoja, were less desirable for qualified teachers. Efforts to address these inequities, such as the hard to reach allowance, have not been sufficient to attract quality teachers.

Thirdly, the thematic curriculum that involves students learning in a local language during the earliest grades of primary school is thought to exacerbate inequalities among disadvantaged communities. Among respondents the emphasis was on the importance of learning English in order to gain entry into the job market. There is also some evidence that it misses the opportunity to create a shared understanding of national identity from an early age. In contrast, the research indicates that peace education and extracurricular activities provide a significant opportunity to encounter children from different linguistic, ethnic and religious backgrounds. There is also some evidence that teachers perceived there to be a reduction in the number of student strikes due to extracurricular activities that provided students with a channel to voice their concerns in a peaceful manner (2015c).

Social Cohesion
A recurring theme in fragile and conflict-affected countries is the relationship between conflict and separate schooling based on identity factors such as language, ethnicity or religion. This has implications for how schools are perceived in the global context of increasing attacks on education. It also has an impact in terms of social cohesion. Research in this area is highly context specific and the impact on social cohesion appears to depend on whether minorities are obliged to attend their own schools or choose to do so (Gallagher 2010). It must also take into account the broader context of whether such schools are perceived to be reinforcing assimilation, separate or shared development (Smith 2014).

In the context of separate schooling, effort can be made to encourage mutual understanding through education. Peace education programmes have a wide variety of goals ranging from what Marc Ross (2000) has called ‘good enough conflict management’, in other words some level of mutual understanding and reduction in violence, through to programmes that aim to attain the legitimization of the other side’s perspective (Salomon, 2007). In a review of quasi-experimental studies carried out with Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian youth Salomon argues that peace education can produce more views of peace, better ability to see the other side’s perspective, and greater willingness for contact. He also finds that in the context of protracted conflict these programs can play a preventative role in blocking the further deterioration of inter-group relations following adverse events outside the confines of the program.

Inter-group contact programmes are another popular initiative in protracted and post-conflict contexts. According to the contact hypothesis on which these types of programmes are based, four key conditions are necessary for inter-group contact to be beneficial (Pettigrew 1998). The groups should have equal group status; work towards common goals; be able to cooperate with each other without intergroup competition; and the contact should have the support of the relevant authorities or customs.

The impact of these programmes has been the subject of much research across a number of contexts (Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996; Horenczyk & Bekerman, 1997). A common criticism of these schemes relates to a lack of follow up events in order to maintain friendships across the groups (Stringer & Cairns, 1992). A variety of studies have also highlighted their failure to address divisive issues (McKeown & Cairns,
More generally, questions have been raised about the need to go beyond the level of superficial contact towards engaging youth in understanding the root causes of conflict and analysing power relations within society. Despite theory highlighting the importance of intergroup inequalities, many programmes have been accused of operating at the level of interpersonal exchange that is unlikely to have an impact on broader social, institutional and structural change within conflict affected societies.

Despite the criticisms there is evidence that contact can have a positive impact on intergroup relations. For example, McKeown and Cairns (2012) highlight research from the Young Life and Times (YLT) survey that indicates that young people aged 16 living in Northern Ireland who had attended cross-community groups demonstrated more favourable attitudes towards the outgroup in comparison with those who had not (Schubotz & Robinson, 2006). This is in line with research that indicates that peace education programmes appear to positively affect attitudes and perceptions in the short term in protracted and post-conflict contexts (Bar-Natan, 2004, cited in Salomon, 2004; Biton & Salomon, 2006; Maoz, 2000).

Language of instruction is another area of policy that has broader implications for social cohesion. UNESCO (2003) identifies language as an ‘essential element of inter-cultural education to encourage understanding between different groups and respect for human rights’. It supports mother tongue education as a means of improving education quality, arguing that a large number of students fail to learn as they are instructed in a language that they do not sufficiently understand: ‘around 221 million children speak a different language at home from the language of instruction in school, limiting their ability to develop foundations for later learning’ (UNESCO 2010: 10-11). It also advocates bilingual and multilingual education as a means of promoting inter-group relations and societal equality (UNESCO 2003). The situation is further complicated by the fact that parents often express a strong preference for their children to learn in the official language because they identify this as a route to enhanced social mobility (UNESCO 2010; Pherali 2013).

Language can be a significant inclusion/exclusion factor (Zakharia and Bartlett 2014). For example, refugees or IDPs that arrive at a location with a different language must learn it or face further exclusion. At the same time, a failure to learn to read and speak in their home language will make it more difficult to return there and complete their schooling. In the context of conflict, it can also be a problematic and perhaps dangerous identity marker. Decisions regarding language of instruction are therefore not apolitical. Some governments promote learning through one single language in order to encourage national unity (Pherali 2013). This may or may not be a vision that incorporates a plurality of identities. There are instances of language policies being implemented in ways that exacerbate conflict. Rösel (2009), for example, gives an account of the way in which language policies in India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka were used as a means of dominating access to education by particular groups. This was also the case for the Kurdish minority in Turkey (Bush and Saltarelli 2000). However, as language politics shift over time, so too does education language policy. For example, countries that focus on English-medium teaching in the aftermath of conflict, may introduce mother-tongue education once linguistic tensions have reduced in an effort to improve education outcomes (Zakharia and Bartlett 2014).

Reconciliation and Transitional Justice.

In fragile contexts that have experienced violent conflict, education may have an important role in longer-term, post-conflict development to help successive generations understand the violent conflict that took place within their own society and potentially contribute
towards future peacebuilding. One aspect of this relates to curriculum and the way in which history education in particular can contain values that either promote division or encourage peaceful management of diversity. For example, analysis of pre-genocide Rwandan textbooks indicates that Hutus and Tutsis were portrayed in opposition to one another which highlighted group division and encouraged intolerance (King 2014). Similarly, ‘jihad literacy’ textbooks funded by USAID for Afghan refugees living in Pakistan in the 1980s appear to have contributed to aligning violence and religion, to have encouraged intolerance, and to have contributed to underlying conditions for conflict in Afghanistan (Burde 2014).

In terms of post-conflict curriculum reform, this raises questions about how far history teaching should refer to recent, violent events. In some cases this may mean introducing a period of silence on recent events, for example a moratorium on history reform in Rwanda. However, evidence from Lebanon indicates that silence on the civil war during history class means that children turn to politicised sources, such as family members and political parties, to understand the past (van Ommering 2015). In this way, education’s potential to challenge conflict dynamics and encourage critical thinking remains untapped. A study of history teaching in Northern Ireland also indicates negative outcomes related to the silence on its recent history. Interviews from a cross-sectional study of 253 students aged 11 to 15 indicated that when students began secondary schooling, they identified with a wide range of historical themes. However, as they progressed through the required national curriculum over three years, their identifications narrowed, and their identification with Unionist or Nationalist history became stronger. Students drew selectively from the “neutral” history curriculum to support their developing identifications with the historical narratives of their own political/religious communities. According to these findings, history education should address their developing ideas more directly by providing alternatives to historical narratives they encounter elsewhere (Barton & McCully, 2005). More successful outcomes are associated with a multi-perspective, enquiry-based history education which 1) provides students with a foundation in critical analysis; 2) encourages them to recognize that the interpretation of the evidence of the past is a discursive process in which alternative versions vie for recognition; 3) fosters empathetic understanding, or caring, for others; and 4) promotes democratic values (McCully 2012).

A second aspect relates to the extent to which education has a role in contributing towards reconciliation following recommendations from formal Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs). Oglesby (2007) reported on how schools in Guatemala began to incorporate some of the findings from the Guatemalan Historical Clarification Commission. Paulson (2010) highlights how despite commitments to introduce textbooks that dealt with recent conflict in Peru, changes in government can influence whether these are actually used. Buckley-Zistel (2009) examines how the Rwandan government approach was to place a moratorium on the teaching of history after the genocide and the use of ngando camps to promote national unity by promoting a narrative that omits any reference to ethnicity. Paulson (2006) documented how ‘the Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission (SLTRC) included children’s testimony and children guided the development of the children’s version of the commission’s report’. These studies also highlight the need for further research into the ethical issues for educators; the role of education in relation to remembrance and commemorative sites and events; and better understanding of the nature of intergenerational learning. It is common, therefore, in countries that have been affected by conflict to point to a role for education in promoting longer-term reconciliation as a means of preventing recurrence of violent conflict. However, it is not an area where there is significant
investment by donors and represents a key gap in the literature.

Finally, the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) and UNICEF have collaborated on a research project that involved the commissioning of 17 papers, including case and thematic studies. The research is addressing two main questions:

• How can transitional justice contribute to peacebuilding goals by shaping the reform of education systems and facilitating the reintegration of children and youth into those systems?
• How can education serve to promote the goals of transitional justice by expanding its outreach agenda and helping to change a culture of impunity into one of human rights and democracy?

Emerging findings from the research suggest that education systems can support a number of functions in relation to transitional justice. These include support for documenting children’s experiences as part of truth recovery; psychosocial support for children giving evidence against perpetrators of human rights abuses; reparations for those whose education was disrupted; memorialisation related to victims; commemoration and educating new generations about causes and consequences of violent conflict; and education reforms that address past injustices.
4. Conclusions

This literature review has provided an up-to-date summary of three major literature reviews in the field of education, conflict and peacebuilding. An analytic framework provided by McCandless (2012) was also applied to review the literature in terms of three main rationales for the integration of education and peacebuilding. The review highlights a number of key messages from the literature for peacebuilding and education policymakers.

4.1 Education as a Peace Dividend

According to the theory of change, by quickly restoring social services such as education people see the benefits of peace through restoration of confidence in the state by demonstrating its capacity to provide social services. The literature provides some evidence that education provision can respond to citizens’ immediate desire for the service and can contribute to lesser incidence of violence, at least in the short term. The question of whether these efforts contribute to greater confidence in the state is more difficult to answer, but there are a number of key messages from the literature. Firstly, speed and visibility of restoration of education services is important in terms of a ‘peace dividend’. Secondly, however, speedy restoration of education is only likely to contribute positively to peacebuilding if it is seen to benefit all, particularly where there have been education inequalities, discrimination against or marginalisation of certain regions or groups. The peacebuilding key is that these injustices are seen to be addressed. Thirdly, visibility of service provision is important, but it will only contribute to confidence in the state if it is provided in a way that generates trust between the state and all its citizens. This means that education needs to be provided in a way that is not perceived as political manipulation or patronage. The literature also raises questions about the extent to which education provision that is insensitive to local context may be perceived as an imposition by government, and whether the use of non-state providers of education may undermine confidence in the state and consequently have a negative impact on peacebuilding.

4.2 Education Governance and Reform

The literature on education and peacebuilding related to governance
suggests that education service provision can provide the basis for improved state-society relations, but the relationship must be understood within the wider political economic processes in which it is embedded. The overwhelming conclusion from the literature is that impact is highly context specific and success is dependent on a thorough understanding of the political economic processes that shape society. Research in this area underscores the importance of undertaking political economy analysis, and that understands the operational implications and the changes to the education system that might be required as a result. Although donor agencies have invested in political economy analysis tools, they have struggled to ensure the impact on policies and practice. From a peacebuilding perspective these may include structural changes to the education system itself as well as administrative changes related to more inclusive participation, representation and recognition of various interests in education governance and decision-making. Thus while reforms under the peace dividend theory focus on high visibility and speed of response, the results from reforms under this second strand may not be seen for quite some time.

The literature also shows that the effects of policies relating to redistribution and decentralisation in post-conflict contexts may be an important element in (re) legitimising the state, but it may also be a source of conflict and needs to be managed sensitively. Research suggests that community participation can lead to improved education outcomes, but the evidence on its impact on social cohesion is less clear. Decentralisation is another dominant reform promoted by the international aid community. However, qualitative research reveals that it can have varying impacts at different levels of society, with important consequences for state legitimacy and long term peacebuilding. The key message form a peacebuilding perspective seems to be that decentralisation policies need to be carefully implemented and monitored to ensure that the overall impacts do not result in greater politicisation of the education sector. It is important that decentralisation results in the reduction of education inequalities and greater inclusion, rather than exclusion based on locality or identity factors. The key from a peacebuilding perspective may be a careful balance between centralised and decentralised powers and functions, rather than total centralisation control or complete decentralisation of the education system.

### 4.3 Education as an Entry Point for Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding

This section analysed the evidence in relation aspects of education policy that can act as entry points for conflict transformation and peacebuilding. The literature suggests that there are four key aspects that peacebuilding and education policymakers need to address: protection; addressing inequalities; promoting social cohesion; and supporting reconciliation. These issues can still be addressed through education policies even when it not possible to make explicit reference to peacebuilding.

- **Protection:** There is an increasing literature related to attacks on education and protecting children from violent conflict and creating safe and secure learning environments. Girls’ safety is a particular concern during violent conflict with negative impacts on their education. Education policies and programmes can address violence against children, which is extremely important as a foundation for peacebuilding, but underlying causes of violence also need to be addressed.

- **Equity and redistribution:** There is now an established body of research examining inequalities in access to education, particularly in relation to gender. However, this literature largely fails to take into account the quality of learning or the need for other forms of disaggregation where inequalities may exist, for example along the lines of ethnicity, religion,
geographical location or language.

- **Social cohesion**: There is a broad ranging literature on the concept of social cohesion and its relevance for peacebuilding generally relates to levels of trust between citizens and government, and between different groups in society. The literature includes research related to a number of education policy areas such as segregated schooling, intergroup contact programmes, peace education and language of instruction policies. Evidence on the impact of these approaches on social cohesion tends to be highly context specific and there is a general critique that social cohesion programmes may have little impact if they focus on interpersonal relations when the underlying causes of conflict are institutional and systemic.

- **Reconciliation**: Education may have an important role in longer term post conflict development. Two education policy areas in this regard concern the curriculum, and in particular the way in which history education can contain values that either promote division or encourage peaceful management of diversity, and the extent to which education has a role in contributing towards reconciliation following recommendations from Formal Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs). It is common in countries that have been affected by conflict to point to a role for education in promoting longer-term reconciliation as a means of preventing recurrence of violent conflict. However, it is often an area that is not prioritised as part of education policy development.

### 4.4 Next Steps

The framework from this literature review provides the basis further research into the integration of education and peacebuilding. Firstly, there is a need to understand the policies, priorities and financing currently available for education and peacebuilding, and an analysis will be provided in the next report. Secondly, there is a need to understand the policy frameworks and approaches that exist for the integration of education and peacebuilding at the global, regional and country level. This will be the focus of a further report, plus a synthesis of findings from four country case studies (Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda). Thirdly, the adoption of new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) includes both Education (Goal 4) and Peace (Goal 16). It will therefore be important to analyse where the indicators proposed for each of these are consistent with the integration of education and peacebuilding, and also identify where there are gaps in the indicator framework. This will be the focus for the final report from this research series.
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