INEE

Thematic Paper
for the Youth, Peace and Security Progress Study

Youth, Peacebuilding, and the Role of Education

Authored by
Mieke T. A. Lopes Cardozo
and Giovanni Scotto

Youth,
Peace &
Security

INEE

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) is an open, global network of representatives from non-governmental organizations, UN agencies, donor agencies, governments, and academic institutions that are working together to ensure the right to a safe, good-quality education for all people affected by crises. To learn more, please visit www.ineesite.org.

Cover image: Death of Innocence mural in Derry, Ireland, by The Bogside Artists, 2000. Photo taken by Mieke T. A. Lopes-Cardozo, July 2016. 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 colored stones at her feet are objects she was collecting for a school project. The broken gun signals a call for and end to violence. Here the innocence of a child's world contrasts vividly with the chaotic violence with which others have surrounded her.

Acknowledgments

Contents

Abstract

Adopted unanimously in December 2015, United Nations (UN) Security Council Resolution 2250 (UNSCR 2250) is the first UN resolution on youth, peace, and security. It recognizes the importance of young women and men as agents in the promotion and maintenance of international peace and security (United Nations, 2017).

This paper outlines key debates and insights on the role of education in relation to UNSCR 2250 and the youth, peace, and security (YPS) agenda. UNSCR 2250 requires the UN Secretary-General to "carry out a Progress Study on youth's positive contribution to the peace processes and conflict resolution" and to present the results to the UN Member States (UN Security Council, 2015, p. 5). The objective of this paper 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.

Section 1 outlines the rationale and relevance of this paper, while **Section 2** describes the conceptual and methodological approach. **Section 3** discusses the relation between education systems (both formal and non-formal), its actors, and the five pillars for action laid out in UNSCR 2250: participation, protection, prevention, partnership, and disengagement and reintegration. Here we ask, what idea or image of education does UNSCR 2250 reflect, and what are the possible limitations of or gaps in this representation? **Sections 4 and 5** offer insights from recent research on the drivers of violence and inequality in relation to education, before moving on to a discussion of the transformative potential of educational spaces. Here we address the following questions:

1. **What are contentious issues in educational governance and within school settings?**

2. **How is education related to forms of violence and social injustice?**

3. **How can education unfold its transformative potential to support peacebuilding?**

The information presented in this paper comes from a range of resources, including academic and programmatic literature, voices of youth as expressed in the YPS survey data, and findings from youth-oriented participatory research. Recent case studies and evaluations provide concrete examples of the potential, as well as the challenges, of education to support young people in their efforts to address conflict and build peace. **Section 6**, the concluding section, offers a reflection and set of recommendations on the key steps that lie ahead for UN, governmental, and non-governmental actors in terms of policy and the practical implementation of UNSCR 2250, with a focus on both formal education systems and non-formal mechanisms for learning and transformation.

PEACE – Five Key Messages

This paper highlights five key messages:

In order to build sustainable peace and better serve young people's needs through education, there is an immediate need to carry out **"P-E-A-C-E"**:

1. **PRIORITIZE** education funding and resources for young women and men in order to achieve the goals formulated in UNSCR 2250 to address the root causes of inequality and violent conflict and enable reconciliation across generations and groups in society.

2. **EMBED** in global responses the progressive and preventive potential of education to address inequalities and build sustaining peace by improving support for teachers and providing more meaningful representation of young people's realities and needs.

3. **ADEQUATELY** assess and respond to the potential of education to contribute negatively 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 and non-formal education into system-wide approaches at, above, and below the state level in order to engage young people's peacebuilding potential.

5. **ENACT** the more holistic and relevant educational opportunities young people demand in order to fully develop all sociocultural, political, and economic aspects of youth empowerment, and, as a result, enable meaningful youth participation, (dis)engagement, and (re)integration.

SECTION I. Introduction and Rationale

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

—Malala Yousafzai,
Nobel Peace Laureate and Education Activist

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

—Malual Bol Kiir,
Advisor to the Progress Study

As reflected in the epigraphs above, this paper is written at a point in time when young people's role in peacebuilding has been gaining momentum, largely as a result of UN Security Council Resolution 2250 (UNSCR 2250) on Youth, Peace, and Security. At the same time, 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, increased recognition in UN circles of the connection between education and both peace and conflict, and a growing body of related scholarship.

Findings of studies on education and peace/conflict call on policy-makers, practitioners, researchers, and educators alike to recognize the potential for education to take on a valuable, transformative role in the process of peacebuilding. At the same time, there is a need to uncover and address the ways in which education systems and actors may (re)produce inequalities and various forms of violence, which can be key drivers or potential triggers of armed conflict. The complex roles played by institutional school systems and non-formal learning mechanisms have featured more prominently in international debates since the recent adoption of the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDGs 4 and 16, and since the adoption of UNSCR 2250 in December 2015.

Considering the general lack of attention paid to the roles, actions, and hopes of youth in conflict-affected situations, UNSCR 2250 represents an important step forward. By urging UN Member States to increase the representation of youth in decision-making at all levels, UNSCR 2250 shifts the international focus from seeing youth as passive victims or a security threat to recognizing them as a large sector of the population that has the potential to contribute to constructive change. **UNSCR 2250 identifies five pillars** that have the potential to foster a positive role for youth in building peace: **participation, protection, prevention, partnerships,** and **disengagement and reintegration**.

UNSCR 2250 makes several direct references in the five pillars to the importance of education in young people's lives. This notwithstanding, it presents a relatively narrow view of the role of education in supporting "*youth entrepreneurship* and *constructive political engagement*" (UN Security Council, 2015, p. 4). This view is also reflected in the recent findings of a four-country comparative study on youth agency in peacebuilding conducted by the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding (Lopes Cardozo, Higgins, & Le Mat, 2016). The report concluded that the majority of interventions in an education context tend to focus first on fostering economic empowerment, and second on political participation. As discussed in more detail below, we posit that the sociocultural aspects of young people's sense of identity and agency are often underestimated and underfunded. There also is little focus in both formal and non-formal education on spaces for reconciliation, which should be regarded as a key aspect of a sustainable approach to peacebuilding (Novelli, Lopes Cardozo, & Smith, 2017). ∎

SECTION 2. Key Concepts and Methodological Approach

2.1 Key concepts and analytical framework

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

Education

The paper begins by highlighting the potential of education to either enhance or undermine sustainable peacebuilding processes and social cohesion (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). The paper discusses both 'formal education' opportunities (government-led, school-based, with formal curricula)[1] , and 'non-formal' learning spaces available to young people (led by civil society, NGOs, or the community)[2] . This categorization provides a conceptual framework with which to understand the various learning environments available, or unavailable, to diverse groups of youth in situations of conflict around the world.

Youth

Finding a meaningful definition for youth is an apparent mission impossible: how can we provide a universally valid definition of a massive segment of the population that is characterized by great diversity? Definitions of the term 'youth' remain contested, and the attempt to find one appears especially complex in societies ridden with violent conflict or affected by phenomena such as child soldiers (Schell-Faucon, 2001). A common perception associates youth with a variety of deep-rooted fears, ambivalence, and unsettling anxieties (Sayed & Novelli, 2016). We have chosen to work with UNSCR

2250 youth age definition of 18-29 years, bearing in mind the limitations of any definition and the need to acknowledge the intersectional heterogeneity (age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, geographic location, political views, sexual orientation, disability status, etc.) of any large segment of the global population. In 2015 there were an estimated 1.2 billion youth aged 15-24 years globally (UN DESA, 2015 a, p.1).[3] Moreover, when speaking about present-day youth, one must take into account both their past and future: today's youth who are dealing with inequality, violence, social transformation, and peacebuilding, were yesterday's children affected by armed conflict, and they will be tomorrow's adult citizens who shape the future of their respective communities.

In moving beyond narrow perceptions of youth as a threat to peace or as victims of violence, this paper defines youth 'agency' as the room for young people to maneuver as they develop (conscious or subconscious) strategies to either support or hinder peacebuilding in relation to their broader cultural, political, and economic context (see Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016). This paper argues the need for a more comprehensive understanding of youth agency for peacebuilding, which the international community should strive for by moving away from a victim-perpetrator binary and toward an understanding of heterogeneous constituents embedded within and co-creating processes of conflict and peace (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2015).

Reducing youth to either victims or perpetrators of violence in conflict situations reflects neither the multiple ways they are affected by conflict nor their potential to contribute to peacebuilding. As this paper argues, both

---

[1] The INEE Term Bank describes -formal education as follows: Formal education includes all learning opportunities provided in a system of schools, colleges, universities, and other educational institutions. It usually involves full-time education for children and young people, beginning at between five and seven years and continuing to 20 or 25 years old. It is normally developed by national ministries of education, but in emergency situations may be supported by other education stakeholders. (INEE, 2010 a).

[2] The INEE Term Bank describes non-formal education as follows: Non-formal educational activities do not correspond to the definition of formal education. Non-formal education takes place both within and outside educational institutions and caters to people of all ages. It does not always lead to certification. Non-formal education programs are characterized by their variety, flexibility and ability to respond quickly to new educational needs of children or adults. They are often designed for specific groups of learners such as those who are too old for their grade level, those who do not attend formal school, or adults. Curricula may be based on formal education or on new approaches. Examples include accelerated 'catch-up' learning, after-school programs, literacy, and numeracy. Non-formal education may lead to late entry into formal education programs. This is sometimes called 'second-chance education' (INEE, 2010 a).

[3] The UN defines youth as persons between the ages of 15 and 24 (UN DESA, 2018).

formal and non-formal forms of education have the potential to strengthen young people's transformative agency for peacebuilding. At the same time, it is clear that agency does not automatically translate to peaceful behavior. It is equally possible that young people's strategies for collective action could bring positive changes in society, while also contributing to the escalation of violent conflicts.

There is also a need for a clear definition of the term 'participation,' a key pillar of UNSCR 2250 and a word used in a variety of political and strategic motives and discourses. This paper identifies participation as it relates to education in a diverse, multiscale manner, recognizing, for instance, formal political participation (voting, campaigning), community-oriented decision-making, and individual choice in the educational trajectory. Furthermore, this paper argues that the quality of participation can be meaningfully assessed by analyzing the level of engagement and relative power within society.[4]

Peacebuilding
Our understanding of 'peacebuilding' is based on the 4Rs Analytical Framework (see Novelli et al., 2017), which identifies the dimensions of recognition, redistribution, representation, and reconciliation.The 4Rs Framework links Fraser's (1995, 2005) work on social justice with the peacebuilding and reconciliation work of Galtung (1976), Lederach (1995, 1997), and others. By combining thinking on social justice and transitional justice, this normative 4Rs Framework for the study of education and peacebuilding recognizes the multiple dimensions of inequality and injustice that characterize contemporary conflicts, as well as the need to address them in and through education. The 4Rs 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 (remediation of the underlying structural and symbolic violence 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, & Smith, 2015, 2017).

There has been a heated discussion within the field of conflict studies on the relationship between inequality, injustice, and armed conflict (see, e.g., the "greed-grievance" debate: Ballentine & Sherman, 2003; Berdal, 2003; Collier, 2000; Keen, 2012). In armed conflicts, real or perceived horizontal inequalities can be catalysts for group mobilization and uprisings (Langer, Stewart, & Venugopal, 2011; Stewart, 2008). There is limited research on the relationship between education and inequality and the outbreak of armed conflict. However, recent quantitative studies (see Family Health International, 2015) show a consistent statistical relationship across five decades between higher levels of inequality in access to education among ethnic and religious groups and the likelihood that a country will experience violent conflict. Therefore, there is a need to explore the multiple dimensions of inequality beyond educational outcomes, as well as the ways 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 these dimensions relate to conflict and peace (Novelli et al., 2015, 2017). Following this framework, this paper argues similarly that education can make a significant contribution to sustainable peacebuilding via its impact on security, and on political, economic, social, and cultural transformation within conflict-affected societies. In this instance, we define "transformation" as the extent to which education policy, peacebuilding, and development programs promote redistribution, recognition, representation, and reconciliation (Novelli et al., 2015, 2017). Examination of inequalities within the education system seeks to capture the interconnected dimensions of the 4Rs that have the potential to work—in complementary and contradictory ways—toward sustainable peacebuilding and social cohesion (Novelli et al., 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 identity in the structures, processes, and content of education as relates to gender, language, politics, religion, ethnicity, culture, and ability.

3) **Representation** concerns participation in governance and decision-making at all levels of

---

[4] See, for instance, a tool such as the "flower of meaningful youth participation" as designed by the youth-led organization CHOICE (CHOICE, 2017).

the education system as relates to the allocation, use, and distribution of human and material resources.

4) **Reconciliation** involves confrontation and engagement with past events, injustices, and the material and psychosocial effects of conflict, as well as developing relationships of trust.

2.2 Methodological approach and scope

The insights reflected in this paper derive from existing literature; accordingly, its aim is to provide a 'review of reviews'. This paper also sets out to justly represent, where accessible, the views and demands of youth, by determining whether the literature and studies this paper draws from reflect a youth-engaged and gender-sensitive approach. In addition to offering insights from recent academic and practitioner studies, this paper aims to give voice to the concerned stakeholders—young people living in a wide range of contexts around the globe— by engaging with primary data collected through the YPS survey and the relevant studies that reflect these perspectives. ∎

SECTION 3. Education and the Five UNSCR 2250 YPS Pillars

This section reviews the ways in which the UNSCR 2250 discourse on Youth, Peace and Security portrays education. UNSCR 2250 in fact makes relatively few explicit references to education. In the following section, the most relevant excerpts of the Resolution are presented and reflected on, with focus on the scope and usefulness of the way in which education is presented in relation to the five pillars.

Figure 1. The five pillars of UNSCR 2250 on Youth, Peace, and Security.

1) **PARTICIPATION**
   - Member States should consider ways to increase inclusive representation of youth in decision-making at all levels for the prevention and resolution conflict
   - All relevant actors should take into account, as appropriate, the participation and views of youth when negotiating and implementing peace agreements

2) **PROTECTION**
   - All parties to armed conflict must take the necessary measures to protect civilians, including those who are youth, from all forms of sexual and gender-based violence
   - States must respect and ensure the human rights of all individuals, including youth, within their territory

3) **PREVENTION**
   - Member States should facilitate an enabling environment in which young people are recognized and provided adequate support to implement violence prevention activities and support social cohesion
   - All relevant actors should promise a culture of peace, tolerance, intercultural and interreligious dialogue that involve youth

4) **PARTNERSHIP**
   - Member States should increase their political, financial, technical and logistical support, that take into account of the needs and participation of youth in peace efforts
   - Member States should engage relevant local communities and non-governmental actors in developing strategies to counter the violent extremist narrative

5) **DISENGAGEMENT AND REINTEGRATION**
   - Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities must consider the needs of youth affected by armed conflict, including through evidence-based and gender-sensitive youth employment opportunities and inclusive labor policies
   - All relevant actors should invest in building young persons' capabilities and skills through relevant education opportunities designed in a manner which promotes a culture of peace

Source: www.youth4peace.info

Pillar I: Education and Participation

> *"[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. S/RES/2250 (para. 2).***

Empowerment and capacity-building may take different forms, including through formal curricula and non-formal education spaces. Examples include formal secondary and tertiary education, as well as non-formal training in conflict transformation and peacebuilding. The discourse on youth participation can be strategically implemented in different ways, based on the interpretations of participation and the level of meaningful youth engagement that is desired or allowed. While the discourse in UNSCR 2250 opens up space for youth **representation** (as reflected 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 being tokenistic.

Pillar II: Education and Protection

Education is not directly mentioned as an element of the protection pillar of UNSCR 2250, and yet education can serve an important protective function. This is an important omission of UNSCR 2250. Protection has been defined as "all activities aimed at obtaining full respect for the rights of the individual in accordance with the letter and spirit of the relevant bodies of law," namely human rights law, international humanitarian law and refugee law (ICRC, 1999, cited in IASC, 1999, p. 4). This broad definition encompasses targeted legal interventions, as well as more routine activities that uphold the protection and wellbeing of individuals during emergencies and crises. Good education is protective and, because education is a human right in and of itself as well as an enabling right (i.e., one that facilitates other human rights), the education setting is especially important for mainstreaming protective programming and policies (INEE, 2018). Education protects not only against situations that hurt and kill young people immediately but also against future threats to lives and livelihoods. Education provides a return to familiar routines and instills hope for the future, mitigating the psychosocial impact of violence and displacement (INEE, 2017 a). Good quality education provided during conflict can also counter the underlying causes of violence, and foster inclusion, tolerance, human rights awareness, and conflict resolution – supporting the long-term processes of rebuilding and peace-building (Talbot, 2013).

Pillar III: Education and Prevention

Relative to the third pillar of prevention, UNSCR 2250 locates the main contribution of education as follows:

> *"[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." S/RES/2250 (para. 11).*

> *"[The Security Council] 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.***"* *S/RES/2250 (para. 12).*

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

Finally, vocational training can offer more to peacebuilding than simply increasing employment opportunities for young people. It should be geared toward needs and openings in the labor market to ensure that being unable to find a job after completing training will not further frustrate young people striving to rebuild their lives after conflict (see Section 4).

From a 4Rs Framework perspective, the role of education elucidated in the prevention pillar has a rather narrow scope, as it focuses predominantly on the economic and political aspects of young people's educational outcomes. This reflects insufficient awareness of the sociocultural (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 Partnerships

UNSCR 2250 directly addresses violent extremism and envisions specific tasks for the education sector:

> "[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." S/RES/2250 (para. 16).

This pillar relates to current efforts to prevent violent extremism (PVE) through direct involvement of youth and educational stakeholders, and through youth capacity- and skill-building and preventing their marginalization (see also Section 5). Education leaders, among others, are called on to develop "tailored" (i.e. context-relevant) approaches with the purpose of, at the cultural level, countering the attraction of violent extremist groups to young people; and, at the social and political level, providing tools for collective action. This is further discussed in Section 5 in relation to agency and empowerment for social inclusion and social cohesion.

Pillar V: Education, Disengagement, and Reintegration

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

> "[The Security Council] 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 labor policies, national youth employment action plans in partnership with the private sector, developed in partnership with youth and recognizing the **interrelated role of education, employment and training in preventing the marginalization of youth;**"
(b) **"investment in building young persons' capabilities and skills to meet labor demands through relevant education** opportunities designed in a manner **which promotes a culture of peace."**
(c) support for youth-led and peacebuilding organizations as **partners in youth employment and entrepreneurship programs."** S/RES/2250 (para. 17).

This pillar deals specifically with one key aspect of many peacebuilding processes: disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration. UNSCR 2250 uses the more general term 'disengagement' instead of 'demobilization,' which points to the fact that abandoning a culture of violence is a much broader and deeper phenomenon than merely leaving the military. Youth need to be encouraged and assisted in disengaging from a culture of violence (see Section 5 on education beyond employment) and be offered alternatives.

Nevertheless, the language of UNSCR 2250 continues to emphasize the economic and employment-related (or redistributive) roles of education. Moreover, while "relevant education" connected to "a culture of peace" could address some concerns about recognition and reconciliation as seen through the lens of the 4Rs Framework, there is limited clarity on how education systems, actors, or content could foster this. Finally, while youth-led organizations are recognized as stakeholders and partners, there is little acknowledgement of the role education could play in young people's political and strategic engagement or in their 'disengagement'.

As discussed in the following sections, educational institutions and activities can make a distinct contribution to achieving the objectives set forth in each of the five pillars. ■

SECTION 4. Insights from Research: Education Governance and Systems as Reproductive of Key Forms of Violence and Inequality

A growing body of research explores the dynamic relationship between education, conflict, and peacebuilding, with the aim of understanding how education is both affected by and affects conditions of extremism, insecurity, and violence. This section revolves around the question of how education is related to violence and social injustice, both positively and negatively. Recent insights from the field on policy, practice, and scholarship emphasize the need for thorough, historically informed, context-specific conflict analysis that includes a focus on education (Shah, Maber, Lopes Cardozo, & Paterson, 2016).

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 inequality and violence. Dale and Robertson (2016) demonstrate how education globally has failed to live up to its promise, resulting in a lack of equal opportunities and educational outcomes. It is important to understand who currently makes decisions regarding education, who provides the funding, and thus who exerts control over educational governance. Drawing on the 4Rs Framework, this section focuses on the various dimensions of contention in the governance of education and how these play out in terms of education 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. While education for refugees and displaced communities did take place in the decades that followed, it was often at the initiative of the affected communities themselves (Winthrop & Matsui, 2013).

The post-Cold War period represented a consolidation of the neoliberal political project, which, within the field of education and development, led to a globalizing set of education policies inspired by neoliberalism, including decentralization, privatization, and school-based management. These policies, which were initiated during the Cold War under structural adjustment policies supported by the World Bank and IMF, 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 level authorities were seen to have the potential to promote active citizenship, social inclusion, and cooperation. They were also understood to have the capacity to increase education providers' accountability and transparency and to encourage community participation (Dupuy, 2008). However, these mechanisms have, in many contexts, become a substitute for, rather than a complement to, public education (events in Guatemala are a case in point; see Poppema, 2012). Furthermore, local management committees can be prone to unchecked influence and by local elites and existing power relations. Furthermore in many contexts, despite their given authority, citizen-actors are often afraid, unwilling, or unaccustomed to challenge professional educational actors when necessary (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 the community from speaking up (Higgins, Maber, Lopes Cardozo, & Shah, 2016).

When one looks at who invests in education at various levels and why, the post-Cold War moment represents an important turning point, as geopolitical realities and intentions shifted dramatically and a new era of more harmonious and coordinated development efforts was ushered in. Humanitarian and human rights bodies started a lobby to achieve a higher standard of education for all children and young people, and to ensure this was on the agendas of bilateral donors and international financial institutions, such as the World Bank. In the decades since the end of the Cold War there has been growing awareness that, unfortunately, many of the world's out-of-school children and youth live in societies affected by violent conflict, and that achieving education for all will depend on successfully addressing educational

access and quality in settings of conflict (Novelli & Smith, 2011). This can only be achieved through fair and equitable distribution of education services.

The Global Monitoring Report analysis of 2011 data from UNESCO's statistics database 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 first into the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and again in the more recent Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs include a direct reference to the "promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence" (article 4.7.), thus reasserting the link between education and peace (UN DESA, 2015 b).

Over the past decade, the international community has given increasing support to education in settings affected by armed conflict, state fragility, and other emergencies. As a result, education, like food and shelter, has gradually come to be located at the core of human development efforts, and it is acknowledged to be 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 as part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, which is charged with the coordination of UN and non-UN humanitarian partners operating in response to humanitarian disasters. Education was included in the Cluster approach after significant advocacy on the part of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and its members who made the case for education as an essential component of emergency response. Headed by UNICEF and Save the Children, the purpose of the Education Cluster is to coordinate the educational response in emergency situations. The role of the education cluster, as stated in its 2017-1019 Strategic Plan Revision, is to is prepare and deploy resources in support of national education coordination mechanisms as part of an overall international emergency response (Global Education Cluster, 2017). Moreover, organizations such as the INEE have produced guidelines for the provision of

education in situations of conflict and disaster, such as the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education*[5] (2010), and international NGOs such as Save the Children, Oxfam, and hundreds of others, 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 have recently provided targeted support to conflict-affected states, with the aim of

> ensuring 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. (GPE, 2015).

Consequently, in 2012, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon initiated the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) (UNESCO, 2017). While GEFI focused on the broader MDG and education for all goals in its push to establish the SDGs in 2015, the work of INEE and its broad membership led to creation of the Education Cannot Wait campaign, which focused specifically on the humanitarian aspects of education in situations of conflict and emergencies. This culminated during the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016 in the establishment of the Education Cannot Wait Fund, whose aim is to support coordination and collaboration between public and private actors. This is the most recent and visible attempt to bridge the humanitarian-development divide in education.[6]

In this international context, over the years 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 on aid to education in conflict illustrates that this bilateral aid is increasingly focused on a small group of conflict-affected countries, including, at that time, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. This suggests that educational aid is unevenly distributed and favors countries whose international diplomatic and defense

---

[5] *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery, or the 'Minimum Standards Handbook' is designed to give governments and humanitarian workers the tools that they need to address the education needs for all those affected by crisis. It is the first step toward ensuring that education initiatives in emergency situations provide a solid and sound basis for post-conflict and disaster reconstruction (INEE, 2010 b). The Handbook forms part of a toolkit of education in emergencies guidelines, which cover topics related to gender, inclusion, conflict-sensitivity, psychosocial support, teacher professional development, and much more (INEE, 2017 b).*

[6] *The Education Cannot Wait Fund has set its overall five-year fundraising target at $3.85 billion. It aims to scale up its resource mobilization during the first five years, commencing with the aim to raise $150 million in the first year and bring funding to a level of $1.5 billion in the fifth year. (INEE, 2016 a).*

efforts are most pronounced (Shah & Lopes Cardozo, 2014), or those that are historically performing well on indicators of good governance (Menashy & Dryden-Peterson, 2015).

It is interesting to note shifting of donor priorities at differing times in their own political landscape. A bilateral donor, Save the Children, previously 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" (Save the Children, 2009, p. 20). Interestingly, Government of the Netherlands' political priorities and the foreign policy development agenda shifted for a time and were more focused on trade. This represented a radical move away from the country's former international position as an international donor. The Netherlands had long been recognized for making considerable funding commitments, including two major grants to UNICEF, and for innovation in developing new funding mechanisms to deliver aid to conflict-affected countries.[7] Fortunately, the Netherlands is starting to resume its role in providing funding for education in emergencies. At the World Humanitarian

Summit in Istanbul in 2016, it was announced that the government pledged an additional 7 million Euros to meet the needs of refugee children (Government of the Netherlands, 2016). Nevertheless, these political and policy shifts on the part of important international donors demonstrate the precariousness of this funding for meeting the long-term needs of young boys and girls affected by crisis.

Meanwhile, the new Education Cannot Wait fund has succeeded in raising global attention to education for children in crisis contexts. It has successfully raised funds from bilateral and multilateral donors, as well as private donors (Education Cannot Wait, 2017). Nevertheless, it is yet to be seen whether this new initiative really succeeds in establishing reliable and substantial support for education in emergencies in the long-term. At the time of writing, education 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.

Case Study: Liberian education during the Ebola outbreak

A recent study of Liberia (Santos & Novelli, 2017), which applied the 4Rs Framework, describes how the country's economy has yet to recover from the civil war, which ended in 2003. Huge social, economic, and political inequalities remain, with low levels of education and employment for men 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. (p. 7)

The education system is under-prioritized and ridden with inequalities, including a lack of access to and resources within education, especially for girls and young people from ethnically marginalized backgrounds, and/or from geographically remote areas. The communities most affected reportedly feel subject to mis-recognition and discrimination, and they have little faith—or representation—in the decisions that affect them, from school management to national government. According to Santos and Novelli (2017), this failure to address the multiple dimensions of inequality in the education system is a result of the over-emphasis in the national and international peacebuilding communities on security, democratic elections, and economic reforms at the expense of quality basic health and education services:

---

[7] These funds from the Netherlands government to UNICEF included the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT, 2006-2010) program, totaling $201 million, and the Peacebuilding, Education, and Advocacy (PBEA, 2011-2016) program, totaling $150 million (UNICEF, 2011).

> *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. (p. 16)*

Bottom-up community processes emerged during the response to the Ebola crisis and were key catalysts for redressing the effects of the outbreak, including 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" (pp. 16-18).

Santos and Novelli conclude by stating 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. (p. 17)*

Finally, Liberia's governance system has a history of highly centralized government control of the education system, with decision-making power concentrated in the hands of a few (Shah & 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" (2011, p. 44). Santos and Novelli (2017) suggest that, rather than a fully centralized system, reforms should strengthen decentralization while establishing or maintaining well-coordinated and unbroken lines of communication at all levels. At the same time, Liberia's recent plan to privatize the nation'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 for young people along the various 4R dimensions of inequality.

We also discern a blurring of lines between defense, diplomatic, and development efforts 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 counterinsurgency strategy to "win the hearts and minds" of civilian populations. The restoration and reform of accessible education 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, failure to provide education may be perceived as a symbol of state incompetence (Alubisia, 2005; Lopes Cardozo & Novelli, 2018; Novelli, 2010). For example, providing education (particularly for girls and young women) became a key justification for the international military intervention in Afghanistan, and educational progress was used to demonstrate the alleged success of the occupation. Newly built schools helped to legitimate continued foreign influence in the internal affairs of the Afghan state (Novelli, 2011; Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2012). However, these new schools, together with those established before the invasion, often with development aid, would frequently become military targets in the fight between internal warring parties and intervening foreign actors.

These new tactics have put humanitarian and reconstruction projects both in and beyond Afghanistan under increasing scrutiny, as aid organizations are often perceived to be working together with occupying forces and/or warring factions. As a result, schools and NGO-funded learning spaces have been increasingly attacked by various armed actors in recent years,

jeopardizing the safety of aid workers and of those learning and working in these spaces (Novelli, 2011; Shah & Lopes Cardozo, 2014).

4.2 Education under attack: Schools as sites of contention, combat, and resistance

Educational institutions cannot be seen as neutral ground that exists outside the dynamics and tensions of social conflict. Indeed, the reverse 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 issues related to schools under attack and analyzes the function of schools as potential spaces of protection—an element added to those described in UNSCR 2250 in the "protection" pillar.

In recent decades, particularly since the end of the Cold War, the number of intra-state armed conflicts has greatly increased, and fighting has taken place more frequently against and among civilians, rather than between national armed forces. Factors such as collective identity, religion, and ethnicity are increasingly the cause of deep societal divisions and armed conflicts, which are often exacerbated by the unequal distribution of resources. In many of the wars that have broken out in recent years, organized violence has become a relatively stable aspect of social life (Berdal, 2003; Kaldor, 2012, 2013). In "new" and "old" wars alike, it is often important for the political elites to gain support for their efforts to control/reduce organized violence. Once a societal conflict becomes a full-fledged war, particularly when issues of collective identity are at stake, there is a high risk that education may become a locus of the conflict. Schools, universities, and other educational institutions 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.

Children's schooling in areas of insecurity and conflict is being increasingly affected by attacks on education (O'Malley, 2010). These attacks vary along multiple dimensions, such as frequency, targeting, repertoire, and purpose (Carapic & Dönges, 2016). They include systematic targeting of perceived "Western-style education", as in the case of Nigerian armed group Boko Haram, the Afghan and Pakistani Taliban, and Al Shabaab in Somalia; direct attacks on individual students and teachers, such as the attack on Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Malala Yousafzai in Pakistan; the destruction of school buildings; and the strategic use of school premises by warring parties. In the Syrian conflict, as of 2013, 18 percent of the nation's schools had been damaged, destroyed, or occupied for purposes other than education (Save the Children, 2014). It is arguably difficult to identify trends in attacks on education worldwide, given that the scale, available data, and contextual triggers are so diverse as to be almost impossible to compare. Nevertheless, a Save the Children report based on UN data shows an exponential growth in reported attacks in recent years (Martinez, 2013, Save the Children, 2014). The 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.

To address the growing problem of targeted military attacks on education during armed conflicts, the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) was established in 2010 by UNICEF, UNESCO, and a number of international NGOs. The GCPEA initiatives have included the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict (or, 'the Guidelines'),* which were developed in stakeholder workshops and released in 2014 (GCPEA, 2014). The Guidelines are the nucleus around which the 2015 Safe Schools Declaration was built (GCPEA, 2015). The Declaration was put forward for international consideration by the governments of Norway and Argentina, and to date has been endorsed by 81 countries around the world (GCPEA, 2018).

Communities often place high value on education in conflict-affected settings and perceive it to be one of the few protective factors in situations of insecurity or instability (Novelli & Smith, 2011; Save the Children, 2013; Smith & Vaux, 2003; Smith, 2005; Talbot, 2013; UNESCO, 2011; Winthrop, 201; Winthrop & Kirk, 2008). Education, both formal and non-formal, has been recognized as a potential preventive tool against student recruitment into the military, abduction, and gender-based violence (Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003). Education institutions can help protect the well-being of children and youth by being attentive to their socioemotional needs, thus increasing their resilience in the face of adversity and the uncertainties of armed conflict (Diaz Varela, Kelcey, Reyes, Gould, & Sklar, 2013; Wiedemann & Dybdal, 2012). UNICEF has been working for quite

some time on establishing child-friendly spaces in refugee camps, for instance, and child-friendly schools around the world 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" (Lopes Cardozo & Shah, 2015, p. 186). Other organizations have also been working for many years, such as the International Rescue Committee, which piloted the "Healing Classrooms" programme (IRC, 2006). However, enhancing the protective function of educational institutions remains a challenging political and pedagogical task (Nordtveit, 2016).

4.3 The relationship between education, violence, and social inequality

Bush and Saltarelli's pioneering report in 2000, "The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict," suggests that reestablishing access to education after an armed conflict is not enough to restore peace: education itself can contribute to conflict, depending on who is making education policies and who is chosen to administer and implement them. Moreover, peace can mean different things to different people, and rather than conceiving of it merely as pacification or the suppression of societal tensions, we refer to what Galtung (1969) calls positive peace, which goes beyond the absence of direct violence, and negative peace. Positive peace includes the presence of social justice, whose purpose and effect are to address the root causes of violence. Education cannot be the sole panacea for conflict transformation; paradoxically, particular dimensions of an education system or its location within the postconflict cultural political economy may in fact do more harm than good (Shah & Lopes Cardozo, 2014), as illustrated above in the example of school-based management (see Section 4.1).

A further illustration of the "negative face of education" emerges when we look at education in relation to direct and indirect forms of violence. Direct violence occurs in conflict-affected states where schools become ideological battlegrounds for control; examples include attacks on teachers or physical punishment of students. Indirect or cultural forms of violence occur 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, cited in Seitz, 2004).

Structural violence can be reproduced within exclusive education systems, which limits meaningful access to education to society's privileged groups. Research in several contexts, including Rwanda, Liberia, Kosovo, and Sierra Leone, has shown that a lack of equitable access to schooling was a grievance between warring parties and helped fuel the conflict (Dupuy, 2008). On the other hand, there is evidence that enhancing tertiary education in the aftermath of a violent conflict may help to reduce the likelihood of societies relapsing into violence (Ishiyama & Breuning, 2012). Even before the reconstruction phase, therefore, governance mechanisms for sustainable peacebuilding could start to consider how opportunity and access might be reallocated more equitably in the postconflict phase. Doing so would require careful consideration of the barriers that have traditionally disadvantaged particular groups and their access to schooling.

If one applies UN Special Rapporteur Katarina Tomaševski's (2003) definition of the right to education, which is based on the principle that education must be available, accessible, acceptable, and adaptable for all, one must view millions of young people as excluded from schooling in conflict-affected societies. There are several factors that contribute to this reality. Many national governments are unable to adequately protect education systems, including students and teachers, from attacks and insecurity (see more in section 4.2 above). Many qualified teachers leave their positions out of concern for their personal safety, which can substantially reduce the skilled teacher workforce (Save the Children, 2013). Additionally, there is still relatively little funding allocated to education in emergency situations (see section 4.1 above), which contrasts with the uncomfortable reality of increasing numbers of humanitarian crises around the globe.

These insights resonate with recent empirical findings from a multi-country study conducted with 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 that failing to fulfill the potential and promise of a quality, meaningful education for everyone will likely exacerbate longstanding inequalities in societies around the world. With this in mind, we now discuss current research on ways to transform the main drivers and root causes of armed conflict and social injustice and through education and in the education system. ■

SECTION 5. Insights from Research: Enhancing the Transformative Potential of Education to Support Peacebuilding

Peacebuilding scholarship and practice tend to either sideline education or treat it as an issue of service delivery, like other public services such as policing and health care. We take a different approach in our analysis. The main focus here is how one can make sure education fulfills 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. Most important, this would entail providing equitable access to schooling facilities and redistributing education budgets to ensure that key resources reach marginalized students. Safe and secure access to education should be considered a key resource in protecting students and teachers from attack and ensuring that school premises are free of discrimination and gender-based violence. These goals relate to UNSCR 2250 pillar I (participation) and pillar II (protection).

Ensuring that learners' diverse identities and needs are recognized is necessary to counteract exclusive curricula in which, for instance, the language of instruction excludes particular linguistic (often minority) groups or leads to further segregation within a society. Sri Lanka's education system offers a clear example of an exclusionary narrative that focuses on the majority version of history, that of the Sinhalese (Davies, 2011; Duncan & Lopes Cardozo, 2017; Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Lopes Cardozo & Hoeks, 2014). However, there also are promising examples of work that specifically targets inclusive language, the goal being to increase social cohesion (Lo Bianco, 2016). This relates to issues addressed in pillars I (participation), III (prevention), and IV (partnership).

Educational governance and political representation ideally should be promoted through ethnically, linguistically, and gender-balanced representation at multiple levels and should include both students' and teachers' voices. Again, these issues are addressed

in pillars I (participation), III (prevention), and IV (partnership). The three "Rs" of redistribution, recognition, and representation enable us to uncover and address root drivers of inequality and violence. The fourth "R," reconciliation, points to ways schooling systems and curriculum content can heal broken trust and start to redress past and present grievances, thereby creating transformation and an alternative pathway to a more sustainable and peaceful future.

We elaborate on these dimensions by focusing on a number of thematic areas that offer insights into the transformative potential of education for peacebuilding. Most of these areas relate to one or several UNSCR 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 leave an entire generation with a sense of distrust and lack of perspective. Formal school systems in such places as South Sudan, Kenya, Uganda, Pakistan, South Africa, and Myanmar largely fail to fulfill the promise of serving and supporting a better future for all, as demonstrated in findings from the work of the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, which applies the 4Rs Framework (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016; Sayed & Novelli, 2016; Smith, Datzberger, & McCully, 2016). These studies point to a lack of focus on issues of recognition and on the reconciliatory potential of education. Investment in education is often tied to economic strategies that increase the human capital of youth 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, it supports the claims made in section 4 that education often fails to live up to its social justice potential.

A four-country synthesis report by the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016) on youth agency for

peacebuilding shows, on the one hand, that young people in these societies have high expectations of how education should impact their lives across multiple dimensions (economic, political, and sociocultural). On the other hand, it points to the ways the systematic or effective exclusion of marginalized young women and men from secondary education, and serious weaknesses in pedagogical approaches, undermine education's potential to empower these young people. Moreover, the disillusion and disaffection noted by the research teams cut 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 men from poorer and more marginalized groups. In addition to the socioeconomic explanations that account for low participation rates, the voices of young people presented in the four country cases express strong opinions about the largely irrelevant content and learning experiences offered them by formal education. Table 1 summarizes their perceptions of how formal education failed to equip them to participate in and become beneficiaries of key peacebuilding processes. Although the table distinguishes between views on redistribution, recognition, representation, and reconciliation, we should keep in mind that, in reality, these areas may overlap, as indicated by the dotted lines.

TABLE 1. 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 knowledge • Inattention to career advice	• Suppression of cultures and identities of minorities within exclusionary formal curricula creates grievance/frustration • Failure to recognize needs of disabled/ ethnic minority/LGBT youth • Highly gendered curricular content marginalizes experiences / needs of female students • Inattention to youth needs in relation to physical, mental, and reproductive sexual health • Dominance of rote learning to meet outdated 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 civil and political literacy education	• Militarized content may legitimize 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 et al. (2016, p. 57)

Table 1 highlights the lack of relevance formal curricula have for young people's daily realities, challenges, and hopes. Young people pointed out that, in some contexts, education was a hindrance rather than a help in securing employment. Furthermore, vocational education initiatives often led to joblessness and despair, and thus possibly acted over 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 youth agency. Many young people highlighted the dominance of rote learning methods in authoritarian instructional techniques, which prevented them from asking questions and developing opinions. In addition, an approach to learning dominated by preparing for exams and relationships with teachers characterized by fear and corporal punishment were generally perceived to be alienating and frustrating (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016).

A large number of the youth-led peacebuilding organizations that participated in a global survey about UNSCR 2250 expressed that hope that peace education, or education for a culture of peace, would be included in national curricula around the world.[8] These young people stated that this would be one of the most desired outcomes of UNSCR 2250. The respondents also 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 providing education (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2015; Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016). A study of Syrian students who fled to Turkey highlights the alienating effects of Syria's "hidden curriculum" (Bali, 2015), which refers to the consequences of negative stereotypes and prejudice that are not explicitly presented in educational material but are expressed, for instance, through classroom interactions. Building on the work of Freire (1985, 1996), the Syrian study concludes that an educational approach that fosters respect and mutuality over fear and mistrust needs to start with 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 (Durrani et al., 2017; Higgins et al., 2016) and Sri Lanka (Duncan & Lopes Cardozo, 2017), where exclusionary single-narrative curricula and teacher education practices leave little space for critical historiographical reflection by teachers or students. This limits the potential for reconciliation through education. Offering context-relevant curricular content would require a locally embedded needs analysis and a critical pedagogical approach that addresses mismatches between the curricular content and local reality, including students' needs (Bentrovato, Korostelina, & Schulze, 2016; Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016).

In Pakistan and Myanmar, for instance (Durrani et al., 2016; Higgins et al., 2016), reforms should focus on implementing more diverse and transformative pedagogies, which could enhance young people's agency and their ability to undertake a critical assessment of social inequalities. One 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 prejudice, the impact apartheid had on them personally, and how this influences the way they teach history. The training was also reported to enhance the adoption of learner-centered pedagogies (Tibbits, 2006, cited in Sayed & Novelli, 2016). Unfortunately, it was not extended to other regions of South Africa (Weldon, 2010, cited in Sayed et al., 2016). While this demonstrates that innovative training interventions can provide 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 young people's negative experiences with formal education, the next section looks into the role of alternative and non-formal (and non-state-led) educational initiatives.

Thematic Paper on Youth, Peacebuilding, and the Role of Education

Recommendations for reforms to formal education:

- Conduct a systematic revision of national curriculum content in conjunction with governments, education ministries, teachers, student representatives, unions, and other (local and international) stakeholders.

- Ensure equal resources to support safe and sustainable learning environments for female and male learners and teachers.

- 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 encompass diverse identities and learning needs.

- Prioritize gender-responsive approaches in both policy and educational practice in order to provide equal educational and career opportunities for male and female students, and for teachers, as well as gender-transformative approaches in order to enhance the relevance and appropriateness of educational content (see also Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016).

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

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

Non-formal education can fulfill different roles than formal education (Rogers, 2005, p. 155):

- *A complementary role* offers new educational opportunities to young people and adults who missed out on formal education during childhood, providing easier access and more flexible curricula.

- *A supplementary role* offers people the opportunity to familiarize themselves with new topics and teaching methods alongside those used in formal education; this frequently takes place through activities such as sports, music, arts, and media, all of which can play an important role in peacebuilding (see also Lopes Cardozo et al., 2015).

- *An alternative role* provides a space for producing and sharing alternative discourses that challenge "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 open 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 an ubiquitous social phenomenon and that it can (and should) be addressed in ways that promote mutual understanding and positive societal transformation (Harris & Morrison, 2013, p. 32). This type of learning uses insights from adult education, experiential education, and social psychology (Rivers & Scotto, 2007).

A substantial number of programs that support 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 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 (e.g., Charbonnier & Oliva, 2016), NGOs (Conflict Sensitivity Consortium, 2012), global activist networks (Galtung, 2000; Hunter & Lakey, 2003), faith-based organizations (Moore, 2014; Neufeldt et al., 2002), and often by local organizations active in the field (e.g., Vásquez, n.d.; Vukosavljević, 2000, 2007). In some cases this work focuses specifically on one issue, such as gender in peacebuilding (see, e.g., 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 that has served as a basis for approaches to training and peacebuilding aimed at supporting local agency and cultures of peace (e.g., "elicitive" approaches; see Lederach, 1995, 1997). 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 communications 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 interfaith, interreligious, and interethnic dialogue, social cohesion activities, training and capacity-building with a view to conflict resolution, peer education on UNSCR 2250 and the SDGs, training for leadership and income-generating skills (Thapa, 2017, p. 28), and arts, sports, and media education activities. For example, a respondent in a global survey of youth-led organizations reported that

> 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, p. 8)

In the last few years, the Internet and social networks have emerged as major spaces in which youth socialize, seek information and leisure, and build networks of material and spiritual support. The Internet

and social media also have generally been recognized as key resources for peacebuilding (Larrauri & Kahl, 2013). An interesting example is the social messaging tool U-Report, which allows anyone from anywhere in the world to respond to polls, report issues, and work as positive agents. It is a low-cost method of activating and networking youth (Davies, 2014). While technology has been used to reach out to young people to promote peacebuilding education in the context of (mostly non-formal) education and information and communication technology has the potential to reach youth in rural areas of conflict-affected countries, unequal access to good quality connections or devices—or a stable electricity supply for that matter—remain serious concerns.

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

Empirical findings from a four-country study (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016) 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 have a more sustainable impact. The data also showed the need for psychosocial approaches to dealing with young people's mental and emotional health at the inter- and intrapersonal levels.

A thorough awareness of and engagement with young people's developing political, civic, and societal beliefs and their worldviews is a crucial aspect of holistic education that supports peacebuilding. This awareness creates a link to recognition through processes of identity formation and building self-esteem, to representation by meaningfully experienced participation in peacebuilding processes, and to reconciliation by supporting trust (when appropriate) and mechanisms to address grievances and frustrations (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016). 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-makers. Depending on the sociopolitical context, an education ministry 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.

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

- Embed peacebuilding goals in education and training planning and programming to align with and/or contribute to wider societal transformation objectives and actors.

- Review past and present context-relevant 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.

- Foster meaningful leverage, advocacy, and support for peacebuilding into formal education sector reforms to accompany innovations in the non-formal sector.

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

In Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, and Uganda, non-formal education interventions that addressed the community-rooted realities and priorities of y outh were more able to be flexible and open when changing their operational strategies than were macro-level interventions of the national formal education system. Nevertheless, comparing a mostly negative image of formal education with 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, one that would ideally serve all youth constituencies equally (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2016). **Our argument here, therefore, should not be read as a rejection of formal or a preference for non-formal forms of education, but as an observation of the relative flexibility and transformability of non-formal interventions, which can potentially have more direct contact with the societies and communities they serve.** It also points to an awareness that reforms to education systems are anything but an overnight exercise, and should accordingly be planned and budgeted for and linked to long-term political commitments. Lessons and content from non-formal ventures may feed into renewal of formal education, such as through new textbooks.

5.3 Vocational training: Youth employment and peace

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

> *Karima 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[9]) (Thapa, 2017, p. 37)

In situations where direct and structural violence are a reality, the field of TVET becomes key for several reasons: it can facilitate access to the job market, it can be a tool for defusing social tensions and ensuring a degree of redistribution, and it is important in terms of prevention. In this respect, managing 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's 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 prepare for disengagement and to provide new livelihood perspectives for former combatants, usually young men but also young women, who often have 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; see also section 5.4 below).

Over time, disarmament, disengagement, and reintegration have become standard components of almost every peace process (Berdal & Ucko, 2013; Dudouet, Gießmann, & Planta, 2012; 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 given to their reintegration into economic and civilian life, including TVET. The paradox of unmet aspirations we refer to above with respect to formal education makes a reappearance here in relation to vocational training. Young former combatants, particularly those who have suffered most, such as former child soldiers, often express their desire to resume education and receive training so they can reenter civilian life. Meanwhile, educational and training programs usually focus on disengagement and do not provide long-term support (Guven, Kapit-Spitalny, & Burde, 2015).

Other conflict-affected groups may also benefit from vocational training and support in entering the civil economy. Returning refugees, displaced persons, and young people should ideally be given needed support. It is critical to find the delicate balance between support for demobilized former combatants, who could pose a threat to stabilization, and support for other potential recipients. Focusing on supporting communities rather than offering individual advantages has helped to avoid "positive discrimination" and rewarding former combatants (Dudouet et al., 2012).

A number of other elements could facilitate the success of vocational training programs for former combatants in postconflict settings: labor market analysis, appropriate vocational guidance, support after training has ended, and social acceptance of participants (on Rwanda, see Finn, Baxter, & Onur, 2014). The important differences between reintegration in urban and rural settings must also be considered: in the latter, for example, prospective farmers need access to land and support in initiating agricultural production (Özerdem & Podder, 2015).

Vocational training can directly encourage peacebuilding by bringing together youth across conflict divides, building on their similar past experiences of violence, and focusing on their plans and dreams for the future. A number of initiatives have linked vocational training,

---

[9] *Original author uses aliases.*

local economic development, and peacebuilding (on Bosnia-Herzegovina, see Fischer, 2006; Maebuta, 2011). The International Labor Organization and UN Development Program 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, encompassed project-management skills, health/HIV awareness, conflict management, and leadership and communication skills, which were 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, sociocultural, 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 living in closer geographical proximity 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, p. 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 vocational training for youth can make to peacebuilding efforts, it is important to note that UNSCR 2250, and many similar short-term external interventions, takes a rather narrow view of these economic development approaches. Vocational training alone does not provide a quick fix for building peace sustainably. Rather, when TVET interventions are not designed in a context-aware, historically grounded, and participatory manner, there is a chance they will do more harm than good by feeding into unmet expectations or reproducing existing injustices and inequalities. A 2015 Mercy Corps report on a study conducted with young people in Afghanistan, Colombia, and Somalia speaks against a widely held but false assumption that "idle young people, lacking licit opportunities to make a living, are a ready pool of recruits for armed movements" (2015, p. 16). This report argues that young people's experiences of injustice (e.g., discrimination, corruption, abuse by security forces) are the principal drivers of engagement in

political violence: "Young people take up the gun not because they are poor, but because they are angry" (Mercy Corps, 2015, pp. 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. Focus particularly on disengaging youth from systems of violence and armed conflict, and recognize that this should be accompanied by structural reforms that address inequalities.

- Take into account the characteristics of local labor markets and communities.

- After training has been completed, provide advice and support, access to labor markets and the relevant economic sectors, and manage students' expectations for the future from the start of training.

- Focus on a community's sociocultural and economic needs when supporting at-risk youth, and target collectives rather than individuals to avoid stigmatization.

- Take a holistic approach to TVET that views education reform and interventions as part of a transformative, sustainable (4Rs-inspired) peacebuilding approach that will require TVET and civic engagement programs to be coupled with transformative governance reforms. This is preferable to an isolated quick-fix approach to TVET as a single solution to address "idle and frustrated youth."

5.4 The complex role of education in preventing violent extremism and radicalization

In pillar IV (partnership), UNSCR 2250 directly addresses the need to prevent violent extremism among youth. 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, p. 4)

For the education sector specifically, addressing violent extremism is 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). 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 Countering Violent Extremism (CVE): in the words of the *Search for Common Ground 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, pp. 41-42). We therefore follow the advice provided in the *Peacebuilder's Guide* to strive for the acknowledgement of the complexity of social conflicts, ideological diversity, and political pluralism. We understand that extremist thought and action can exist in all ideological spaces and that they are often closely connected to hegemonic or counterhegemonic 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 (UN Secretary-General, 2015), which offered UN Member States a detailed set of suggestions for action (UN Office of Counter-Terrorism, 2017). At the same time, awareness is growing that, in order to prevent and transform violent extremism, it is necessary to better understand its drivers and mechanisms. A common distinction in literature dealing with violent extremism is between "push" factors, such as grievances and experiences of marginalization and social injustice, and "pull" factors, which relate 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 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 as both an important factor in preventing the spread of violent extremist discourses and a major structural factor in producing inequalities that push young people toward violent extremism (on Syria, see Aubrey, Aubrey, Brodrick, & Brooks, 2016). The Plan of Action identifies youth as a key social group in countering and preventing violent extremism. It also defines education as one essential area to take action, stating that

> 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. (UN Secretary-General, 2015, par. 54)

Nevertheless, there is still limited consensus on education's role in preventing violent extremism (see INEE, 2017 c), as well as limited analysis in the CVE literature of the crucial position education takes in the lives of young people, due either to its absence or limited availability and low quality, or to its possible transformative and preventive potential, which is what this section explores.

Different 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. (INEE, 2016 b, p. 14)

A second, often related dimension is education for global citizenship to foster an increased sense of community and encourage constructive social engagement and public participation. Starting with 197/EX Decision 46, taken by UNESCO's executive board in October 2015, the organization has promoted efforts to strengthen education, including human rights-based global citizenship education programs to prevent violent extremism, keeping in mind national contexts. 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 & Costa, 2017).

A third domain consists of empowering individuals and groups to effect political change. Sometimes this work is specifically oriented toward transforming the action repertoire of political groups that have previously resorted to 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. (Slachmuijlder, 2017, p. 4)

Lynn Davies discusses how education can actively interrupt the spread of violent extremism. Working through systems and not individuals, systems should encourage diversity, dynamic secularism, and a variety of belief systems to guard against polarization (Davies, 2016). Davies advocates for an education that explicitly encourages difference based on radical freedom of expression in order to prevent and address violent extremism (Davies, 2011). The focus in Davies' work is on respect for the rights of the other and on nonviolent behavior, including dialogue, participation, and nonviolent resistance to authority. Davies identifies four approaches to education for geared toward taking action against extremism; these approaches are focused primarily on the UK context and thus might need to be

contextualized for application in other contexts and societies. First, organizational patterns can work toward students' inclusion in their societal contexts by emphasizing dynamic identities and commonalities. Second, according to Davies, values need to be rooted in "secular morality" (p. 159) through the discussion and practice of universal human rights. Third, strong knowledge bases strengthen students' capacity to deal constructively with conflict. And, finally, education can help to engage students in critical appraisal of discourses offered by media, religious organizations, and schools themselves (Davies, 2011; see also Bickmore, 2010).

Another way to frame the issue is to look at the possible transformation of actors who advocate violent strategies. Studies suggest that abandoning violent extremism can be a realistic option, even for radical armed groups. Recent history offers several examples of armed groups turning to nonviolent struggle or mainstream politics (Dudouet, 2015). However, such a transformation is more difficult when the armed group has resorted to actions that directly harm civilians. Providing public education and political training for former militants can help encourage this transition (Dudouet, Planta, & 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%) that ended their activities did so by joining the political mainstream (Jones & Libicki, 2008).

Critical scholarship has referred to the dangers inherent in the politicization of education (Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008). Educational interventions, for example, 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" (2017, p. 2).[10] More recently, he argues, education strategies aimed at preventing violent extremism have in turn been implemented, in the UK for instance, "to monitor, control and suppress marginalized communities in a form of 'internal colonialism'" (Novelli, 2017, p. 2).

While initial attempts are underway to design educational strategies for the prevention of violent

---

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

extremism, there is a crucial need to assess the logics behind such interventions in different contexts and to determine why some well-intended prevention initiatives have unintended negative consequences. One telling example is the Prevent program in the UK, which asks teachers in the entire formal education (pre-primary to university) system to detect and report on potentially worrying student behavior. According to Novelli, Prevent was launched as part of a strategy to "identify potential terrorist suspects prior to any attack" and instill "British values" (Novelli, 2017, pp. 11-14) by holding teachers accountable for anti-terrorist agendas, which resulted in racialized and stigmatizing surveillance of Muslim students.

Such narrow views are counter to a dialogical pedagogy, which would critically engage with alternative views, dissent, and nonviolent forms of resistance, thereby 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 of inequality and conflict or extremism in any society (Naseem & Arshad-Ayaz, 2016; Sukarieh & Tannock, 2015). In supportive settings, educators and students alike can benefit from what Dale and Robertson (2016) hinted at as "education's promises," which we define here as opening up spaces for critical learning that might enable young women and men to become "radical" in a socially aware and socially just sense.[11]

Nevertheless, transformation through education cannot be conceived as linear, and it may have unintended consequences. While political empowerment training and civic engagement can support peacebuilding, they also can have unpredictable results, especially when conducted in isolation from broader reforms to address inequalities. As illustrated by Mercy Corps,

> 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. (2015, pp. 1-2)

A final caveat relates to the roles of formal and non-formal education. Individuals may support, or disengage from, violent extremism due to the influence of their peers, relatives, and friends, and their life experiences, rather than because of the influence of education or other conscious attempts to sway them (Garfinkel, 2007). Nevertheless, since (formal and non-formal) educational spaces remain crucial social spaces where young people spend much of their time, more research is needed to understand the complex relationships between education and challenges to violent extremism.

Recommendations for stakeholders involved in education to prevent violent extremism:

- Recommendations for stakeholders involved in education to prevent violent extremism:

- Acknowledge politically charged notions of who is considered "extremist" and foster a diverse understanding of various extremist ideologies, thus avoiding harmful stereotypes.

- Engage in nuanced analysis of educational possibilities to address the root causes of conflict and violence that are driven by alienation, exclusion, and frustration.

- Critically assess the underlying rationales and possible (unintended) outcomes of education strategies that involve surveillance and national security.

- Guarantee or work to create educational learning spaces that promote respect for diversity (in background and opinion) and freedom of expression, while strongly condemning violence.

- Foster a culture of respect and nonviolence that stimulates constructive, radical, innovative thinking and youth action.

5.5 Teaching history and engaging with the past through transitional justice

An essential aspect of education is the way educational institutions, textbooks, and teachers present past events and offer collective narratives

---

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

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 that circulate 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). Thus they often focus 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.

Teaching history is one of the most contested aspects of education in many divided societies. This is particularly true after a violent conflict, as the pathways and responsibilities that led to the conflict and who is responsible for human rights violations become contested topics (Bentrovato et al., 2016). The manipulation of history for political purposes is a key strategy of the negative face of education in identity-based conflicts (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). For instance, attempts to sanitize the content of curricula following a conflict or ethnic tension by removing any references to differences leaves citizens feeling that important questions of identity and struggle are being glossed over, thus 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 and leaves 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 transformation of societies toward positive peace. Histories and memories can be retold, "the past that lies before us" (Lederach, 2005) can be understood and appreciated differently, memories and identities can be renegotiated, and communities can be imagined anew. Education has been noted as having an important role in reconciliation and nation-building through the messages and shared values it can promote. In essence, education has the potential to support a form of social cohesion that is often lost during periods of conflict (Tawil & Harley, 2004). In the aftermath of violence, education

also can provide for psychosocial recovery, help to restore a sense of normalcy and hope, and promote the acquisition of values and skills for building and maintaining a peaceful future (Sommers, 2002, p. 18). Matters such as land mine education, health education, and disaster preparedness are critically relevant in such moments (Kirk, 2006, p. 2), and may perhaps be used to create a sense of national unity. Education—particularly non-formal education—can also provide safe spaces for reflection on the losses shared by youth affected by conflict. One example is the cultural projects carried out by Bosnian and international youth organizations in the 2000s. These efforts brought together young people who had suffered because of societal division and collective violence and gave them a chance to speak, thus giving a voice to "those who were not asked" (Scotto, 2004).

A specific dimension of engagement with the past that is receiving increasing recognition as fundamental to peacebuilding efforts is transitional justice (TJ), understood as a set of judicial and nonjudicial 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 how transitional justice and education could reinforce each other in peacebuilding contexts, and on the tensions and obstacles arising from attempts to coordinate TJ education processes and objectives (Ramírez-Barat & Duthie, 2015).

Recommendations for the role of education in reconcilliation and transitional justice:

- Include the education sector in a societal response to past human rights violations.

- Consult and seek support from all relevant stakeholders involved in transitional justice.

- Teach about the past 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 sustainable peacebuilding through education policy and practice.

As societal transformation processes advance, education systems face the challenge of transforming explicit and implicit narratives. The transformation needed covers curricula, textbooks, the ethos and working style of teachers, and the structural conditions that predominate, 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 (Ramírez-Barat & Duthie, 2015, p. 34). 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. This is not easy to do within an education system whose students and teachers come from different sides of a conflict. 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 TJ in education relates particularly to the prevention and participation pillars of UNSCR 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 living as refugees or as displaced persons within their own countries (UNHCR, 2016 a). Many of these people have had to endure prolonged periods of time—years or even decades—far from their homes: the average number of years of displacement is now more than 20 (UNHCR, 2016 a). A considerable proportion of young people affected by armed conflict globally are refugees or IDPs; however, it is not easy to determine the exact percentage of displaced youth as defined in UNSCR 2250 as those between 18-29 years old. In UNHCR's global statistics, the number of refugees is usually aggregated from age 18 to 59. Even still, it is safe to assume that refugees in the 18-29 age group comprise a significant portion of the total refugee population.

Primary and, to some extent, secondary education have been the traditional focus of education efforts by humanitarian agencies addressing the immediate needs of refugees and IDPs. This is clearly reflected in the available figures on education attendance: about 50 percent of refugee children are able to attend primary school, as compared to a global rate of 90 percent for non-refugee children. As they get older, the gap widens: 84 percent of non-refugee adolescents attend lower secondary school, but only 22 percent of refugee adolescents have that same opportunity. Moreover, only 1 percent of refugees attend university, compared to 34 percent of non-refugees globally (UNHCR, 2016 b, p. 4). Conflict-induced displacement also greatly reduces young people's chances of accessing continuing and vocational education (Muggah, 2000). As these figures demonstrate, the young refugee population often has limited access to education, particularly at the secondary and tertiary levels. This has many potentially adverse effects, as young out-of-school refugees miss out on the opportunity to acquire knowledge and build skills useful for life and work, and they become more vulnerable to economic exploitation, abuse, or political radicalization. Non-formal education programs play an important role in providing education in many refugee communities, but integrating these schemes with formal education is often challenging (Datzberger, 2017). For example, certification is important for refugee students, but the reality is that there is a lack of reliable records and examination certificates for these young people, which hinders their integration into formal schooling systems or the labor market (Kirk, 2009).

Whether integrating into a new society or returning to their country of origin, education can be a key element of the processes that help young refugees become transformative agents of social cohesion, conflict prevention, and peace. Opportunities and constraints for refugees vary greatly: while some will return to their home country as soon as conditions are conducive to their return, others will have to settle for temporary or permanent residency in host countries because the situation in their own country remains unsafe. When a conflict wanes and the political situation in the country of origin stabilizes, refugees either choose to return home or are sometimes forced to return by their hosting country. Refugees who do return to their home country often face the challenges of reintegrating and rebuilding, as their homes and land often have been ruined, and entire social and economic systems often have been destroyed (Ruben, van Houte, & Davids, 2009). Education can play a key part in facilitating the return process by both helping refugees prepare to return and providing services for children and young people once families are back home.

Other refugees must integrate into their host community, and a small proportion must resettle in a third country. Diaspora communities may arise in these host nations, as the displaced people seek to find a modus vivendi in the host society while at the same time maintaining economic and political ties with their home countries (Betts & Jones, 2012). Diaspora communities can play a constructive role in the peaceful transformation of conflicts in their countries of origin, and in societal redevelopment after a conflict. Furthermore, they often support relatives who remain in their country of origin. However, diasporas also may contribute to the entrenchment of adversarial attitudes and prolong unforgiving approaches to conflicts in the countries of origin, sometimes even offering financial and political support to armed groups (Betts & Jones, 2016; Carment & Sadjed, 2016; Vimalarajah & Cheran, 2010; Zunzer, 2004).

An intermediate situation that affects most of the world's refugees (Loescher, Milner, Newman, & Troeller, 2008; Loescher & Milner, 2011) arises when a protracted refugee situation develops. UNHCR estimates that the average length of a major protracted refugee situations is now 26 years (UNHCR, 2016 a, p.20). This is the predominant state of affairs at present, and the upward trend toward lengthy displacement, often longer than a full education cycle, is expected to continue. Therefore, education systems and programs need to take into account the prospect of an unknowable future for their students (Dryden-Peterson, 2017). Education for refugees living in temporary shelters and camps is often provided by humanitarian agencies, including UN agencies, national and international NGOs, and local ad hoc services. UNHCR is mandated to provide refugee protection and assistance globally, and UNRWA is mandated to do the same specifically for Palestine refugees. It is also important to note that national governments are responsible for fulfilling the right to education within their territory; for signatories to the 1951 Refugee Convention, this includes refugees. Nonetheless, while primary responsibility for education sits with governments, their willingness and capacity to respond are often constrained, and thus both international and national/sub-national actors become involved. Among refugees in protracted situations, young people who find shelter in urban settings may become more vulnerable while simultaneously enjoying new opportunities in the local economy and with civil society actors (Mendenhall et al., 2017).

Education for refugees is often considered "basic service'" in emergency and prolonged humanitarian responses, particularly in the context of refugee camps. An alternative discourse in policy and research identifies education as not merely a basic service but as an intervention aimed at capacity-building and providing refugee individuals and groups with agency (Troeller, 2003). Political forces in refugee communities, host country education systems, and international humanitarian agencies and NGOs, each with their own agenda and objectives, may pursue or support this discourse (Fresia & von Känel, 2016). It should be noted that education for a long time was not considered a basic service comparable to such life-saving assistance as health care, shelter, water, and sanitation. However, UN agencies, NGOs, and governments are now putting a greater focus on providing access to education, as well as on the quality of that education, on ensuring relevance in the curriculum, on language of instruction, on certification, and on developing knowledge and skills that will be useful to the refugees, all of which will enable them to contribute to sustainable investment in their host or home country's future.

Traditional education in emergencies responses have focused mostly on primary education and somewhat on secondary education. However, postsecondary education for young people should be seen as equally important. There is evidence that providing tertiary education in the aftermath of a violent conflict may lessen the likelihood that a society will relapse into violence (Ishiyama & Breuning, 2012). In recent years, UNHCR has defined an educational strategy for their populations of concern that centers on providing improved access to secondary and tertiary education, and on the inclusion of peacebuilding, conflict sensitivity, and social cohesion in educational curricula (UNHCR, 2012). Priority 6 of UNHCR's Global Strategic Priorities for 2016-2017 is "promoting active participation in decision-making of people of concern and building coexistence with hosting communities" (UNHCR, 2017, p.26). This is an important aspect of contributing to long-term peace.

Young refugees are a key segment 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 UNSCR 2250 pillars, offering refugee youth postsecondary education and training specifically aimed at peacebuilding can strengthen their participation in processes of positive change and help to prevent future tensions and conflicts, both within refugee hosting societies and upon their return to their countries of origin. Education can also be a tool for fostering partnerships in society and preventing young people from falling prey to violent extremism (see section 5.4 on PVE).

Recommendations for refugee youth education:

- Humanitarian agencies, including UNHCR, should reformulate future Global Strategic Priorities in order to address the specific educational needs of youth. This should be done 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, offer appropriate non-formal education curricula, and support formal education systems that include refugee students in meaningful ways.

- National governments should provide refugees and internally displaced persons with access to postsecondary and pre-secondary education, and integrate non-formal and accelerated education with formal education systems to accommodate the range and diversity of needs among refugee populations.

- The international community should provide support for multiple stakeholders, including youth-led peacebuilding organizations, to enhance peacebuilding education programs aimed at increasing constructive agency among young refugees, both in their countries of origin and in host communities. ■

SECTION 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 and recommendations for stakeholders working on supporting the potential of youth agency for peacebuilding through formal and non-formal education?*—we draw on the 4Rs Framework for sustainable peacebuilding by addressing injustices related to **redistribution**, **recognition**, **representation**, and **reconciliation**. This paper highlights five key messages (see Textbox 1 at the start of this paper) that connect, where relevant, to the five pillars of UNSCR 2250: participation, protection, prevention, partnerships, and disengagement and reintegration.

Key recommendations for specific stakeholder groups

Governments, bilateral donors, and international organizations should:

- Prioritize long-term funding and political commitment to **integrate** education within sustainable peacebuilding approaches, especially in emergencies and postconflict transitions.
- Foster collaborative **partnerships** that will enhance the integration of education reforms into broader policy frameworks for social justice and social cohesion, including the **participation** of grassroots stakeholders such as students and student representative organizations, and teachers and their representative bodies.
- **Protect** education spaces and actors (including students and educators) from direct (physical) and structural (exclusionary) forms of violence.
- Ensure fair **redistribution** of resources, training, and remuneration for educators.

Education policy and program designers should:

- 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 (INEE, 2013).

- Conduct a critical analysis to uncover, **prevent**, and address direct physical, structural (exclusionary), and cultural (discriminatory) forms of violence that are reproduced in and through education systems.
- Ensure respect for and inclusion of diverse identities (gender, ethnicity, age, religion, language, disability, sexual orientation, refugee status, political ideology, socioeconomic class, etc.) in order to give learners and educators full and meaningful **participation** in decision-making processes and educational opportunities.
- Prioritize gender-responsive approaches to enhance equitable educational and career opportunities for male and female students, and for teachers, as well as gender-sensitive approaches to enhancing the relevance and appropriateness of educational content.
- Design curricula that recognize intersectional diversity and represent 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 (both students and aspiring students) and youth-led organizations should:

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

Educators (in both formal and non-formal systems) should:

- When possible, **engage** in conflict-sensitive and transformative pedagogical training, and develop approaches that support education's positive promise to promote equity and social justice for all.

- Seek appropriate support and, where feasible, commit to ensuring **protective** and safe learning environments for students and educators alike by fostering non-violence and respect for intersectional diversity.

- Encourage students and young people to **participate** and **engage** in critical and constructively radical, nonviolent, yet transformative observation, thinking, and action.

- Pay attention to students' varied needs and talents, and support their economic, political, and sociocultural empowerment.

The research community should:

- Initiate research to address the gap in knowledge and the dearth of systematic evaluation of the short- and long-term effects of formal and non-formal education on the lives and choices of young people, particularly those in conflict-affected contexts.

- Develop and **engage** in capacity-building in order to conduct conflict-sensitive analysis of the ways education systems, content, and practices either fracture or contribute to peacebuilding.

- Work in **partnership** with young people to build their capacity and encourage their meaningful **participation** in research strategies.

- Work in **partnership** with civil society, policy designers, and other stakeholders to ensure that research outcomes are presented in relevant ways and are widely disseminated to allow for their integration into policy and program development. ■

References

Alubisia, A. (2005). *UPE myth or reality: A review of experiences, challenges and lessons from East Africa.* Oxford, UK: Oxfam Great Britain and African Network Campaign on Education for All.

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.* Chard, UK: Action Aid. Retrieved from **http://www.actionaid.org/2016/12/challenges-education-reform-and-privatisation-liberia**

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. Retrieved from **http://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/Syria_YouthRecruitmentExtremistGroups_EN_2016.pdf**

Bali, Z. (2015). *Domination, privilege and fear: Uncovering a hidden curriculum of oppression in the Syrians' narratives on school.* Lund, Sweden: Lund University. Retrieved from **http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=8084523&fileOId=8084524**

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. (Eds.). (2003). *The political economy of armed conflict: Beyond greed and grievance.* Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner.

Bentrovato, D. (2015). *Narrating and teaching the nation: The politics of education in pre- and post-genocide Rwanda*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bentrovato, D., Korostelina, K. V., & Schulze, M. (2016). History can bite: History education in divided and postwar societies. Göttingen, Germany: V&R unipress.

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

Berdal, M., & Ucko, D. H. (2013). Introduction to the DDR Forum: Rethinking the reintegration of former combatants. *International Peacekeeping*, 20, 316-320.

Betts, A., & Jones, W. (2012). *The transnational exile complex: How to think about African diaspora politics*. Oxford, UK: Refugee Studies Centre.

Betts, A., & Jones, W. (2016). *Mobilising the diaspora. How refugees challenge authoritarianism.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bickmore, K. (2001). Student conflict resolution, power "sharing" in schools, and citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 31, 137-162. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1111/0362-6784.00189**

Bjork, C. (2006). *Educational decentralization: Asian experiences and conceptual contributions* (Vol. 8, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects). New York: Springer.

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*. New York: 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.

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

CHOICE for Youth & Sexuality [CHOICE]. (2017). Meaningful Youth Participation. Retrieved from **https://choiceforyouth.org/our-results/meaningful-youth-participation/** Last visited 20 September, 2017.

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.* Oxford, UK: 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]. Retrieved from **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, 157-180. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.554085**

Davies, L. (2014). *Unsafe gods: Security, secularism and schooling*. London: Institute of Education Press.

Davies, L. (2016). "Wicked Problems: How Complexity Science Helps Direct Education Responses to Preventing Violent Extremism". Journal of Strategic Security 9, no. 4 (2016): 32-52. DOI: **http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.9.4.1551**. Available at: **https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss4/4**

Date-Bah, E. (Ed.). (2003). *Jobs after war: A critical challenge in the peace and reconstruction puzzle*. Geneva: International Labor Organization.

Datzberger, S. (2017). Peacebuilding through non-formal education programs: A case study from Karamoja, Uganda. *International Peacekeeping*, 24, 326-349. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2016.1214073**

Department for International Development (DFID). (2010). *DFID education strategy consultation paper*. Retrieved from **http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091016092835/ http://consultation.dfid.gov.uk/education2010/downloads/**

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.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

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

Dudouet, V. (2015). *Civil resistance and conflict transformation: Transitions from armed to nonviolent struggle*. London: Routledge.

Dudouet, V., Gießmann, H. J., & Planta, K. (2012). *From combatants to peacebuilders: A case of inclusive, participatory and holistic security transitions*. Berlin: 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*. Berlin: Berghof Foundation. Retrieved from **http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/ redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/UNDP-Berghof_Political Transformation-BannedGroups_2016.pdf**

Duncan, R., & 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), 76-94.

Dupuy, K. (2008). Education for peace: Building peace and transforming armed conflict through education systems. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) for Save the Children Norway. 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., & Sayed, Y. (2017). *Education and social cohesion in Pakistan: Summary report.* Brighton, UK: University of Sussex, Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, UNICEF PBEA Programme.

Education Cannot Wait. (2017). *About Education Cannot Wait.* Retrieved from **http://www.educationcannotwait.org/about-ecw/**

Family Health International. (2015). *Financial statements*. London: 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*. New York: Routledge.

Finn, A., Baxter, D. V., & Onur, M. F. (2014). *Rwanda—Making vocational training work: A study of vocational training in DDR*. Washington, DC: World Bank. 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 (Eds.), *Local business, local peace: The peacebuilding potential of the domestic private sector* (pp. 262-266). London: International Alert. Retrieved from **http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/ pnadl015.pdf#page=262**

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

Fraser, N. (2005). Mapping the feminist imagination: From redistribution to recognition to representation. *Constellations*, 12, 295-307. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1351-0487.2005.00418**

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

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Penguin Books.

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, 250-272. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fev016**

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, 167-191. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301**

Galtung, J. (1976). Three realistic approaches to peace: Peacekeeping, peacemaking, peacebuilding. *Impact of Science on Society,* 26, 103-115.

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

Galtung, J. (2000). Conflict transformation by peaceful means (the Transcend Method). Geneva: United Nations Disaster Management Training Programme.

Garfinkel, R. (2007). *Personal transformations: Moving from violence to peace* [Special report: DTIC Document]. Retrieved from **http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix= html&identifier=ADA472142**

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA]. (2014). *The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict*. Retrieved from **http://www.protecting education.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_en.pdf** Last accessed 30 December 2017.

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA]. (2015). *Safe Schools Declaration*. Retrieved from **https://www.regjeringen. no/globalassets/departementene/ud/vedlegg/utvikling/safe_schools_ declaration.pdf** Last accessed 30 December 2017.

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA]. (2018). *Safe Schools Declaration and Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict*. Retrieved from **http://www.protectingeducation.org/safeschoolsdeclaration#the_ guidelines** Last accessed 4 September 2018.

Global Counterterrorism Forum. (2017). Rome memorandum on good practices for rehabilitation and reintegration of violent extremist offenders. Turin, Italy: United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. Retrieved from **http://www.unicri.it/ topics/counter_terrorism/Rome_Memorandum.pdf**

Global Education Cluster (2017). Global Education Cluster Strategic Plan 2017-2019 Revision. Retrieved from: **https://reliefweb.int/ report/world/global-education-cluster-strategic-plan-2017-2019-revision**

Global Partnership for Education [GPE]. (2017). *Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict*. Retrieved from **http://www. globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/countries-affected-fragility-and- conflict** Last accessed 30 June 2017.

Government of the Netherlands. (23 May 2016). *The Netherlands pledges extra educational support for refugee children*. Retrieved from **https://www.government.nl/latest/news/2016/05/23/the- netherlands-pledges-extra-educational-support-for-refugee-children**

Guven, O., Kapit-Spitalny, A., & Burde, D. (2015). *The education of former child soldiers: Finding a way back to civilian identity*. Doha, Qatar: Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict. 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). *The role of education in peacebuilding: Myanmar country report.* Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding.

Holmes, M. (2017). Preventing violent extremism through peacebuilding: Current perspectives from the field. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 12(2), 85-89.

Hunter, D., & Lakey, G. (2003). Opening space for democracy: Third-party nonviolent intervention training curriculum. *Training for Change*, 23, 34-38.

ICRC. (1999, January 7). Third workshop on protection: Background paper. Geneva, Switzerland: ICRC.

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

INEE. (2010 a). INEE Term Bank. Retrieved from **http://toolkit. ineesite.org/term-bank/en/**

INEE. (2010 b). *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery - A Commitment to Access, Quality and Accountability.* New York: INEE. Retrieved from **http://toolkit.ineesite. org/inee_minimum_standards**

INEE. (2013). I*NEE conflict-sensitive education pack.* New York: Author. Retrieved from **http://toolkit.ineesite.org/inee_conflict_ sensitive_education_pack**

INEE. (2016 a). *Education Cannot Wait: a fund for education in emergencies.* Retrieved from **http://www.ineesite.org/en/ education-cannot-wait** Last visited 31 December 2017.

INEE. (2016 b). *INEE background paper on psychosocial support and social and emotional learning for children & youth in emergency settings.* New York: Author. Retrieved from **http://www.ineesite.org/ en/resources/inee-background-paper-on-psychosocial-support-and- social-and-emotional-lear**

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

INEE. (2017 b). *Toolkit*. Retrieved from **https://toolkit.ineesite.org/**

INEE. (2017 c). Thematic Paper – An introduction to education and preventing violent extremism. New York: INEE. Retrieved from **http://www.ineesite.org/en/resources/inee-thematic-paper- preventing-violent-extremism**

INEE. (2018). *Guidance Note on Psychosocial Support*. New York: INEE. Retreived from **http://www.ineesite.org/en/ resources/resource-inee-guidance-note-on-psychosocial-support**

International Rescue Committee [IRC]. (2006, June). *Creating healing classrooms: Guide for teachers and teacher educators.* New York: IRC. Retrieved from **http://www.healingclassrooms.org/ downloads/CHC_Guide_for_Teachers_TEs.pdf**

Ishiyama, J., & Breuning, M. (2012). Educational access and peace duration in post-conflict countries. *International Interactions*, 38(1), 58-78. Retrieved from **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. 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, UK: Polity Press.

Kaldor, M. (2013). In defence of new wars. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, 2(1), 4.

Keen, D. (2012). Greed and grievance in civil war. I*nternational Affairs*, 88, 757-777.

Kirk, K. (2006). *Education in emergencies, the gender implications* [UNESCO Advocacy Brief]. Bangkok: UNESCO.

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

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 (Eds.), *Peacebuilding in crisis: Rethinking paradigms and practices of transnational cooperation (pp. 155-174).* New York: Routledge.

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

Larrauri, H. P., & Kahl, A. (2013). Technology for peacebuilding. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development,* 2(3).

Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures.* New York: Syracuse University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace.* Oxford, UK: 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.* New York: United Nations University Press.

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, M. T. A. (2008). Sri Lanka: In peace or in pieces? A critical approach to peace education in Sri Lanka. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(1), 19-35.

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.* Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam. Retrieved from **https://educationanddevelopment.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/youth-agency-synthesis-report-final16.pdf**

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

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*, 12(1), 56-73.

Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Novelli, M. (2018). Education in emergencies: Tracing the evolution of a field. In A. Verger, M.

Kosar-Altinyelken, & H. Novelli (Eds.), *Global education policies (2d ed.), (pp. 233-254).* New York: Bloomsbury.

Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Shah, R. (2015). The politics of education in emergencies and conflict. In T. McCowan & E. Unterhalter (A c. Di), *Education and international development: An introduction (pp. 181-200).* London: Bloomsbury.

Maebuta, J. (2011). Technical and vocational education and training in peace education: Solomon Islands. *Journal of Peace Education*, 8, 157-176.

Marques, J. B. V., & de Freitas, D. (2017). Characterization factors of non-formal education: A literature review. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 43(4).

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.

Mendenhall, M. A., Russell, S. G., & Bruckner, E. (2017). *Urban refugee education: Strengthening policies and practices for access, quality, and inclusion.* New York: Columbia University Academic Commons. Retrieved from **https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/ac:207814**

Mercy Corps. (2015). *Youth and consequences, unemployment, injustice and violence.* Portland, OR: Author.

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.* Digbeth, UK: 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, 133-164. Retrieved from **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*. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.20355/C5DS33**

Neufeldt, R., Fast, L., Schreiter, R., Starken, B., MacLaren, D., Cilliers, J. et al. (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), 1-40.

Nordtveit, B. H. (2016). *Schools as protection? Reinventing education in contexts of adversity.* New York: Springer.

Novelli, M. (2010). The new geopolitics of educational aid: From cold wars to holy wars? *International Journal of Educational Development, 30*, 453-459. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.03.012**

Novelli, M. (2011). Are we all soldiers now? The dangers of the securitization of education and conflict. In K. Mundy & S. Dryden-Peterson (Eds.), *Educating children in conflict zones: Research, policy, and practice for systemic change. A tribute to Jackie Kirk (pp. 49-66; International Perspectives on Education Reform Series).* New York: Teachers College Press.

Novelli, M. (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, 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. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.01.004**

Novelli, M., & Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A. (2012). Globalizing educational interventions in zones of conflict: The role of Dutch aid to education and conflict. In A. Verger, M. Novelli, & H. Kosar Altinyelken (Eds.), Global education policy and international development: *New agendas, issues and policies* (pp. 223-244). London: Continuum. Retrieved from **https://educationand development.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/wp13.pdf**

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.* Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam. Retrieved from **https://pdfs. semanticscholar.org/3349/e37ed31dcfc290d905e237b72760e527fca2.pdf**

Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Smith, A. (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), 14-43.

Novelli, M., & Smith, A. (2011). *The role of education in peacebuilding: A synthesis report of findings from Lebanon, Nepal and Sierra Leone.* New York. UNICEF. Retrieved from **http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/EEPCT_Peace-buildingSynthesisReport%281%29.pdf**

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.

Özerdem, A., & Podder, S. (2015). *Youth in conflict and peacebuilding mobilization, reintegration and reconciliation.* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2017, April 22). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. Critical Studies in Education, 1-16. Retrieved from **http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1318772**

Paulson, J. (2011). *Education, conflict and development.* Oxford, UK: Symposium Book.

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**

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**

Ramírez-Barat, C., & Duthie, R. (2015). Education and transitional justice: *Opportunities and challenges for peacebuilding.* New York: International Center for Transitional Justice. Retrieved from **https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-UNICEF-Report-EducationTJ-2015.pdf**

Rivers, R., & Scotto, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Peace training: Preparing adults for nonviolent intervention in conflicts.* Cluj-Napoca, Rumania: PATRIR.

Robertson, S., Novelli, M., Dale, R., Tikly, L., Dachi, H., & Alphonce, N. (2007). *Globalisation, education and development: Ideas, actors and dynamics.* London: DFID. Retrieved from **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*, 908-937. Retrieved from **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.* Brighton, UK: University of Sussex. Retrieved from **https://educationanddevelopment. files.wordpress.com/2016/06/liberia-report_march2017_lowres.pdf**

Save the Children. (2009, May). *Trends in donor policies towards conflict-affected countries* Unpublished background paper for *Global Monitoring Report 2010*.

Save the Children. (2010). *The future is now: Education for children in countries affected by conflict*. London: Author.

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

Save the Children. (2014). *Futures under threat: The impact of the education crisis on Syria's children.* London: Author. 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. Brighton, UK: University of Sussex. 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.* Cantonment-Accra, Ghana: Eastern Mennonite University, West African Network for Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation. 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.* Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. Retrieved from **http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2584/**

Scotto, G. (2004). *Friedensbildung in Mostar: Die rolle der internationalen NRO.* Muenster, Germany: Lit.

Seitz, K. (2004). *Education and conflict: The role of education in the creation, prevention and resolution of societal crises.* Berlin: German Technical Cooperation, Deutsche Gessellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit.

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,* 2-12.

Shah, R., Maber, E. M., Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Paterson, R. (2016, June). *Peacebuilding education and advocacy programme* [UNICEF programme report 2012-2016]. New York: UNICEF.

Slachmuijlder, L. (2017). *Transforming violent extremism: A peacebuilder's guide.* 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**

Smith, A. (2005). Education in the twenty-first century: Conflict, reconstruction and reconciliation. *Compare*, 35, 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.* Ulster, NI: Ulster University. Retrieved from **http://uir.ulster.ac.uk/34795/1/ Smith%2CDatzeberger%2C McCully %282016%29 Policy Synthesis Report.pdf**

Smith, A., & Vaux, T. (2003). Education, conflict and international development contents. *Training*, 240. Retrieved from **https://doi. org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004**

Sommers, M. (2002). *Children, education and war: Reaching the EFA objectives in countries affected by conflict* [Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit working paper]. Washington, DC: World Bank.

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, 168-189.* Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260600603402**

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

Sukarieh, M., & Tannock, S. (2015). The deradicalisation of education: Terror, youth and the assault on learning. *Race & Class, 57, 22-38.* Retrieved from **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. In UNESCO (Ed.), Education, conflict and social cohesion (pp. 3-33).* Geneva: UNESCO.

Thapa, R. (2017). *Mapping a sector: Bridging the evidence gap on youth-driven peacebuilding.* The Hague: UNOY Peacebuilders and Search for Common Ground.

Tomasevski, K. (2003). *Education denied: Costs and remedies.* London: Zed Books.

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

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs [UN DESA]. (May, 2015 a). *Youth population trends and sustainable development.* UN DESA Population Division. POPFACTS, No. 2015/1. Retrieved from **http:// www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/YouthPOP.pdf**

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2015 b). *Sustainable development knowledge platform: Sustainable development goal 4.* Retrieved from **https://sustainabledevelopment. un.org/sdg4**

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2018). *United Nations – Youth – Frequently Asked Questions.* Retrieved from **https://www.un.org/development/desa/youth/what-we-do/faq.html**

UN Office of Counter-Terrorism. (2017). *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism.* Retrieved from **https://www.un.org/ counterterrorism/ctitf/en/plan-action-prevent-violent-extremism.** Last accessed 30 December 2017.

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**

UNESCO. (2017). *About the Global Education First Initiative.* Retrieved from **http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/** Last accessed September 27, 2017.

UNHCR. (2012). *Displacement: The new 21st century challenge.* Retrieved from **http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrendsjune2013/UNHCR GLOBAL TRENDS 2012_V08_web.pdf**

UNHCR. (2016 a). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2015.* Retrieved from **http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html**

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

UNHCR. (2017). *UNHCR Global Appeal 2016-17*. Retrieved from **http://www.unhcr.org/ga16/index.xml**

UNICEF. (December, 2011). *Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition: global evaluation and management response. UNICEF Executive Board, First regular session 2012. E/ICEF/2012/CRP.6.* Retrieved from **https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2012-CRP6-EEPCT-global_evaluation-10Jan2012.pdf**

United Nations. (2017). *Resources on youth, peace and security.*

Retrieved from **https://www.un.org/development/desa/youth/international-youth-day-2017/resources-on-youth-peace-and-security.html**

United Nations Secretary-General. (2015). *The United Nations global counter-terrorism strategy: Plan of action to prevent violent extremism.* Retrieved from **https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/456/22/PDF/N1545622.pdf?OpenElement**

United Nations Security Council. (2015). *Resolution 2250*. S/RES/2250 (2015). Retrieved from **http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2250(2015)&referer=/english/&Lang=E**

Vásquez, G. (Ed.). (n.d.). *Noviolencia: La transformación creativa del conflicto social* [pdf]. 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* [pdf]. 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.* Charlottesville, VA: Pitchstone.

Vukosavljević, N. (2000). *Training manual for nonviolent conflict transformation.* 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. (2011). Understanding the diverse forms of learning valued by children in conflict contexts. In K. Mundy & S. Dryden-Peterson (Eds.), *Educating children in conflict zones: Research, policy, and practice for systemic change. A tribute to Jackie Kirk* (pp. 123-136). New York: Teachers College Press.

Winthrop, R., & Kirk, J. (2008). Learning for a bright future: Schooling, armed conflict, and children's well-being. *Comparative Education Review*, 52, 639-661. Retrieved from **https://doi.org/10.1086/591301**

Winthrop, R., & Matsui, E. (2013). *A new agenda for education in fragile states* [working paper 10, Center for Universal Education at Brookings]. Washington: Brookings. Retrieved from **http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/brookings_education_agenda_fragile_states.pdf**

Zunzer, W. (2004). *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**

www.ineesite.org