

# **Education at the Intersection of Conflict and Peace: The Trends, Inclusion and Framing of Education in African Peace Agreements from 1975-2017**

Emily Dunlop<sup>a\*</sup> and Elisabeth King<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a\*</sup> *Department of Applied Statistics, Social Sciences and Humanities, New York University, New York, USA;*

Corresponding Author: emily.dunlop@nyu.edu

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Applied Statistics, Social Sciences and Humanities, New York University, New York, USA*

## **Acknowledgments:**

We are very grateful to all who helped with this research and drafting. We would like to thank the following: Kendra Dupuy and Susan Shepler for their earlier insights on the manuscript; Giuditta Fontana for providing guidance on the framing of early drafts and confirming education inclusion rates; Brittney Lewer for reading many earlier versions of the manuscript; and Sebastian Cherng for comments on the statistics and their presentation. In addition, we would like to thank the editors and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions on earlier versions which strengthened the article.

## **Abstract**

International actors have called for greater inclusion of education provisions in peace agreements given the important symbolic and practical roles peace agreements play post-conflict. Yet, the inclusion, framing, and role of education in peace agreements remain understudied. This paper investigates the trends in education's inclusion in African peace agreements from 1975-2017. We provide a descriptive quantitative analysis of education trends over time, test several hypotheses that may explain these trends, and apply these findings to a qualitative case study in Burundi to illustrate key factors in implementation. We find that education is present in 46% of agreements, that the presence of international actors and disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration provisions increases the likelihood of inclusion, and that educational structure and content clauses are equally likely to be included. These findings have implications for international education practice and forward a research agenda for further study by international education and conflict scholars.

Keywords: education; peace agreements; Africa; conflict; peace

## **Introduction**

Intrastate conflicts increasingly end in peace agreements (Olson Lounsbury and DeRouen 2016). These agreements allocate roles and responsibilities of governments post-conflict; they also signal priorities to local populations and the international community with regards to rebuilding and restructuring social, political, and economic institutions (Cochrane 2008; Dupuy 2008a). There is a robust literature on peace agreements in political science and international relations, however, education is typically overlooked. Similarly, literature on education in conflict zones acknowledges complex and multiple relationships between and among education, the state, armed conflict, and peace (Bush and Saltarelli 2000; Burde 2014; Davies 2004; 2005; King 2011; 2014), though often overlooks peace agreements. This study bridges the gap between literature from political science on peace agreements and literature on education and conflict to explore the trends in education's inclusion in full and partial African peace agreements from 1975-2017. This is important not least because international organizations, including education actors, argue for a greater inclusion of education in peace agreements (Dupuy 2008a; 2008b; International Crisis Group [ICG] 2009; Tortsu 2005; Save the Children 2009; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] 2016; United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF] 2011; Zasloff, Sharipo and Coyne 2009).

In this study, we answer the following questions, focusing on Africa: (1) What are the trends over time (if any) for inclusion of education provisions in peace agreements? And (2) when included, how has education been framed in peace agreements in terms of its structure and content? Acknowledging natural follow-up questions regarding the effects of inclusion, we also

begin to answer: (3) what, if any, are the relationships between the inclusion of educational provisions in peace agreements and changes in the education systems post-conflict?<sup>1</sup>

The first part of this paper provides an overview of peace agreements and literature on the relationship between education, conflict and peace. The second part provides an outline of the mixed-methods we used, centred around cross-national quantitative analysis and a qualitative case study. The third section presents our findings. Education is mentioned in some way in 46% of the agreements and there is no clear upward or downward trend over time. When there are more international negotiators present, education is more likely to be included in a peace agreement. The presence of demobilization, disarmament and reintegration (DDR) provisions are also associated with higher likelihood of inclusion. Finally, we find that clauses are equally likely to focus on content and structure of education. Our case study picks up on some of the key ideas in the quantitative analysis and focuses on the *Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement* in Burundi (2000). This part shows how education's inclusion in a peace agreement might relate to implementation, and also the nuances and complexities involved in teasing out the effects of the peace agreement on an education system. The final section considers some of the implications of this study for the field of education and conflict studies, and practitioners in education development. It also outlines next steps and future research agendas.

### **The importance of peace agreements**

Peace agreements are important as societies transition away from conflict. From 1989, nearly three-quarters of all intrastate conflicts ended in peace agreements rather than decisive military victories (Olson Lounsbury and DeRouen 2016). While there is mixed evidence on the

---

<sup>1</sup> We also acknowledge follow-up questions related to effects of inclusion on peace, although these remain beyond the scope of this paper.

effects of peace agreements compared to military victories (Hartzell 2007; Maina 2016; Toft 2010), peace agreements are important as ‘necessary and legitimate tools of resolving conflicts and bringing about durable peace’ (Maina 2016: 3). As an alternative to military victory, they epitomise the liberal peacebuilding paradigm that has dominated approaches to peace in recent years (Barnett 2006; Paris 2004; Richmond 2010). They often contain commitments to power-sharing, democracy, economic reconstruction, and human rights – deemed necessary for building sustainable peace (Doyle 2005). Peace agreements also allocate responsibility and signal the priorities of the post-conflict government, and are symbolic documents that outline government commitments to post-conflict reconstruction to both local populations and international actors (Cochrane 2008; Collier et al. 2003).

Scholarly literature on peace agreements is divided into at least three strands. The first strand examines the success or failure of negotiating peace agreements and the conditions under which each outcome is most likely, including such issues as commitment problems (Mattes and Savun 2009), the presence of spoilers who undermine the process (Stedman et al., 2002) and the effect of relative state capacity (DeRouen Jr, et al. 2010). A second strand examines agreement implementation and the effects on peace (Fearon 2003; Fortna 2004). The third strand, between these two approaches, comprises studies that analyze the specific provisions of peace agreements that might best contribute to peace, including the role of peacekeepers or third-party guarantors (Walter 2001), power-sharing (Mattes and Savun 2009; Hartzell and Hoddie 2003; Sisk 1996) and ethnic recognition (King and Samii 2018). A handful of scholars have examined the inclusion of education and implementation of education reforms under this third strand (Dupuy 2008a; 2008b; Fontana 2016; 2018; Ishiyama and Breuning 2012; Poppema 2009), but existing scholarship leaves many questions about the role of education unanswered.

## Education and peace agreements

Scholars and practitioners often make the case that education is important for building peace in conflict-affected countries. Though there is a broad consensus that education can have both positive and negative effects on social relations, the study of education in peace agreements naturally draws on the so-called ‘positive face’ (Bush and Saltarelli 2000) of education. Literature that argues that there are positive peacebuilding effects of education falls into two broad groups. The first considers education as a state-provided public good, which focuses largely on educational *structure*, that can reduce the likelihood of renewed violence in a variety of ways. These include: increasing the opportunity costs of participation in violence (Humphreys and Weinstein 2007); decreasing ethnic, religious, and regional inequalities to address grievances (Brown 2011; Langer 2005); and alleviating poverty that may underlie conflict (Collier et al. 2003). Here, the provision of, and access to, education is also an important tool for state legitimization (Matsumoto 2016) and signals, if sometimes only symbolically, that the state is concerned about the well-being and success of its people (Thyne 2006). The second grouping of literature argues that specific educational *programs and content* have positive effects on attitudes and behaviour of children and youth. Programs of this nature include, but are not limited to, teaching about controversial issues (King 2009); teaching about the history of violence (Bekerman, Zembylas and McGlynn 2009); peace education programs (Bar-Tal and Rosen 2009); and education for human rights (du Preez and Beker 2016). These two categories of education and peace scholarship not only have different foci regarding the purpose and role of education in society, but also focus on different facets of education with diverse goals as they relate to building peace.

Recent scholarship argues that these two groups of literature may be best considered in concert. In order for education to promote peace after conflict, it must include both systemic change and programs for peace. As King (2014) notes, education's structure – access and distribution – and its content – what is taught, explicitly or implicitly, in schools – can contribute to conflict. She thus notes that in order for education to contribute to peace, educational change must address both aspects. Elaborating further, a series of UNICEF papers point to the importance of the '4 Rs' framework for peacebuilding and education (Novelli, Lopes-Cardozo and Smith 2015; Novelli et al. 2017). These '4 Rs' reference holistic changes to education post-conflict such that education systems not only address key structural aspects such as inequalities and grievances through redistribution, but also embed programs for recognition, representation and reconciliation in schools. Thus, educational provisions in peace agreements can, and should, address both structure and content if education is to have a measurable effect on peace.

There are very few studies that specifically focus on education in peace agreements. The most commonly cited cross-national study specific to education provisions in peace agreements shows that from 1989-2005, education was mentioned in 57 out of 103, or 55%, of publicly available full and partial agreements from around the world (Dupuy 2008a). This study, still commonly cited in literature advocating for education's inclusion in peace agreements (UNICEF 2011; UNESCO 2016), is due for an update and raises important questions which merit investigation. Other studies on education in peace agreements are specific to a country and/or specific aspects of education within an agreement (see Poppema 2009). More commonly, literature focuses on education post-conflict, with the peace agreement as just one aspect of education under study; in Northern Ireland, much has been written about the integration of Catholic and Protestant schools after the *Good Friday Agreement* (McGlynn 2009; Nolan 2009),

and similar studies exist on segregated education in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the signing of the *Dayton Peace Accord* (Torsti 2009). Fontana (2016; 2018) also looks at the relationship between the implementation of educational provisions and types of power-sharing provisions in the agreement. Given the prominence of advocacy efforts that argue education should be included in peace agreements (cited above) and the relatively limited academic attention paid to the issue, a study such as this one can make an important contribution.

## **Methods**

### ***Methods for Quantitative Coding and Analysis***

The quantitative methods look at general inclusion trends over time and also the frequency and type of education included within agreements. We analyze how education is framed in full and partial African peace agreements from 1975 to 2017. We primarily based our coding on the Uppsala Conflict Data Program's [UCDP] *Peace Agreements* dataset, version 2.0 (Högbladh 2012), and included full and partial peace agreements from 1975-2011. *Full agreements* arise when warring parties settle "the whole incompatibility", whereas *partial agreements* only settle "part of the incompatibility" (Högbladh 2012 10). Africa represents the largest number of negotiated settlements in the dataset, with 86 full and partial agreements.<sup>2</sup> For agreements from 2011-2017, we used the coding rules developed by UCDP to include an additional 11 agreements that met our selection criteria. Of the 97 total agreements, 12 were not publicly available, therefore 85 agreements – 33 full and 52 partial – are included for analysis here.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> We did not include *framework agreements, ceasefires, or peace process agreements* in the coding.

<sup>3</sup> We obtained the agreements from the United States Institute of Peace ([www.usip.org](http://www.usip.org)) and United Nations Peacemaker ([unpeacemaker.org](http://unpeacemaker.org)), and broader internet searches, where necessary. All twelve agreements that are not



First, we coded the agreements for the inclusion or absence of education provisions. We took ‘education’ to mean any type of education at any level, including ‘schools’ and ‘training’, as well as terms such as ‘programs’, which encompass broader types of education beyond formal schooling. We then examined trends in education inclusion in peace agreements over time in the dataset. Given that this analysis builds on Dupuy’s (2008a) work, we also checked to ensure our coding and results were consistent with hers for the 1989-2005 period upon which she focuses.

Second, drawing from literature on peace agreements, political science, and education and conflict, we hypothesised several factors that may increase the likelihood of inclusion of education in peace agreements:

- 1) Given the focus of international development policy stating that education contributes to peace (UNESCO 2016), the presence of international actors may increase the likelihood for inclusion of education in peace agreements;
- 2) Protracted conflicts destroy political, social, and economic institutions in a country and schools are particularly vulnerable (King 2011; GCPEA 2018). Consequently, longer conflicts may be more likely to include educational provisions in their peace agreements.
- 3) Education is important for providing political and cultural legitimacy of governments post-conflict (Matsumoto 2016; Thyne 2006). As such, we would expect conflicts fought over territorial disputes, including secessionist disputes, or agreements with provisions for autonomous governments, are more likely to include educational provisions.
- 4) Similarly, education is important for legitimizing power-sharing regimes (Fontana 2016). We would therefore expect agreements that include power sharing provisions to be more likely to include educational provisions as per another recent study (Fontana 2018).
- 5) Successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programs often include education for demobilised soldiers (Edloe 2007). We thus hypothesised that agreements with DDR provisions would be more likely to include education provisions, including training and skills development for ex-combatants.

---

publicly available are from Chad’s intrastate conflict. Of these, three are from 1978/1979, eight are from the 1989-2005 period (as per coding in Dupuy, 2008a) and one is from 2006.

To test these hypotheses, we use logistic regressions to determine the likelihood odds of inclusion of provisions based on these conditions, as well as simple linear regressions and t-tests, to further investigate these relationships regarding inclusion in general, and also number of education provisions. The variables of interest – international actors, duration, territory, power sharing and local power sharing, and military and DDR provisions – were also drawn from the UCDP *Peace Agreements* dataset for each agreement. We note, however, a number of limitations to our approach: given the sample size (N = 85 total, and N = 39 for agreements with education clauses), it is difficult to make claims regarding statistical significance. In our analysis we further do not control for many factors of the violence and subsequent peace agreements themselves – including the presence of international intervention and peacekeeping missions/security guarantors, conflict intensity, and number and relative strength of warring parties. These factors have been hypothesised in peace agreement literature as important factors in both the signing of peace agreements and their implementation. Unfortunately, the UCDP *Peace Agreements* dataset does not contain this information. Finally, given the use of simple and logistic regression, we cannot make claims of causality regarding our findings and further analysis would be required to do so. Nonetheless, this approach highlights some key relationships between education and peace agreements and points to additional avenues of research.

Third, we conducted a content analysis of those agreements with education clauses to understand how education is framed. We divide the clauses according to structure and content of education. By the *structure* of education, we mean ‘who has access to schooling... [and other] procedures to grant or deny access directly, [as well as indirect access, such as] linguistic and symbolic processes’ (King 2014: 10). In practice, this includes provisions pertaining to access to education; resource distribution (such as school, textbook, and teacher allocations); ministerial

positions, roles, and responsibilities, as well as educational funding; level of education (primary, secondary, tertiary, or vocational); language of instruction and national entry/exit exams; and statements pertaining to ‘universal’ education or ‘education for all.’ The *content* of schooling ‘encompasses curriculum and curriculum policy... [and] plays a role in the formation and transmission of collective identity, memory, sense of citizenship, and shared destiny’ (ibid). In our dataset, this includes provisions for specific programs and curricula taught within schools – such as training and vocational programs, demobilization and reintegration programs focused on training and skills development, and programs for peace education, national unity and identity, history, culture, and human rights and citizenship education. Table 1 highlights examples of structure and content clauses.

[insert Table 1 about here]

### ***Methods for Qualitative Case Study: The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement and education in Burundi***

The second part of this study explores how education has developed in Burundi after the 2000 *Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement*, and begins to look at implementation of education provisions, regarding the third research question. We chose this agreement for several reasons. It contains 24 provisions for education, one of the highest rates of inclusion in our dataset. It is also the only agreement to identify education as a cause of the intrastate conflict (Protocol III, Chapter I, Article 2.2) and contains provisions across all coding domains for both structure and content. Burundi might be termed a “well-predicted” case (Lieberman 2005), in the sense that if implementation follows from meaningful inclusion of education in peace agreements, holding all other factors constant, we should see it occurring in Burundi.

Furthermore, since education policies are often slow to develop and implement even in relatively

non-violent contexts, the 19-year time span between the ratification of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement and this writing allows for greater opportunity for implementation to occur. By implementation we mean whether policies relating to the provisions in the peace agreement were put in place and evidence that these changes can be found in the current school system. We do not present this case study with the aim of generalization, rather it illustrates the complexity associated with the inclusion of education provisions, their implementation, and the multi-directional relationships between education, conflict and peace. The case study analysis is based on the first author's field visits during June 2017, November 2018, and February 2019, including discussions with school inspectors and visits to secondary schools, and a careful reading of secondary literature.

## **Findings**

### ***Education in peace agreements over time***

Education appears in 39 of 85 agreements in our dataset, or 46% of agreements in Africa from 1975-2017. This rate of inclusion is slightly lower than Dupuy's (2008a) reported 55%. However, Dupuy's analysis is both from a shorter period (1989-2005) and from around the world. Of the 33 full peace agreements in our dataset, 22 contain education provisions (66%), compared to just 16 of the 52 partial agreements (31%). Partial agreements only settle certain aspects of the conflict, rather than the conflict in full, so such partial agreements are somewhat intuitively less likely to focus on education. Figure 1 shows the overall inclusion of education over time in the dataset. The figure illustrates that the rate of inclusion over time is variable, with no overall increase or decrease. We re-ran our analysis for African agreements from just 1989-2005 and found that 27 of the 54, or 50%, of agreements contain education clauses. A t-test

shows no statistically significant difference between our 46% inclusion rate (1975-2017) and the 50% inclusion rate from 1989-2005 ( $p = 0.6538$ ).<sup>4</sup>

[insert Figure 1 about here]

Further, when education is mentioned, most agreements contain only one or two clauses, though four agreements contain 17 or more references (Rwanda 1993, Burundi 2000, Democratic Republic of Congo [DRC] 2003, and Sudan 2005). The maximum number of education clauses is 29 (DRC 2003). The median number of clauses is two, with a mean of 4.7 and standard deviation of 6.6. Figure 2 shows the distribution of the agreements according to the number of clauses.

[insert Figure 2 about here]

### ***Conditions under which education is included in peace agreements***

We were interested in possible explanations for the variation in inclusion of education in peace agreements and examined five hypotheses we derived from the literature.<sup>5</sup> We first ran a pairwise correlation between education and our variables of interest as they relate to the five hypotheses. The correlation showed broad support for a relationship in hypotheses one (international actors) and five (military/DDR) relating to education inclusion in an agreement. The pairwise correlation also showed a relationship between the number of education provisions and hypothesis one (international actors). We then conducted a series of logistic and Ordinary

---

<sup>4</sup> Our overall findings also align with Fontana (2018), who finds education is included in 52% of agreements from 1989-2008, worldwide.

<sup>5</sup> Note: given that the UCDP Peace Agreements only goes until 2011, the statistics reported here are from 1975-2011.

Least Squares (OLS) regressions to further explore these relationships. Table 2 outlines key results from the logistic regressions on the likelihood of education inclusion.

[insert table 2 about here]

On the first hypothesis regarding the presence of international actors, our analysis suggests mixed results. Most agreements in our dataset have at least one international third-party negotiator and/or signatory, so this factor alone cannot explain variation in adoption. As such, we look at the number of international third-party negotiators and signatories, and whether the negotiator specifically represents the UN. We find that while the presence of UN negotiators does not increase the likelihood of inclusion of education provisions, the number of international negotiators does. A greater number of international third-party negotiators is associated with a greater likelihood of inclusion of education provisions ( $p = 0.04$ ). Further, our analysis, through an OLS regression, shows that the number of international actors is correlated with the number of education provisions in an agreement ( $p = 0.010$ ). These findings suggest that the presence of international negotiators is important for the inclusion of education in the final agreements.

Our analysis finds no support for hypothesis two, the relationship between conflict duration and educational provisions. This may be due to variations in conflict intensity over time and/or other intervening variables not accounted for in this analysis. Likewise, hypothesis three, which looks at territorial provisions shows that there is no statistically significant relationship in relation to the inclusion of education overall.

There are mixed results for hypothesis four, which looks at the relationship of education to broader power sharing provisions. There is some evidence to suggest that the presence of power sharing provisions is correlated with the *number* of educational provisions in an

agreement ( $p = 0.026$ ), though the mere presence of power-sharing provisions is not associated with the likelihood of education inclusion. This relationship therefore provides some evidence in support of the hypothesis that education is a key component of power-sharing and providing government legitimacy post-conflict.

Finally, we find broad support for the fifth hypothesis that the inclusion of military provisions, and particularly DDR provisions, increases the likelihood of inclusion of educational provisions. In looking at the clauses of education in the 24 agreements that contain both DDR and education clauses, we see that 10 agreements (42%) contain clauses specific to training/re-integration of ex-combatants. This indicates that there is some focus on the importance of education programs for reintegrating ex-combatants, though given the importance of education programs for successful DDR, we might have expected more peace agreements to contain these types of provisions.

This above analysis shows that inclusion of educational provisions in peace agreements does not occur in isolation, and several factors relate to the rate of inclusion of education, the number of education clauses and the likelihood of inclusion. This analysis, while not causal, suggests that international actors have a role to play in helping to secure the inclusion of education in negotiations and ultimate peace agreements. We further find that there is a relationship between DDR-type clauses and education's likelihood of inclusion.

### ***Structure and content of education in peace agreements***

When education is included in peace agreements, how is it framed? Of the 39 agreements in the dataset that mention education, 27 (69%) contain clauses relating to its structure, compared

to 26 (67%) that contain clauses relating to content. 14 agreements (36%) contain both structure and content clauses. Figure 3 shows the number of agreements with structure and/or content clauses by year.

[insert Figure 3 about here]

### *Structure of Education*

Of the 26 agreements that contain structure clauses, eleven mention increases in access to education and seven contain clauses that specifically relate to resource distribution. While one might expect an increased focus on ‘education for all’ given its prominence in the Millennium Development Goals (UN 2000), there is no statistically significant difference in inclusion rates pre- and post-MDGs, although this may be because of the low number of agreements in the dataset. Uganda’s (2008) comprehensive peace agreement is the only agreement in the post-2000 era to specifically reference ‘Universal Primary Education,’ (Part C, Article 8.3), while the DRC’s (2003) agreement requires the adoption of ‘policies and measures to achieve the so-called “millennium” objective’ such that boys and girls have equal access to primary schools (Resolution 21.2a). The seven agreements that mention resource distribution – of schools, teachers, and textbooks, for example – consider regional distributions of education wherein governments agree to increase school allotment in previously marginalised areas or with respect to gender and ethnic requirements that commit governments to increasing access for previously marginalised groups.

In terms of level of education mentioned in agreements, there is much variation. Six agreements specifically mention primary education, although other agreements, such as the three Djiboutian peace agreements (1994, 2000, and 2001) indirectly reference primary education by



mentioning ‘child’ or ‘children’ education. Four agreements also mention secondary school access directly. When agreements mention tertiary-level schooling (four), it relates to training for civil servants or in the context of the creation or expansion of national universities, such as in Sudan’s (2005 and 2013) agreements. The DRC’s (2003) agreement also contains several clauses relating to the training and professionalization of university teachers, and the provision of supplies to universities, though it does not explicitly state increased access to university education as a goal (Resolution 21.a).

### *Content of Education*

Educational content clauses were equally present in the agreements. These clauses fall into several categories: education for democracy and/or civics education; education for national unity or peace; and training for demobilised/re-integrated soldiers, civil servants, the judiciary or security forces. The first two types (democracy/civics; unity/peace programs) are important in direct peacebuilding education (Davies, 2005; Harris, 2004) and the latter type (training and education for employment) is important in providing pathways to employment and poverty alleviation as an indirect route to peace (Collier et al. 2003).

Clauses on national unity and/or peace and human rights education appear in several agreements. For example, Rwanda (1993) recognises the need to educate the population to achieve ‘national unity and reconciliation’ (Chapter 4 Article 24.A.1). Civic and voter education meanwhile are the most common forms of informal education – or education outside the formal school system – mentioned in the documents. The DRC agreement (2003) contains three separate references to ‘programs in civics and human values’ (21, vii), the ‘promot[ion] of developmental and civic education for improved civil awareness’ (28) and the ‘promotion, through the national educational system, of values of good citizenship, as well as a culture of dialogue and peaceful

resolution of conflicts’ (35). Similarly, in Liberia’s 2003 *Accra Agreement*, there are two clauses that mandate human rights education and voter education (Part VI, Article XII and Part VIII, Article IX, respectively).

Skills development and training are key aspects of education in several of the peace agreements in our dataset. These clauses reference training for re-integrated and de-mobilised soldiers, such as in the Republic of Congo’s (1999) or Angola’s (1994) agreement that directly references the need to develop training and vocational programs for ex-combatants to reintegrate into society (Annex 4). However, training also includes professional training of teachers and civil servants at the tertiary and adult levels, such as Sudan’s agreement (1997) that references ‘training up to university level’ (Chapter 3); and Uganda’s (2008) references to ‘training for persons in conflict-affected areas’ (Part C. 9).

This cross-national examination reveals general trends and patterns in the inclusion of education in peace agreements. We now turn the qualitative case of Burundi to begin to explore questions of implementation.

### ***Burundi: Including Education in Peace Agreements***

#### *Context – The Arusha peace negotiations and the Burundian civil war*

Burundi is a small country in central Africa with a population of approximately 11.5 million people, comprised of two main ethnic groups, Hutus (85%) and Tutsis (14%). Since its independence in 1962, Burundi has experienced several rounds of violence, including a genocide against Hutus in 1972 and civil war in 1988 (Lemarchand 1995). The most recent civil war in Burundi lasted from 1993-2005 and left almost 300,000 dead and close to one million internally displaced persons and refugees (Call 2012). The *Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement*

was signed in 2000. The agreement and subsequent constitution (signed in 2005) illustrate many of the key components of the liberal peace building paradigm (Paris, 2004; Richmond 2010), including commitments to power-sharing between Hutus and Tutsis. While there has been low-level violence in the country from about 2015, it is generally not considered to be ethnic-based, unlike previous conflict (Vandeginste 2015).

### *Education in the Arusha Peace Agreement*

The agreement has one of the highest inclusion rates for education in our dataset, with 24 clauses, and includes clauses related to both structure and content of education. Echoing literature from around its signing (Jackson 2000; Ndikumana 2005), the agreement asserts that the pre-war education system did not provide access for all ethnic groups and that the exclusive nature of the education system is a cause of the war (III, I, 2.2).<sup>6</sup> There are three clauses dedicated to the equitable distribution of schools and to “correcting imbalances” relating to school infrastructure (I, II, 6.11; I, II, 7.25a.; IV, II, 12.b). The agreement also states that no one should be denied access to education (II, I, 3.17), that education is a human right (III, I, 8.a) and that the government must provide primary and secondary education to the age of 16 (I, II, 6.12). It also includes several clauses relating to the content of education, such as: human rights education (III, I, 8.c), the promotion of peace education in schools and around the country (I, II, 6.7; IV, II, 13.c), and civic and citizenship education at various levels, including in the civil service and in the security forces (I, II, 6.26; III, II, 11.10). Clauses additionally refer to various other aspects of the system, including transparency of national exams and special allotments for returnees.

---

<sup>6</sup> For brevity, the clauses listed here are in the format (Protocol, Chapter, Article).

### *Implementation of education provisions*

According to the *Peace Accords Matrix* (2016) that assesses the implementation of peace agreements, the provisions regarding educational access have ‘intermediate implementation’. The current administration (2005-present) developed policies to address several of the school access clauses. Since 2005, Burundi has constructed more primary and secondary schools than the three administrations before the civil war (1966-1993) combined (Cieslik et al. 2014), and has abolished school fees at the primary level in order to increase enrollment (Travaglianti 2017). Trends in enrollment show an overall increase in access to education over time. The net enrollment ratio (NER) at the primary level increased from 41% in 2000 to 94% in 2015 (UIS-UNESCO 2017). Several school inspectors confirmed that, in practice, they have observed no official school fees for public schools at the primary level, though public school fees exist at the secondary level of approximately \$7.50 USD per year (first author’s field notes). Yet, NER drops off at the secondary level to just 28%, and there are high repetition and low completion rates (UIS-UNESCO 2017). This may be due to a low primary completion rate of just 62% (ibid), in addition to a highly competitive primary exit exam wherein only 25 to 30% of pupils who took the exam in 2010 were successful (Cieslik et al. 2014). This further brings up issues surrounding the quality of education delivered as access to education has increased, and about how governments interpret education clauses in peace agreements.

In response to pre-war inequalities, the government ratified a law regarding the organization of colleges and universities, which mandated that there would be no discrimination with respect to ethnicity in either secondary or tertiary education (Republic of Burundi 2011). The government also recently conducted a survey on the ethnic make-up of the national

university, including students, professors and administrators, although the resultant data is not yet available (first author's field notes).

While there is no reliable information regarding the overall distribution of schools and school resources post-civil war, nor any publicly available ethnic data about students, a good indicator for changes to regional education distribution is the scores on the *concours nationales*, and the proportion of students from each province that attend secondary schools. This exam is mandatory for students at the end of primary school, and success determines not only whether a student can get into a secondary school, but also what type of school and program the student can pursue. Cieslik et al. (2014) note that some of the previously marginalised provinces in the north and west now post relatively higher scores and boast comparatively higher acceptance rates to secondary schools. Thus, in addition to overall access, there appears to be some efforts to address inequality, although more research is needed to further investigate its breadth and depth.

There are also several educational policy documents that point to an attempt to implement the content-focused peace and national unity programs in the education sector, as per the agreement. In 2007, the Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research (MENRS) developed the *Curriculum for Civic and Human Education and Peace and Human Rights Education* (MENRS 2007). This document not only directly addresses the violence prior to and during the civil war, but also includes a detailed section on 'Education for Peace' that is targeted at grades four through six. Second, the Ministry released an education sector and development plan (MENRS 2008). This plan specifically draws its justification from the peace agreement, as well as international and regional documents promoting human rights and peace, and explicitly states that teachers are to "develop lessons in education on peace, democracy, and on respecting human rights and freedoms in academic life" (MENRS 2008 5-6). The government has since

updated the civics curriculum, now called *Patriotic and Human Rights Education* (2017). This new curriculum is for all ages and visits to secondary schools in Burundi show that this curriculum is now being taught in schools (first author's field notes). However, the resource-poor context of Burundi's education system means that teachers have yet to be properly trained in this curriculum, and several students indicated to author 1 that the content is often written out directly from the text to the chalkboard, without much explanation (first author's fieldnotes).

Civic education programs also exist across the country. In 2013, the president launched a program called the 'patriotic education and training program' (PEFP) as part of an effort to embed values teaching in the school system (Nkurunziza 2017). The international community has also endeavoured to implement priorities consistent with the peace accord: in 2015, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) launched a nationwide civic and voter education campaign with the help of six local civil society organizations (IFES 2015). There have also been several women's civic education campaigns developed by the UNDP and UNIFEM (UNDP 2014). We were unable to find a clear assessment of the level of implementation; however, some news articles indicate that the PEFP has been put in place in at least some schools around the country (Elyse 2013; Mbazumutima 2014).

Overall, the Burundian government has taken strides to implement many of the education priorities identified in the peace accords. While the peace accords are referenced in justifying some of these educational efforts, we do not know the counterfactual, that is, what would have happened if education had not been included in the peace agreement in Burundi? At the same time, there is also scope for further entrenching and operationalizing the peace agreement's priorities. These might include further steps to address regional and ethnic inequalities, including at the secondary and tertiary level, improving exams and exam transparency, which may also

help to reduce inequalities, and implementing the programs in national unity and human rights/peace education, as identified in the peace agreements, in both schools and throughout the country. Indeed, these three steps would help to address not only concerns about the structure of education, but also its content. This case study offers preliminary insights into some of the accomplishments, and also of the challenges facing the implementation of education provisions in resource-poor, post-conflict contexts. It also reminds us of the importance of additional research on what happens after education is included in a peace agreement.

### **Conclusion: Discussion and Implications**

What can we say about trends in the inclusion of education in peace agreements in Africa? Extending the only existing cross-national dataset to examine how education is included and framed in peace agreements in Africa from 1975 to 2017, we found that education is included in 46% of the agreements. Our study indicates that Africa is not an outlier compared to the rest of the world. While there is no clear upward trend, the inclusion of education has held steady over time, for both full and partial peace agreements. On one hand, the inclusion of education in nearly half of the agreements illustrates that it is indeed a priority for many post-conflict states. On the other hand, we could equally say that education is included in “only” 46% of agreements, nearly the same rate referred to by international actors when they began calling for a more systematic inclusion of education in peace agreements. When we compare the inclusion of education to other possible domains, we lean toward the first interpretation. One UNICEF study points to the fact that out of 19 possible domains, education is fifth in terms of overall inclusion – behind only political features such as elections and decentralization. Education provisions are included at a higher rate than domains such as health and others

relating to economic recovery (UNICEF 2011).<sup>7</sup> Yet, to the extent that inclusion in a peace agreement signals issues of importance and begins to lay out plans for post-conflict society, it may be a mistake that any full agreement overlook education as a key institution of the post-conflict state.

The analysis of the conditions under which education is likely to be included in peace agreements should be of particular interest to the domestic and international community focused on education. That the presence of international actors increases both the likelihood of inclusion and the number of education provisions in an agreement points to the importance of these international actors and their potential for negotiations. These findings raise questions about international priorities and norms favouring post-conflict education, and the likelihood that education is rarely among the most pressing issues for warring parties. It may be, however, that if the warring parties see the educational system as a cause of violence, rather than the social good it is often presumed to be, they might be more likely to include educational provisions – and with more specificity, as in the case of Burundi – as potential solutions. This merits further investigation.

What about the *ways* in which education is included? Our analysis suggests that the ways education is included in peace agreements line up with much of the recent literature on the role of education in peacebuilding post-conflict. For example, some agreements provide for increased access and addressing regional and gender inequalities in schooling. Others focus on the content of education, whether regarding human rights or civic education, or other curricular reforms, indicative of the types of programs that are important for building peace and reconciliation

---

<sup>7</sup> Similarly, a forthcoming study on political agreements and internal conflict finds that education provisions rank above territorial self-governance (including decentralization, federalism, and autonomy), but below political and military provisions, international involvement, and transitional justice (Fontana et al. forthcoming).



through education. Still others contain provisions that mandate changes to both structure and content of schools – these agreements have as many as 29 provisions pertaining to education and cover a wide range of issues. Education literature often argues that structure and content should not be looked at in isolation, as they interact with each other. Therefore, those agreements that focus solely on structure or content are missing key aspects of education that affect peace and conflict.

That education is addressed in peace agreements as a positive social good, either directly (such as teaching human rights) or indirectly (as a means of poverty alleviation and by consequence to address inequalities and reduce the likely recurrence of civil wars), echoes much of the literature. Only one agreement, from Burundi (2000), directly states that education prior to the civil war was a cause of the violence. Yet, literature on many of the countries in the dataset suggests that education was a direct or indirect cause of the violence (see King 2014 on Rwanda; Richards 1996 on Sierra Leone). That peace agreements do not also acknowledge the potential negative effects of education may reflect a continued simplification of the multiple relationships between education, conflict and peace.

Our findings raise a number of questions that set out a research agenda forward. Expanding an exploration of education clauses and their implementation to the full dataset (where education was included and not), as well as comparing educational outcomes post-conflict for countries without education clauses, would be the next step to examine (non)inclusion and post-conflict attention and outcomes in education. Endeavouring to isolate the effects, if any, of inclusion of education in a peace agreement on lasting peace is a subsequent challenge. There are also several questions to investigate that precede those that we have addressed here. What is the process by which education comes to be included generally, and in

the specific ways (content, structure, etc.) it is included? What roles do domestic, international and non-governmental actors play in this process? When education is not included, why not? Is it an oversight or a purposeful exclusion? What relationship do, or could, education issues play in broader peacemaking negotiations? For example, we wonder if the continued tendency to focus on the ‘positive face’ of education might be harnessed to use education – an issue towards which different sides in a negotiation might perceive agreement – as an entry way into negotiations on perceived thornier security and political issues.<sup>8</sup> Overall, in continued work on themes of education, conflict and peace we believe that the study of education and peace agreements merits continued consideration.

---

<sup>8</sup> Zasloff, Shapiro, and Coyne (2011) note that including education in the peace process might not only provide an entryway to other, more difficult, issues, but also create more effective mediation and increase success overall.

## References

- Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement. 2000.
- Bar-Tal, D. and Y. Rosen. 2009. "Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models." *Review of Educational Research* 79 (2): 557-575.
- Barnett, M. 2006. "Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States after War." *International Security* 30 (4): 87-112.
- Bekerman, Z., M. Zembylas and C. McGlynn. 2009. "Working toward the De-essentialization of Identity Categories in Conflict and Postconflict Societies: Israel, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland." *Comparative Education Review* 53 (2): 213-234.
- Bentley, K. A., & R. Southall. 2005. *An African Peace Process: Mandela, South Africa and Burundi*. Human Sciences Research Council Press: Cape Town, South Africa.
- Buckland, P. 2005. *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction*. Washington, D. C.: The World Bank.
- Burde, D. 2014. *Schools for Conflict and Peace in Afghanistan*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bush, K. and D. Saltarelli. 2000. *The Two Faces of Education and Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children*. Florence, Italy: Innocenti Research Centre, UNICEF.
- Call, C. (2012). *Why Peace Fails: The Causes and Prevention of Civil War Recurrence*. Georgetown University Press: Washington, DC.
- Cieslik, K., M. Giani, J.-C. Muñoz Mora, R. L. Ngenzebuke, and P. Verwimp. 2014. *Inequality in Education, School-dropout and Adolescent Lives in Burundi*. Brussels, Belgium: UNICEF-Burundi/Université Libre de Bruxelles.
- Cochrane, F. 2008. *Ending Wars*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Collier, P., V. L. Elliott, H. Hegre, A. Hoeffler, M Reynal-Querol, and N. Sambanis. 2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Develop Policy*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank and Oxford University Press.
- Davies, L. 2004. *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- Davies, L. 2005. "Teaching about Conflict through Citizenship Education." *International Journal of Teacher and Citizenship Education* 1 (2): 17-34.
- DeRouen, K. Jr., M. Ferguson, S. Norton, Y. H. Park, J. Lea, and A. Streat-Bartlett. 2010. "Civil war peace agreements implementation and state capacity." *Journal of Peace Research*. 47 (3): 333-346.
- Doyle, M. 2005. "Three Pillars of Liberal Peace." *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 463-466.

- Dupuy, K. 2008a. "Education in Peace Agreements, 1989-2005." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 26 (2): 149-166.
- Dupuy, K. 2008b. *Where Peace Begins: Education's role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding*. London, UK: Save the Children Alliance.
- Du Preez P, and A. Beker. 2016. "Ontologies and Possibilities of Human Rights: Exploring Dissensus to Facilitate Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Education Contexts." *Perspectives in Education* 34 (3): 1-14.
- Edloe, L. L. 2007. "Best Practices for Successful Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR)." *New Voices in Public Policy* 1: George Mason University: School of Public Policy.
- Fearon, J. D. 2004. "Why Do Some Civil Wars Last So Much Longer Than Others?" *Journal of Peace Research* 41 (3): 275-301.
- Fontana, G. 2016. *Education Policy and Power Sharing in Post-Conflict Societies: Lebanon, Northern Ireland, and Macedonia*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fontana, G. 2018. "Mapping the Relationship between Education Reform and PowerSharing in and after Intrastate Peace Agreements: A Multi-Methods Study" *Journal of Education in Emergencies* 4 (1): 74-113.
- Fontana, G., Katsonaki, A., Walsh, D., Wolff S., and C. Yakinthou (forthcoming). ICCS Dataset on Political Agreements in International Conflicts (PAIC), Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Fortna, V. P. 2003. "Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace." *International Organization* 57 (Spring): 337-372.
- GCPEA. 2018. *Education Under Attack 2018*. GCPEA: New York.
- Harris, I. M. 2004. "Peace Education Theory." *Journal of Peace Education* 1 (1): 5-20.
- Hartzell, C. 2007. *Deconstructing civil war settlements: What makes for an enduring peace?* Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the Midwestern Political Science Association, Chicago, 12-15 April.
- Hartzell, C. and M. Hoddie. 2003. "Institutionalize Peace: Power Sharing and Post-Civil War Conflict Management." *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (2): 318-332.
- Högbladh, S. 2012. "Peace Agreements 1975-2011 – Updating the UCDP Peace Agreement Dataset." In L. Themnér. *States in Armed Conflict 2012*. pp. 39-56. Uppsala: Uppsala University. Department of Peace and Conflict Research Report 99.
- Humphreys, M. and J. Weinstein. 2008. "Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil Wars." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 436-455
- Ishiyama, J. and M. Breunnig. 2012. "Educational Access and Peace Duration in Post-Conflict Countries." *International Interactions* 38 (1): 58-78.

- Jackson, T. (2000). *Equal Access to Education: A Peace Imperative for Burundi*. London: International Alert.
- Joshi, M. and J. Darby. 2013. "Introducing the Peace Accords Matrix (PAM)" A Database of Comprehensive Peace Agreements and their Implementation, 1989-2007." *Peacebuilding* 1: 256-274.
- King, E. 2011. "The Multiple Relationships between Education and Conflict: Reflections of Rwandan Teachers and Students." In K. Mundy and S. Dryden-Peterson (Eds.) *Educating Children in Conflict Zones: Research, Policy, and Practice for Systemic Change - A Tribute to Jackie Kirk*. pp. 137-151.
- King, E. 2014. *From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- King, E. 2018. "What Kenyan Youth Want and Why It Matters for Building Peace." *African Studies Review*.
- King, E. and C. Samii. 2018. "Minorities and Mistrust: On the Adoption of Ethnic Recognition to Manage Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 20 (10): 1-16.
- King, J. 2009. "Teaching and learning about controversial issues: Lessons from Northern Ireland." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 37 (2, Spring): 215-246.
- Langer, A. 2005. "Horizontal Inequalities and Violent Group Mobilization in Côte d'Ivoire." *Oxford Development Studies*. 33 (1): 25-45.
- Lemarchand, R. 1995. *Burundi: Ethnic Conflict and Genocide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberman, E. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research". *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 435-452.
- Maina, G. 2016. "Introduction" in Maina, G. and E. Melander (Eds.) *Peace Agreements and Durable Peace in Africa*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press: 1-15.
- Matsumoto, M. 2016. "Three strands of explanations on root causes of civil war in low-income and weak states in sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for education." *International Journal of Educational Development*. 49: 1-10.
- Mattes, M. and B. Savun. 2009. "Fostering Peace After Civil War: Commitment Problems and Agreement Design." *International Studies Quarterly* 53: 737-759.
- McGlynn, C. 2009. "Negotiating Cultural Difference in Divided Societies: An Analysis of Approaches to Integrated Education in Northern Ireland." In C. McGlynn, M. Zembylas, Z. Bekerman and T. Gallagher. (Eds.) *Peace Education in Post-Conflict Societies: Comparative Perspectives*. pp. 9-26. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MENRS [Burundi]. 2007. *Plan D'Action de Formation Civique et Humain et d'Education a la Paix et aux Droits de l'Homme, 2007-2008*. Bujumbura, Burundi.

- MENRS [Burundi]. 2008. *Le Développement De L'Éducation: Rapport National du Burundi*, Bujumbura, Burundi.
- Ndikumana, L. 2000. "Towards a solution to violence in Burundi: a case for political and economic liberalization." *The Journal of Modern Studies*. 38 (3): 413-459.
- Ndikumana, L. 2005. "Institutional Failure and Ethnic Conflicts in Burundi" *African Studies Review*, 41(1): 29-47.
- Nkurunziza, J. D. 2013. "Inequality and Post-Conflict Fiscal Policies in Burundi" in Langer, A., F. Stewart, and R. Venugopal (Eds.) *Horizontal Inequalities and Post-Conflict Development*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, p. 209-229.
- Nkurunziza, P. 2017. *Address by HE Pierre Nkurunziza on the 26<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on the Charter of National Unity*. Bujumbura, Burundi.
- Nolan, P. 2009. "From Conflict Society to Learning Society: Lessons from the Peace Process in Northern Ireland." In C. McGlynn, M. Zembylas, Z. Bekerman and T. Gallagher. (Eds.) *Peace Education in Post-Conflict Societies: Comparative Perspectives*. pp. 59-74. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A., and A. Smith. 2015. *A Theoretical Framework for Analysing the Contribution of Education to Sustainable Peacebuilding: 4Rs in Conflict-Affected Contexts*. University of Amsterdam, available online: <http://learningforpeace.unicef.org/partners/research-consortium/research-outputs/>
- Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo M. T. A., and A. Smith. 2017. "The 4R's Framework: Analyzing Education's Contribution to Sustainable Peacebuilding with Social Justice in Conflict-Affected Contexts." *Journal on Education in Emergencies* 3 (1): 14-43.
- Obura, A. 2008. *Burundi – Staying Power: Struggling to Reconstruct Education in Burundi since 1993*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Olson Lounsbery, M. and K. DeRouen Jr. 2016. "The viability of civil war peace agreements." *Civil Wars* 18 (3): 311-337.
- Paris, R. 2004. *At War's End*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulson, J. 2006. "The Education Recommendations of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions: Potential and Practice in Sierra Leone." *Research in Comparative and International Education* 1 (4): 335-350.
- Poppema, M. 2009. "Guatemala, the Peace Accords and education: a post-conflict struggle for equal opportunities and participation in education." *Globalization, Societies and Education* 7 (4): 383-408.
- Quaynor, L. 2015. "'I do not have the means to speak': educating youth for citizenship in post-conflict Liberia." *Journal of Peace Education* 12 (1): 15-36.
- Richards, P. 1996. *Fighting for the Rain Forest: War, Youth, and Resources in Sierra Leone*. Oxford, James Currey.

- Richmond, O. 2010. "A genealogy of peace and conflict theory." In O. Richmond (Ed). *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical Development Approaches*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Save the Children. 2009. *Where Peace Begins: The Pivotal Role of Education for Lasting Peace*. Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina: Save the Children.
- Shepler, S. and J. H. Williams (2017). "Understanding Sierra Leonean and Liberian teachers' views on discussing past wars in their classrooms." *Comparative Education* 53 (3): 418-441.
- Sisk, T. 1996. *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflict*. Washington D. C.: United States Institute of Peace.
- Stedman, S. J. 2002. *Implementing Peace Agreements in Civil Wars: Lessons and Recommendation for Policymakers*. New York: International Peace Academy.
- Straus, S. 2015. *Making and Unmaking Nations: War, Leadership, and Genocide in Modern Africa*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Travaglianti, M. 2017. "How abolishing school fees increased support for the incumbent in Burundi." *African Affairs* 116 (462): 101-124.
- Thyne, C. L. 2006. "ABC's, 123's and the Golden Rule: The Pacifying Effect of Education on Civil War, 1980-1999." *International Studies Quarterly* 50 (4): 733-754.
- Toft, M. D. 2010. "Ending Civil Wars: A Case of Rebel Victory." *International Security* 34 (4): 7-36.
- Torsti, P. 2005. "Peace Agreements Must Address Education." *Forced Migration Review* 22: 64.
- Torsti, P. 2009. "Segregate Education and Texts: A Challenge to Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *International Journal on World Peace* 26 (2): 65-82.
- UIS-UNESCO. 2017. UNESCO Institute for Statistics Data. Available at: <http://data.uis.unesco.org/>
- UN. 2000. *Millennium Development Goals and Beyond 2015*. Available at: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- UNESCO. 2016. *Education for People and Planet: Creating Sustainable Futures for All*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing.
- UNICEF. 2011. *The Role of Education in Peacebuilding: Literature Review*. New York, NY: UNICEF.
- UNICEF. 2016. *Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme in Ethiopia*. New York, NY: UNICEF.
- Uvin, P. 1999. "Ethnicity and Power in Burundi and Rwanda: Different Paths to Mass Violence" *Comparative Politics*, 31(3): 253-271.

- Vandeginste, S. 2015. "Burundi's electoral crisis: back to power-sharing as usual?" *African Affairs*. 114 (457): 624-636.
- Walter, B. 2001. *Committing to Peace: The Successful Settlement of Civil Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wolpe, H. 2011. *Making Peace After Genocide: Anatomy of the Burundi Process*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace
- Zasloff, B., A. Shapiro, and A. Heather Coyne. 2009. *An Education Track for the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace.