UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Youth, Peacebuilding and the Role of Education

Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A.; Scotto, G.

Publication date
2017
Document Version
Final published version

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Scotto, G. (2017). *Youth, Peacebuilding and the Role of Education*. (INEE/YPS Thematic Paper). Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). https://www.youth4peace.info/system/files/2018-04/11.%20TP_Education_Cardozo%20%26%20Scotto.pdf

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:18 Nov 2026

INEE/YPS THEMATIC PAPER

YOUTH, PEACEBUILDING & THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2017

Thematic Paper prepared as a collaborative INEE study to inform the Youth, Peace and Security Progress Study, as mandated by the Security Council in the context of Resolution 2250.

Authors: Mieke T.A. Lopes Cardozo & Giovanni Scotto

INEE/YPS THEMATIC PAPER

YOUTH, PEACEBUILDING & THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2017

Thematic Paper prepared as a collaborative INEE study to inform the Youth, Peace and Security Progress Study, as mandated by the Security Council in the context of Resolution 2250.

Authors: Mieke T.A. Lopes Cardozo (University of Amsterdam, Assistant Professor International Development Studies) & **Giovanni Scotto** (University of Florence, Georg Arnhold Visiting Professor in Education for Sustainable Peace 2017)

Education and International Development

University of Amsterdam

FORMA Mentis

Laboratorio PIN - Polo Universitario di Prato

Picture front cover: M. Lopes Cardozo, July 2016, Londonderry
Credits to "The Bogside Artists, 2000, *The Death of Innocence; Here the innocence of a child's world contrasts vividly with the chaotic violence with which others have surrounded her. The mural commemorates fourteen-year-old Annette McGavigan who was shot by a British soldier in 1971, the 100th victim of the Troubles and one of the first children to be killed. The little coloured stones at her feet are objects she was collecting for a school project. The broken gun signals a call for and end to violence.*"

Youth Peace & Security

INEE

An international network for education in emergencies
Un réseau international pour l'éducation en situations d'urgence
Una red internacional para la educación en situaciones de emergencia
Uma rede internacional para a educação em situações de emergência
الشبكة العالمية لوكالات التعليم في حالات الطوارئ

Contents

Abstract 4

Acknowledgements 5

Executive Summary 6

1. Introduction and rationale 10

2. Methodological approach and key concepts 12

2.1 Key concepts and analytical framework 12

2.2 Methodological approach and scope 15

3. Education as reflected in the five YPS SCR 2250 pillars 15

Pillar I: Education and Participation 16

Pillars II and III: Education, Protection and Prevention 17

Pillar IV: Education and Partnership 18

Pillar V: Education, Disengagement and Reintegration 19

4. Insights from research: Education governance and systems as reproductive of key forms of violence and inequalities 20

4.1 Power over education – contentious issues in education policy and governance 20

4.2 Education under attack – schools as sites of contention, combat and resistance 25

4.3 The relationship between education, violence and social inequality 27

5 Insights from research: Enhancing the transformative potential of education to support peacebuilding 29

5.1 Reforms in the formal education system as called for by young people 30

5.2 Potential and challenges of non-formal learning spaces for youth peacebuilding agency 34

5.3 Vocational training: youth employment and peace 38

5.4 The complex roles of education in preventing forms of violent extremism and “radicalization” 42

5.5 The teaching of history and engagement with the past through transitional justice 46

5.6 Education and refugee youth: challenges and opportunities for peace and security 49

6. Key messages and recommendations for the role of education in a forward-looking YPS agenda 52

7. References 55

Abstract

This thematic paper outlines key debates and insights on the role of education in relation to the UN Security Council Resolution 2250 (SCR 2250) and the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda. Its objective is to provide stimuli for the YPS Progress Study and, at the same time, to serve as a discussion piece for policy-makers, practitioners and scholars interested in the role of education in relation to YPS. Both authors are members of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), and part of the Education Policy Working Group of INEE.

After outlining the main rationale and relevance of the paper (section 1) and the conceptual and methodological approach (section 2), we reflect in section 3 on ways in which education systems (formal and non-formal) and actors are related to the five pillars that constitute the basis of SCR 2250: participation, protection, prevention, partnership, and disengagement and reintegration.
In sections 4 and 5, we provide an overview of the most recent insights from a range of resources, including academic and programmatic literature, youth voices as expressed in the YPS survey data, and findings from youth-oriented participatory research. Here we outline key drivers of violence and inequality within and/or fostered by education before moving on to a discussion of the transformative potential of various educational spaces.
We draw on recent case studies and evaluations in order to provide concrete examples of the various challenges and pitfalls as well as the potential of education and educational transformation in supporting young people in endeavors to address conflict and build peace. The paper concludes with a reflection on the key steps that lie ahead in terms of policy and practical implementation for UN, governmental and non-governmental actors at multiple levels, focusing both on formal education systems and on non-formal mechanisms for learning and transformation.

This paper highlights five key messages

In order to build sustainable peace and better serve young people's needs through education in highly diverse and unequal societies around the globe, there is an immediate need to [P-E-A-C-E]:

1) Prioritize education (funding and resources) for young women and men as a key component with which to achieve the goals formulated in UNSCR 2250, to address the root causes of inequalities and violent conflict and prioritize reconciliation across generations and groups in society;

2) Embed education's progressive and **preventive** potential for addressing inequalities and building and sustaining peace via improved support for teachers and a more meaningful representation of young people's realities and needs;

3) Adequately assess and respond to education's potentially negative contributions to conflict and violence, and ensure that educational institutions, students and teachers are **protected** from direct attacks;

4) Create **partnerships** to translate conflict-sensitive, gender-responsive and youth-informed reforms of formal/non-formal education into system-wide approaches at, above and below state level to better serve young people's peacebuilding potential;

5) Enact more holistic and relevant educational opportunities, as demanded by young people, in order to fully develop all (socio-cultural, political and economic) aspects of youth empowerment and, as a result of this support, meaningful **participation, (dis)engagement and (re)integration**.

Acknowledgements

We are most grateful for the editorial support that was provided by Melina Merdanović (student intern, University of Amsterdam), Katherine Ebisch-Burton and Wendy Anne Kopisch (Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research, Braunschweig). We also thank the UN SCR 2250 Secretariat's Cécile Mazzacurati, Ali Altiok, Gabrielle John and lead author Graeme Simpson for their supportive feedback and inspiring collaborations. We are also grateful for the valuable input provided by the following members of the INEE Education Policy and Advocacy Working Groups: Laura Davison (INEE), Pete Simms (Children in Crisis), Marina Lopez-Anselme (RET International), Margaret Sinclair (Protecting Education in Insecurity and Conflict), Uli Jaeger (Berghof Foundation). And finally, we thank the following individuals for lending their expertise to review this paper: Solvi Karlsson (UNOY), Lynn Davies (University of Birmingham) and Heddy Lahmann (NYU/INEE JEiE). We thank Nathan Thompson for his great support in developing the executive summary draft. Finally, Eleni Christodoulou (GEI) and Elena Butti (University of Oxford) helped with insightful comments during the review process.

We acknowledge that due to space limitations, this paper naturally presents a selective view that reflects the expertise and areas of work of its two authors and their aim to cover a broad range of relevant debates. The feedback of a wide range of reviewers is fundamental to the quality of the work presented here. All ideas and interpretations presented as such are solely those of the two authors, and we welcome feedback and comments on this work.

Executive Summary

The international community's increased attention to the role of education in conflict-affected areas corresponds with the increasingly popular view that young people are important actors in sustainable peacebuilding. UN Security Council Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (SCR 2250) urges member states to recognize the potential of young people to act as constructive change agents for peace. SCR 2250 includes several direct references to the importance of education and lays out broad mandates for education system actors. However, similar to many educational interventions, the Resolution primarily conceptualizes education as a driver of young people's economic participation and civil political engagement. In Section 1, we argue that relatively little attention is paid to the sociocultural aspects of young people's identity and agency. As such, many educational interventions miss an opportunity to integrate youth agency for peacebuilding with the roles, actions, and hopes of young people in conflict situations. The jumping off point for this paper is the question of how education may support youth to engage in long-term processes of peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

We undertake a close reading of SCR 2250 to assess the Resolution's representation of education and identify the possible limitations or gaps in this regard. In Section 2, our analytical approach begins with a definition and a framework. First, a comprehensive definition of youth agency for peacebuilding calls on readers to sideline the victim-perpetrator binary and to see agency as the room to maneuver among various individual and collective actors, to develop strategies for fueling conflict and/or building peace within the broader cultural, political, economic contexts of conflict. Second, we discuss "The Four Rs Framework" for peacebuilding, which links ideas from social justice and transitional justice with an understanding of the multiple dimensions and directions of inequality. It builds on the idea that formal and non-formal learning environments that address the 4 Rs – recognition, redistribution, representation, and reconciliation – are better suited to serve young people's needs and promote sustainable peace.

SCR 2250 identifies five pillars for fostering young people's participation in building sustainable peace: participation, protection, prevention, partnerships, and disengagement and reintegration. In Section 3, we discuss how each pillar of SCR 2250 reflects one or more of the 4 Rs in its recommendations to UN member states and how education is portrayed in the Resolution.

- **Pillar I: Participation.** Member states are encouraged to include youth **representation** in conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes whenever possible. Work is needed to ensure such participation is transformative and young people's representation is not merely tokenistic.

- **Pillar II: Protection.** Education is not directly included as an element of the protection pillar, which we argue is an important omission of SCR 2250. Attacks on students and schools by Boko Haram in Nigeria, the Taliban in

Afghanistan and Pakistan, and Al Shabaab in East Africa show that education systems are vulnerable. Students and schools need the international community to make specific commitments which **recognize** students' vulnerability and potential victimization during conflict and **redistribute** resources for bodily and mental security toward young people affected by conflict.

- **Pillar III: Prevention.** The notion that employment and constructive political engagement underlie conflict prevention appears again in the language of the prevention pillar. SCR 2250 frames education as a means for young people to acquire professional or vocational training or learn to become entrepreneurs, which locates young people's agency as economic and political actors. A more comprehensive view is to also see young people as acting through their sociocultural identities, implying **recognition** of those identities in transformative post-conflict education and **reconciliation** of the harm brought upon members of those identity communities during conflict. Although SCR 2250 here mentions educational quality, young people often report the need for comprehensive education reform after conflict, including reforms to subjects taught, methods of instruction, teacher selection and training, and the quality of textbooks and teaching materials.

- **Pillar IV: Partnership.** Pillar IV identifies youth, families, women, and religious-, cultural-, and educational leaders as actors in the process of preventing violent extremism. To do this, SCR 2250 calls on actors within countries' education systems to develop context-relevant approaches to helping young people find alternative opportunities for identification and expression more attractive than extremist association. Pillar IV implicates more inclusive **representation** of marginalized stakeholders.

- **Pillar V: Disengagement and Reintegration.** This pillar interprets the role of education as the capacity building and training necessary to meet the demands of the labor market and employment as crucial to reintegration. The emphasis on economic agency and employment, while narrow, lends itself to **redistributive** activities. Learning a "culture of peace" is another potential avenue for education coming from this pillar, but there is limited clarity on how to address the concerns of **recognition** and **reconciliation** in education in practice, an issue which this paper further elaborates upon.

In Section 4, we focus on contentious issues regarding power over education systems. We examine cases where each of the following issues has been a driver of conflict: education policy and school/teacher governance, the school site as the locus of violence or resistance, and the relationship between education, social inequality, and violence. A greater emphasis on the Four Rs would better position SCR 2250 to counter these forces.

For example, we find that resources should be **redistributed** toward marginalized

students. Diverting resources that enable access to equitable school facilities and measures to promote these students' sense of security at school are goals of **Pillar I** and **Pillar II** of SCR 2250. **Pillar I**, **Pillar III**, and **Pillar IV** are involved in efforts to elevate the **recognition** of marginalized groups during the peace process through more equitable language of instruction policies and more inclusive curricula, to use just two examples. **Representation** of marginalized groups is possible through ethnic-, linguistic-, and gender-balanced and governing bodies informed by youth voices and inclusive pedagogical approaches in education systems. Representation of this sort forms part of the intention behind **Pillar I**, **Pillar III**, and **Pillar IV.** Finally, **reconciliation** points to ways in which schooling systems and content can heal broken trust and start to redress past and present grievances, creating transformation and an alternative pathway to a more sustainable and peaceful future.

Section 5 gives the complete set of our recommendations for unfolding the transformative potential of reconciliation through education to support peacebuilding, as informed by research insights. We give special attention in this section to the voices of young people and youth organizations. Where relevant, these recommendations call out how they may be adopted by UN member states wishing to extend their application of the pillars of SCR 2250.

Governments, bilateral donors, and international organizations should prioritize the task of integrating education and sustainable peacebuilding approaches, fostering collaborative partnerships for policymaking with grassroots-level education system stakeholders, and protecting educational spaces through long-term funding and political commitments. They should ensure fair distribution of resources, training, and remuneration for educators.

For designers of educational programming in the formal and non-formal spaces – and for education policymakers – we recommend the use of gender-sensitive and conflict-sensitive approaches informed by historical and local contexts, youth needs, and INEE's Conflict-Sensitive Education pack. Program- and policy designers should uncover, prevent, and address all forms of violence which present themselves in formal and non-formal education and promote inclusiveness and respect for diversity (in terms of gender, ethnicity, age, religion, language, disability, sexual orientation, refugee status, political ideology, socio-economic class, etc.) in curricula, program design, and policy, especially language of instruction policies. At the school and community level, engagement with parents and community (including religious) leaders is a key feature of a more holistic and integrated approach to education's potential to support social cohesion.

Young people and their representative organizations should participate in decision-making processes where relevant and feasible. We recommend they create partnerships within their learning settings (formal and non-formal) and with relevant actors in the community and beyond that nurture youth-led initiatives and that young people engage with their support networks for continued capacity-building

and training for constructively challenging, innovating in, and transforming the education systems in which they are embedded.

We recommend that educators in both formal and non-formal settings seek training in conflict-sensitive and transformational pedagogical approaches and foster non-violence, safe learning environments, and respect for intersectional diversities. Educators should pay attention to students' varied needs and talents and encourage young people to think critically and act constructively on their observations about their reality, while simultaneously discussing the inherent challenges involved in peacebuilding activism especially in conflict-affected situations.

The research community has an opportunity to narrow a gap in its knowledge of how formal and non-formal educational programming affects the lives and choices of young people with regard to building sustainable peace. Researchers should work in partnership with young people and civil society to encourage broader use of participatory research strategies and ensure that the benefits of research are disseminated to those who will benefit from them in practice, i.e., via training education system stakeholders in critical analysis of the ways in which education systems, content and practices either fracture or contribute to peacebuilding.

1. Introduction and rationale

"Let us become the first generation to decide to be the last that sees empty classrooms, lost childhoods, and wasted potentials."

-Malala Yousafzai, Nobel Peace Laureate and Education Activist

"We need to close the gap between local and international peacebuilders"

- Malual Bol Kiir, 2016, Advisor for Progress Study

As reflected in the epigraphs above, this paper is written at a point in time when young people's roles in peacebuilding have been gaining momentum as a result of the Security Council Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) and, simultaneously, attention to the role of education in zones of conflict has been gradually increasing. This latter development is largely due to advocacy by education specialists and members of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), increased recognition of the connection between education and peace as well as conflict in UN circles, and a growing body of related scholarship. In 2015, INEE's Education Policy Working Group formed a subgroup working on issues related to Youth, Violence and Peacebuilding. As members of this working group, the two authors of this paper will center their discussion on the role of education in relation to the SCR2250 and the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda. Its objective is to provide stimuli for the YPS Progress Study[1] and, at the same time, to serve as a discussion piece for policy-makers, practitioners and scholars interested in the role of education in relation to YPS in the field of Education in Emergencies (EiE).

Findings of studies on education and peace/conflict call upon us to recognize the potential inherent in education taking on a transformative role that positively contributes to processes of peacebuilding. At the same time, there is a need to uncover and address the ways in which education systems and actors may conversely (re-)produce inequalities and various forms of violence, which are key drivers or potential triggers of armed conflict. These complex roles played by institutionalized systems of schooling and non-formal learning settings have featured more prominently in international debates with the recent adoption of the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, and especially SDG 4 and 16) and of UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (YPS, December 2015).

Considering the general lack of attention paid to the roles, actions and hopes of

[1] The Progress Study as mandated by the Security Council in relation to the SCR2250, see also https://www.youth4peace.info

youth in conflict-affected situations, UN Security Council Resolution 2250 is an important step forward in terms of international recognition. By urging member states to increase the representation of youth in decision-making at all levels, SCR 2250 shifts the international focus from seeing youth as passive victims or a security threat to recognizing young people as a large sector of the population with the potential to contribute to constructive change. The Resolution identifies five pillars with the potential to foster the positive role of youth in building peace: participation, protection, prevention, partnerships, and disengagement and reintegration.

Elaborating on these five pillars of work, the SCR 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security includes several direct references to the importance of education for young people's lives. This notwithstanding, it adopts a relatively narrow view of the role of education in supporting "youth entrepreneurship and constructive political engagement". This is also reflected in the recent findings of a comparative four-country study conducted by the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding (Lopes Cardozo, Higgins and Le Mat, 2016). Its synthesis report on youth agency for peacebuilding concluded that the majority of interventions in an educational context tend to focus on fostering, first, economic empowerment, and second, political participation. As we shall discuss in more detail below, socio-cultural aspects of young people's sense of identity and "agency" are often underestimated and underfunded. Likewise, there is little focus within both formal and non-formal education on spaces for reconciliation, which, we argue, should be seen as a key aspect of a sustainable approach to peacebuilding (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo and Smith, 2017).

This paper focuses on young people's agency and *the ways in which education can support youth to engage in long-term processes of peacebuilding and conflict transformation, or, as the case may be, fail to provide this support, and what this means in practical terms for actors working in this field*.

After outlining our conceptual and methodological approach in section 2, we will progress, in section 3, to reflecting on ways in which education systems (formal and non-formal) and actors relate to the five pillars presented in SCR 2250: participation, protection, prevention, partnership, and disengagement and reintegration. Here we ask: *What idea or image of education does the SCR 2250 reflect, and what are the possible limitations of or gaps in this representation?* In sections 4 and 5 we provide an overview of recent insights from the academic and programmatic literature, highlighting key drivers of violence and inequalities within or fostered by education, and subsequently moving into a discussion of the transformative potential of various educational spaces. We address the following two questions:

- What are the various contentious issues in educational governance and within school settings? How is education related to forms of violence and social injustice? (section 4)
- How can education unfold its transformative potential to support peacebuilding? (section 5)

We draw on recent case studies and evaluations in order to provide examples of the challenges, pitfalls and potential of education in supporting young people in their endeavors to address violent conflict and building peace. Throughout the text, we engage with youth voices as expressed in the YPS survey data and in findings from youth-oriented participatory research. In its conclusion, the paper will reflect on key steps that lie ahead in terms of policy and practical implementation for UN, governmental and non-governmental actors at multiple levels, focusing both on the formal education system and non-formal spaces for learning and transformation.

2. Methodological approach and key concepts

2.1 Key concepts and analytical framework

This paper places its combined focus on the role of *education* in relation to *youth agency* and *peacebuilding*, two factors rarely addressed simultaneously (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2015). In the discussion that follows, we present our understanding of these three key concepts, and on how they are related to our analytical framework.

Beginning with *education*, our aim is to highlight its potential to either enhance or undermine processes of sustainable peacebuilding and social cohesion (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000). We are interested in both formal (government-led, formal curricula-based) forms of schooling available to young people, and non-formal (non-governmental, civil society/(I)NGO or community-led) spaces of learning.[2] This broad conceptualization allows us to understand the various learning environments that are available, or unavailable, to diverse groups of youth around the world in situations of conflict.

Second, finding a meaningful definition for *youth* is an apparent mission impossible; how can we provide a universally valid definition of a massive, in some cases majority, segment of the population characterized by great diversity? Definitions of the term "youth" remain contested, and the undertaking to find one appears even more complex in societies ridden with violent conflict or affected by phenomena such as child soldiers (Schell-Faucon, 2001). One common representation associates youth with a variety of deep-rooted fears, ambivalences, and unsettling anxieties (Sayed et al, 2016). We have chosen to work with the SCR

[2] For a useful defintion of non-formal education see http://toolkit.ineesite.org/term-bank/en/terms/non-formal_education, accessed 30-08-2017.

2250 age range of 18-29 years, bearing in mind the above-mentioned limitations to any definition applied and the need to consistently acknowledge the intersectional (age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic class, geographical location, political views, sexual orientation, disability etc.) heterogeneity of any larger collective of young people. We also take into account a long-term perspective: today's youth dealing with inequalities, violence, social transformation and/or peacebuilding were yesterday's children affected by armed conflict, and will be tomorrow's adult citizens shaping the future of their respective communities. When speaking about present-day youth, we must take into account both their past and future.

In moving beyond narrow perceptions of youth as mere threats to peace or victims of violence, more conceptually we define youth *agency* as the room for manoeuver available to young people as they develop (conscious or subconscious) strategies that either support or hinder peacebuilding in relation to the broader cultural, political and economic context (see Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016). We argue that we need a more comprehensive understanding of *youth agency for peacebuilding*, which we should seek to attain by moving away from a victim-perpetrator binary toward an understanding of heterogeneous constituents embedded within and co-creating processes of conflict *and* peace (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2015).

The reduction of youth to either victims or perpetrators of violence in conflict situations reflects neither the multiple ways in which young people are affected by conflict nor their potential contribution to peacebuilding. As we shall see, both formal and non-formal forms of education have the relevant potential to strengthen youth transformative agency for peacebuilding. At the same time, we also recognize that agency does not automatically connect to peaceful behavior, and that young people's strategies for collective action could both ultimately bring positive changes in society as well as contribute to the violent escalation of conflicts.

Third, we feel there is a need for a clear definition of the term 'participation', as a key pillar of the SCR2250 and a term employed with a variety of political and strategic motives and discourses. In relation to education, we identify participation in a diverse and multi-scalar manner, recognizing for instance formal political participation (voting, campaigning), community-oriented decision-making, and individual choice in educational trajectories. In addition, the quality of participation can in our view be meaningfully assessed by analyzing the levels of engagement and relative power within society.[3]

Fourth, our understanding of *peacebuilding* is based on the "4 Rs Analytical Framework" (see Novelli, Lopes Cardozo and Smith, 2017). The framework identifies

[3] See for instance a tool such as the 'flower of meaningful youth participation' as designed by the youth-led organization CHOICE: https://choiceforyouth.org/our-results/meaningful-youth-participation/

the dimensions of recognition, redistribution, representation, and reconciliation, linking Fraser's (1995, 2005) work on social justice with the peacebuilding and reconciliation work of Galtung (1976), Lederach (1995, 1997), and others. Combining social justice and transitional justice thinking, this normative framework for the study of education and peacebuilding recognizes the multiple dimensions of inequality and injustice characterizing contemporary conflicts and the need to address them in and through education. The framework is in line with well-established peacebuilding thinking (cf. Galtung 1976, 1996; Lederach 1995, 1997) on the need to address both *negative peace* (the cessation of violence) and *positive peace* (the remediation of the underlying structural and symbolic violence that often underpins the outbreak of conflict, i.e. its drivers). It also recognizes the importance of addressing and redressing the 'legacies of conflict' in tandem with the 'drivers of conflict' (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo and Smith, 2015; 2017).

Within conflict studies, there has been a heated discussion on the relationship between inequality, injustice and armed conflict (see, for example, the "greed/grievance" debate: Collier 2000; Ballentine and Sherman 2003; Berdal 2003; Keen 2012). In armed conflicts, real or perceived horizontal inequalities can provide catalysts for group mobilization and uprisings (Stewart 2008; Langer, Stewart and Venugopal 2011). There is limited research on the relationship between education and inequality in the outbreak of armed conflict. However, recent quantitative studies (see FHI 360, 2015) show a consistent statistical relationship across five decades between higher levels of inequality in access to education between ethnic and religious groups and the likelihood that a country will experience violent conflict. There is, therefore, a need to explore the multiple dimensions of inequality beyond educational outcomes, as well as the different ways in which the education system might contribute to or alleviate conflict.

The 4Rs framework seeks to capture the multiple economic, cultural, political, and social dimensions of inequality in education and the ways in which these might relate to conflict and peace (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo, and Smith, 2015; 2017). Following this framework, we similarly argue here that education has a significant contribution to make to sustainable peacebuilding via its impact on security as well as political, economic, social and cultural 'transformations' within conflict-affected societies.

Finally, 'transformation' is defined as the extent to which education policy, peacebuilding and development programs promote redistribution, recognition, representation, and reconciliation (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo, and Smith, 2015; 2017). The examination of inequalities within the education system seeks to capture the interconnected dimensions of the 4Rs with the potential to work – in complementary or contradictory ways – toward sustainable peacebuilding and social cohesion (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo and Smith, 2015; 2017):

1. *Redistribution* relates to equity and non-discrimination in education access, resources, and outcomes for different groups in society, particularly marginalized and disadvantaged groups.
2. *Recognition* concerns respect for and affirmation of diversity and identities in the structures, processes, and content of education, in terms of gender, language, politics, religion, ethnicity, culture, and ability.
3. *Representation* concerns participation, at all levels of the education system, in governance and decision-making related to the allocation, use, and distribution of human and material resources.
4. *Reconciliation* involves confrontation and engagement with past events, injustices, and material and psychosocial effects of conflict, as well as the development of relationships of trust.

2.2 Methodological approach and scope

The insights reflected in this thematic paper are derived from existing literature; accordingly, its aim is to provide a 'review of reviews'. In attempting to 'walk the walk' as well as 'talk the talk' of the *voice* of youth, we aim to do justice to the representation of young people's views and demands where accessible, by reviewing whether the literature and studies we draw on reflect a youth-engaged and gender-sensitive approach. In addition to the latest insights from academic and practitioner studies, we aim to give voice to the real stakeholders – youth, in a wide range of contexts, from around the globe – by engaging with primary data collected through the YPS survey and those relevant studies that reflect this perspective.

3. Education as reflected in the five YPS SCR 2250 pillars

Figure 1 – The five pillars of SCR 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (Source: www.youth4peace.info)

In this section we provide a starting point for our further analysis and reflection by reviewing the ways in which the SCR 2250 discourse on YPS portrays education. As we shall see, there are relatively few explicit references to education in the wording of the Resolution. We present the most relevant excerpts from SCR 2250 and reflect on the links with these pillars in the following sections of the paper.

Pillar I: Education and Participation

> *SCR 2250: 2. [The Security Council] (…) "Calls on all relevant actors, including when negotiating and implementing peace agreements, to take into account, as appropriate, the participation and views of youth, recognising that their marginalisation is detrimental to building sustainable peace in all societies, including, inter alia, such specific aspects as: (…) (c)* ***Measures to empower youth*** *in peacebuilding and conflict resolution"*

Empowerment and capacity-building may take different forms, including formal

curricula and non-formal educational projects. Examples include formal secondary and tertiary education, alongside non-formal training in conflict transformation and peacebuilding. In section 5 we will present various dimensions of empowerment through education: opportunities in non-formal education; challenges and opportunities of refugee empowerment through education; and educational approaches to transitional justice and dealing with the past. The discourse on "youth participation" can be strategically implemented in different ways, based on the interpretations of participation and the relative level of meaningful youth engagement that is desired or allowed. While the discourse opens up space for youth *representation*, in the terminology of the 4Rs framework, critical analysis and case-by-case inquiry is needed to ensure that youth participation lives up to its transformative potential, rather than serving a tokenistic approach.

Pillars II and III: Education, Protection and Prevention

Education is not directly mentioned as a constitutive element of the protection pillar, yet, as we shall see in section 4.2 below, education stands in need of protection from violence, and also serves a potential protective function. This is an important omission of the resolution.

In relation to the third pillar of prevention, the Resolution locates the main contribution of education as follows:

> *(11) [The Security Council] "Stresses the importance of creating policies for youth that would positively contribute to peacebuilding efforts, including social and economic development, supporting projects designed to grow local economies, and provide youth employment opportunities and* ***vocational training, fostering their education****, and promoting youth entrepreneurship and constructive political engagement;*
>
> *(12) Urges Member States* ***to support, as appropriate, quality education for peace that equips youth with the ability to engage constructively in civic structures and inclusive political processes****"*

SCR 2250 thus links education with the prospect of economic growth and development on the one hand, and the task of civic and political education on the other. In order to achieve these objectives, major challenges related to governance and funding must be addressed (see section 4). The quality of teaching is also important: in several different contexts, young people have voiced the need for comprehensive education reform, including reforms to subjects taught, methods of instruction, teacher selection and training, and the quality of textbooks and teaching materials.

Finally, vocational training is an area which can offer more to peacebuilding than simply increasing employment opportunities, and should be carefully connected to

needs and openings in the labor market in order to ensure that unmet job expectations after completion of training will not give rise to more frustration (see section 4).

From a 4Rs perspective, the elucidation of the role of education in the prevention pillar follows a rather narrow scope, focusing more prominently on economic and political aspects of educational outcomes for young people. This means that there is insufficient awareness of the socio-cultural (recognition) and reconciliatory potential of education, a tendency confirmed by recent comparative research on the prioritization of education policy and programming for youth in conflict-affected regions (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016).

Pillar IV: Education and Partnership

The Resolution directly addresses the issue of violent extremism and envisages specific tasks for the education sector:

> (16) *[The Security Council] "Encourages Member States to engage relevant local communities and non-governmental actors in developing strategies to counter the* ***violent extremist narrative*** *that can incite terrorist acts, address the conditions conducive to the spread of violent extremism, which can be conducive to terrorism, including by* ***empowering youth****, families, women, religious, cultural and* ***education leaders****, and all other concerned groups of civil society and adopt tailored approaches to countering recruitment to this kind of violent extremism and promoting social inclusion and cohesion."*
>
> (17): [Education should support] (a) *"employment and training in preventing the marginalization of youth" and (b) "investment in building young persons' capabilities and skills to meet labour demands through relevant education opportunities designed in a manner which promotes a culture of peace."*

This pillar relates to current efforts to work on preventing violent extremism (PVE) through educational institutions as key arenas in which discourses encouraging violence can be called into question (see also section 5). "Education leaders", among others, are called upon to develop "tailored" (i.e. context-relevant) approaches with the purpose of:

- at the cultural level, countering the force of attraction that narratives of violence, extremist groups, and ideologies exercise on some young people by providing alternative narratives or opportunities for identification;
- at the social and political level, providing tools for collective action, which we further discuss in relation to agency and empowerment for social inclusion and social cohesion in section 5. Our analysis there illustrates the political sensitivity of the topic, and the need for nuanced debate and policy development that is not primarily

driven by fear, but rather recognizes the potential of education to foster social cohesion over segregation, and inclusiveness over competition and exclusion.

Pillar V: Education, Disengagement and Reintegration

The resolution envisages an important role for education in this final pillar:

> *(17) Encourages all those involved in the planning for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to consider the needs of youth affected by armed conflict, including, inter alia, such specific aspects as:*
> *(a) evidence-based and gender-sensitive youth employment opportunities, inclusive labour policies, national youth employment action plans in partnership with the private sector, developed in partnership with youth and recognising the* ***interrelated role of education, employment and training in preventing the marginalisation of youth****;*
> *(b) investment in* ***building young persons' capabilities and skills to meet labour demands through relevant education opportunities designed in a manner which promotes a culture of peace****;*
> *(c) support for youth-led and peacebuilding organisations as* ***partners*** *in youth employment and entrepreneurship programs;*

This pillar deals specifically with one key aspect of many peacebuilding processes: DDR, originally Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration. SCR 2250 uses the more general term "disengagement" instead of "demobilization". This points to the fact that the abandonment of a "culture of violence" is a much broader and deeper phenomenon than merely leaving the military. Youth need to be encouraged and facilitated in disengaging from a culture of violence (see section 5 on education beyond employment) and be offered alternative means of engagement and interaction.

Nevertheless, we feel the language of the Resolution continues to narrowly emphasize the economic and employment-related (or *redistributive)* roles of education. And while "relevant education" connected to "a culture of peace" could potentially address some of the concerns on *recognition* and *reconciliation* as seen through the lens of the 4Rs framework, there is limited clarity on ways in which education systems, actors or content could foster this. Finally, while youth-led organizations are called up as "partners", there is neither much acknowledgement of the potential role of education in young people's political and strategic engagement, nor of possible disengagement.

Educational institutions and activities can offer a distinct contribution to the achievement of the objectives set forth in each of the five pillars, which we further discuss in the following two sections.

4. Insights from research: Education governance and systems as reproductive of key forms of violence and inequalities

A growing body of research is exploring the dynamic relationship between education, conflict and peacebuilding, with the aim of coming to understand how education is both affected by and affects conditions of extremism, insecurity, and violence. This section revolves around the question of *how education is both positively and negatively related to forms of violence and social injustice*. Recent insights from the field of policy, practice, and scholarship emphasize the need for thorough, historically informed and context-specific conflict analysis that includes a focus on education (UNICEF final report PBEA, 2016).

The 4Rs analytical model introduced earlier can be one of the approaches employed in the study of the various (economic, socio-cultural, political, and reconciliatory) dimensions of the root drivers of conflict and of the ways in which education is implicated in such processes. Below we provide an analysis of how education systems available to young people carry the potential danger of reproducing or intensifying inequalities and tensions in society. More specifically, we will respond to the following two questions: *What are the various contentious issues in governance and power over education, and within schooling settings? How is education related to forms of violence and social injustice?*

The following section (5) will go on to discuss the potential transformative power carried within and through education.

4.1 Power over education – contentious issues in education policy and governance

Education is an inherently political undertaking, and the authority to make decisions on education-related matters easily becomes a space of contention, not least in contexts characterized by inequalities and various forms of violence. In this light, Dale and Robertson have sought to demonstrate how education has failed to live up to its promises, resulting in a lack of equal opportunities and educational outcomes (Dale and Robertson, podcast, 2016). It is important for us to understand who currently makes decisions regarding education, who provides the funding, and who thus exerts control over educational governance. Drawing on the 4Rs framework, this section will focus on the various dimensions of contention in the governance of education, and how these play out in relation to its role in fostering further violence and social injustice.

In a historical review of the field of education and conflict/peace, Winthrop and

Matsui (2013) note that, although political and scholarly attention to the role of education in societal reconstruction and peacebuilding has grown in the last two decades, the practice of providing schooling and non-formal education to children and youth affected by conflict dates back at least to reconstruction efforts after World War II. In the decades that followed, while education for refugees and displaced communities did take place, this was often at the initiative of the affected communities themselves, whilst the international community focused on 'life-saving' interventions in housing, food and health (Winthrop and Matsui 2014).

The post-Cold War period represented a consolidation of the neoliberal political project, which in the field of education and development led to a globalizing set of education policy recipes inspired by neoliberalism, including decentralization, privatization, and school-based management. These policies had been initiated during the Cold War under structural adjustment policies supported by the World Bank and IMF, and continue into the present in various forms (Robertson et al. 2007).

Mechanisms such as school-based management and the devolution of authority, control, and provision to local levels have the potential to promote active citizenship, social inclusion, and cooperation, and also possess the capacity to increase levels of accountability, and transparency of education providers, as well as encourage the participation of communities (Dupuy, 2008). However, these mechanisms may be introduced to substitute rather than complement public education; events in Guatemala are a case in point (Poppema 2012). Additionally, such local management committees are prone to elite capture; despite being given authority, citizen-actors are either afraid, unwilling or unaccustomed to challenge professional educational actors (for cases in Indonesia and Cambodia see Bjork, 2006; INEE, 2009). The interplay of these factors often leaves little space for meaningful youth representation. This is especially true in contexts where generational hierarchies prevent young members of communities from speaking up (Higgins et al, 2016).

When we look at who invests in education on various levels and why, the post-Cold War moment provides an important turning point, as geopolitical realities and intentions have changed and a new era of more "harmonized" and "coordinated" development responses was ushered in. Both humanitarian and Human Rights (UN) bodies started an effective lobby to achieve a higher standing for *education for all* (EFA) on the agendas of bilateral donors and international financial institutions such as the World Bank. Following this period, the last two decades saw a growing awareness that many of the world's out-of-school children and youth live in societies affected by violent conflict and that the attainment of the *Education for All* targets depends on successfully addressing educational access and quality in such settings

(Novelli and Smith, 2011).

An analysis of data from the year 2011 taken from UNESCO's statistics database conducted by the Global Monitoring Report team reveals that half of the 50 million school-aged children and young people worldwide who do not attend school are from conflict-affected countries (UNESCO 2013). Consequently, education as a basic human right was incorporated not only into the Millennium Development Goals, but again into the more recent Sustainable Development Goals. These even included direct reference to the "promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence" (article 4.7.[4]), thus reasserting the link between education and peace

Most recently, the past decade has seen increasing international attention to supporting education in settings affected by armed conflict, state fragility and emergencies. As a result, education, like food and shelter, has come to be located at the core of human development and a necessary and vital part of the humanitarian response to conflict situations in particular (Save the Children 2010). In 2007, a Global Education Cluster was created, headed by UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance, with the purpose of coordinating the educational response in emergency situations, as part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee which is charged with the overall coordination of the UN and non-UN humanitarian partners operating in conflict zones. Networks such as the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE, since 2000) have arisen and produced guidelines for the provision of education in situations of conflict and disaster; and international NGOs such as Save the Children and Oxfam have made education for children and youth affected by conflict a key concern of their action and advocacy work. As a result, funding bodies such as the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) have recently launched targeted support to conflict-affected states with the aim of:

> *[e]nsuring that children have access to education during conflict and crises [which] protects their rights, instills a sense of normalcy, and fosters resilience, inclusion and tolerance, supporting the long-term processes of rebuilding and peace-building.*[5]

Consequently, in 2012 UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon initiated the *Global Education First Initiative* (GEFI).[6] While GEFI focused on the broader MDG and EFA goals in its push towards the establishment of the SDGs in 2015, the work of INEE and its broad membership led *inter alia* to the *Education Cannot Wait* campaign, focusing specifically on the humanitarian aspects of education in situations of

4 See https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4 , last accessed June 30, 2017.

5 Webpage GPE, http://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/countries-affected-fragility-and-conflict (last accessed April 28, 2017)

6 See http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/, last accessed September 27, 2017.

conflict and emergencies. This culminated during the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016 in the establishment of the *Education Cannot Wait Fund*. This is the most recent and visible attempt to "bridge the humanitarian-development divide" in education, and aims to support coordination and collaboration between public and private actors.[7]

In this international context, several bilateral donors have taken center stage in the funding of education-related interventions in conflict-affected regions. These investments tend to be closely tied to their development, foreign policy, and, in some instances, defense strategies. Data from the UNESCO 2011 report focusing on aid to education in conflict illustrates how this bilateral aid is increasingly being targeted to a small group of conflict-affected countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan (UNESCO 2011, p. 174), which suggests that educational aid is unevenly distributed in favor of those where international diplomatic and defense efforts are most pronounced (Shah and Lopes Cardozo, 2014), or, in contrast, only to historical "good performers of good governance" (Menashy and Dryden-Peterson, 2015).

For example, the UK government Department of International Development (DFID), according to its 2015 development strategy paper (DFID, 2015), aspires to spend 50 percent of its aid budget and 50 percent of all funds available for education in conflict-affected contexts, maintaining a commitment first formulated in 2010 (see DFID, 2010, Education Strategy Paper). Another bilateral donor, Save the Children (2009: 20), has observed that '*The Netherlands' substantial weight as one of the key education donors has given them considerable sway in influencing the shape of the international aid architecture*'. Interestingly, shifts in Dutch political priorities and a foreign policy development agenda now focused on trade have meant a radical move away from this international position. In the past, the Dutch have been recognized for considerable funding commitments, including two major grants to UNICEF[8], and for their innovation in developing new funding mechanisms to deliver aid to conflict-affected countries, which has encompassed, inter alia, their position as the largest donor to the *Fast Track Initiative* (FTI) catalytic fund, now transformed into GPE.

7 The *Education Cannot Wait Fund* has set its overall 5-year fundraising target at $3.85 billion and aims to scale up its resource mobilization over the first five years, commencing with an aim to raise approximately $150 million in the first year and with an ambition to bring funding to a level of $1.5 billion in the fifth year. Resources: http://www.educationcannotwait.org/the-fund/ and http://www.ineesite.org/en/education-cannot- wait and http://www.unicef.org/media/media_91132.html.

8 These funds from the Netherlands government to UNICEF included the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT, 2006-2010) Program, totaling 201 million US dollars, and the Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA, 2011-2016) Program, totaling 150 million US dollars.

Currently, however, Dutch political investments in education in conflict or crisis-affected contexts have been reduced. This seems to be in line with a broader tendency to scale back funding for education in contexts of crisis and conflict, exceptions like the UK left aside. Additionally, despite declarations and bilateral as well as multilateral efforts, the level of humanitarian funding allocated for education in emergencies remains relatively low, falling to 2 percent in 2014 (INEE 2017). Education therefore remains underfunded by international humanitarian actors, bilateral donors, and governments of conflict-affected states. These uneven and insufficient funding commitments clearly do not match the rhetoric found in international agreements such as the SDGs, the *Global Education First Initiative,* or *Education Cannot Wait*.

In addition, we also discern a blurring of lines between defense, diplomatic and development efforts (also known as a "3D approach") by external bilateral actors in conflict-affected regions. Following the United States, some states such as the UK and Australia have begun to see building schools and strengthening education in certain conflict zones as part of their military *counter-insurgency* strategy aimed at winning the "hearts and minds" of civilian populations. The restoration and reform of education service delivery is seen as a key component of this strategy. It is based on the assumption that widespread, highly visible education policy changes can win public support for a new political order, while, conversely, poor educational provision may be perceived as a symbol of state incompetence (Novelli, 2010; Alubisia, 2005; Lopes Cardozo and Novelli, forthcoming 2017). For example, education provision (particularly for girls and young women) became a key discursive aspect of justification for the military intervention in Afghanistan, and educational progress served as a means of demonstrating the alleged success of the occupation. Newly built schools helped to legitimate continued outside influence in the internal affairs of the Afghan state (Novelli, 2011; Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2012), yet these new schools, together with those established pre-invasion, often with the support of development aid, became collateral damage as warring parties fought against intervening foreign actors.

These new tactics have put humanitarian and reconstruction projects in and beyond Afghanistan under increasing scrutiny, as aid organizations are seen to be "working together" with occupying forces and/or warring factions. As a consequence, schools and (I)NGO-funded learning spaces have increasingly faced attacks from various (armed) actors in recent years, jeopardizing the safety both of aid workers and those learning and working inside these spaces (Novelli, 2011; Shah and Lopes Cardozo, 2014).

Liberian education during Ebola and youth volunteers for grassroots peacebuilding

A recent study of Liberia (Santos and Novelli, 2017), applying the 4Rs framework, describes how the economy has yet to recover and huge inequalities remain since the end of the civil war in 2003, with low levels of male education and employment and even lower levels for women and girls. The study describes how young Liberians

> "are often acutely aware of wealth and power inequalities, while contrasts between […] what is learned in civic education, and daily practices can trigger further disaffection. In the complexity of Liberia's post-war context, approaching education as a mere component of a pacification strategy to mitigate youth involvement in violence, risks it becoming part of an underlying narrative that simply posits youth as a threat. This risks overlooking young people's legitimate concerns and aspirations, which may also be fuelled by internationally-led aid projects. For example, manifestations of urban bias and privileging the interests of an urban elite contribute to the alienation of rural youth and add incentives for rural-urban migration." (Santos and Novelli. 2017: 7)

The education system is under-prioritized and ridden with inequalities, including a lack of *redistribution* of access to and resources within education, especially for girls and young people from ethnically marginalized backgrounds and/or geographically remote areas. The communities most affected in this way are reported to feel subject to mis*recognition* and discrimination and to have little faith – or *representation* - in the decisions that affect them, from school management to national government. According to the authors (Ibid: 7), this failure to address the multiple dimensions of inequality in the education system is a result of an over-emphasis on the part of the national and international peacebuilding community, on security, democratic elections, and economic reforms at the expense of quality basic health and education services:

> "When the Ebola outbreak emerged, the health system was woefully inadequate to address the challenges that the disease brought. Similarly, the education system, which could have acted as a national preventative factor in combatting the outbreak, became instead a risk factor, with poor hygiene and sanitation and lack of preparedness."

As a response, bottom-up community processes emerged during the Ebola crisis and functioned as key catalysts for redressing the effects of the outbreak, with a central role for the young people connected to the National and Junior Volunteers. "Drawing upon youth as a resource for the future, rather than a security risk – as is so often the case in many post-conflict societies - the National and Junior Volunteers seemed to have played a really important role in raising awareness about the disease, providing community guidance and building trust between communities and the state." (Ibid, 16-18)

Santos and Novelli conclude by recommending that the government of Liberia

> "needs to take a stronger ownership of the education of its population. Among the policies the Government of Liberia needs to take a lead and invest in is the provision of long term training for teachers and the establishment of a recruitment process that enables the entrance to the MoE's teaching staff of those that, enrolled as National Volunteers in education, show motivation and quality work. […] The education system, through curriculum, formal and informal teaching spaces[,] needs to provide better health information, not just on Ebola but on other diseases."

Finally, Liberia's governance system is characterized by a history of highly centralized government control of the education system, with decision-making power concentrated in the hands of a few (Shah and Lopes Cardozo, 2014). According to UNESCO, this remains "the core of political, economic, social and environmental fragility [in the country], both in the past and in the present" (UNESCO-IIEP, 2011: 44). Santos and Novelli (2017) suggest that, rather than a fully centralized system, reforms should strengthen decentralization, yet establish or maintain well-coordinated and unbroken lines of communication between all levels. At the same time, Liberia's recent reform plans to privatize Liberia's education system have met with strong criticism (Archer, 2016), and future research will need to look carefully at the implications of such a reform process for young people along the various 4R dimensions of inequalities.

4.2 Education under attack – schools as sites of contention, combat and resistance

Educational institutions cannot be seen as a neutral ground existing outside of the dynamics and tensions of social conflict. Indeed, the converse is true; control over the education system, including curricula, student access, and teacher selection, may

all become contentious issues in times of conflict. This section discusses these issues related to schools under attack and schools as factors of protection, with recourse to the Protection Pillar in SCR 2250.

In the last decades, and particularly after the end of the Cold War, the number of intra-state armed conflicts has greatly increased and fighting has taken place against and among civilians rather than between national armies. Increasingly, factors such as collective identities, religion, and ethnicity have become a driving force for deep societal divisions and armed conflicts, often exacerbated by the unequal distribution of resources. “New wars” have emerged, where organized violence becomes a relatively stable aspect of social life (Kaldor 2012, 2013; Berdal 2003). In “new” and “old” wars alike, it is important for political elites to gain support in their efforts to control/reduce organized violence. Once societal conflicts escalate to fully-fledged wars, and particularly when issues of collective identity are at stake, there is a high risk that education itself may come under attack. As a result, schools, universities, and other educational institutions can become not only “the battlegrounds for the hearts and minds of the next generation” (Chung, 1999, p. 1), but also real targets of armed attacks.

Increasingly, children’s schooling in times of insecurity and conflict is being severely affected by different types of attack on education (O’Malley, 2010). These vary along multiple dimensions, such as frequency, targeting, repertoire, and purpose (Carapic and Dönges, 2016). They can include systematic targeting of “Western-style“ education, as in the case of the Nigerian armed group Boko Haram, the Afghan and Pakistani Taliban and Al Shabaab; direct attacks on individual students and teachers such as that on 2014 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Malala Yousafzai in Pakistan; the destruction of school buildings; or the strategic use of school premises by warring parties. In the Syrian conflict, 18% of the schools had been damaged, destroyed or occupied for purposes other than education (Save the Children, 2014). It is arguably difficult to seek trends in attacks on education worldwide, given that the scale, available data on attacks and contextual triggers are so diverse and almost impossible to compare. Nevertheless, a Save the Children report based on UN data has shown an exponential growth in reported attacks in recent years (Martinez 2013). This report calls on world leaders, governments, the UN and aid donors to prioritize the protection of education by criminalizing attacks on education, prohibiting the use of schools by armed groups, and cooperating with local communities and local authorities to safeguard schools as *Zones of Peace*.

The *Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack* (GCPEA) was established in 2010 by UNICEF, UNESCO and a number of international Non-Governmental

Organizations (INGOs) "to address the problem of targeted attacks on education during armed conflict." Among their initiatives was the preparation of *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use During Armed Conflict* developed through stakeholder workshops and released in 2014.[9] This was the nucleus around which the 2015 *Safe Schools Declaration* was build,[10] put forward for international consideration by the governments of Norway and Argentina, and to date endorsed by 69 states.

Simultaneously, communities often place high value on education in conflict-affected settings and perceive it as one of the few protective factors in situations of insecurity or instability (Smith and Vaux, 2003; Smith, 2005; Winthrop and Kirk, 2008; UNESCO, 2011; Winthrop, 2011; Novelli and Smith, 2011; Save the Children, 2013; Talbot, 2013). Education, both formal and non-formal, has been recognized as a potential preventive tool against recruitment to the military, abduction and gender-based violence (Nicolai and Triplehorn, 2003). A specific way in which educational institutions can help protect the well-being of children and youth is by becoming attentive to their socio-emotional needs, thus increasing their resilience in the face of adversity and the uncertainties of armed conflict (Wiedemann and Dybdal, 2012; Diaz Varela et al. 2013). UNICEF has been working for quite some time on establishing "child-friendly spaces", for instance in refugee camps, and "child-friendly schools", to "create a safe environment for psychological and emotional healing. By reestablishing a daily routine and helping to restore a sense of normalcy, the objective is for schools to become therapeutic spaces in the midst of destruction" (UNICEF 2015). Enhancing the protective function of educational institutions, however, remains a challenging political and pedagogical task (Nordtveit, 2016).

4.3 The relationship between education, violence and social inequality

Bush and Saltarelli's (2000) pioneering report, *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict,* has suggested that re-establishing educational provision after an armed conflict is insufficient for the restoration of peace: as seen in section 4.1 above, education itself can contribute to conflict depending on who is governing education policies and who is chosen to administer and implement them. Yet peace can mean different things to different people, and rather than conceiving of it as mere pacification or the suppression of societal tensions, we refer to what Galtung (1969) calls *positive peace*, which moves beyond mere 'negative peace', or the absence of

[9] See: http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_en.pdf (last accessed: 13.10.2017)

[10] See: http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/safe_schools_declaration-final.pdf (last accessed: 13.10.2017).

direct violence, and includes the presence of conditions of social justice whose purpose and effect is to address the root causes of violence.

Education by itself cannot be the sole panacea for conflict transformation and, paradoxically, particular dimensions of the education system or its location within the post-conflict cultural political economy may cause more harm than good (Shah and Lopes Cardozo, 2014), as the example of school-based management above (section 4.1) has illustrated.

A further illustration of this 'negative face of education' arises when we look at education in relation to direct and indirect forms of violence. Direct violence occurs where schools become ideological battlegrounds for control in conflict-affected states and in instances of physical harm (examples might be attacks on teachers or physical punishment of students, as in section 4.2). Indirect violence, or cultural forms of violence, occurs when social injustice and inequality are perpetuated and legitimized in discriminatory or (culturally, linguistically, politically) biased schooling practices, giving rise to social exclusion and sowing the seeds for possible further conflict (Salmi, 2000, in Seitz 2004).

Structural violence can be reproduced within exclusionary education systems which restrict meaningful access to privileged groups in society. In several contexts, such as Rwanda, Liberia, Kosovo, and Sierra Leone, research has shown that a lack of equitable access to schooling amongst the civilian population served as a grievance among warring parties and helped fuel armed conflict (Dupuy, 2008). There is evidence that enhancing tertiary education in the aftermath of violent conflict may contribute to reducing the likelihood of societies relapsing into violence (Ishiyama and Breuning, 2012). Governance mechanisms for sustainable peacebuilding could therefore, during or even before reconstruction phases, start to consider how opportunity and access might be reallocated more equitably in the post-conflict phase. Doing so requires careful consideration of the barriers that have traditionally disadvantaged particular groups and their access to schooling.

If we apply UN Special Rapporteur Tomaševski's (2003) definition of the right to education — based on the principle that education must be *available, accessible, acceptable,* and *adaptable* to all — we must count millions of young people as effectively excluded from schooling in conflict-affected societies. There are several factors behind this situation. National governments have failed to adequately protect education systems, including students and teachers, from attack and insecurity (see section 4.2). This can result in substantial reductions in the skilled teacher workforce as many qualified teachers leave their positions out of concern for their personal safety (Save the Children, 2013). Additionally, relatively low levels of

funding continue to be allocated for education in emergency situations (see section 4.1), which contrasts with the uncomfortable reality of increasing humanitarian crises around the globe.

These insights resonate with recent empirical findings from a multi-country study conducted with and among young people in Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, and Uganda (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016). The painful conclusion was that most of their experiences with formal schooling were unsatisfactory, if not blatantly frustrating and irrelevant. Following this line of thinking, we argue here how failure to meet the potential and promise of quality and meaningful education for everyone will likely exacerbate rather than reduce long-standing inequalities in societies around the world. In this light, we will now discuss the proposals made by current research regarding ways to transform the largely failing systems of power over, through and in education.

5 Insights from research: Enhancing the transformative potential of education to support peacebuilding

Peacebuilding scholarship and operational practice tend to either sideline education or treat it as an issue of service delivery alongside other public services, such as policing and health care. We will take a different approach in our analysis. Based on the 4Rs framework, we will examine direct and indirect peacebuilding opportunities through education governance, policy, and practice to address drivers of inequality and violence. Our focal question here is: *How can we make sure education reaches its transformative potential to support the role of youth in peacebuilding?*

Applying a 4Rs lens, interventions aimed at strengthening the "positive face" of education would logically counter many of the failures discussed in section 4. First and foremost, this would entail equitable access to schooling facilities, *redistributing* educational budgets to ensure that targeted resources are directed toward marginalized students. Safe and secure access should be seen as a key resource for the protection of students and teachers from attack and for ensuring that school premises are free of gender-based violence and discrimination. These goals relate to pillar I (participation) and pillar II (protection) in SCR 2250.

Ensuring *recognition* of the diversity of learners and their needs is necessary in order to counteract exclusive curricula, in which, for instance, the language or languages of instruction effectively exclude particular linguistic (and often minority) groups, or lead to further segregation within a society. Sri Lanka's education system is a clear example of the prioritization of a single, exclusionary narrative focused around the

majority, Sinhalese, version of history (Davies 2011; Lopes Cardozo 2008, Lopes Cardozo and Hoeks 2014, Duncan and Lopes Cardozo 2017). There are promising examples of work specifically targeted at language inclusion with the goal of increasing social cohesion (Lo Bianco 2017). This dimension relates to issues addressed in pillars I (participation), III (prevention) and IV (partnership).

Educational governance and political *representation* should ideally be promoted through ethnic-, linguistic- and gender-balanced representation at multiple levels of educational governance, and include both students' and teachers' voices. Again, this dimension relates to issues addressed in pillars I (participation), III (prevention) and IV (partnership). The 'three Rs' of *redistribution, recognition* and *representation* allow us to uncover and consequently address root drivers of inequality and violence. The fourth 'R', *reconciliation,* points to ways in which schooling systems and content can heal broken trust and start to redress past and present grievances, creating transformation and an alternative pathway to a more sustainable and peaceful future.

This section elaborates on these dimensions by focusing on a number of thematic areas that offer closer insights into the transformative potential of education for peacebuilding: reforms of formal education called for by young people (5.1); the potential and challenges of non-formal learning spaces (5.2); vocational education and youth (un-)employment (5.3); preventing violent extremism and radicalization (5.4); the teaching of history and dealing with the past (5.5); and education for refugee youth (5.6). As we shall see, most of these issue areas relate to one or several SCR 2250 pillars.

5.1 Reforms in the formal education system as called for by young people

The formal schooling space, as a site of state-citizen contact, can in some cases leave an entire generation with a sense of distrust and lack of perspective. Formal systems of schooling in cases such as South Sudan, Kenya, Uganda, Pakistan, South Africa and Myanmar largely fail to match up to the promise of serving and supporting a better future for *all*, as findings from the work of the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding applying the 4Rs framework have shown (Smith, Datzberger and McCully, 2016; Sayed and Novelli, 2016; Lopes Cardozo, Higgins and Le Mat, 2016). These studies point to a lack of focus on issues of *recognition* and on the *reconciliatory* potential of education. Investments in education are often tied to economic strategies increasing the potential of youth as human capital in a narrow economic sense rather than building social cohesion and reconciliation through a more holistic approach to formal and non-formal education. This mismatch can be perceived as a tragic paradox and, from the students' point of view, support the

claims made in section 4 that education in many situations fails to live up to its social justice potential.

A four-country synthesis report on youth agency for peacebuilding produced by the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding (Lopes Cardozo, Higgins and Le Mat, 2016) shows, on the one hand, that in these societies young people have high expectations of how education could and should positively impact their lives across multiple dimensions of their personal agency (economically, politically and socio-culturally). On the other hand, it points to the ways in which the systematic or effective exclusion of marginalized groups of young women and men from secondary education, as well as serious weaknesses in curricular pedagogical approaches, undermine the potential of education to contribute to empowerment. Moreover, the resulting disillusion and disaffection noted by the research teams intersectionally cuts across class, gender and ethnic differences. Educated middle-class male urban youth are just as likely to show dissatisfaction – albeit of a different nature – with their educational experience, as are poorer and more marginalized groups. In addition to the socio-economic explanations put forward to account for low participation rates, the voices of young people who participated in the four country cases revealed strong opinions about the largely irrelevant content and learning experiences offered within formal education. Table 5 below summarizes their perceptions on the failures of formal education to equip them to participate in and become beneficiaries of key peacebuilding processes. Although the chart distinguishes between views on *Redistribution, Recognition, Representation and Reconciliation,* we should keep in mind that these areas may overlap in reality, as visualized by the dotted lines.

Table 5: Youth's Critical Views on Formal Education

Redistribution	Recognition	Representation	Reconciliation
• Inadequate provision of vocational education linked to job opportunities within uncertain/ changing economies • Inattention to employment related skills and knowledges • Inattention to career advice	• Suppression of cultures and identities of minorities within exclusionary formal curricula creates grievance/frustration • Failure to recognise needs of disabled/ ethnic minority/LGBT youth • Highly gendered curricula content marginalises experiences/needs of female students • Inattention to youth needs in relation to physical, mental and reproductive sexual health • Dominance of rote learning to meet out-dated assessment systems undermines attention to relevant skills development	• Lack of attention to developing critical thinking • Exclusion of youth from decision-making processes within (and beyond) the education sector • Lack of context-specific civic and political literacy education	• Militarised content may legitimise violence • Inattention to conflict resolution skills • Inattention to supporting youth in navigating social relationships across generational divides • Lack of mother tongue instruction perceived as discriminatory for ethnic minority youth • Inattention to the integrated nature of youth needs linking political/economic/ cultural and social dimensions

Source: Lopes Cardozo, Higgins and Le Mat (2016: 57) Synthesis Report

The above table draws attention to the lack of relevance of formal curricula for young people's daily realities, challenges and hopes. In some contexts, young people pointed out that education was a hindrance rather than a help in securing employment, with vocational education initiatives leading to joblessness and despair – and thus possibly acting in the long-term as new drivers of conflict. Negative experiences with curricular content were also linked to a critique of pedagogical practices perceived to undermine and suppress their agency. Many young people highlighted the dominance of rote learning methods within authoritarian instructional techniques that prevented them from asking questions and developing opinions. In addition, an exam-dominated approach to learning, and relationships with teachers characterized by fear and corporal punishment, were generally perceived as alienating and frustrating (Lopes Cardozo et al. 2016).

A large number of the youth-led peacebuilding organizations that participated in a Global Survey on the SCR2250, expressed a hope for the inclusion of peace education, or education for a culture of peace, in national curricula around the world.[11] According to these young people, this would be one of the most desired

[11] This survey was conducted as part of the Progress Study on SCR2250 on Youth, Peace and Security, more info: https://www.youth4peace.info.

outcomes related to UNSCR 2250. Further, young respondents to the survey called on national governments to partner with them via formal structures and systems.

A review of recent literature and empirical case studies further exemplifies how young people are demanding more context-specific, needs-based and holistic approaches to education provision (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2015; 2016). A study among Syrian students who fled to Turkey highlights the alienating effects of the Syrian "hidden curriculum" (Bali, 2015), referring to the indirect consequences of negative stereotypes and prejudice not written explicitly in educational material, but expressed, for instance, through classroom interactions. Building on the work of Freire (1985, 1996) the study concludes that an educational approach seeking to foster respect and mutuality over fear and mistrust needs to start from the reality of students' lives and their direct experience of injustice and oppression.

Similar reflections have taken place on the (mis)use of formal history curricula in Pakistan and Myanmar (Higgins et al, 2016; Durrani et al, 2016) and Sri Lanka (Duncan and Lopes Cardozo, 2017), where exclusionary single-narrative curricula – and teacher education practices - provide little space for critical historiographical reflection by teachers or students. This limits the potential for reconciliation through education. In order to offer context-relevant curricular content, reforms would require a locally embedded needs analysis and critical pedagogical approaches in order to address mismatches between curricular content and local realities and needs (Bentrovato, Korostelina & Schulze 2016; Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016).

In relation to the disappointment of young women and men with rote learning and other outdated teaching practices in, for instance, Pakistan and Myanmar (Higgins et al, 2016; Durrani et al, 2016), reforms should focus on implementing more diverse and transformative pedagogies, which could enhance young people's agency and ability to undertake a critical assessment of social inequalities. An illustrative example comes from South Africa, where a multi-actor teacher training intervention called *Facing the Past* has made progress in terms of teachers' understanding of prejudices, the impact that apartheid had on them as individuals, and how this influences the way they teach history. The training was also reported to enhance the adoption of learner-centered pedagogies (Tibbits, 2006, in Sayed et al, 2016), yet its scope was not extended to regions of South Africa (Weldon, 2010, in Sayed et al, 2016). While this exemplifies that such innovative training interventions can provide a transformative potential, their impact often remains limited. The extent to which alternative pedagogical approaches can be sustainably implemented depends on the openness of teachers' work environments.

Considering this rather alarming picture painted by examples of young people's negative experiences with formal education, the next section looks into the role of

other, alternative and non-formal (and non state-led) educational initiatives.

Recommendations for reforms to formal education:

- Conduct a systematic revision of national curriculum content in conjunction with governments, ministries of education, teachers, student representatives, unions and other (local and international) stakeholders;
- Ensure equal resources for female and male learners and teachers to support safe and sustainable learning environments;
- Improve connections between education and the labor market;
- Apply more diverse and critical pedagogies to the teaching of history and social studies (politics, citizenship education, life skills, geography, etc.);
- Develop inclusive language-of-instruction policies that allow for diverse identities and learning needs;
- Prioritize gender-responsive approaches in order to enhance equal educational and /career opportunities for male and female students and teachers, and gender-transformative approaches in order to enhance the relevance and /appropriateness of educational content.

5.2 Potential and challenges of non-formal learning spaces for youth peacebuilding agency

Non-formal education (NFE) is provided by agencies other than the state, such as local and international non-governmental, civil society or community-led projects, and offers educational opportunities not tied to traditional schooling curricula. NFE often specifically aims to serve recipients who have not been integrated into formal schooling. Target groups are usually youth and young adults, as well as disadvantaged or marginalized groups with limited access to formal schooling, such as rural or remote populations, indigenous groups, and marginalized women. NFE programs are often developed with specific attention to the needs, motivation and existing knowledge of participants, following pedagogical principles of adult education (Marques and Freitas, 2017).

NFE can fulfill different roles from those filled by formal education (Rogers, 2005, p. 155):

- a *complementary role:* offering new educational opportunities to young people and adults who missed out on formal education during childhood, with easier access and more flexible curricula;
- a *supplementary role:* offering the opportunity for people to familiarize themselves with additional topics and teaching methods alongside those communicated in formal education; this frequently takes place through activities such as sports, music, arts, and media, all of which can play an important role with respect to

peacebuilding (see also Lopes Cardozo et al., 2015).
- an *alternative role*: providing a space for producing and sharing alternative discourses challenging "official" education with respect to identity, history, political realities, and visions for the future. This is particularly the case where the political and societal context do not allow for an open expression of dissent.

Many non-formal education projects in contexts of violence, injustice and oppression tackle the issue of conflict transformation and peacebuilding directly (Schmelzle, 2006). They are predicated on the assumption that conflict is a ubiquitous social phenomenon and that it can (and should) be addressed in ways that promote mutual understanding and positive societal transformation (Harris and Morrison, 2013, p. 32). This type of learning uses insights from adult education, experiential education and social psychology (Rivers and Scotto, 2007).

A substantial number of programs supporting peace in war-torn countries have a training component specifically related to work with youth and adults. Some of these programs are explicitly rooted in the tradition of nonviolent action and civil resistance (Mischnick, 2007). Participants in these types of courses are usually either people engaged in peace work in conflict-affected regions, or people working in an environment of violent conflict, including staff of national and international organizations, donors, and other agencies (Schmelzle, 2006). In recent years, a wealth of training materials and handbooks on peace training, nonviolent action, constructive conflict transformation, and related areas have been produced by international agencies (for example Charbonnier and Oliva, 2016), INGOs (Conflict Sensitivity Consortium, 2012), global activist networks (Galtung, 2000; Hunter and Lakey, 2003), faith-based organizations (Neufeldt et al., 2002; Moore, 2014) and very often by local organizations active in the field (for example, Echeverri Vásquez, s.d.; Vukosavljevic, 2007; Vukosavljević, 2000). In some cases, this work focuses specifically on one aspect, such as gender in peacebuilding (see, for instance, Schirch, 2004). While this plethora of publications might suggest a busy field of work, little systematic evaluation has been performed on this type of non-formal education until now.

Building on knowledge and insights from local actors and cultures is a widely-held principle which has served as a basis for approaches to training and peacebuilding aimed at supporting local agency and cultures of peace ("elicitive" approaches: see Lederach, 1996). However, many educational projects still struggle to follow this principle, as the section on formal schooling in this report has pointed out. Youth organizations often use channels of non-formal education, and internet and communication technology play increasing roles in building local, national and

supranational networks of youth activism and peer-to-peer training. These can include activities such as inter-faith, interreligious and interethnic dialogue, social cohesion activities, training and capacity building with a view to conflict resolution, peer education on UNSCR 2250 and SDGs, training for leadership and income-generating skills (UNOY Peacebuilders and SFCG, 2017, p. 28), and arts, sports, and media education activities. For example, a respondent in a global survey of youth-led organizations (UNOY Peacebuilders and SFCG, 2017:8) reported:

> "*every year, [the organisation] organised a Regional Training of Trainers (ToT) on Peace and Merit camp for about 100 participants from across [the] East African region. Here we explore and share strategies for conflict management and resolution, promote cross cultural exchange, empower youth with entrepreneurial skills and share experiences"* (respondent in Bujumbura, Burundi).

In the last few years, the Internet and social networks have emerged as a major space in which youth socializes, seeks information and leisure, and builds networks of material and spiritual support. The Internet and social media have generally been recognized as key resources for peacebuilding (Larrauri & Kahl, 2013). The role of **social media** is important not just because it spreads negative messages, but also because young people are using this for positive ends. An interesting example is the social messaging tool U-Report. It allows anyone from anywhere in the world to respond to polls, report issues, and work as positive agents. It represents a low-cost method of activating and networking youth (Davies 2014). While technology has been used to extend outreach to young people in order to promote peacebuilding education in the context of (mostly non-formal) education, and ICT has a relevant potential to reach youth in rural areas of conflict-affected countries, unequal access to good quality connections or devices, or stable electricity supplies for that matter, remain serious issues of concern.

A recent review of the relevant literature on NFE, including art groups, sports clubs, NGO-led training courses and so forth has shown that they often enable only small and exclusive numbers of young people to access and benefit from them. Nevertheless, especially those non-formal training courses and learning spaces that were youth-led or have recognized and built upon existing youth initiatives, were considered particularly effective (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2015).

Empirical findings from a four-country study illustrate that a lack of human and financial resources, as well as a lack of political will to empower youth, was a notable structural challenge at the macro-level in Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and

Uganda. At the meso- and micro-levels, the findings pointed to the importance of community support for interventions if they are to result in more sustainable impacts. The data also showed the need for psychosocial approaches focusing on young people's mental and emotional health at the inter- and intra-personal levels (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016).

A thorough awareness of and engagement with adolescents' and young people's developing political/civic/societal beliefs and worldviews is therefore a crucial aspect of holistic education that supports peacebuilding. This links to *recognition* through processes of identity formation and the building of self-esteem, to *representation* via meaningfully experienced participation in peacebuilding processes, and to *reconciliation* by supporting trust (when appropriate) and supporting mechanisms to address grievances and frustrations (Ibid). It is crucial to note here that certain terminology, and approaches to fostering transformative youth agency, might not be acceptable for state institutions and policy-developers. Depending on the socio-political context, a Ministry of Education might be more open to reforming a system that supports positive civic youth engagement, while such terminology as critical thinking or political agency might be seen as connected to (politically) undesirable forms of dissent.

The importance of avoiding the romanticization of non-formal education and potentially concomitant neglect of investment in formal schooling

In Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda, NFE interventions that addressed the community-rooted realities and priorities of youth were able to draw on greater flexibility and openness to change in their operational strategies than were nationally driven macro-level formal education systems. Nevertheless, comparing these reflections of a mostly negative image of formal education versus a simplistically promising picture of non-formal initiatives creates the danger of disregarding the importance and potential of a reformed/transformed public formal education system that would ideally serve all youth constituencies equally (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016). **Our argument here should therefore *not* be read as a rejection of formal or preference for non-formal forms of education, but rather as an observation of the relative flexibility and transformability of non-formal interventions, which can potentially operate in more direct contact with societies and communities.** It also points to an awareness that reforms to education systems are anything but an overnight exercise, and should accordingly by planned and budgeted for, and linked up with significant long-term political commitments. Lessons and content from non-formal ventures may feed into renewal of formal education, e.g. textbooks.

Recommendations for non-formal peacebuilding education delivered by international agencies, INGOs and donors:

- ❖ embed peacebuilding goals into education and training planning and programming in line with wider societal transformation objectives and actors;
- ❖ review context-relevant past and present experiences with peacebuilding education and build on youth initiative;
- ❖ engage and elicit local resources and knowledge for peacebuilding, particularly among young people;
- ❖ provide open access to relevant materials (baseline analyses, manuals, background texts);
- ❖ ensure systematic evaluation of short- and medium-term outcomes, without enforcing unnecessarily bureaucratic time investments;
- ❖ stimulate meaningful leverage, advocacy, and support for peacebuilding into formal sector reform to accompany innovations in the non-formal sector.

5.3 Vocational training: youth employment and peace

Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) comprises formal and non-formal forms of learning, delivered across a wide range of institutional and work settings, whose primary purpose is to help individuals enter the world of work by developing their knowledge and skills at varying levels of complexity. These mostly economically oriented interventions are at the heart of (international) development assistance directed towards youth (Mercy Corps, 2015). Arguably, TVET plays an important role for young people everywhere, as it lays the foundations for successful access to the labor market. It is perhaps all the more vital in societies recovering from violent conflict, where jobs and a decent livelihood become a critical but daunting challenge for all (Date-Bah, 2003). Youth respondents to the YPS Survey expressed the need for educational content that is relevant for entering the labor markets relevant to them, and proudly cited examples of successful (youth-led) training, including the following:

> **Anecdote from a YPS Survey respondent on facilitating employment**
>
> *"Karima[12] continues to be a police officer after the completion of her apprenticeship provided by [the organisation]. Her apprenticeship has been instrumental in increasing her skills and uplifting her financial status. She states, '[the organisation]'s initiative changed my life. I would have never returned to this field if the initial support in my professional development had not been there. Apprenticeship, capacity building and exposure served as an effective launching pad for my professional career and I am back to serving society as a woman police officer'"* (Kabul, Konar, Jawazjan, Afghanistan).

12 Anecdotes cited under aliases in the YPS Survey report (Thapa, 2017: 42).

In situations where direct and structural violence represent a concrete reality, the field of TVET becomes key for several reasons: it can facilitate access to the job market, it can act as a tool for defusing social tensions and ensuring a degree of redistribution, and it is important from the point of view of **prevention**. In this respect, management of expectations is crucial, as a lack of work opportunities following vocational training interventions or limited participation in decision-making processes following political awareness training may exacerbate youth frustrations, thereby driving rather than mitigating conflict and alienation (Lopes Cardozo et al, 2016; Mercy Corps 2015).

Vocational education becomes even more important in periods of transition from war to peace, when it is necessary to provide for **disengagement** and new livelihood perspectives for former combatants, usually young men, yet also young women, often with little prior education or vocational skills. It has long been recognized that participation in armed groups and the possession of firearms has an economic aspect alongside its other dimensions (Ballentine & Nitzschke, 2005; Ballentine & Sherman, 2003). Disarmament and demobilization therefore need to be accompanied by reintegration into civilian economic life and the dismantling of war economies (Pouligny, 2004; Spear, 2006), not least for former members of irregular armed forces, militias, and guerrilla movements. The provision of vocational training in rehabilitation programs for extremist offenders has been suggested as good practice for the prevention of violent extremism (Global Counterterrorism Forum, 2017). Nevertheless, emerging insights from research point to the need to carefully assess the rationales behind and the (sometimes unintended) outcomes of targeted interventions to counter violent extremism (Novelli, 2017 forthcoming, see also section 5.4 below).

Disarmament, disengagement and reintegration (DDR) have over time become a standard component of almost every peace process (Dudouet, Gießmann, and Planta, 2012; Berdal and Ucko, 2013; Krause, 2016). Usually, however, most attention and resources are devoted to the technical aspects of disarmament and the demobilization of fighters, with only marginal attention to their reintegration into economic and societal life, including TVET. Here, the ***paradox of unmet aspiration*** we refer to above with respect to formal education makes a reappearance in relation to vocational training. Young former combatants and particularly those who have suffered most, such as children formerly associated with armed forces ("child soldiers"), often express their desire to resume education and receive training so that they might re-enter civilian life; meanwhile, educational and training programs usually focus on disengagement and do not provide for long-term

support (Guven, Kapit-Spitalny, and Burde, 2015).

Different conflict-affected groups may also benefit from vocational training and support toward entry into the civil economy. Besides former combatants, returning refugees, displaced persons, and young people should also ideally be granted access to support when required. In this respect, it is necessary to find a delicate balance between support for demobilized former combatants who could pose a threat to stabilization and for other potential groups of recipients. Focusing on supporting communities rather than offering individual advantages has been successful in avoiding "positive discrimination" towards and the "rewarding" of former combatants (Dudouet, Gießmann, and Planta, 2012).

A number of additional elements have the potential to facilitate the success of vocational training programs for former combatants in post-conflict settings: previous labor market analysis, provision of appropriate vocational guidance, support after the training has ended, and social acceptance of participants (for Rwanda: Finn, Baxter, and Onur, 2014). There are also important differences between reintegration in urban and rural settings: in the latter, prospective farmers need access to land and specific support in initiating agricultural production (Özerdem and Podder, 2015).

Vocational training itself can directly encourage peacebuilding by bringing together youth across conflict divides, building on their similar experiences of violence in the past and focusing on their plans and dreams for the future. A number of initiatives have linked vocational training, local economic development and peacebuilding (Bosnia-Herzegovina: Fischer, 2006; Maebuta, 2011). The International Labor Organization and UNDP are among the main agencies supporting vocational training as a tool for prevention, disengagement and peacebuilding (Date-Bah, 2003). In Myanmar, the *Empowering Youth for Peacebuilding* program, led by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), encompassed project management skills, health/HIV awareness, conflict management, and leadership and communication skills, delivered to rural youth over a period of 12 months. This comprehensive approach reflected the project's aims to respond to context-specific and community-rooted priorities across personal, socio-cultural and economic dimensions of young people's daily realities. The program recognized and responded to a range of peacebuilding dynamics and challenges, with some participants living in more ethnically and religiously homogeneous areas than others, and some in closer geographical proximity than others to meetings in which peace negotiation processes took place. Reflecting this multifaceted strategy, one manager noted that "we've found that an effective programme integrates lots of different things

together to offer young people" (Higgins et al, 2016: 70). Such holistic approaches to education tend to involve engagement with more than one, if not all, of the 4Rs of sustainable peacebuilding.

Finally, while acknowledging the potential meaningful contribution of vocational training for youth to peacebuilding efforts as discussed above, it is important to note that the SCR2250, and many similar short-term external interventions, have a rather narrow view of these economic development approaches. Vocational training alone does not provide a quick fix to building peace sustainably. Rather, when TVET interventions are not designed in a context-aware, historically grounded and participatory manner, there is a chance that they might do more harm than good by feeding into unmet expectations or reproducing existing injustices and inequalities. A 2015 report by Mercy Corps on a study with young people in Afghanistan, Colombia and Somalia speaks against a widely held, yet false, assumption that "idle young people, lacking licit opportunities to make a living, are a ready pool of recruits for armed movements". Rather, this report argues, young people's experiences of injustice (e.g. discrimination, corruption, abuse by security forces) form the principal drivers for engagement in political violence: "young people take up the gun not because they are poor, but because they are angry" (Mercy Corps, 2015: 1-2; see also Slachmuijlder, 2017). Hence, and as argued throughout this paper, a more holistic approach that views education reform and intervention as part of a transformative, sustainable (4Rs-inspired) peacebuilding approach would require TVET and civic engagement programs to be coupled with transformative governance reforms.

Recommendations for TVET:

- Initiate meaningful vocational and technical education for young people living in contexts of armed conflict, and particularly focused at attempts to disengage youth from systems of violence and armed conflict, recognizing this needs to be accompanied by structural reforms that address inequalities;
- take into account the characteristics of local labor markets and communities;
- provide advice and support, access to labor markets and the relevant economic sectors after training has been completed, and manage expectations well from the start of a training;
- focus on socio-cultural and economic community needs in supporting at-risk youth, targeting collectives rather than individuals to avoid stigmatization;
- In contrast to a narrow quick-fix and isolated approach to TVET as a single solution to address "idle and frustrated youth", a more holistic approach that views education reform and interventions as part of a transformative, sustainable (4Rs inspired) peacebuilding approach would require TVET and civic engagement programs to be coupled with transformative governance reforms.

5.4 The complex roles of education in preventing forms of violent extremism and "radicalization"

UNSCR 2250 directly addresses the need to prevent violent extremism among youth in Pillar IV (**partnership**). According to the definition adopted by *Search for Common Ground*, violent extremism can be understood as "the choice individuals make to use or support violence to advance a cause based on exclusionary group identities. The particular identity of the perpetrator of violence does not determine what constitutes violent extremism, nor does the nature of the ideology ... Rather, violent extremism relates to an individual or group's violent advancement of an exclusionary ideology, which seeks to eliminate the 'other' group, culture, or identity" (Slachmuijlder 2017, 4).

For the education sector specifically, addressing violent extremism becomes particularly important in order to prevent or lessen the likelihood of future violent attacks targeting learners, educators, education facilities, and societies at large (see section 4.2 in this document). Conversely, as we shall see below, it is necessary to reflect on a possible instrumentalization of education in the framework of surveillance and military counterterrorism strategies.

Before addressing educational responses to violent extremism in more detail, it is crucial to warn about the danger of (mis)using terms for those engaged in work related to CVE: in the words of SFCG *Peacebuilder's Guide* "The adage that one group's "terrorists" are another group's "freedom fighters" is especially true in the CVE space" (Slachmuijlder 2017, 41-42). We therefore follow the advice provided in the *Peacebuilder's Guide* to strive for the acknowledgement of complexity of social conflicts, ideological diversity, and political pluralism. We understand that extremist thought and action can exist in all ideological spaces, and is often closely connected to hegemonic or counter-hegemonic political ideologies.

The issue of preventing violent extremism has gained widespread international attention in the last few years. In January 2016 the UN Secretary General presented to the UN General Assembly a *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism* (PVE) (A/70/674, 2015), offering UN member states a detailed set of suggestions for action.[13] At the same time, awareness is growing that there is a need to better understand violent extremism, its drivers and mechanisms, in order to work towards its prevention and transformation. A common distinction in literature dealing with violent extremism is between "push" factors, such as grievances and experience of marginalization and social injustice, and "pull" factors, related to the ability of extremist groups to widen their influence in society and attract more individuals (Borum 2011; Holmes 2017; Slachmuijlder, 2017). In other words, it can be useful to

[13] Source : https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/en/plan-action-prevent-violent-extremism

distinguish between structural factors on the one hand, and strategies and patterns of interaction used by extremist groups on the other.

Education has been identified by several agencies both as an important factor in preventing the spread of violent extremist discourses as well as a major structural factor in producing inequalities that push young people towards violent extremism (see e.g. on Syria: Aubrey et al. 2016). The *Plan of Action* identifies youth as a key social group to counter and prevent violent extremism. It also defines education as one essential area to take action and states:

> "Education should include teaching respect for human rights and diversity, fostering critical thinking, promoting media and digital literacy, and developing the behavioural and socioemotional skills that can contribute to peaceful coexistence and tolerance" (A/70/674, par. 54).

Nevertheless, there is still limited analysis in the CVE literature of the crucial position education takes in the lives of young people, whether due to its absence or limited and low-quality availability, or to its possible transformative and preventive potential, which is what this section aims to explore.

Different types of educational responses to the challenges of violent extremism have been proposed. First, socio-emotional learning (SEL) skills are often considered fundamental to ending cycles of violence:

> "SEL skills are often identified as the core competencies in programs intended to build social cohesion before, during, and after crisis and conflict. (…). For communities that are (…) dealing with violence, prioritizing SEL can help to build stronger, more socially cohesive groups that can pave the way for ending the cycle of violence" (Alves 2016, p. 14).

A second, often related, dimension is education for global citizenship, in order to foster an increased sense of community and encourage constructive social engagement and public participation. Starting with 197/EX Decision 46, taken by its Executive Board in October 2015, UNESCO has promoted efforts to strengthen education, including human rights-based global citizenship education programs, keeping in mind national contexts, to preventing violent extremism. UNESCO has produced tools and guidelines specifically aimed at supporting teachers in this regard. Nevertheless, critical academic research on Global Citizenship Education (GCE) has questioned an economic or entrepreneurial orientation, and the odd coexistence of critical democratic discourses that might well stand in opposition to market-oriented neoliberal discourses, which are both prevalent in GCE (Pais and Costa, 2017).

A third domain consists in empowering individuals and groups to effect political change; sometimes this work is specifically oriented to transforming the action repertoire of political groups who have previously resorted or are at risk of resorting

to violent tactics. In the words of the *Peacebuilder's Guide on Transforming Violent Extremism*:

> "Transforming violent extremism recognizes that while violent extremism exists, the reasons and motivators leading to an individual being drawn to violent extremist movements can be transformed into a different type of agency or engagement. This is distinct from countering violent extremism which is reactive to extremist violence rather than aimed at altering the dynamics that motivate it." (SFCG 4).

Lynn Davies (2011) advocates an explicit education *with* and *for* conflict and difference, based on radical freedom of expression in order to prevent and address violent extremism. The focus here is on respect for the rights of the other and on nonviolent behavior, including difficult dialogue, participation, and nonviolent resistance to authority. Davies identifies four bases in education for taking action against extremism, which are mostly focused on the UK context (and might need to be reconsidered in different societies). *Organizational patterns* work toward students' inclusion in their societal contexts, emphasizing dynamic identities and commonalities. *Values* are rooted in "secular morality" (2011: 159) through discussion and practice of universal human rights. *Knowledge bases* strengthen students' capacities to deal constructively with conflict. *Operational processes* engage students in critical appraisal of discourses offered by media, religious organizations, and schools themselves (Davies 2011; see also Bickmore 2010).

Beyond the push/pull distinction, a different way to frame the issue is to look at the possible transformation of collective actors that advocate violent strategies. Studies suggest that abandoning violent extremism can be a realistic option even for radical armed groups. There are several examples in recent history of armed groups turning to nonviolent struggle or mainstream politics (Dudouet, 2015). However, such a transition faces more difficulties when the armed group has resorted to actions directly harming civilians (i.e. violent extremism in the strict sense). Public education and political training of former militants can help encourage this transition (Dudouet, Planta and Gießmann 2016). A quantitative study conducted by RAND shows that out of 268 identified "terrorist groups", only 20 were defeated via military means, while the majority (114, or 43%) ended their activities by joining the political mainstream (Jones and Libicki, 2008).

Critical scholarship has referred to the dangers related to the politicization of education, where educational interventions are all too easily integrated into so-called counterterrorism or counterinsurgency strategies. According to Novelli, in

countries such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, among others, education has been deployed "to serve Western military and security objectives"[14]. More recently, education strategies aimed at preventing violent extremism have in turn been implemented, for instance in the UK, "to monitor, control and suppress marginalized communities in a form of 'internal colonialism'" (as cited in Novelli, forthcoming 2017).

While initial attempts are underway to design educational strategies for the prevention of violent extremism, there is a crucial need to critically assess the logics behind such interventions in different contexts and to study why some of these well-intended prevention initiatives might have unintended negative consequences. One telling example is the *Prevent* program in the UK, recently critically reviewed by Novelli, which asks teachers in the entire (pre-primary to university) formal education system to detect and report on potentially worrying student behavior. *Prevent* was launched as part of a strategy which sought to "identify potential terrorist suspects prior to any attack" and instill "British values", holding teachers accountable for anti-terrorist agendas and resulting in racialized and stigmatizing surveillance targeting Muslim students (Novelli 2017: 11-14).

Such narrow views are counter to a dialogical pedagogy, which would critically engage with alternative views, dissent and (non-violent) forms of resistance – fostering respect and diversity, rather than producing fear and forced assimilation (Davies 2011; Novelli 2017). Importantly, architects of educational interventions should not shy away from critically assessing how education systems and content relate, positively or negatively, to drivers and triggers of inequalities and conflict or extremism, in any society (Sukarieh and Tannock, 2015; Naseem & Arshad-Ayaz, 2016). In more supportive settings, educators and students alike can hope to benefit more from what Dale and Robertson (2016) hinted at as "education's promises"; which we define here as opening up spaces for critical learning which might allow young women and men to become "radical" in an socially aware and social justice-inspired sense.[15]

Nevertheless, transformation processes through education cannot be conceived as linear, and may have unintended consequences. While political empowerment training or civic engagement potentially carries the opportunity to support peacebuilding, they can also result in unpredictable results, especially when such

[14] Dana Burde offers a disturbing historical account of US influence on education in Afghanistan beginning in the late 1970s (Burde 2014)

[15] See, for instance, the speech given by the youth environmental activist Anjali on "Radical Youth and Global Politics", https://www.tedxdirigo.com/talks/radical-youth-and-global-politics/

interventions are conducted in isolation from broader reforms to address inequalities. As illustrated by Mercy Corps (2015, 1-2):

> "we found civically engaged youth to be more supportive of armed opposition groups, not less. Confident, outspoken and politically conscious young people, it turns out, are not the types to sit quietly by when the society around them disappoints. These are gloomy findings, and yet there is much to celebrate. Most young people are peaceful, eager to succeed, doggedly optimistic – in spite of their circumstances – and remarkably resilient."

A final caveat relates to the role of formal and non-formal education. Individuals may support or disengage from violent extremism rather due to informal influence by role models among peers, relatives and friends as well as life experiences, than because of education or other conscious attempt to influence them (Garfinkel, 2007). Nevertheless, since (formal and non-formal) educational spaces remain crucial socially interactive spaces where young people (those included in the system at least) spend most of their time, much more research and understanding is needed in order to explore the complex relationships between education and challenging violent extremism.

Recommendations for stakeholders involved in education to prevent violent extremism

- ❖ Acknowledge politically-charged connotations of who is considered "extremist" and foster a diverse understanding of various extremist ideologies, avoiding harmful stereotypes;
- ❖ Engage in nuanced analysis of educational possibilities for addressing root causes of conflict and violence driven by alienation, exclusion and frustration;
- ❖ Critically assess underlying rationales and possible (unintended) outcomes of education strategies that aim at surveillance and national security;
- ❖ Guarantee or work towards educational learning spaces that allow for respect for diversity (in background and opinion) and freedom of expression, while strongly condemning violence;
- ❖ Foster a culture of respect and non-violence that stimulates constructive, radical (going to the root), innovative thinking and youth action.

5.5 The teaching of history and engagement with the past through transitional justice

"History can Bite" (Bentrovato, Korostelina & Schulze, 2016)

An essential aspect of education consists in the ways in which educational institutions, textbooks and teachers present past events and offer collective narratives whose purpose is to foster identification and a sense of belonging. A society's shared experience of the present largely depends on the narratives about the past in circulation in that society. Historical narratives also serve to justify and reinforce the present social order (Bentrovato, 2015). While all modern nations can be understood as "imagined communities" (Anderson, 1983), narratives of the past are often (mis)used in times of conflict in order to construct an image of historical struggle between "us" and "them" (Ferro, 2004), often focusing on episodes of collective suffering and historical grievances, or "chosen traumas" (Volkan, 2014), whose remembrance is an effective way of fostering a sense of identity and social cohesion.

The teaching of history is one of the most contested aspects of education in many divided societies. This is true particularly after a violent conflict has occurred: the pathways and responsibilities which led to crisis and violent conflict and the attribution of responsibility for human rights violations become contested topics (Bentrovato, Korostelina, and Schulze, 2016). The manipulation of history for political purposes is one key strategy characterizing the "negative face" of education in identity-based conflicts (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000). For instance, attempts to sanitize the content of curricula following conflict or ethnic tension by removing any references to difference leaves citizens feeling that important questions of identity and struggle are being artificially glossed over, allowing little space for critical reflection on the past and for drawing lessons. Such is the case with the current curriculum in Rwanda, which presents a one-nation narrative, leaving untouched a very real sense of identity based on ethnic difference in the wake of the genocide (Paulson, 2011).

Conversely, the teaching and learning of history can play an important role in the transition and transformation of societies toward positive peace. Histories and memories can be re-told, "the past that lies before us" (Lederach, 2005) can be understood and appreciated differently, memories and identities can be re-negotiated, and communities can be imagined anew. Education has been noted as having an important role in reconciliation or nation-building objectives through the messages and shared values it can promote; in essence, it has the potential to support a form of social cohesion that can often be lost during periods of conflict (Tawil and Harley, 2004). In the aftermath of violence, education can also provide for psychosocial recovery, the restoration of normalcy, hope, and the acquisition of values and skills for building and maintaining a peaceful future (Sommers 2002, p.

18). Matters such as landmine education, health education (water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) or HIV/AIDS education), and disaster preparedness are critically relevant in such moments (Kirk, 2006, p. 2), and may perhaps be harnessed towards a sense of national unity. Specific work can be done on deconstructing stereotypes and images of the 'enemy' in textbooks, as the long history of the Georg Eckert Institute in Germany demonstrates (Höpken, 2003). Education – particularly non-formal education - can also provide protected spaces for reflection on the losses youth affected by conflict share. One example might be cultural projects carried out by Bosnian and international youth organizations in the 2000s which brought together young people who had suffered because of societal division and collective violence and let them speak, providing a voice to "those who were not asked" (Scotto, 2004).

A specific dimension of engagement with the past which is increasingly receiving recognition as fundamental to peacebuilding efforts is Transitional Justice (TJ), understood as a set of judicial and non-judicial measures aimed at promoting accountability and affording redress for massive violations of human rights. War crimes tribunals and "Truth and Reconciliation Commissions" are some of the traditional institutions implementing TJ. UNICEF and the International Center for Transitional Justice have recently conducted extensive research on ways in which transitional justice and education could reinforce each other in peacebuilding contexts, as well as the tensions and obstacles arising from attempts to coordinate education TJ processes and objectives (Ramírez-Barat and Duthie, 2015).

Educational systems face the challenge of transforming explicit and implicit

Recommendations for the role of education in reconciliation and transitional Justice:

- Include the education sector as part of a societal response to past massive human rights violations
- Consult and seek support from all relevant stakeholders involved in transitional justice
- Include the teaching of the past in the education system in a way that is conflict-sensitive, gender-sensitive, culturally adequate, and socio-emotionally informed
- Adopt a context-specific, historically informed, and incremental approach to?? effecting change.

narratives as societal transformation processes advance. The transformation needed here covers curricula, textbooks (and the explicit/implicit messages they convey), the ethos and working style of educators/teachers, and the structural conditions predominating in the relevant education system, including equality of access, (re)distribution of resources, and teacher recruitment. As demonstrated in examples from South Africa and Argentina, confronting the past and integrating TJ in school curricula is a long-term endeavor. Young people have the right and responsibility to transform past narratives, deconstruct traditional stereotypes and images of the former 'enemy', and acknowledge and interact with authentic experiences of suffering related to the conflict, but it is not easy to do this within an education system where students and teachers come from different sides of the conflict. Non-formal fora have potential to move forward more swiftly in this regard. Reforms in the education sector should be a priority in postwar societal reconstruction, as is the case for other institutions and state functions (such as the security sector). The issue of confronting the past and ensuring Transitional Justice in education relates particularly to the **prevention** and **participation** pillars in SCR 2250.

5.6 Education and refugee youth: challenges and opportunities for peace and security

High numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) are a feature of most contemporary armed conflicts and a key challenge for peacebuilding. In 2016, more than 65 million people were forced to migrate abroad or within their own countries (UNHCR 2017). In many cases, people have to endure prolonged periods of time – years or decades – far from their homes. While a considerable proportion of young people affected by armed conflict globally are refugees or IDPs, it is not easy

to determine the exact share of young people, as defined in SCR 2250, in the global refugee population: in global UNHCR statistics, numbers are usually aggregated for refugees aged 18 to 59. It is, however, safe to assume that refugees belonging to the age group 18-28 comprise a significant fraction of the total refugee population (for example, on the Eastern European transit route toward the EU: IOM, 2016).

Primary and secondary education has traditionally been the focus of efforts by humanitarian agencies addressing the immediate needs of refugees and IDPs. This is clearly reflected in the available figures: globally, about half of refugee children are able to attend primary school, as compared to a global percentage of 90%. By contrast, only one per cent of refugees attend university, compared to 34 per cent of general populations globally (UNHCR, 2016). Conflict-induced displacement also greatly diminishes young people's chances of accessing continuing and vocational education (Muggah, 2000). As these figures demonstrate, the young refugee population often experiences difficulties with access to education, particularly at secondary and tertiary levels - a situation with many potentially adverse effects. Non-formal education programmes play an important role in providing education among many refugee communities, while integration of these schemes with formal education is often challenging (Datzberger, 2017). For example, "certification counts" for displaced and refugee students, while the reality unfortunately shows a lack of reliable records and examination certificates, which might hinder students' integration into schooling systems or the labour market (Kirk, 2009).

Education can be a key element of processes which aim to help young refugees to become transformative agents of social cohesion, conflict prevention and peace, either integrating into a new society or returning to their country of origin. Opportunities and constraints for refugees vary greatly: while some may want (or are obliged) to return to their homes as soon as possible, others will seek and attain permanent residency in host countries. When war wanes and political situations stabilize, refugees may be encouraged or compelled to return to their homes. Returning refugees face the challenge of becoming "embedded" once again in their places of origin (Ruben, van Houte and Davids, 2009). Education is essential in the facilitation of return processes, both as a means for preparing returnees and as a service provision for children once families have returned.

Alternatively, refugees may integrate into their host community. In the long term, *diaspora communities* may arise, usually maintaining ties with their home countries (Betts Jones, 2012). Often playing a major role in supporting livelihoods of relatives remaining in their country of origin, diaspora communities have the potential to play a constructive role in the peaceful transformation of conflicts in their countries of

origin and in societal redevelopment after conflict. Nevertheless, in some cases diasporas may contribute to the entrenchment of adversarial attitudes, prolonging unforgiving approaches to conflicts (Zunzer 2004; Vimalarajah Cheran, 2010; Carment and Sadjed, 2016).

An intermediate situation, one which affects most of the world's refugees (Troeller, Newman, Milner and Loescher, 2008, Milner and Loescher, 2011), arises when refugee status becomes long-term and thus a "protracted refugee situation" develops. This is the predominant state of affairs and the trend is expected to continue, therefore, educational projects need to take account of the prospect of an "unknowable future" for their beneficiaries (Dryden-Peterson, 2017). Among long-term refugees, young people who find shelter in urban settings may simultaneously become more vulnerable and enjoy new opportunities in the economy and via civil society actors (Mendenhall et al., 2017). For refugees living in temporary shelters and camps, education is often provided by humanitarian agencies – the UNHCR, international NGOs and local ad hoc services - with the role of national governments varying in different settings.

Education for refugees is usually understood as the delivery of basic services, alongside healthcare, and thus as an emergency or prolonged response in times of crisis, particularly in the context of refugee camps. An alternative discourse in policy and research identifies education as an intervention aimed at capacity-building and providing refugee individuals and groups with agency (Troeller, 2003). Political forces in refugee communities, host country educational systems, or international humanitarian agencies and NGOs, each with their own agendas and objectives, may pursue or support such projects (Fresia and von Känel, 2016).

However, post-secondary education aimed at young people should be seen as equally important. There is evidence that enhancing tertiary education in the aftermath of violent conflict may contribute to lessening the likelihood of societies relapsing into violence (Ishiyama and Breuning, 2012). In recent years, UNHCR has defined a specific educational strategy for their populations of concern, centering around improved access to secondary and tertiary education and the inclusion of peacebuilding, conflict sensitivity and social cohesion in educational curricula (UNHCR 2012). Among the objectives of UNHCR's strategies for 2016-2017, priority 6 is '[p]romoting active participation in decision-making of people of concern and building coexistence with hosting communities'.

Young refugees are a key sector of the wider group of global youth affected by armed conflict. Educational responses to their needs have been identified, but

enabling displaced young people to become agents for positive change has yet to become a priority within the humanitarian and peacebuilding communities. In terms of SCR 2250 pillars, addressing refugee youth as a target group, and specifically offering post-secondary education and specific training aimed at peacebuilding, can strengthen **participation** in processes of positive change and contribute to the **prevention** of possible future tensions and conflicts, both within refugees' host societies and upon their return to their countries of origin. Education can also be a suitable tool for fostering **partnerships** in society and preventing young people from falling prey to violent extremism (see section 5.4 on PVE).

Recommendations

- UNHCR specifically could reformulate future Global Strategic Priorities in order to address the specific educational needs of youth in connection with the challenges of preventing tensions, engaging in partnerships, and promoting social cohesion in host countries, as well as contributing to societal reconstruction in countries of origin;
- Global civil society actors should harness the transformative potential of young refugees, offering appropriate non-formal education curricula and support formal systems of education to meaningfully include refugee students;
- National governments should provide refugees and IDPs with access to post-secondary education, in addition to access to pre-secondary levels of education, and integrate non-formal education with formal education systems to accommodate the range and diversity of needs among refugee populations;
- Multiple stakeholders, including youth-led peacebuilding organisations, should be supported to enhance specific peacebuilding education programs aimed at increasing constructive agency among young refugees both in their countries of origin and in host communities.

6. Key messages and recommendations for the role of education in a forward-looking YPS agenda

In responding to the final guiding question of this paper, *What are the key steps that lie ahead and recommendations for key stakeholders working on supporting the potential of youth agency for peacebuilding through formal and non-formal education?,* **this paper draws on the 4Rs framework for sustainable peacebuilding through addressing injustices related to Redistribution, Recognition, Representation and Reconciliation. The paper highlights five key messages.** These messages connect, where relevant, to the five key pillars of the SCR 2250:

Participation, Protection, Prevention, Partnerships, and Disengagement and Reintegration.

In order to build sustainable peace and better serve young people's needs through education in highly diverse and unequal societies around the globe, there is an immediate need to [P-E-A-C-E]:

1) Prioritize education (funding and resources) for young women and men as a key component with which to achieve the goals formulated in UNSCR 2250, to address the root causes of inequalities and violent conflict and prioritize reconciliation across generations and groups in society;

2) Embed education's progressive and **preventive** potential for addressing inequalities and building and sustaining peace via improved support for teachers and a more meaningful representation of young people's realities and needs;

3) Adequately assess and respond to education's potentially negative contributions to conflict and violence, and ensure that educational institutions, students and teachers are **protected** from direct attacks;

4) Create **partnerships** to translate conflict-sensitive, gender-responsive and youth-informed reforms of formal/non-formal education into system-wide approaches at, above and below state level to better serve young people's peacebuilding potential;

5) Enact more holistic and relevant educational opportunities, as demanded by young people, in order to fully develop all (socio-cultural, political and economic) aspects of youth empowerment and, as a result of this support, meaningful **participation, (dis)engagement and (re)integration**.

Key recommendations for specific stakeholder groups

- Governments, bilateral donors and international organizations:
  - Prioritize long-term funding and political commitment to **integrate** education within sustainable peacebuilding approaches (especially in emergencies and post-conflict transition)
  - Foster collaborative **partnerships** which would enhance the integration of education system reforms into broader policy frameworks for social justice and social cohesion, including **participation** of grassroots stakeholders such as students and student representative organizations, and teachers and their representative bodies
  - **Protect** educational spaces and actors (including students and educators) from direct (physical) and structural (exclusionary) forms of violence
  - Ensure fair redistribution of resources and training and remuneration for educators.
- Education policy and program designers:
  - Design conflict-sensitive approaches, informed by youth needs, to education policy and programming, drawing on a historically and locally informed context and conflict analysis and on INEE's Conflict-Sensitive Education pack

- Employ critical analysis to uncover, **prevent** and address direct (physical), structural (exclusionary) and cultural (discriminatory) forms of violence which are reproduced in and through education systems
- Ensure intersectional respect for and inclusion of diversities (including, for instance, gender, ethnicity, age, religion, language, disability, sexual orientation, refugee status, political ideology, socio-economic class, etc.) in order to achieve full and meaningful **participation** of learners and educators in decision-making processes and educational practices
- Prioritize gender-responsive approaches to enhance equitable educational/career opportunities for male and female students *and* teachers, and gender-sensitive approaches to enhancing the relevance and appropriateness of educational content
- Design curricula that allow for recognition of intersectional diversities and representation of multiple languages and points of view
- Pay specific attention to the ways in which education policy and practices approach the teaching of history and train/support educators to help build trust and reconciliation.

❖ Youth (students or aspiring students) and youth-led organizations:

- Engage to **participate** where relevant and feasible in decision-making processes to represent individual and collective youth voices
- Seek supportive **partnerships** within formal or non-formal learning settings, with the aim of nurturing youth-led initiatives which attempt to complement and innovate alongside existing forms of education
- Develop training and **engage** with (educational) support networks for continued capacity-building to constructively challenge, innovate and transform systems that are hindering social justice and peacebuilding.

❖ Educators (formal and non-formal systems):

- Where available, **engage** in conflict-sensitive and transformative pedagogical training and develop approaches which support education's "positive" promise to serve equity and social justice for all
- Seek appropriate support and, where feasible, commit to ensuring safe learning environments for students and educators alike, fostering non-violence and respect for intersectional diversities
- Encourage students and young people to **participate** and **engage** in critical and constructively "radical", non-violent yet transformative observation, thinking and action
- Pay attention to students' varied needs and talents, having regard to their economic, political and socio-cultural empowerment

❖ Research community:

- Initiate research to respond to the gap in knowledge and the dearth of systematic evaluation of both short- and longer-term effects of formal and non-formal education on the lives and choices of young people, particularly in conflict-affected contexts
- Develop and **engage** in capacity building for critical analysis of the ways in which education systems, content and practices either fracture or contribute to peacebuilding
- Work in **partnership** with young people, building capacity and meaningful youth **participation** in the context of participatory research strategies

- Work in **partnership** with civil society, policy designers and other stakeholders to ensure knowledge generation is relevant, widely disseminated and integrated into policy and programmatic development

7. References

A/70/674. The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy: Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (2015). Retrieved from https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/456/22/PDF/N1545622.pdf?OpenElement

Alubisia, A. (2005). *UPE Myth or Reality. A Review of Experiences, Challenges and Lessons from East Africa*. Oxford: Oxfam Great Britain and African Network Campaign on Education for All.

Alves, V. (2016). INEE Background Paper on Psychosocial Support and Social and Emotional Learning for Children and Youth in Emergency Settings. INEE - Interagency Netowrk for Education in Emergencies. http://toolkit.ineesite.org/resources/ineecms/uploads/1126/20161219_PSS_SEL_Background_Note_Digital_Final.pdf

Aubrey, M., Aubrey, R., Brodrick, F., & Brooks, C. (2016). *Why young Syrians choose to fight. Vulnerability and resilience to recruitment by violent extremist groups in Syria*. London: International Alert. http://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/Syria_YouthRecruitmentExtremistGroups_EN_2016.pdf

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Archer, D. (2016). The Challenges of Education Reform and Privatization in Liberia. *Action Aid*. Retrieved from http://www.actionaid.org/2016/12/challenges-education-reform-and-privatisation-liberia

Ballentine, K., & Nitzschke, H. (2005). *The Political Economy of Civil War and Conflict Transformation*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management*)*.

Ballentine, K., & Sherman, J. (A c. di). (2003). *The political economy of armed conflict: Beyond greed and grievance*. Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner Pub.

Bali, Z. (2015). *Domination, Privilege and Fear Uncovering a hidden curriculum of oppression in the Syrians‟ narratives on school*. Lund University, available online: http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=8084523&fileOId=8084524

Baxter, P. (2001) The UNHCR peace education program: skills for life. *Forced Migration Review* 11: 28–30.

Bentrovato, D. (2015). *Narrating and Teaching the Nation: The Politics of Education in Pre- and Post-Genocide Rwanda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bentrovato, D., Korostelina, K. V., & Schulze, M. (2016). *History Can Bite: History Education in Divided and Postwar Societies*. V&R unipress GmbH.

Berdal, M. (2003). How" new" are" new wars"? Global economic change and the study of civil war. *Global Governance*, *9*(4), 477–502.

Berdal, M., & Ucko, D. H. (2013). Introduction to the DDR Forum: Rethinking the Reintegration of Former Combatants. *International Peacekeeping*, *20*(3), 316–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2013.843971

Bickmore, K. (2001). Student Conflict Resolution , Power " Sharing " in Schools , and Citizenship Education. *Student Conflict Resolution , Power " Sharing " in Schools , and Citizenship Education*, *31*(2), 137–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/0362-6784.00189

Bjork, C. (2006). *Educational decentralization: Asian Experiences and Conceptual Contributions*. *Education in the Asia-Pacific Region Issues, Concerns and Prospects* (Vol. 8).

Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism II: A review of conceptual models and empirical research. *Journal of Strategic Security*, *4*(4), 37.

Burde, D. (2014). *Schools for Conflict or for Peace in Afghanistan*. Columbia University Press.

Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. Retrieved from: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/80473/1/Bush_2000_Two_Faces_of_Education_.pdf

Caparic, J., & Dönges, H. (2016). *Attacks on Education in Conflict, Post-Conflict and Non-Conflict*

Settings. New York: Springer.

Carment, D., & Sadjed, A. (2016). *Diaspora as Cultures of Cooperation: Global and Local Perspectives*. New York: Springer International Publishing.

Charbonnier, L., & Oliva, F. (2016). *Conflict Analysis*. Turin (Italy): United Nations System Staff College. Retrieved from: http://www.unssc.org/sites/unssc.org/files/unssc_conflict_analysis_fabio_oliva_lorraine_charbonnier.pdf

Chung, F. (1999). Education: A Key to Power and a Tool for Change: A Practitioner's Perspective. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *2*(1), 91–95.

Collier, P. (2000). *Greed and grievance in civil war.* University of Oxford, Institute of Economics and Statistics, Centre for the Study of African Economies.

Conflict Sensitivity Consortium. (2012). *«How to» guide to conflict sensitivity*. London: International Alert. Retrieved from: http://local.conflictsensitivity.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/6602_HowToGuide_CSF_WEB_3.pdf

Dale R. & Robertson S. (2016), *FreshEd #56 . Year in review*, podcast. https://soundcloud.com/freshed-podcast/freshed-56-year-in-review

Davies, L. (2011). Learning for State-Building: Capacity Development, Education and Fragility. *Comparative Education*, *47*(2), 157–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.554085

Davies, L. (2014). *Unsafe Gods: Security, Secularism and Schooling*. London: Institute of Education Press.

Date-Bah, E. (A c. di). (2003). *Jobs After War: A Critical Challenge in the Peace and Reconstruction Puzzle*. International Labor Organization.

Datzberger, S. (2017). Peacebuilding Through Non-Formal Education Programs: A Case Study from Karamoja, Uganda. *International Peacekeeping*, *24*(2), 326–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2016.1214073

DFID. (2010). *DFID Education strategy Consultation paper*. Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091016092835/http://consultation.dfid.gov.uk/education2010/downloads/

DFID (2015) *UK Aid: tackling global challenges in the national interest*. DFID: London. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478834/ODA_strategy_final_web_0905.pdf

Diaz Varela, A., Kelcey, J., Reyes, J., Gould, M., & Sklar, J. (2013). *Learning and resilience: The Crucial role of Social and emotional Well-being in Contexts of adversity*. World Bank.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2017). Refugee education: Education for an unknowable future. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *47*(1), 14–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2016.1255935

Dudouet, V., Gießmann, H. J., & Planta, K. (2012). *From Combantants to Peacebuilders: A Case fo Inclusive, Participatory and Holistic Security Transitions*. Berghof Foundation: Retrieved from http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Papers/Policy_Reports/PolicyPaper_dudouetetal.pdf

Dudouet, V., & Planta, K., Gießmann, H. J. (2016) *The Political Transformation of Armed and Banned Groups Lessons Learned and Implications for International Support*. Berghof Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/UNDP-Berghof_PoliticalTransformation-BannedGroups_2016.pdf

Dudouet, V. (2015). *Civil Resistance and Conflict Transformation: Transitions from Armed to Nonviolent Struggle*. London: Routledge.

Duncan, R. and Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A. (2017)**,** 'Reclaiming Reconciliation through Community Education for the Muslims and Tamils of post-war Jaffna, Sri Lanka', *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 12:1, pp 76-94.

Dupuy, K. (2008). *Education for Peace Building Peace and Transforming Armed Conflict Through Education Systems*. *Children*. Retrieved from http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1050/Education_for_Peace_Building_Peace.pdf

Durrani, N. Halai, A., Kadiwal, L., Rajput, S. K., Novelli, M. and Sayed, Y. (2017) *Education and Social Cohesion in Pakistan*. Summary Report. Research Consortium on Education and

Peacebuilding, UNICEF PBEA Programme, University of Sussex.

Family Health International. (2015). *Financial Statements*. *Ernst & Young LLP*. Retrieved from https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/fhi-360-audited-financials-fy2015.pdf

Ferro, M. (2004). *The Use and Abuse of History: Or How the Past is Taught to Children*. Routledge.

Finn, A., Baxter, D. V., & Onur, M. F. (2014). *Rwanda - Making vocational training work : a study of vocational training in DDR*. Washington D.C. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/447321467991969774/Rwanda-Making-vocational-training-work-a-study-of-vocational-training-in-DDR

Fischer, M. (2006). Young people build the future: income generation in eastern Bosnia. In J. Banfield, C. Gündüz, & N. Killick (A c. Di), *Local business, local peace: the peacebuilding potential of the domestic private sector* (p. 262–266). London: International Alert. Recuperato da http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadl015.pdf#page=262

Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, *15*(4), 20.

Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a “post-Socialist” age. *New Left Review*, (212), 68–93. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756119.ch54

Fraser, N. (1996). Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, (Stanford University (April-May), 63–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05856.

Fraser, N. (2005). Mapping the Feminist Imagination : From Redistribution to Recognition to Representation. *Constellations*, *12*(3), 295–307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1351-0487.2005.00418.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Bergin and Garvey.

Fresia, M., & Von Känel, A. (2016). Beyond Space of Exception? Reflections on the Camp through the Prism of Refugee Schools. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *29*(2), 250–272. Retrieved from

https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fev016

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, *6*(3), 167–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301

Galtung, J. (1976). Three realistic approaches to peace - Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, Peacebuilding. *Impact of Science on Society*, *26*(1–2), 103–115.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. Sage.

Galtung, J. (2000). *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method)*. United Nations - Disaster Management Training Programme.

Garfinkel, R. (2007). *Special Report: Personal Transformations. Moving from Violence to Peace*. DTIC Document. Retrieved from http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA472142

GCPEA. (2014). *Education under attack*. New York: Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack.

Global Counterterrorism Forum. (2017). Rome Memorandum on Good Practices for Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders. UNICRI - United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. Retrieved from http://www.unicri.it/topics/counter_terrorism/Rome_Memorandum.pdf

Guven, O., Kapit-Spitalny, A., & Burde, D. (2015). *The Education of Former Child Soldiers: Finding a Way Back to Civilian Identity*. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/inee-assets/resources/Burde-Education_of_Former_Child_Soldiers.pdf

Harris, I. M., & Morrison, M. L. (2013). *Peace Education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Higgins, S., Maber, E., Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Shah, R. (2016). *Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding. The Role of Education in Peacebuilding: Myanmar Country Report*.

Höpken, W. (2003). *Textbooks and Conflicts. Experiences from the Work of the Georg-Eckert-Institute for International Textbook Research*. Washigton DC: World Bank. Retrieved from: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1121703274255/1439264-1126807073059/World_Bank.pdf

Hunter, D., & Lakey, G. (2003). Opening Space for Democracy: Third-Party Nonviolent Intervention Training Curriculum. *Philadelphia: Training for Change*, *23*, 34–38.

IIEP. (2011). *Education and fragility in Liberia*. International Institute for Educational Planning - UNESCO. Retrieved from : http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002121/212197E.pdf

INEE (2009). *Education and fragility in Cambodia*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

INEE (2017). *Education in Emergencies*. Retrieved from http://www.ineesite.org/en/education-in-emergencies.

Ishiyama, J., & Breuning, M. (2012). Educational Access and Peace Duration in Post-Conflict Countries. *International Interactions*, *38*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2012.640211

Jones, S. G., & Libicki, M. C. (2008). How Terrorist Groups End: Lessons For Countering al Qa'ida. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. Retrieved from: https://books.google.it/books?hl=it&lr=&id=FGNdPTQxLDQC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=jones+libicki&ots=eQW0u5gb8X&sig=rjrkrlfqF4mxERlffDLr9MMyPho

Kaldor, M. (2012). *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kaldor, M. (2013). In Defence of New Wars. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, *2*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.5334/sta.at

Keen, D. (2012). Greed and grievance in civil war. *International Affairs*, *88*(4), 757–777. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01100.

Kirk, K. (2006) *Education in Emergencies, the gender implications*, UNESCO Advocacy Brief, Bangkok.

Kirk, J. (2009). *Certification Counts. Recognising the learning attainments of displaced and refugee students*. UNESCO/IIEP, Paris.

Krause, K. (2016). Reforming the security sector and the rule of law: the hidden transcript of local resistance. In T. Debiel, T. Held, & U. Schneckener (A c. Di), *Peacebuilding in Crisis: Rethinking Paradigms and Practices of Transnational Cooperation* (pagg. 155–174). Routledge.

Langer, A., Stewart, F., & Venugopal, R. (2011). *Horizontal inequalities and post-conflict development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Larrauri, H. P., & Kahl, A. (2013). Technology for Peacebuilding. Stability: International Journal of Security and Development, 2(3). https://doi.org/10.5334/sta.cv

Lederach, J. P. (1995). Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures. Syracuse studies

on peace and conflict resolution. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. *Book*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: the art and soul of building peace*. Oxford University Press.

Lo Bianco, J. (2016, June 13). Languages show way to cohesive societies. *Bangkok Post*. Retrieved from http://www.bangkokpost.com/print/1008521/

Loescher, G., Milner, J., Newman, E., & Troeller, G. (2008). *Protracted refugee situations: Political, human rights and security implications*. *United Nations University Press*. Retrieved from http://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/publications/latest-books/protracted-refugee-situations-political-human-rights-and-security-implications.

Loescher, G., & Milner, J. (2011). Responding to protracted refugee situations: Lessons from a decade of discussion. *Forced Migration Policy Briefing 6*, (January), 1–36.

Lopes Cardozo, Mieke T.A. (2008), Sri Lanka: in peace of in pieces? A Critical Approach to Peace Education in Sri Lanka, Research in Comparative and International Education, 3 (1), pp. 19-35.

Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A. & Hoeks, C.M.Q. (2014). Losing ground: a critical analysis of teachers' agency for peacebuilding education in Sri Lanka. Journal of Peace Education.

Lopes Cardozo, M., Higgins, S., Maber, E., Brandt, C. O., Kusmallah, N., Le Mat, M. L. J., & others. (2015). *Literature review: Youth agency, peacebuilding, and education*. Retrieved from: http://dare.uva.nl/record/1/490433

Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., Higgins, S., & Le Mat, M. L. J. (2016). *Youth Agency and Peacebuilding: an analysis of the role of formal and non-formal education Synthesis report on findings from Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda*. Retrieved from https://educationanddevelopment.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/youth-agency-synthesis-report-final16.pdf

Machel, G. (1996). *Impact of Armed Conflict on Children: Report of Graça Machel: Expert of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*. United Nations Children's Fund.

Maebuta, J. (2011). Technical and vocational education and training in peace education: Solomon Islands. *Journal of Peace Education*, *8*(2), 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2011.589253

Marques, J. B. V., Freitas, D. de, Marques, J. B. V., & Freitas, D. de. (2017). Characterization factors of non-formal education: a literature review. *Educação e Pesquisa*, (AHEAD), 0–0. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1517-9702201701151678

Martinez, E. (2013). *Attacks on Education. The impact of conflict and grave violations on children's futures*. London: Save The Children. Retrieved from http://www.cridlac.org/digitalizacion/pdf/eng/doc19358/doc19358-contenido.pdf

Menashy, F., & Dryden-Peterson, S. (2015). The Global Partnership for Education's evolving support to fragile and conflict-affected states. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *44*, 82–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.07.001

Mercy Corps. (2015).*Youth and Consequences, Unemployment, Injustice and Violence.* Retrieved from https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/MercyCorps_YouthConsequencesReport_2015.pdf

Mischnick, R. (2007). *Nonviolent Conflict Transformation: Training Manual for a Training of Trainers Course*. Wustrow (Germany): KURVE.

Moore, L. V. (2014). *Working in Conflict: A Faith Based Toolkit for Islamic Relief*. Islamic Relief Worldwide.

Muggah, R. (2000). Through the developmentalist's looking glass: Conflict-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement in Colombia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *13*(2), 133–164. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/13.2.133

Naseem, M., & Arshad-Ayaz, A. (2016). What Kind of Pedagogy Do We Need to Address Extremism and Terror? *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.20355/C5DS33

Neufeldt, R., Fast, L., Schreiter, R., Starken, B., MacLaren, D., Cilliers, J., & Lederach, J. P. (2002). *Peacebuilding: A Caritas training manual*. Vatican City: Caritas Internationalis.

Nicolai, S., & Triplehorn, C. (2003). The role of education in protecting children in conflict. *Network*, (March 2003), 1–40.

Nordtveit, B. H. (2016). *Schools as protection?: Reinventing education in contexts of adversity*. *Schools as Protection?: Reinventing Education in Contexts of Adversity*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25651-1

Novelli, M., & Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A. (2008). Conflict, education and the global south: New critical directions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *28*(4), 473–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.01.004

Novelli, M. (2010). The new geopolitics of educational aid: From Cold Wars to Holy Wars? *International Journal of Educational Development*, *30*(5), 453–459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.03.012

Novelli, Mario (2011) *Are we all soldiers now? The Dangers of the Securitization of Education and Conflict.* In: Educating children in conflict zones: research, policy, and practice for systemic change: a tribute to Jackie Kirk. International Perspectives on Education Reform Series. Teachers College Press, New York, pp. 49-66. ISBN 978-0807752432

Novelli, M., & Smith, A. (2011). *The Role Of Education In Peacebuilding: A synthesis report of findings from Lebanon, Nepal and Sierra Leone [Research Study]*. New York. Retrieved from http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/EEPCT_PeacebuildingSynthesisReport%281%29.pdf

Novelli, M., & Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A. (2012) 'Globalizing Educational Interventions in Zones of Conflict: The Role of Dutch Aid to Education and Conflict'. chapter 11 in: A. Verger, M. Novelli and H. Kosar Altinyelken (eds). *Global Education Policy and International Development: New Agendas, Issues and Policies*, London, Continuum, pp. 223-244.

Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A., Smith, A (2015) *A Theoretical Framework for Analyzing the Contribution of Education to Sustainable Peacebuilding: 4Rs in Conflict-Affected Contexts*. University of Amsterdam, available online: http://learningforpeace.unicef.org/partners/research-consortium/research-outputs/

Novelli, M. (forthcoming, 2017) Education & Countering Violent Extremism (CVE): Western Logics from South to North? *Compare, a Journal of Comparative and International Education*, special issue on BAICE conference 2016.

Novelli, Mario, Lopes Cardozo, Mieke and Smith, Alan (2017). The 4Rs Framework: Analyzing Education's Contribution to Sustainable Peacebuilding with Social Justice in Conflict-Affected Contexts. Journal on Education in Emergencies, 3 (1).

O'Malley, B. (2010). *Education under attack 2010. A global study on targeted political and military violence against education staff, students, teachers, union and government officials, aid workers and institutions*. Paris: UNESCO.

Oliver, R. (2016). France Oedipal Islamist Complex. Retrieved from http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/01/07/frances-oedipal-islamist-complex-charlie-hebdo-islamic-state-isis/

Özerdem, A. & Podder, S. (2015). Experiences in Reintegration. In *Youth in Conflict and Peacebuilding Mobilization, Reintegration and Reconciliation*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pais, A. & Costa, M. (2017) 'An ideology critique of global citizenship education', *Critical Studies in Education*, pp. 1-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772.

Paulson, J. (2011). *Education, Conflict and Development*. Oxford: Symposium Book Ltd.

Peled-Elhanan, N. (2012). *Palestine in Israeli school books: Ideology and propaganda in education*. London / New York: IB Tauris.

Pouligny, B. (2004). *The politics and anti-politics of contemporary «Disarmament, demobilization & reintegration» programs*. Geneva: CERI. Retrieved from http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/5772~v~Les_anciens_combattants_d_aujourd_hui__Desarmement_Demobilisation_et_Reinsertion.pdf

Poppema, M. (2012). School-Based Management in Post-Conflict Central America: Undermining Civil Society and Making the Poorest Parents Pay. In A. Verger, M. Novelli & H.K. Altinyelken (Eds.). *Global Education Policy and International Development: New Agendas, Issues and Policies* (pp. 161–180). London: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544575.ch-008

Pratchett, L., Thorp, L., Wingfield, M., Lowndes, V., & Jabbar, R. (2010). *Preventing Support for Violent Extremism through Community Interventions: A Review of the Evidence - Rapid Evidence Assessment Full Final Report*. London: Department of Communities and Local Government.

Retrieved from https://www.dora.dmu.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/2086/7654

Ramírez-Barat, C., & Duthie, R. (2015). *Education and Transitional Justice: Opportunities and Challenges for Peacebuilding*. ICTJ, USA. Retrieved from https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-UNICEF-Report-EducationTJ-2015.pdf

Rivers, R., & Scotto, G. (A c. di). (2007). *Peace Training Preparing Adults for Nonviolent Intervention in Conflicts With contributions by Robert Rivers & Giannis Scotto (Eds.), Jan Mihalik, Frode Restad & Kai Frithjof Brand Jacobsen.* Cluj Napoca: PATRIR.

Robertson, S., Novelli, M. et al (2007) *Globalisation, Education and Development: Ideas, Actors and Dynamics.* London: DFID. Available in: http://www.dvv-international.de/files/aaaglobal-education-dev-68.pdf

Rogers, A. (2005). *Non-formal education: flexible schooling or participatory education?* New York: Springer.

Ruben, R., Van Houte, M., & Davids, T. (2009). What determines the embeddedness of forced-return migrants? Rethinking the role of pre- and post-return assistance. *International Migration Review*, *43*(4), 908–937. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00789.

Santos, R., & Novelli, M. (2017). *Education and Peacebuilding The Effect of the Ebola Crisis on the Education System ' s Contribution to Post-Conflict Sustainable Peacebuilding in Liberia*. Retrieved from https://educationanddevelopment.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/liberia-report_march2017_lowres.pdf

Save the Children (2010), The Future is Now, Education for Children in Countries Affected by Conflict. London: Save the Children.

Save the Children. (2013). *Results for Children - Annual Review 2013*. Retrieved from https://www.savethechildren.net/sites/default/files/libraries/Annual Review_2013_English.pdf

Save the Children. (2014). *Futures Under Threath – The impact of the education crisis on Syria's children.* Retrieved from http://www.savethechildren.org/atf/cf/%7B9def2ebe-10ae-432c-9bd0-df91d2eba74a%7D/FUTURES_UNDER_THREAT.PDF

Sayed, J., & Novelli, M. (2016). *The Role of Teachers in Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion: A synthesis*

report of South Africa, Uganda, Pakistan and Myanmar case studies. Retrieved from https://educationanddevelopment.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/role-of-teachers-synthesis-report-final16.pdf

Schell-Faucon, S. (2001). *Conflict Transformation Through Educational and Youth Programmes*. Berlin: Berghof Center for Constructive Conflict Management. Retrieved from http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2587/

Schirch, L. (2004). *Women in peacebuilding resource and training manual*. West African Network for Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation - Eastern Mennonite University. Retrieved from: http://emu.edu/cms-links/cjp/star/docs/women-in-peacebuilding-pt1.pdf

Schmelzle, B. (2006). Training for Conflict Transformation: An Overview of Approaches and Resources. Retrieved from: http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2584/

Scotto, G. (2004). *Friedensbildung in Mostar: die Rolle der internationalen NRO*. Muenster: Lit.

Slachmuijlder, L. (2017). Transforming Violent Extremism: A peacebuilder's guide, 1st ed. Washington DC: Search for Common Ground. Retrieved from https://www.sfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/SFCG-Peacebuilders-Guide-to-Transforming-VE-final.pdf

Seitz, K. (2004) Education and Conflict: The Role of Education in the Creation, Prevention and Resolution of Societal Crises - Consequences for Development Cooperation, Berlin: *German Technical Cooperation/ Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ).*

Shah. R., & Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A. (2014) Education and social change in post-conflict and post-disaster Aceh, Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development, 38*, pp. 2-12.

Smith, A., & Vaux, T. (2003). Education, Conflict and International Development Contents CONTENTS. *Training*, 240. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Smith, A. (2005). 'Education in the twenty-first century: Conflict, reconstruction and reconciliation.' *Compare*, 35(4), 373-391.

Smith, A., Datzberger, S., & McCully, A. (2016). *The Integration of Education and Peacebuilding: Synthesis Report on Findings from Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda*. Retrieved from http://uir.ulster.ac.uk/34795/1/Smith%2C Datzeberger%2C McCully %282016%29 Policy Synthesis Report.pdf

Sommers, M. (2002). *Children, Education and War: Reaching the EFA Objectives in Countries Affected by Conflict*. *Education*.

Spear, J. (2006). From political economies of war to political economies of peace: The contribution of DDR after wars of predation. *Contemporary Security Policy*, *27*(1), 168–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260600603402

Stewart, F. (2008). *Horizontal inequalities and conflict: understanding group violence in multiethnic societies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sukarieh, M., & Tannock, S. (2015). The deradicalisation of education: terror, youth and the assault on learning. Race & Class, 57(4), 22–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396815621236

Talbot, C. (2013). *Education in Conflict Emergencies in Light of the Post-2015 MDGs and EFA Agendas*. *NORRAG Working Paper*. Retrieved from http://www.norrag.org/fileadmin/Working_Papers/Education_in_conflict_emergencies_Talbot.pdf

Tawil, S., & Harley, A. (2004). Education and Identity-based Conflict: Assessing curriculum policy for social and civic reconstruction. *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion*, 3–33.

Tomasevski, K. (2003). *Education Denied: Costs and Remedies*. London & New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Troeller, G. (2003). *Refugees in contemporary international relations: reconciling state and individual sovereignty*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/3e71f1b64.pdf.

UNESCO. (2011). *The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education (Education for All Global Monitoring Report*). Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.

UNESCO. (2013). *Global Monitoring Report*. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002271/227146e.pdf

UNHCR. (2012). *Displacement: The New 21st Century Challenge*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrendsjune2013/UNHCR GLOBAL TRENDS 2012_V08_web.pdf

UNHCR. (2016). *Missing out. Refugee education in crisis*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/57d9d01d0

UNHCR. (2017). Figures at a Glance. Retrieved on 07.03.2017, from http://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html

UNICEF. (2016). *The Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy in Conflict-Affected Contexts*

UNOY Peacebuilders and SFCG (2017) *Mapping a Sector: Bridging the Evidence Gap on Youth-Driven Peacebuilding*, The Hague.

Vásquez, G. (A c. di). (s.d.). *Noviolencia - La transformación creativa del conflicto social.pdf*. Antioquia, Colombia. Retrieved from: https://www.scribd.com/document/231634228/Noviolencia-La-transformacion-creativa-del-conflicto-social-pdf

Vimalarajah, L., & Cheran, R. (2010). *Empowering Diasporas: The Dynamics of Post-war Transnational Tamil Politics*. Retrieved from http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Papers/Occasional_Papers/boc31eBPS.pdf

Volkan, V. (2014). *Killing in the Name of Identity: A Study of Bloody Conflicts*. Pitchstone Publishing (US&CA).

Vukosavljević, N. (2000). *Training manual for nonviolent conflict transformation [Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian language]*. Sarajevo / Belgrade: Centar za nenasilnu akciju.

Vukosavljević, N. (2007). *Training for peacebuilding and conflict transformation: Experiences of the "Centre for Nonviolent Action" in the Western Balkans*. Retrieved from: http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2585/

Wiedemann, N., & Dybdal, A.-S. (2012). *Understanding Children's Wellbeing. The Children's Resilience Programme: Psychosocial Support in and Out of Schools*. Copenhagen: IFRC Reference Centre for Psychosocial Support / Save the Children Denmark. Retrieved from https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/sites/default/files/documents/6004_0.pdf

Winthrop, R., & Kirk, J. (2008). Learning for a Bright Future: Schooling, Armed Conflict, and Children's Well-Being. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*(4), 639–661. https://doi.org/10.1086/591301

Winthrop, R., & Matsui, E. (2013). *A New Agenda for Education in Fragile States*. Center for Universal Education at Brookings.

Zunzer, W. (2014). *Diaspora Communities and Civil Conflict Transformation*. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.126.9346&rep=rep1&type=pdf