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Introduction

There is a popular view, perhaps an Enlightenment conceit, that since education is a good thing, life generally is improved by having more, rather than less, education. As Bush and Saltarelli (2000) highlighted, there are many ways in which education can act to inflame ethnic division or promote inequality. This can occur through unequal access to educational opportunity, differential levels of support for school systems, or active disparagement of minority identities. Education can be used as a vehicle to promote social cohesion, forge new identities, or promote racist ideologies.

At a broad level, education is considered an essential element of human development (Sen, 2002).\(^1\) Taking illiteracy and innumeracy as pivotal insecurities, education can respond by directly improving the chances of finding employment and pursuing social promotion. Educated people are considered to be more aware of their legal rights and better empowered to formulate their ideas and claims, which enables personal development and decreases the chances of social unrest. Education is particularly relevant to protecting gender-related rights and enabling women’s empowerment (Sen, 2002). Similarly, there is international consensus that education is key to preserving human security values, including peace, democracy, justice, tolerance and freedom of expression (UNESCO-FLACSO-Chile, 2002). Some argue that it is the most fundamental factor in promoting human security, as “it reinforces all the methods and strategies for improving socio-economic conditions and brings more and better possibilities to improving human rights and security” (Lee, 2004: 105).\(^2\)

There is also growing recognition of the longer-term transformative role that education can play in states attempting to transition out of conflict. If all preventative efforts fail, the focus needs to be on investing as much as possible in a sustainable just society. Such a society must promote education, access to education, and quality of education (Smith, 2005). Barat and Duthie (2017) identify at least two important goals that require systematic attention in coming to terms with an abusive past: to develop children’s abilities and skills for participating in a country’s productive and socio-political realms; and to build the capacity of citizens “to think critically about the present and the past, so they can foresee and construct a better future.” Others similarly have promoted its crucial role in building peace and strengthening social cohesion (Dupuy, 2008). With specific focus on minority rights protection, education can be an important medium for integration. What children are taught in school about the ‘other’, as well as the acquisition of (language) skills needed for effective participation in society and interaction with other groups will determine the way in which they will integrate into society in later life.

In countering and preventing violent extremism, there is some evidence that both formal and non-formal education can build a culture of peace and mutual respect (Fountain, 1999). In particular, quality education can play a critical role in helping young people distance themselves from extremism and resist...

---

1 The Human Development Index, considers literacy and schooling as central to the expansion of human capability and development. See UNDP, Human Development Report 1990, New York: Oxford University Press.

2 The correlation between education and human security is demonstrated in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, as violent conflict and other forms of fragility disrupt and prevent an equitable access to education and other related primary services. This is particularly the case for the high number of refugees and forcibly displaced populations and their host communities, as well as for women and youth, especially in those states undergoing high levels of political instability as they respond to or transition out from the Arab Spring. Nearly two-thirds of the six million school-age children classified as refugees have no school to attend according to a recent UN report, and most of these children live in MENA. In Syria, where in 2009, 94 per cent of children attended primary and lower secondary education, by June 2016 only 60 per cent were still in school. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, “UNHCR Reports Crisis in Refugee Education,” UNHCR, accessed February 21, 2017, http://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2016/9/57d7d6f34/unhcr-reports-crisis-refugee-education.html.
the ‘pull factors’ through awareness raising, generating respect for others, and creating and maintaining cultures of peace and dialogue (Fink, 2013). Curricula need to be reformed and increasing attention needs to be dedicated to building social civic skills.

Although education is not a direct cause of violent conflict, it can influence the incidence of violence based on its interaction with many dimensions at the individual and societal levels. Ultimately, education can determine attitudes, values and behaviour across generations. At one end of the spectrum, education can be used as a tool to foment divisions and tensions along religious, political, social and ethnic lines. Given the important role of schools in ‘reproducing (and re-creating) the identity of a group’ in post-conflict contexts (Lyon, 2013), disagreements over the design and delivery of education can be an important source of tensions between groups. Minorities can teach their children their history, their language and their culture, and can take ownership of the design and delivery of education by participating in the education system. A denial of these rights might be perceived by minorities as a threat to their very existence.

This paper was prepared for the British Council to examine existing evidence on the role of education in conflict-affected societies and to consider ways in which the positive contribution of education might be realized. In preparing this paper we carried out a survey of the existing literature on the role of education in conflict-affected societies, considered the role of education systems in different jurisdictions and examined case studies of interventions carried out by the British Council and other organizations. The intention was to inform discussions within the British Council on the future shape of its work in this area.

The role of education

Between 1989 and 2015 there were 31 peace accords in contexts involving intra-state communal violence (Madhav et al., 2015). The Kroc Institute of International Peace Studies, Notre Dame University, established a database of these accords and the measures they included. They identified 51 distinct provisions in the accords, where a provision was defined as ‘a goal oriented reform or stipulation that is costly to one or both actors, falling under relatively discrete policy domain’. The present paper categorised these provisions into five main areas:

- Measures providing support or compensation to designated groups
- Legal measures aimed at dealing with different aspects of the post-conflict situation
- Military measures designed to support a reduction in violence
- A range of reform measures across all areas of government
- Measures aimed at supporting human rights or promoting equality

When the frequency of provisions is analyzed then the overall pattern is that greatest priority is given to measures which aim to reduce the likelihood of further violence, followed by measures which seek to reform some of the more contentious aspects of the internal dispute. Thereafter the provisions included in the agreements start to focus on medium- to long-term measures, including the reform of education, which appeared in a little over half the accords. Thus, while education is not seen as one of the first priorities in post-conflict situations, it does appear to have significance, particularly in relation to securing peace in the longer term.

When we view the role of education through a longer historical lens we can see a variety of arrangements and intentions, which change over time as social values and mores change. The
development of mass education systems in the 19th century was part of the process of nation-building. A key role for the new national school systems was that they inculcated individuals with a sense of common identity, even if they also often reproduced social class differentiation (Green, 2013). There was, at least initially, limited concern with the interests of minorities. The extent to which the position of minorities has been acknowledged has waxed and waned over time. Following the collapse of some multi-national states after the First World War the League of Nations set a priority on the protection of minorities, but this was abused by the Nazis and used as an excuse for invading Czechoslovakia. Following the defeat of the Axis powers the United Nations played down the rights of minorities per se in favour of universal human rights for individuals.

The 20th Century was the apogee of the nation-state as the end of the First, Second and Cold Wars, and the collapse of colonialism, saw the emergence of newly independent states. Much of this was based on the nation-state claim to represent culturally and ethically distinct peoples, but this claim looking increasingly fragile as the reality of ethnic diversity was recognized more and more. Some of this was due to the ‘ethnic inaccuracy’ of state boundaries, but it was heightened by migration from former colonial territories into former metropolitan centres, economic migration more generally, or population displacement due to internal violence. In such circumstances the context within which education systems operated changed.

Gallagher and Duffy (2016) examined some of the systemic variety that emerged and identified four main types: unitary, segregated, multicultural and plural. Unitary systems operate on the basis of a common cultural identity and minorities are expected to conform to mainstream values. Such systems often explicitly adopt an assimilation policy in which minorities are expected to adopt the values and mores of mainstream society. In segregated systems parallel school systems cater for distinctive groups of students. The organisation of separate schools is normally based on exclusionary criteria, with ethnic or social criteria mediating entry to the different school systems. In these arrangements minorities are recognised, but marginalised, and often receive significantly poorer access to resources or opportunities. Multicultural systems include some acknowledgement and recognition of the identities of communities other than the majority identity, but seek to achieve this through a common school system. Plural systems also seek to recognize and protect different identities, but try to achieve this by allowing minorities to operate their own schools. Unlike segregated systems, separate schools in a plural arrangement are accorded some level of equal treatment and minorities are not excluded from attending mainstream, or majority community, schools if they wish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition accepted: separate schools</th>
<th>Recognition not accepted: common schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of difference important</td>
<td>Tolerance of difference not important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural pluralism – between school difference</td>
<td>Segregation – forced separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism – within school difference</td>
<td>Assimilation – forced commonality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four types can be differentiated on the basis of two criteria: first, the extent to which they recognize the right to separate identities; and second, the extent to which separate identities are tolerated (see Table 1: adapted from Gallagher and Duffy, 2016). Unitary and segregated systems do not
set tolerance as a core principle, but the latter accepts the principle of recognition within the context of an asymmetrical system of power. On the contrary, multicultural and plural systems both accept the principle of recognition and claim to put tolerance as a core value. The difference is that multicultural models promote the value of shared space and hence may be described as placing tolerance above recognition, whereas plural models place recognition above tolerance and seek the latter through institutional autonomy in a context of equality.

An alternative perspective is to focus on the processes involved, as in Figure 1. This shows the different emphases arising from various strategies, three of which we have already encountered. The fourth strategy of interculturalism developed in response to a critique of multiculturalism, claiming that this had privileged difference to the extent that it was encouraging the development of a ‘silo society’ in which group identities were becoming reified and fixed. Interculturalism sees identity as a dynamic and changeable entity and so encourages dialogue and interaction, and even the development of hybrid identities. His intercultural strategy could be pursued through common schools or engagement between schools.

**Figure 1: Social strategies for intergroup relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Promotes</th>
<th>Focus on</th>
<th>Privileges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Promotes commonality</td>
<td>Focus on majority</td>
<td>dominant identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>Promotes difference</td>
<td>Focus on the dominant &amp; dominated</td>
<td>dominant identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Recognises difference</td>
<td>Focus on minorities</td>
<td>group identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interculturalism</td>
<td>Promotes dialogue &amp; hybridity</td>
<td>Focus on group interactions</td>
<td>individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparative study of school systems provides examples of all of these, and some school systems have changed strategic direction over time. This is so because any specific system reflects the values and priorities of its society at a point in time. Furthermore, these values and priorities change over time, so that the goals set for school systems, and hence the structures through which they are delivered, change over time. For example, in the early 1960s the response of the British government to the arrival of immigrants from the Caribbean was to adopt an explicitly assimilationist policy for schools so that the children of immigrants would learn to adopt British values. When it emerged that some schools were enrolling large numbers of immigrant children there was official concern that the culture and identity of White British children might be affected. In order to prevent this an official policy of dispersal was enacted so that no school could enroll above a set proportion of immigrant children. In the latter part of
the 1960s this was changed to a policy of multiculturalism in which the identities of minority groups were recognized and celebrated in schools.

More generally the consideration of case studies of education systems in Europe and North America illustrate these different approaches, and changes over time. The US public school, for example, embodied the assimilationist approach in that its historic social role was to be the engine-room of the ‘melting-pot’ through which immigrants of any religious, national, or linguistic community could become an American citizen. The Netherlands, by contrast, adopted a plurality of institutions in which each religious minority had its own ‘pillar’ of institutions, including schools, and all were state funded. Belgium adopted a more radical approach of pluralism through allocating territory to language communities, each with their own education systems. After democracy the Spanish constitution created regions and allowed some a high level of autonomy, including over education policy: the core curriculum had to reflect the Castillian centre, but in autonomous communities a proportion of the curriculum could be located determined, and usually focused on the teaching of home languages and history.

All of these cases highlight a number of elements. First, there is no ‘silver bullet’ in education that allows for a guaranteed positive outcome to the challenges posed by diversity in society. Second, the role of education has changed over time, and no doubt will continue to evolve, as social values and mores evolve, so its social purpose also changes over time. Third, education is important as schools are key civic institutions, but their impact is crucially dependent on a wide range of other social and economic measures which shape and influence the experience of people within society. Different educational structures reflect national traditions, values and trajectories, and set different levels of constraint or possibility on a variety of policy measures, but no one structure, or no one policy, provides a simple answer. In some respects the position advocated by the Minority Rights Group in 1994 remains apposite:

‘The normal pattern of life, including educational activities (whether formal or informal), are effectively disrupted in areas suffering armed struggle and civil strife. This is true both for both minorities and majorities, but it is the breakdown of inter-group relations which may itself be one of the reasons for the violence. A peaceful environment is both conducive to education and also a product of an education which respects and promotes minority rights. And which also fosters intercultural understanding and equitable minority and majority relations’. (MRG, 1994, p6)

They go on to argue that educational differentiation can take many forms and is found to some extent in every system, so the question is not whether it is good or bad, but rather on the extent to which it is forced: in such circumstances educational inequalities are a very likely outcome and this is likely to have wider social consequences.

**The interaction between education and conflict**

Among the case studies we considered as part of the background to this paper was the role of education in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Historically, the DRC has suffered extensive political instability since its independence from Belgium in 1960. The country is marked by a series of conflicts, including an extremely violent civil war from 1998 - 2002 that resulted in a massive loss of life, the displacement of millions, horrific abuses against women and children, and a greatly debilitated national infrastructure that has left state institutions still weak (N’Gambwa, 2011). Despite the signing of a peace agreement in 2003, and the election of a transitional government and approval of a state constitution by voters in 2006, conflict has persisted and ensured protracted insecurity and political
instability (Public Group on Governance, 2009). Violence (direct, sexual, and gender-based) is widespread and pervasive. Non-state armed groups are present in many locations.

The main drivers of conflict in DRC are tribalism/ethnicity; the unequal distribution of resources; inequitable access to basic social services and inappropriate delivery and quality of those same services; land issues; and poor governance. INEE (2012) highlighted the way each one of these drivers of conflict had affected education, whether this was through access, equity, quality or the management of schools. Rural and poor communities are particularly badly affected, as are some of the minority communities in the country. That said, as a consequence of living through decades of instability, the Congolese have developed very strong coping and adaptation mechanisms and can resettle comparatively rapidly. Such resilience is also seen in the local supply of and demand for education. The strong roles played by the Catholic and Protestant churches have also undoubtedly contributed to building the system’s resilience to shocks including the collapse of state infrastructure and the increasingly minimal role of the national state as provider of basic services at the central level. The demand for education has not decreased, which demonstrates the strong faith of the Congolese people in education. The survival of the national education system has depended on the parents’ continued financing of schools, which has maintained not only education provision but also parts of the administration and management of the system (Public Group on Governance, 2009).

The direction of influence has not just been one way, however. Education in DRC has not only encouraged tribal, ethnic and cultural hatred, it has also become an instrument to institutionalize systematic discrimination through the exclusion of certain groups on the basis of gender, ethnicity or religious belief, and references in the pedagogical materials and teaching methods (INEE, 2012). Through the influence of Belgian rule, certain groups were valued over others and higher education for indigenous people was discouraged. The education of local populations was entirely managed by missionaries and their education agenda, which undermined indigenous African culture and promoted colonial domination. By the time of independence In 1960, the country only had 16 African university graduates out of a population of more than 10 million, and a lack of centralized education. These conditions had an inevitable impact on the ability of the Congolese people to build national unity and identity. The absence of national identity and an educated citizenry in an ethnically diverse Congo is seen as contributing greatly to the instability that would follow (INEE, 2012).

A significant lack of accountability and transparency in the management of the education system, the proliferation of entities, and the exclusion of parents and communities from the decision-making process have all contributed to the undermining of trust in public institutions and the Congolese state. Low salaries and poor working condition, combined with a lack of training, have decreased the motivation and expertise of teachers, with an impact on the quality of education and educational outcomes especially in the poorest areas. Finally, the lack of conflict sensitive programs, the exclusion of minority groups, and the lower standards of schools in certain areas of the country have perpetrated social and cultural divisions, and in turn raised the risk of recurring conflict.3

Conflict sensitivity analysis

Conflict sensitivity is proposed as a set of processes that help recognise the unintended (positive and negative) contribution of all programs and projects to conflict, and where possible, peace. Conflict sensitivity involves systematically understanding the conflict (through a conflict analysis), assessing how programming interacts with the conflict (and the opportunities for peace), and revising programming based on this knowledge.4

The UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) understands a conflict sensitive approach to involve:

[...] gaining a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and context and acting to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organization’s given priorities/objectives (mandate) (Brown, Groenewald, and McGregor, 2009: 19).

DFID goes further to include that, “conflict sensitivity ensures that design, implementation and outcomes of interventions do not undermine peace or exacerbate conflict, and contribute to peace where possible (within the given priorities).” (Goldwyn and Chigas, 2013: 8).

Conflict analysis is the foundation of conflict sensitive practice. It studies the profile, causes, actors and dynamics of a conflict as well as their inter-relationships. It can be conducted at various levels (local, national, regional or international) and seeks to establish linkages between them.

The Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INNE) has produced a set of guiding principles through which conflict sensitivity analysis can be integrated into education policy and programmes in conflict-affected societies. The basic principles are that: there should be a full assessment of the context; a commitment to do no harm; a priority on preventative measures; there should be a commitment to promote equity and the holistic development of the child as a citizen; a priority on stabilizing, rebuilding or building the education system; and that development partners should act fast, respond to change, and stay engaged beyond short-term support.

Some of the specific themes articulated for each of these guiding principles by INNE are outlined below:

Assess: Understand the background and context of the conflict, and the role education has played within it; understand the interaction between education and the conflict, and identify ways in which education might mitigate the conflict.

Do no harm: Since education interventions can have positive or negative effects, ensure that priorities, plans and programmes are based on a comprehensive conflict analysis; that sensitivity training is provided; that plans do not intentionally favour one group over another; that education is not manipulated to divide or cause conflict; and that education does not perpetuate existing inequities.

4 ‘Conflict sensitivity’ has several roots in literature and thinking that includes: Mary Anderson’s ‘Do No Harm’, the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), and more broadly, the work of DFID, USAID and the World Bank.
Prioritize prevention: Ensure that young people and teachers are safe, and that schools and learning environments are protected from attack; provide alternative education routes for employability and life skills; provide training for young people to be aware of basic safety issues.

Promote equity and the holistic development of the child as a citizen: Promote equitable distribution of services across all communities; avoid processes which exclude and promote reintegration; deliver education for peace through the curriculum, pedagogy and teaching materials that reflect the value of equity, responsible citizenship and resilience; and involve parents, communities and local leadership.

Stabilize, rebuild or build the education system: strengthen the education system and build staff capacities; improve teacher training, while ensuring they reflect the ethic pattern of society; favour fairness, transparency and accountability.

Development partners should act fast, respond to change, and stay engaged beyond short-term support: Ensure systems are flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances, especially where it becomes necessary to adjust assistance programmes to eliminate negative impacts on the context; respond to national priorities and prepare exit strategies so that emergency education interventions can be handed over to longer term system development; recognize the links between education, development objectives, state-building and security.

Contact

Although research and practice in the field of education has not engaged significantly with theories of prejudice development, there has been extensive interest in theories of prejudice reduction. Reflecting widespread interest in schools as sites for social change, this is perhaps not surprising. Most notable in this field is the use of intergroup contact theory to inform interventions and programmes aimed at improving intergroup relations. Contact theory has been around for decades and is generally credited to social psychologist Gordon Allport (1954). His thesis is that positive contact between members of negatively stereotyped groups can lead to improved social attitudes towards the group as a whole, providing certain conditions are met. These facilitating conditions include: equal status between the groups involved in the encounter; the presence of common objectives or superordinate goals; cooperation; and institutional or authority sanction. A fifth contact condition subsequently added is that the contact should facilitate the development of more intimate (as opposed to superficial) relationships, offering what Pettigrew (1998) terms ‘friendship potential’.

Contact theory has been subjected to considerable research scrutiny and in 2006 Pettigrew and Tropp published a meta-evaluation of more than 500 studies, undertaken in 38 countries and involving more than 250 thousand participants. They reported a consistent and definitive association between contact undertaken in a range of settings (including schools), countries and within different population groups, and prejudice reduction that generalised beyond the particular contact situation (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006).

In the context of seemingly indisputable evidence for the prejudice ameliorating effect of contact, researchers, particularly within social psychology have turned their focus to the mediators and moderators of contact effectiveness. A burgeoning body of work in this area has identified key mediators as, anxiety, empathy and self-disclosure (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008; Turner et al., 2013), and

moderators, such as prior out-group attitudes, identity strength and whether one belongs to the majority or a minority group (Graham, Frame and Kenworthy, 2014; Hodson, Harry and Mitchell, 2013; Tausch et al., 2007; Tropp, 2007). Drawing on social identity theory, this work has also explored how different categorisation of group members, and the salience of social identity during contact affects outcomes. Findings in this regard are inconsistent with strategies that encourage personalisation (Ensari et al., 2012), make salient separate identities (Brown et al., 2007) or promote a superordinate identity (Dovidio, Gaertner and Saguy, 2009) all seemingly having potential to promote more pro-social attitudes (Eller and Abrams, 2003, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998).

Although the role of separate schooling in the perpetuation of intergroup hostilities remains contested, the value of intergroup contact in reducing negative social attitudes and promoting social harmony has been recognised by educationalists and others. Drawing extensively on contact theory, initiatives to facilitate cross-group ‘mixing’ have taken many forms. At a systemic level, desegregation of schools the US and South Africa are notable examples. Whist tackling racial inequalities was the main driver in these cases, desegregation of schooling has become a focus of attention for contact researchers and commentators interested in contact processes (Scofield and Eurich-Fulcer, 2001; Holtman et al., 2005). In other countries with binary education systems, where such seemingly radical reform has not been possible, efforts have focused on encouraging inter-group encounters between children and young people attending separate schools. In countries such as Israel, Cyprus and in some Balkan states, cross-group interventions have been supported by Government and large scale NGOs (Andrejč, 2014; Smith, 2010; United Nations Development Programme, 2015).

Schools based contact processes have been subjects of research programmes across the world. Internationally much of this has been concentrated in the US where the findings have been mixed in respect of impact and effectiveness. Generally, increased opportunity for contact in ethnically mixed environments is associated with more cross-group friendships and more pro-social responses to the out-group over the longer term. These outcomes are seemingly more likely where the contact experience is structured and takes account of the facilitating conditions proposed by Allport (Scofield and Eurich-Fulcer, 2001). Juxtaposed with this though, some studies have reported a tendency towards re-segregation and contact avoidance, particularly in social spaces where encounter is optional. It has also been noted that in desegregated schools intra-group friendship remains considerably more common than cross-group friendship (Joyner and Kao, 2000; Scofield and Eurich-Fulcer, 2001). There is also a minority/majority group differential, with minority groups reporting less frequent and lower quality contact than their majority peers (Bifulco, Buerger and Cobb, 2012).

The empirical endorsement of contact as a means of promoting more positive inter-group attitudes ostensibly places the approach as core within the field of educational intervention in deeply divided societies, and suggests a natural fit with the work of those interested in citizenship, democracy and human rights education. However, adopting a more critical educational lens, there are potentially significant deficits in the contact approach and these are considered in this section.

Since the time of Allport, conceptualisations of pluralism, multiculturalism, diversity and difference have evolved significantly, and relatedly the justifications for human rights, democracy and citizenship education (Roth and Burbules 2007). Critical educational theorists have challenged the taken-for-granted neutralist framing of contact interventions which ignores power imbalances and the socio-political dynamics that are at play in inter-group relations and place schools as ‘small p’ political organisations (Apple 2015). They argue that contact theorists have not kept pace with intersecting areas of research interest such as critical anti-racism (Erasmus 2010) and that their work is too ‘self-
referential’ (Connolly 2000, 171). Four areas of significant tension between critical education and contact theory have been identified (Hughes et al, 2018 (in press)).

The first of these is the difficulty that can arise from the privileging of commonality in contact encounters as this can lead to silence and avoidance of more controversial and difficult aspects of group differences. It may also lead to the essentialising of identities. The second difficulty arises from the implicit assumption that it is ignorance and stereotyping which leads to inter-group hostility, and the consequent downplaying of structural and systemic discrimination and disadvantage between groups. The third difficulty lies in the gradualist assumptions in contact initiatives which seek to stabilize intergroup relations: by contrast, a transformative approach, which seeks to address inequalities and injustice, may require a disruptive intervention. The final difficulty lies in an idealist tendency within contact theory which implies positive outcomes when defined conditions are put in place, as this ignores the interpretative lens through which individuals experience and understand contact.

Shared education

In Northern Ireland, a twin track approach has been adopted with contact programmes and integrated schools both seen as important components of peace education. Contact interventions typically offer one-off and short–term opportunities for children from schools with predominantly Catholic or Protestant enrolments to come together for activity based encounters and/or excursions. The most enduring of these was the Government sponsored Schools Community Relations Programme, which operated from 1987 to 2010 (DENI, 2011; O’Connor, Hartop and McCully, 2002). Integrated education was initiated by parents and volunteers who were concerned that the only option available to their children was separate education. The first formally integrated school opened in 1981, and since a further 65+ schools have been established (DENI, 2015; Meredith 2016).

Research findings in respect of contact in Northern Ireland have generally been positive, providing the contact observed is of sufficient duration. Hence, whilst short-term and one-off contact projects have been reported as sometimes having the potential to exacerbate stereotypes, the regular and sustained encounter offered by integrated education has been more effective. When compared with peers attending denominational schools, pupils in integrated schools have been found to have more positive attitudes towards the out group, more moderate positions on political and constitutional issues and greater respect for the other group’s culture and religion (Hughes et al., 2013; Hayes, McAllister and Dowds, 2013, 2007; Stringer et al., 2009). Analysis suggests that these differences are attributable to the opportunity for contact in the mixed school settings and more frequent and positive encounter with out-group peers (Hughes et al., 2013; Stringer et al., 2009).

Recently, a third approach, termed ‘shared education, has been developed which aims to promote more sustained and curriculum based encounter via inter-school partnerships. In this approach schools collaborate across denominational and sectoral lines to offer lessons or activities for mixed groups of students (Gallagher, 2016). In this model pupils can move between the schools to attend these shared classes and the intention is that contact occurs at least weekly and the pattern of school partnership will become a permanent feature of educational delivery in local areas. As with the effects of contact referred to above, pupils participating in shared education have been found to have higher numbers of cross-group friendships than those at non-participating schools, which in turn is associated with being less anxious about interaction and more positive intergroup attitudes and action tendencies (e.g., a desire to help, support and learn more about the other) (Hughes et al., 2010, 2012).
The shared education model emerged as a consequence of the perceived weakness of the short-term contact initiatives that had been common in Northern Ireland throughout the period of the Troubles and the limited growth of the new sector of integrated schools. It is based on a number of distinct elements, including sustained, regular and multi-stranded contact; a focus on core curriculum activity; the pursuit of educational and economic goals, alongside social goals; a commitment to bottom-up teacher empowerment; and the development of locally tailored partnerships (Gallagher, 2016).

The development of the approach is also interesting as it set out to become a mainstreamed part of the school system in Northern Ireland: from the first pilot projects in 2007 with 12 schools, currently over half the schools are involved in some form of shared education partnership, the main programme is now managed and run by the Education Authority and the NI government has made shared education a formal responsibility of the Department of Education. Mainstreaming this approach required extended engagement with political and policy stakeholders, in addition to the typical requirements of an academic research programme. The model which has also attracted significant international interest, with related work on-going in Israel, Macedonia and Los Angeles, and preliminary work underway in Bosnia, Croatia and the Lebanon.

**Radicalization and de-radicalization**

Following the end of the Second World War a de-Nazification programme attempted to remove the influence of the defeated political leadership in Germany, but there was a larger effort put into the positive process of promoting a democratic culture and this was seen as requiring active educational and practical efforts. After the Korean and Vietnam Wars the issue was revisited: the motives for this were varied, and included concerns at why some prisoners-of-war declined to return home, alongside active attempts to encourage returning prisoners-of-war to become agents of change.

Issues to the conversion of former combatants is therefore nothing new, but it has taken on a new resonance since the 9/11 attack in New York as a consequence of individuals being radicalized and recruited to fight in foreign wars, particularly in Iraq or Afghanistan, or to carry out terrorist attacks in their own countries, or other Western countries. In a relatively short period an extensive body of literature has developed and it is possible to discern five main themes: work on the process of radicalisation; the role of the internet as a link to information, and a source of support and connection; various approaches to de-radicalisation programmes; the use of preventative measures; and the role of education more generally.

The extent of the literature is matched by its variety and the wide range of approaches taken to this issue. Thus, for example, in some Muslim countries religion is used as a weapon against radicalization, while in the secular west this is generally avoided; a wide range of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ measures are used in different jurisdictions; some approaches focus on identifying and ‘turning’ key individuals, while other work tries to identify ways of de-radicalizing entire groups. There is, however, little evidence on the effectiveness of the wide range of programmes.

In the papers we reviewed for this study virtually all included some type of educational activities within their scope, though usually as part of an integrated package of measures, and typically not as one of the higher priority elements of the programmes. A somewhat different perspective on the potential educational contribution is provided by Macaluso (2016) who reminds us, that although the term radicalization has recently been associated with terrorism, it has a longer history reflecting unconventional or challenging views, many of which have been the spur to progressive social change.
and have become mainstreamed over time. It also problematizes the association between radicalization and terrorism on the twin basis that not all people with radical views commit terrorist acts, and not all people who commit terrorist acts hold radical views. The paper does not accept or reject the concept of radicalization altogether, but rather cautions that its contradictions and limitations need to be taken into account:

‘The ambivalence and complexity of the concept, coupled with our limited knowledge of the drivers, processes, and outcomes linked to radicalization suggest not only that no blueprint from which to design policies and interventions exists, but also that a serious risk of unexpected and counterproductive effects does, especially when it comes to policies that affect children and young people, where the outcomes become apparent only in the long term.’ (p4)

The relationship between education and radicalization is not simple: there is an extensive literature to confirm that lack of access to educational opportunity can fuel resentment, marginalisation and radicalisation, yet many of those who participated in terrorist acts in the UK and USA had higher educational backgrounds – the ‘engineers of jihad’ phenomenon. Similarly, individuals with lower levels of educational experience may be more likely to seek membership of terrorist groups, but recruiters typically prefer those with higher levels of achievement.

These and similar studies have:

‘raised awareness that education is not an antidote to radicalization, they have also reversed the common thinking on education, in that the assumption behind many recent policies is now that schools can be hotbeds of radical ideas and networks.’ (p5)

At its broadest there seems to be a basic tension between two approaches. The first is a security based approach which seeks to identify those most at risk of radicalization and prevent them carrying out terrorist acts: work on the process of radicalization and the development of de-radicalization programmes is most likely to be found. The second tries to create a more holistic environment which either inculcates democratic values, or addresses issues such as inequality or resilience, in an attempt to discourage the development of radicalization in the first place. Within this body of work there are also some who highlight the emotional attraction of radicalized propaganda and therefore emphasize the need to provide young people with alternative aspirations.

At this point there is insufficient evidence to determine which of these two broad approaches is more successful, though it is worth pointing out that there the conceptualization of ‘success’ in this field is itself a varied terrain.

**Systematic review of the evidence**

The growth of interest in the value of public investment in academic research and the emergence of a ‘what works?’ movement has highlighted the need to examine systematically and empirically research findings. Originally this approach developed in medical research, but has become increasingly important in education research. As part of this study we carried out a systematic review of the research literature on the link between education and conflict.

Prior to carrying out our own systematic review we searched for extant reviews on issues related to education, conflict, security and stability. Only five emerged from the search (Crumlish and O’Rourke,
2010; Lloyd et al, 2005; Mark et al., 2016; Spangaro et al., 2013; Tyrer and Fazel, 2014) and all of these related to the effects of war and conflict on children.

We did find one systematic review which examined evidence on the extent to which interventions have been effective in preventing or mitigating armed violence in developing and middle-income countries (Cramer et al., 2016). They identified a very small number of articles that provided high quality evidence on the effects of interventions, but not sufficient to develop a clear understanding of ‘what works’. They covered a wide range of types of interventions, including educational interventions. The education interventions indicated a mixed pattern of outcomes and even those which identified some positive outcomes remained theoretically weak in relation to causal links to the prevention of armed conflict:

‘... many of these found an effect of an intervention ... on outcomes that may or may not have a clear influence on the level or likelihood of armed conflict: outcomes like ‘social cohesion’, perceptions of ‘others’, ‘trust’, or tolerance of diversity. Some of this research is high quality and may be used to support the case for further research to try to understand the next step in a causal chain, for example, whether and under what conditions greater inter-group trust actually influences the risk of armed conflict.’ (p44)

This point is particularly important as it highlights the need to consider carefully what outcomes are possible or achievable from educational interventions, either working alone or as part of a wider integrated package of measures.

We also found an older review (Tomlinson et al., 2005) which looked at evidence for the effects of education interventions in conflict. This review examined a wide range of contexts in order to explore the impact of conflict on education systems, and the educational experience of young people, and the ways in which education policy has been used to address conflict related issues, including conflict resolution. They found limited high quality evidence on the impact of interventions, but suggested there was potential for further work on formal evaluation of interventions, the role of parents and their influence on schools and work on the impact of citizenship education.

For our systematic review we were interested primarily on education initiatives, including projects targeting school-age populations from early years through to post-secondary education and tertiary tiers of education. The outcomes element of the search focused on the terms ‘peace building’, ‘stability’, and ‘security’, but additional outcome terms were identified by the project team following the project initiation meeting, and from the existing literature, supplemented by a UNICEF (Smith et al, 2011) report retrieved during the preliminary search. Six electronic databases were used, including one database for grey literature.

When the search terms for the intervention and outcomes were used across the six databases, 52,350 studies were found. This figure decreased dramatically to 23 when the terms for conflict-affected contexts/countries were incorporated, and it decreased even further to only 13 studies when searching for studies that presented some form of evidence or robust methodology related to evaluating outcomes. It should be noted that this search only included six electronic databases of journal articles and it did not remove duplicate studies. However, it does illustrate that there is a small evidence base exploring the use of education interventions as a means of addressing challenges around peacebuilding.

Many of the papers identified in the search process focused on the role of the curriculum, particularly in the arts and humanities, on promoting understanding and tolerance. Of those which were most relevant
to the present concern, three focused on bilingual education, as a positive contributor to pluralism and bicultural education in Central America (involving Spanish and indigenous languages) (Suchenski, 2001), as a promoter of cohesion and inclusion through immersion classes in Berlin (Meier, 2009), but as a mechanism which enhanced division in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Askew, 2011). Matsumoto (2012) examined the role of education in Sierra Leone and found that policy and practice in areas such as access, curriculum and governance may have exacerbated the conditions for conflict. A number of others looked at aspects of education in relation to post-conflict reconstruction, or urban reform, but perhaps the most relevant examined the teaching of civic education in Iraq and Sudan in post-conflict situations (Levine et al, 2010). This paper highlighted the importance of classroom pedagogy alongside content, in order to model good practice; the value of informal opportunities to link classroom teaching with wider societal events and the importance of ‘high-quality materials and teacher training, engagement with education officials at the highest level possible, and sustained attention and adaptation following lessons learned.’ (p14)

**Case studies of projects**

In order to explore some of the issues identified in the literature review and provide a focus on practice-on-the-ground, we carried out a number of case studies of education projects. Some of these case studies concerned initiatives put in place by the British Council, while some focused on activities promoted by a range of other organisations and bodies.

We considered evidence from six different sites where British Council initiatives have been put in place:

- Gaza: A school education programme and a dialogue skills training programme for university students
- Ukraine: Ukraine Higher Education Leadership Development programme
- Lebanon: A programme on teaching the history of conflict and a school education programme
- Jordan: A school education programme
- Colombia: A science policy and capacity programme
- Nigeria: Employability skills and work-based learning opportunities for secondary school students

The case studies of other projects included the following:

- A shared education initiative in Macedonia
- Council of Europe programmes on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education, in Norway, Ukraine and Russia
- The application of conflict sensitivity approaches

In each case we were interested in the type of activities that had been put in place; how the programmes had been adapted to local circumstances; the goals and objectives set for the initiative and how they were assessed; and whether any unexpected benefits had emerged from the initiatives. There was no intention to evaluate the programmes, but rather to get some insight into their modes of operation and attempt to draw some general lessons from the comparative experiences.

The range of case studies examined was wide and we were extremely grateful for the time given to us by officials of the British Council and other organisations in each of the areas to explain the nature of
their work and the local circumstances: in every case it was clear that they were committed to their work and to making a significant impact in the regions in which they were based.

The details of the case studies are available in an associated paper, but the main conclusion to emerge from the comparisons lay in the extent to which the implementation of an initiative was linked, or not, to the wider strategic imperative behind the programme. In many of the initiatives, for example, the local actors were primarily focused on immediate activities and their focus of evaluation was in the delivery and quality of these activities. In some of these contexts wider, transnational evaluation frameworks were in place, but these appeared to be a disconnect between the frameworks and the people delivering programmes on the ground.

Three case studies provided illustrations on how this disconnect could be overcome. The first relates to Council of Europe programmes on Education for Democratic Education and Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE) which are delivered in a range of contexts. The over-arching framework for this work is provided by the ‘Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education of the Council of Europe’⁶. A variety of publications provide support for pedagogical approaches, case studies of good practice and examples of curriculum development in support of the principles of the Charter⁷.

The strategic framework for project activity and evaluation is provided by the Tool for Democratic School Development⁸. Drawing on the European Convention on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, The Council of Europe developed a Charter on education for democratic citizenship and human rights and a Framework for competences for democratic culture. From these various sources the Tool for democratic school development is focused on the three main focus areas of governance, teaching and learning, and partnerships with local community and 28 specific quality standards for schools. 128 Beneath the 28 quality standards are 128 specific indicators which can be used to determine the level of development of the school for each of the quality standards: the four levels are broadly defined as ‘beginning’, ‘partial’, ‘advanced’ and ‘sustainable’.

The main value of this framework is that it provides a basis for ‘placing’ specific activities within a wider strategic whole, and a framework for evaluating work in the field and the overarching evaluation plan.

The second example concerns the British Council project in Colombia in which the British Council, British Embassy and government agencies in Colombia all helped identify a series of priorities for projects collaboratively pursued by universities in the UK and Colombia. The British Council played a key role in establishing institutional links between universities in the UK and Colombia, but also was in a position to use its network of contacts with government in Colombia, and the trust that had developed from these networks, as an effective means of connecting people.

The third example was provided by a dissertation on a British Council school education programme in Jordan which examined its potential as a vehicle for peacebuilding (Thomson, 2018). The dissertation concluded that this link could be made if it is delivered by teachers who have received high-quality training on school partnerships, skills development and peacebuilding, and who can translate this

---

⁷ https://www.coe.int/en/web/edc/publications
⁸ Available at http://www.theewc.org/Content/What-we-do/Schools-for-Democracy-in-Ukraine/Schools-for-Democracy-in-Ukraine
training into effective classroom practice; worked with partnerships which were equitable and focused on achieving common goals; and if the programme was appropriately tailored to the Jordanian context.

Thomson (2018) considers a range of policy and theoretical frameworks, and while many are not directly linked to the British Council school education programme, she endeavors to find conceptual links and crossovers such that specific goals of the programme can be seen to be coincident to a range of peacebuilding goals. The frameworks examined include: approaches to peacebuilding; the role of contact; critical thinking, student leadership and citizenship skills; extremism and radicalization; violence against women and children; corporal punishment and crime.

Underpinning this analysis was the approach provided by the 4Rs (redistribution, recognition, representation and reconciliation) which she linked to a global citizenship tradition\(^9\). Thompson (2018) argued that the programme should more explicitly adopt this as a theoretical framework as it would allow for a consideration of the role of employment in a globalized economy, while at the same time allowing for such issues as ‘addressing inequalities, respecting differences, encouraging equal participation, and tackling past, present and future injustices’ (Thomson, 2018, p71) to be considered. She also pointed out that this framework provided an analytic framework, which itself allows for the derivation of a set of indicators through which progress could be measured.

Both examples highlight the value of an overall strategic framework which can be adapted for use at a variety of different levels, while at the same time providing a basis for coherence across a programme of work and helping to maintain fidelity to an overall set of objectives.

The final point to make here relates to the methodology of evaluation. Addressing issues related to peacebuilding, safety and security implies engagement with a complex set of realities. Although there are few examples of the use of ‘what works?’ evidence-based approaches, including the use of randomized control trials (RCTs) or other quasi-experimental methods, in addressing these issues, their potential value should not be dismissed. Use of this approach requires careful consideration of design and outcome conditions that can lead to a more realistic sense of what might be possible under given circumstances and a clearer basis for assessment on whether programme goals have been achieved. Furthermore it requires the construction of a detailed logic model in which the different steps involved in moving towards final outcomes have to be carefully considered and charted. This type of approach has been adopted by the Centre for Social Innovation and Evidence in addressing the potential of early years’ education in peacebuilding processes across a wide range of contexts\(^10\).

**Summary and Conclusions**

The report to the British Council comprised two main sections. The first section was a desk-based review of a range of issues and areas related to the overall agenda on safety and security. The second section

---

\(^9\) For further details on this see Novelli et al. (nd) The 4Rs Framework: analysing education’s contribution to sustainable peacebuilding with social justice in conflict-affected countries, available at: [http://uir.ulster.ac.uk/37771/1/Novelli%2C%20Lopes%20Cardozo%20and%20Smith%20%282017%29%20The%204Rs%20Framework%20-%20FINAL.docx](http://uir.ulster.ac.uk/37771/1/Novelli%2C%20Lopes%20Cardozo%20and%20Smith%20%282017%29%20The%204Rs%20Framework%20-%20FINAL.docx)

\(^10\) https://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/cesi/News/CESITeamAwarded2mGranttoEstablishGlobalResearchGrouponECDforPeacebuilding.html
comprised a series of case studies looking at British Council initiatives in a range of jurisdictions, and a few case studies of interventions organized by other agencies in a number of jurisdictions.

In order to locate the role of education in post-conflict situations we carried out some secondary analysis of the Kroc Center database on conflict accords to examine the role education played in those accords. What we found was that the overall pattern was that greatest priority was given to dealing with measures which would reduce the likelihood of further violence, followed by measures which sought to reform some of the more contentious aspects of the internal disputes. Thereafter the provisions included in the agreements started to focus on medium- to long-term measures, including the reform of education. The provisions which appeared least frequently in the agreements included ones which allowed for more fundamental changes in the structure of states, including measures to allow for local self-determination of independence, or measures focused on protecting the rights of specific groups. The key finding was that education reform is a significant provision in conflict accords in that it appears in half of the formal agreements. It should be noted that this database simply records what is in the published accords and there are no data on the extent to which these measures were implemented, or the level of success or otherwise they achieved.

We next considered the various structural arrangements through which education systems can be organized and how these related to the position of majority and minority communities in particular societies. Four main structural options seem to predominate, each of which have a different pattern of relationship to issues of culture, tolerance and the recognition of minorities:

- Unitary systems provide a singular arrangement of schools, privilege dominant cultures, provide no formal recognition of minorities and do not have tolerance of difference as a high priority
- Segregated systems offer a plural arrangement of schools, privilege dominant cultures, do offer recognition of minorities albeit normally in subordinate roles, and do not have tolerance of different as high priority
- Multicultural systems normally provide a singular arrangement of schools, attempt to privilege cultural diversity, do provide recognition of minorities and do establish tolerance of difference as a priority
- Plural systems provide a plural arrangement of schools, privilege cultural diversity, provide recognition of minorities and do establish tolerance of difference as a priority

Having outlined the structural options we then examined the literature on the evidence on the outworking of examples of these different system across a range of country case-studies. Three main conclusions emerged from this analysis:

- First, there is no ‘silver bullet’ in education structures that allows for a guaranteed positive outcome to the challenges posed by diversity in society. In other words, the impact of any particular education structure is linked to the context within which it is based.
- Second, the societal role of education has changed over time, and no doubt will continue to evolve as social values and mores evolve, so its social purpose has also changed over time. This implies that a particular education structure may have different consequences, either positive or negative, at different times because the context has changed.
- Third, education systems are important as schools are key civic institutions, but their impact is crucially dependent on a wide range of other social and economic measures which shape and influence the experience of people within society. Different educational structures reflect
national traditions, values and trajectories, and set different levels of constraint or possibility on a variety of policy measures, but no one structure, or no one policy, provides a simple positive answer to the challenges facing societies now, or in the past.

This consideration of the role and impact of different education structures also highlighted an important conclusion from a study published by the Minority Rights Group in 1997 which concluded that ‘...educational differentiation can take many forms and is found to some extent in every system, so the question is not whether it is good or bad, but rather on the extent to which it is forced: in such circumstances educational inequalities are a very likely outcome and this is likely to have wider social consequences.’

We next provided a more in-depth consideration of the role of education in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo. This case study pointed to a significant lack of accountability and transparency in the management of the education system, the proliferation of entities, and the exclusion of parents and communities from the decision-making process, and concluded that these had all contributed to the undermining of trust in public institutions and the Congolese state. Low salaries and poor working condition, combined with a lack of training, had decreased the motivation and expertise of teachers, with an impact on the quality of education and educational outcomes especially in the poorest areas. Furthermore, the lack of conflict sensitive programs, the exclusion of minority groups, and the lower standards of schools in certain areas of the country had perpetrated social and cultural divisions, and in turn raised the risk of recurring conflict.

A consideration of a long-standing corpus of research on intergroup conflict examined the impact of the ‘contact hypothesis’ and the role it could play in reducing negative intergroup perceptions and relations. Recent evidence from multiple studies and a large-scale meta-analysis have demonstrated the positive impact of contact. At the same time there have been criticisms of the ‘contact hypothesis’ for ignoring some of the contextual elements in the processes of intergroup relations. Thus, some suggest that it focuses on promoting harmony, but not exploring difference; focuses on individuals, rather than structural features; implicitly seeks ‘bounded and gradual’ change, rather than radical change; while it has also been criticized for providing an idealist perspective which assumes the conditions for contact can be put into place unproblematically, with a guaranteed outcome, while ignoring the capacity of people to interpret experience differently.

We were interested in exploring conceptual frameworks that might provide strategic guidance for education interventions aimed at addressing issues related to safety and security, and so explored the ‘conflict sensitivity’ approach. The conflict sensitivity approach provides a set of processes that help recognise the unintended (positive and negative) contribution of all programs and projects to conflict, and where possible, peace. Conflict sensitivity involves systematically understanding the conflict (through a conflict analysis), assessing how programming interacts with the conflict (and the opportunities for peace), and revising programming based on this knowledge. A key part of the rationale for the approach is that, although education is normally not a direct cause of violent conflict, it can influence the incidence of violence based on its interaction with many dimensions at the individual and societal levels. Ultimately, education can influence attitudes, values and behaviour across generations, and can be used as a tool to foment divisions and tensions along religious, political, social and ethnic lines. Published research on this theme has suggested a relationship between education and violent extremism, to the extent that educational benefits, through job skill and civic programmes, can raise expectations even if there are not sufficient jobs or quality of employment in a given country context and, in this way, fuel resentment and, possibly, violent reactions.
This final theme was explored in more depth in a consideration of the growing literature on the role of education in radicalisation and de-radicalization. This analysis highlighted a number of relevant issues. First, the relationship between education and radicalization is not simple: there is an extensive literature which suggests that lack of access to educational opportunity can fuel resentment, marginalization and radicalization, yet many of those who participated in terrorist acts in the UK and USA had higher educational backgrounds. Similarly, while individuals with lower levels of educational experience may be more likely to seek membership of terrorist groups, recruiters typically prefer those with higher levels of achievement. Second, it seems also to be the case that virtually all of the de-radicalization programmes have included some type of educational activities within their scope, though usually as part of an integrated package of measures, and typically not one of the higher priority elements of the programmes.

Attempts to convert former combatants is nothing new, but it has taken on a new resonance since the 9/11 attack in New York as a consequence of individuals being radicalized and recruited to fight in foreign wars, particularly in Iraq or Afghanistan, or to carry out terrorist attacks in their own countries, or other Western countries. Broadly stated there are two main approaches to this, a security approach and a rights approach.

The security approach is largely based on putting measures in place to prevent radical groups recruiting new members, or processes which will de-radicalize those who have already joined, either to change their outlook and leave, or more simply not to engage in acts of violence, whether they eschew the radical outlook or not. Proposed actions in Russia are explicit on the need to develop counter-terrorist materials and actively counter terrorist propaganda, while programmes in the Middle East and Southeast Asia are often based on persuading militants in prison to adopt a ‘correct’ version of Islam. Since most of the states involved are Islamic, there is little hesitation in government involvement in religious advocacy. By contrast many European states are less willing to address religious issues directly. In some places there are active attempts to discredit ‘terrorist’ organizations and/or to discredit the motivations of individuals who join.

In the UK this type of approach is addressed through monitoring of internet use (as in the UK), seeking to identify individuals who might be at risk of radicalization and encouraging interventions to halt this process. This type of intervention can be seen in other European programmes, but in France they also encouraging patriotic values through education.

The second type of approach seeks to cast schools as places where diversity, openness and engagement are encouraged, and action is addressed at structural, behavioural and attitudinal levels. The aim is to promote a positive sense of inclusion alongside respect for diversity. Values and ideas should be constantly confronted and questioned, it is suggested, and students encouraged to develop critical thinking skills and question taken-for-granted assumptions. This approach seeks to address some of the roots of radicalization through education, but rather than trying to identify or target specific groups of students, the approach encourages critical thinking, allowing a diversity of opinions to be aired and confronted in open and constructive ways, in order to promote a greater sense of civic participation and efficacy. In this respect it echoes aspects of the Council of Europe’s approach which is rooted in inter-culturalism and the promotion of dialogue (Council of Europe, 2008; see also Flecha, 1999) and seeks to challenge radicalization by the active promotion of democratic values and practices. Advocates of this approach may be more likely to point out that although the term radicalization has recently been
associated with terrorism, it has a longer history reflecting unconventional or challenging views, many of which have been the spur to progressive social change and have become mainstreamed over time.

In the final part of the desk-based research we carried out a systematic review of the literature on education and conflict and found a very limited evidence base. Many of the papers identified in the search process focused on the role of the curriculum, particularly in the arts and humanities, on promoting understanding and tolerance. The few papers most directly relevant to the present interest focused on a variety of topics, including immersion bilingual education to promote cohesion and inclusion, post-conflict reconstruction, or urban reform, and the teaching of civic education. Some of the papers also highlighted that some education initiatives actually inflamed situations, rather than improved them.

The empirical phase of the study focused on a range of case studies, with a selection of British Council case studies, then a number of case studies of interventions supported by other organisations. The British Council case studies included work on teacher capacity and student dialogue in Gaza; the teaching of history in Lebanon; higher education leadership in Ukraine; the coordination of a series of Newton funded projects in Colombia and an assessment of a schools education programme in Jordan.

The case studies of interventions supported by other organisations included work on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education supported by the Council of Europe in Ukraine and an education intervention to promote school collaboration in Macedonia. We also offered some analysis of evaluation reports on a global schools education programme. Each of the case studies were interesting in their own right, but the broader patterns across them was more relevant for the present purposes. In particular, it was clear that a distinct advantage for the British Council lies in the value of its local knowledge and capacity to network and connect, and the level of trust it has built up in many different contexts. It has also developed an approach which is based on over-arching programmes which can be adapted to local circumstances in different contexts. This has led to a fairly high degree of variability in implementation across British Council programmes and this may not always have taken the most optimal routes.

A contrast can be seen in the Council of Europe programmes in that they are placed within a more explicit strategic framework which helps to guide focus and inform decisions when adaptations were being put in place. This also provided the basis for an evaluation framework that went beyond measures of activity or indicator measures, but rather encouraged focused discussion on specific themes which were part of the overall programme goals. There are limitations to this approach: in comparison with the British Council approach, the Council of Europe approach does not place as much significance on an explicit theory of change. In part this is because it places more significance on a normative stance towards the value of democracy and democratic culture and, by definition, this is almost always a more long-term objective and one, moreover, which may hit set-backs along the way as a consequence of circumstances and ‘events’. It does seem to mean, however, that there is less immediate pressure for empirical outcomes. Furthermore, as a global entity, the British Council may be working in a wider range of contexts which provide a greater set of constraints on what is possible at any one time.

More generally the case studies highlight some themes that had emerged in the desk-based phase of the research, including the importance of context as a mediator of structure; the impact of measures on majority and minority communities; and the need for careful attempts to understand the potential impact on different communities as part of the process of planning interventions. Furthermore, the importance of curriculum and pedagogy as the ‘software’ of education interventions was highlighted as
a necessary complement to the perceived need to develop the ‘hardware’ of education, that is building schools and training teachers: it is not enough, in other words, to create places where education can be taught, but we have to give careful attention to what is taught and how it is taught in those places. Related to this, an advantage of the Council of Europe approach was its deliberate focus on the normative aspects of what it was seeking to achieve and the way the frameworks guiding its work constantly brought participants back into discussion and consideration of these normative issues.

This strategic dimension needs to be conjoined with a focused awareness of tactical options to guide practice on the ground. We saw, for example, the value of a host of tactical options in the de-radicalization work, including the use of civic actors, providing alternative aspirations or building coalitions with families. The use of contact initiatives in intergroup contexts has a potentially important role to play, but once again care is needed in analyzing the context within which this occurs so that unintended negative consequences, or the reinforcement of existing inequalities, are not the outcomes. Serendipity also plays a role in that not all unintended positive outcomes are predictable, but when novel challenges are being addressed they are almost inevitable, so that mechanisms should be in place to identify and amplify them when they do occur.

In some respects the experience of the global schools education programme provides some useful illustrations of this, in that we have seen instances where some project elements have been adapted to local contexts to such an extent that their wider strategic import may be diluted, or even lost. We saw this, for example, in the analysis of the schools education programme in Jordan where the theme of critical thinking was oriented towards preparation for employability whereas it is more fundamentally a key theme in democratic practice and should be not only taught in the classroom, but practiced in the school.

Three further conclusions emerged from this part of the report:

- Evidence of the causal effectiveness or ineffectiveness of education interventions in supporting security and stability is weak, as the areas has been under-researched and under-evaluated, and while it is likely that education, either alone or in combination with other activities, achieves only a certain level of influence, it is difficult to assess reliably this level of ambition before an intervention.
- Since we know that education is not an unambiguous good, then care should be taken in the planning of interventions to ensure that no intentional or unintentional harm is likely as a consequence of the intervention.
- Interventions can be put in place for a variety of purposes, and sometimes the intent changes over time, but if there is a broad strategic interest in specific goals, such as security and stability, then these strategic goals should be reflected at every level of the intervention and familiar, at some level, to those who are involved with the intervention. Using a logic model helps to locate steps along the pathway towards the intended outcomes of an intervention, while the process of developing a logic model ensures detailed discussion on the nature and efficacy of these steps.

The overall main theme that emerges from this study in relation to the practice of the British Council lies in the recommendation to develop an over-arching strategic framework to guide specific activities and programmes. In this study three distinct frameworks have been considered, and while each of them has a primary focus on different stages of the implementation process, all of them provide a useful framework for guiding project practice and evaluation. The first of these was the ‘conflict sensitivity’
approach pioneered by the International Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) which provides a systemic model for diagnosing the challenges and issues in any specific intervention, and acts as an early warning system for unintended consequences. The second was the ‘4 R’s’ model of redistribution, recognition, representation and reconciliation which provided a framework for considering the role of employment in a globalized economy, while at the same time allowing such issues as ‘addressing inequalities, respecting differences, encouraging equal participation, and tackling past, present and future injustices’ to be addressed. The third framework was that adopted by the Council of Europe on Education for Democratic Education/Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE), or even more recently with its programme of work on Competences for Democratic Education (CDC). While this framework is more explicitly normative in intent than the others, they all share the characteristic that they allow for a derivation of specific themes and indicators from the wider strategic framework, and the use of these to guide project planning, implementation and evaluation.

The British Council could consider the development of its own strategic framework aimed at the same purpose, but with themes related to stability and security. This could be used to place peacebuilding more explicitly at the heart of some of its core programmes. This framework could be used as a mechanism for strategic evaluation of all programmes, perhaps on a triennial basis, while at the same time providing an over-arching framework which project teams in specific jurisdictions can use as a touchstone for their own activities. The process of developing such a framework could act as a catalyst within the British Council for a discussion on how its key priorities can be better linked, and how they in turn can be linked to action on the ground: it would certainly provide a mechanism for encouraging high level consideration of the priorities which should shape future actions. The British Council currently has a plethora of useful mechanisms in place such as a conflict evaluation model, a method for putting programmes in place on the ground, an approach to evaluation linked to a theory of change, but the type of framework envisaged here could potentially act as a connector to all of these existing systems. Currently the goals of stability and security are in the British Council’s corporate plan, but perhaps they are not as well connected to specific programmes, or appropriately realized through the activity arising from those programmes. Perhaps making those connections should be the next priority.
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