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PART I - INTRODUCTION

1.0 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, DESCRIPTION OF PEP
The purpose of the 2001 evaluation of the UNHCR Peace Education programme (PEP) was to determine if the programme had had any positive impact on peace building and conflict prevention during the four years of its existence in the Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps. (From 1998 to 2001.) The second issue was whether refugees had learned peace-building skills.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were:

1. To assess the impact of the programme on the beneficiaries.
2. To provide accountability to beneficiaries and donors.
3. To assist forward programming.
4. To contribute to the development of peace education in Africa.
5. To gather information relevant to donors for future funding decisions.

The evaluation follows two previous exercises to assess the PEP community workshops (1999) and programme materials (2000). The current exercise is timely in the sense that the programme was adopted in 2001 by INEE, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies.

Introduction to the Peace Education Programme

The Peace Education programme of the UNHCR is derived from the belief that peace can be fostered in the world through the adoption of peace promoting behaviour and by the practice of specific peace related skills, which can be taught. The objectives of PEP can be summarised as follows:

- PEP educators strive to promote what they call positive peace, enhancing the quality of life for all individuals, and for the community and nation; and they aim to prevent violent conflict.

- They teach peace building skills to pre-empt conflict, including an initiation into mediation techniques for conflict resolution and dispute containment.

- At the same time, in order to strengthen skill acquisition, PEP provides opportunities for individuals to acquire new understandings, values and attitudes related to peace.

PEP has therefore adopted a skills oriented approach aimed at behaviour development and/or behaviour change. PEP uses a variety of activities for teaching and learning effectiveness in the programme, focusing on the learning of specific skills and on skill practice during each workshop and each lesson of the year. The same skill is then practised in the wider context of school life, in the home, and in the street. The programme is characterized by experiential learning. PEP aims at improving the quality of life for all refugees, now and in the long term. It focuses on conflict prevention, and includes elements of conflict resolution, opting for mediation techniques which produce more satisfying long term positive outcomes for everyone, in preference to intrusive methods with less durable outcomes.

It is important to appreciate what the peace education programme is and what it is not.
WHAT IS PEP?

- PEP emphasises skill acquisition – it’s activity-centred
- PEP is an education programme
  - It’s not a communication programme
- PEP promotes peace building and conflict prevention
  - It’s not a conflict resolution programme

**PEP is an education programme**
PEP is an education programme aiming at individual learning over time, through long-term programmes: a twelve year programme in schools and an initial 12-unit community workshop reinforced by follow-up activities over the years. *PEP is first and foremost a skills acquisition programme* targeting various peace building skills such as: the skills of cooperation; communication skills - including enhanced listening, speaking skills and the skill of remaining silent; skills of trusting, of practising empathy; skills of assertiveness deriving from enhanced self-esteem and self-image; the skill of taking increased individual and social responsibility - for one’s life and decisions, and for other people; the skill of controlling emotions; mediation skills (a conflict resolution skill, together with problem solving, negotiation, and reconciliation skills) derived from an increased attitude of tolerance and open-mindedness.

**PEP is not a communication programme, nor a conflict resolution programme**
PEP is not a communication programme despite the fact that is has a minor communication component, which it calls ‘public awareness’ (Component C below). And, PEP is not a conflict resolution programme, although it includes a small component on conflict resolution skills. It teaches conflict mediation techniques, which promote the active participation of the parties, concerned in finding a win-win, durable solution facilitated by a mediator.

PEP poses the question: ‘Can peace be taught?’ and responds: ‘peace... can certainly be learned’. And PEP goes on to explain its approach to skills learning:

**Peaceful behaviour can be learned if the [learner] has the opportunity to develop and practise peace behaviours through:**

- Sequential activities
- Structured activities
- And through seeing these behaviours modelled
PEP was a vision of UNHCR, translated into a programme through the inputs of refugees in Dadaab and Kakuma. It has two major components comprising a schools based programme and a community programme for youth and adults, which is the most dynamic element in the entire programme. A needs assessment was carried out in the two camps in 1997 through participatory workshops. Efforts were co-ordinated by UNHCR and a first programme design was developed during that year, comprising a stated approach to peace education, a curriculum, and a PEP methodology embedded in teacher guide books and teaching/learning materials. These materials now form a materials kit, of teachers’ and facilitators’ guides, trainers’ materials, a reference booklet for workshop graduates, poetry and story books, posters, charts, role play cards, proverb cards, all listed at the end of the reference section. Sensibly, there is no textbook for children since the cost would have been prohibitive. This serves to reinforce the activity-oriented nature of PEP and forces learning sessions into activity and experiential learning.

Teaching proper started in 1998 in the two camps with an initial ten-day training of facilitators and teachers, followed by inservice training over two further ten-day sessions during the year. This is the pattern of teacher/facilitator training to date, three ten-day training sessions in the first year. It is supplemented by regular visits of PEP advisors to schools/workshops and monitoring; professional development meetings, which are fortnightly or monthly when regular, organized by PEP advisors for mixed groups of teachers and facilitators; and follow-up training at a later date. Up to ten refugees have become trainers and work regularly with the UNHCR/IP PEP advisors. One refugee has risen to the rank of peace adviser (counterpart) in Kakuma camp, administering the programme in its entirety during recurrent UNHCR staff shortages in the field over the years.

**Description of PEP**

PEP has two main thrusts to encompass all potential school and out-of-school learners, from camp leaders and secondary school graduates in the camp, to illiterate adults, housewives, goatherds, and youth who have missed out on schooling:

- **A. The schools programme**, with one peace lesson a week for all children at primary and secondary schools, with corresponding teacher guides for 28 lessons per year for eight primary grades. A secondary programme is currently being piloted.

- **B. The community workshop programme**, for adults and out-of-school youth, comprising an extensive programme - a weekly workshop over ten or twelve weeks; or a more intensive option running over ten/twelve consecutive half days.

In addition there is (C) a public awareness programme using posters and drama, akin to a communication component, and a fourth component of (D) various planned and spontaneous PEP activities, which are characterised by their multiplicity and inventiveness and by the diversity of their initiators.

To the credit of the programme, one of the major findings of the evaluation was that the refugees have been highly active participants in PEP. They are among the prime movers in PEP development and their perception of programme impact has been central to the evaluation exercise, providing the elements for developing a framework for the definition of impact in this report.

> Whoever designed this programme understands us very well. It allows us to discuss all that is important in our lives.
> [New refugee teacher, Dadaab]
2.0 METHOD OF THE EVALUATION EXERCISE

Two methodological challenges faced the evaluation. First, assessment of behaviour change was to be based on secondary sources, that is, on crime reports and on a variety of oral evidence on peace building behaviour gathered from a range of observers. This was not as satisfactory as direct observation of behaviour but in the absence of baseline data on behavioural patterns and due to the difficulty of mounting a complex and costly observational study, secondary sources were to suffice. Second, it was discovered at the start of the evaluation exercise that several other units and organizations in the camps were working on issues related to peace, namely, on improved security, conflict resolution and, to some extent, on conflict prevention. It was, consequently, going to be difficult to determine the precise contribution of PEP to peace building as an isolated entity among the plethora of related activity in the camps. It is however possible to relate the increased activity in peace making activities to the existence of PEP in the camps. Given these constraints an assessment was nevertheless made on the impact of PEP.

Since PEP is an education programme, which sets out to teach skills related to peace building and to contribute to the prevention of conflict, specific questions to guide the evaluation process were developed:

- **Learning acquisition:**
  Is there evidence that peace related skills, the skills taught by PEP, are being practised or acquired?
  Is there evidence that the practice of these skills reduces or prevents conflict in the camps?

- **Nature and source of evidence:**
  What is the nature of the evidence? What is the credibility of the informants?

- **Significance of the evidence:**
  If there is evidence of reduced conflict/more peace in the camps, can it be attributed (solely or partly) to PEP?
  If there is evidence of more peaceable skills practice/behaviour, can this be attributed (solely or partly) to PEP?

The baseline survey methods, tools and outcomes were noted when developing the current evaluation procedures. However, unfortunately, neither the baseline questionnaire code definitions nor the raw data could be retrieved by UNHCR. Three principal data collection instruments were used during the 2001-2002 evaluation study. They were:

- **Documentary evidence** such as camp reports, background reading, PEP materials and reports, UNHCR reports and papers, initial impact evidence from the Kenya Police;
- **Observation**, that is, observation of PEP teaching/learning in workshops and schools; and observation of impact through secondary sources using camp crime statistics, security reports, gender-related security reports, interviews with witnesses to events;
- **Interviews** (one-on-one) and **focus group discussions**, mainly the former; solicited and unsolicited oral reports and views on change since 1998 from informants outside and inside PEP.

A survey was carried out by interview with the help of 33 refugee interviewers, trained for the purpose in four half-day sessions prior to the exercise. They were community development workers outside PEP. Interviews were minimally structured, around six questions. The interview lasted one hour. A total of 319 interview survey reports were
collected and analysed. The consultant carried out unstructured interviews with 40 expert informants. In Nairobi two associate consultants worked with the principal consultant to conduct (a) content analysis and (b) an SPSS analysis on the survey interview data.

**An important underlying principle** of the evaluation exercise, from the start, was the active participation of the beneficiaries, the refugees, in the evaluation. Two mechanisms were chosen. First, refugees made up the team of survey interviewers. Second, refugee perceptions on PEP were translated into an organising conceptual framework for the study. The refugee perspective served as the major instrument for constructing the conceptual organising framework at the mid point of the evaluation and for the analysis of the findings, reproduced in Sect. 4. Beneficiary perceptions and beneficiary assessment of outcomes were therefore integrated as a prime conceptual construct in the study and as one of the significant indices of PEP achievement.

### 3.0 DADAAB AND KAKUMA CAMPS

The major refugee camps of Kenya, Dadaab and Kakuma, are situated in the most remote, arid and developmentally neglected areas of the country, in that northern and eastern part of Kenya which is geographically and demographically an integral part of the Horn of Africa, within 150 kms of the Somali and Sudanese borders. They are two of the most inhospitable areas for human habitation and almost no one among Kenya’s southern city dwellers and agriculturalists has ever been there. They are far from the concerns of mainstream political, social and economic development. The areas could be described as geo-politically hostile environments.

There are chronic and new problems of insecurity in northern and eastern Kenya, they include four features endemic to the area and two features arising from the introduction of refugee populations into the region:

(a) competition for natural resources resulting in raiding among nomadic pastoralists in the areas;
(b) regular cross border armed banditry over the last four decades after the formation of modern nation states in the Horn of Africa;
(c) the massive introduction of armaments by the great powers into the Horn during the Cold War;
(d) the 46 year old civil war in Sudan, internal political upheaval in Ethiopia in the 1970s-1980s, and civil war in Somalia in the 1990s;
(e) the continual overspill of political strife in the home countries to the refugee camps;
(f) the current high concentration of equipment, provisions, and possessions stocked in refugee camps, which are attractive to looters.

Crime statistics in and around the camps reached a peak in the mid-late 1990s. They included armed banditry in the camps, cattle raiding on the periphery of the camps and repeated incidents of sexual and gender-based violence, and theft. Camp/police reports listed: murder, manslaughter, rape, shooting, inter-clan fighting, assault, abduction, arson, strikes and strike threats, rioting, theft; and accidents and substance abuse.

Water provision is regular but insufficient, requiring twice daily queuing at tap-stands. WFP food provision dwindled from 1,878 Kcals in July 2001 to 1,744 in Aug, then to 1,515 Kcals. UNHCR was obliged to top up the food basket by providing oil and pulses despite the 1,264,936 tonnes of food distributed in August by WFP. Food and fuel requirements are enormous. The 52,872 bundles of firewood stocked at three firewood yards in Kakuma in Aug 2001 were distributed but proved insufficient for the population
of 132,000. Despite these difficult conditions, it is to the credit of UNHCR and the implementing agencies that the refugees have a relatively good health and nutritional status, measured in terms of infant, child and maternal mortality rates, and in the health services and free schooling available. The camp social indicators are better than those of the local populations of Dadaab and Kakuma. The relatively high primary school gross enrolment ratios of 79 and 44 per cent in Kakuma and Dadaab Camps are constrained by the availability of school places, not by lack of household income.

Intolerable frustrations build up for individuals, as Box 1 indicates below. While some exceptional individuals have succeeded in viable trading, even within the context of the camps, it is not the experience of the majority who struggle daily to find meagre ways of earning a living and of finding purchasers for produce that they sell. In the survey sample 46% of the respondents were not income earners. The irony of the situation is that the host population would like to benefit more in economic (and developmental) terms from the presence of the refugees while the refugees would welcome the opportunity of increased access to trading with the host population.

Box 1

NOBODY KNOWS THE TROUBLES I'VE SEEN…..

There was an incident at the tap-stand that could have turned ugly. People were waiting patiently in the queue for their turn at the water tap, with their jerry cans placed one behind the other in a very long line. Out of nowhere a man appeared and rudely pushed to the head of the queue to get his water before all the others. The people were all Congolese. And the man was Congolese.
- Why can’t you wait like everyone else? The people called out stridently.
The man paid no heed but threw the lined up jerry cans out of line, one after the other. Men and women alike started to rough him up and push him around. Then they started to beat him viciously.
A peacemaker was passing by at the time. What is the problem? He asked. And he was told. He asked for calm. Then he put the jerry cans back, one behind the other in line. He picked up the troublemaker's jerry can and he addressed the people.
- Now, he said, there is water enough here in this tap for everyone. If this man takes his water first it will not deprive anyone else of water. Is this not so?
The people agreed. It is so, they said.
- You see, went on the peacemaker, everyone has his problems here. We cannot know what is in the head of this man or what problems he has. We can’t know whether he brought these problems with him, wherever he comes from, or whether he found new problems waiting for him in this camp. Let this man go first and take his water. Then you can all go quietly to take your water. Perhaps you would allow me to draw water first for him so that he can be satisfied and leave us?
- Let it be so, said the people wearily. And they watched the peacemaker fill the troublemaker's jerry can, and give it to him.

[ p.137, Long Report]  
Story contributed by Pastor Ondolo, Congolese, Kakuma

In Turkana and Dadaab, the refugee camps constitute the largest ‘towns’ or concentrations of population in each district, with 84,553 refugees in Kakuma and 132,000 in Dadaab camps. Despite resettlement and repatriation schemes the number of refugees continues to grow.

The local population feels caught up in a cycle of poverty and neglect. In the hope of preserving some natural resources for themselves in the extremely fragile pastoralist
environments, local populations have demanded restrictions on refugee access to fuelwood and a total ban on livestock keeping around Kakuma. The situation creates tensions on both sides and has been a major source of hostility between refugees and host communities. UNHCR has made gestures to the host populations by providing a water borehole here and a water tank there outside the camps but it is the role of national focused agencies and the host government to foster development in the locality. There is evidently a great challenge for hosts, development agencies and UNHCR to collaborate from the start in setting up refugee camps rather than leave the challenge solely to the refugee-focused mandate of the UNHCR as if refugee camps exist in isolation from host populations.

The characteristics of age, gender and nationality, of the Dadaab and Kakuma camp populations are indicated in Table 1. The camps have similar age bands. For example, schoolage children of 5/6–17 yrs represent over one third in the two localities. This implies a need for significant investment in education. Given the total breakdown of education systems experienced in both countries during the last decade, educational opportunities for refugee children in the camps are of special importance for long term postwar national development in addition to the security, the return to normalcy and trauma alleviation that the schooling experience provides in the short term. Dadaab Camp is well balanced in terms of gender. However, Kakuma has only 37-38 per cent girls and women, which reflects the more mobile lifestyle of Sudanese men and boys who have independently and proactively sought out better life opportunities by coming to the refugee camps; the widespread conscription of boys into militias in Sudan; and the pressure put on women to stay at home to feed the remaining population and the armies through agricultural output (Jok 1995). In these circumstances it is vital to ensure the full representation of girls in the camp schools, and adult education for women. As regards the national profile of refugees, each camp is dominated by one nationality but Dadaab is the most homogeneous, where 98% of the population is Somali. Ethiopians are 1% while other nationalities are less than one hundred each. Kakuma is a more mixed context with 81% Sudanese, 15% Somalis, 3% Ethiopians and a couple of hundred Ugandans, Congolese, Rwandans, Burundese, with a smattering of Eritreans and two Liberians.

In the PEP programme the numerically dominating Somali and Sudanese nationals have warmly welcomed the participation of minority nationals in the programme. In a true spirit of peace building and community integration, PEP educators and peacemakers work daily with the many national groups in the camps. The minority nationals have asserted themselves and achieved not only acceptance but also warm recognition from the majority groups. The result is a striking and enthusiastic group of mixed nationals in each camp leading PEP into new territory. It was striking that the residents of Kakuma II and III camps, which are of mixed nationality and mixed ethnic groups, continually pointed out the importance of living in mixed communities. They said it was a major factor for encouraging interaction and peace between refugee communities and for learning the vital lessons of community integration and cooperation, especially across ethnic lines.
### Table 1: Population by Age and Gender, Dadaab & Kakuma Camps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Male N (%)</th>
<th>Female N (%)</th>
<th>Total Pop (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DADAAB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 0-4yrs*</td>
<td>10,167 (51)</td>
<td>9,594 (49)</td>
<td>19,759 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 5-17yrs*</td>
<td>26319 (53)</td>
<td>23,043 (47)</td>
<td>49,345 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18yrs +)</td>
<td>28,023 (47)</td>
<td>32,027 (53)</td>
<td>60,050 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DADAAB Totals</strong></td>
<td>67,477 (51)</td>
<td>64,660 (49)</td>
<td>132,114 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAKUMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 0-5 yrs</td>
<td>7,885 (53)</td>
<td>7,807 (47)</td>
<td>14,692 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6-17yrs</td>
<td>17,815 (62)</td>
<td>11,170 (38)</td>
<td>28,985 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 yrs +)</td>
<td>25,907 (63)</td>
<td>14,969 (37)</td>
<td>40,876 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAKUMA Totals</strong></td>
<td>51,716 (61)</td>
<td>32,837 (39)</td>
<td>84,553 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Dadaab SITREP Sept 2001 (revised); Kakuma UNHCR Pop. Statistics Update Dec 2001

---

**PART II - FINDINGS**

### 4.0 PEP COVERAGE

**PEP Exceeded its Target?**

Given the fluctuating arrival and departure rates from the camps, and the difficulties of finding solid data on camp residence and school drop-out, it is difficult to produce exact figures on PEP coverage in schools, and exact data for school and workshop coverage as a proportion of camp population. The conclusions of the evaluation, based on school enrolment statistics from the IPs and on PEP attendance records, are as follows. Since the start of PEP in 1998, the population reached is estimated at **70,000 school and community participants over the four year programme**. PEP has exceeded its coverage target, which was 20% of the total community population, but 100% of the school population. The programme is estimated to have directly reached **30 per cent of the current camp population** or 55,000 of the 181,000 camp population of adults and school children. Unfortunately, because of turnover within the camp, it is a numerical success rather than a physical success.

The programme based its objective of 20% on the ‘social contact’ theory of 1:10 (a circle of influence of ten people). Assuming that every participant/graduate in the PEP undergoes an attitude and behaviour change they could then influence ten other people. Erring on the side of caution, the PEP developers decided on a 50% success rate of the...
participants, which in turn meant that 20% of the population needed to be directly reached in order to indirectly reach 100% of the camp population.

**PEP Schoolchildren**: All primary schoolchildren attend a weekly Peace Education lesson, that is, 28 peace lessons a year. A secondary PEP programme started in 2002.

**Table 2: Total Primary/Secondary School Enrolment in Dadaab and Kakuma Camps, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total School Enrolment</th>
<th>Total Population5/6 – 17 years</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>Total Camp population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dadaab</td>
<td>21,279</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>21,636</td>
<td>49,345</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>132,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma</td>
<td>20,817</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>22,745</td>
<td>28,985</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dadaab statistics report 5-17 yrs; Kakuma report 6-17 yrs*

Sources: Education Statistics, Education Section CARE, Nov 2001, Dadaab
Education Statistics, Education Section LWF, Sept 2001, Kakuma

An additional 14,000 schoolchildren could have attended PEP classes in 1998-2000 and since graduated from and/or dropped out of the education system.

**Community PEP participants**: By 2001 approximately 12,000 youth and adults had passed through PEP community workshops, 4,110 in Dadaab and 8,000 in Kakuma. The Kakuma data are more regular than Dadaab data. This could be due to the continuing presence of the refugee PEP administrator in Kakuma, while no such post exists to date in Dadaab to palliate the problematic issue of continuity of UNHCR PEP staffing in the two camps.

**Social Groups and Profiles Targeted by PEP**

At the initial launch of the programme, traditional leaders, religious leaders and group leaders (elected) were the first groups to be trained. This was in the hope that if these people considered the programme worthwhile (and their attitudes and behaviour was changed) then they would encourage the communities. As the programme developed, **Youth** were targeted since they were expected to play an important future role in the community. A second reason was their repeated involvement in camp fights. In 2001 Kakuma workshops focused 3:1 on youth. The democratic election of new leaders in 2001 in the camps gave new prominence to this social group and they attended workshops and occasionally special workshops were run for them.

**Women**, who form 45 per cent of the two-camp population, have been under-represented (22 per cent) in PEP workshops: 21-22 per cent of the 49 they represent in Dadaab and 17 of the 38 they represent in Kakuma; **22% of the total workshop participants**. This is even though women’s only workshops are conducted periodically. The **illiterate** also need more targeting in the future, and **people with disabilities**. Four factors keep women out of PEP workshops:

(a) high demand for training/workshop opportunities by men, pre-empting women’s less forceful applications;
(b) limited time, due to heavy domestic workloads and lack of child-minding facilities;
(c) restricted language-appropriate PEP arrangements;
(d) and lack of attention to these factors by PEP and camp managers.
The first issue is a daily source of frustration to women in the camps. The unexpected, relatively high rate of conflictual attitudes among younger women revealed by this report could be linked to their limited exposure to PEP and to the fact that they bear the brunt of constant queuing in the camps (out of proportion to their numbers, particularly in Kakuma) which is a major contextual contributor to disputes. Their life frustrations must be considerably higher than men’s. The second factor related to workload is acknowledged but insufficient/no relevant action is planned or has been taken by any sector including PEP. Also, there are too few women PEP educators, especially in Kakuma, and they are less skilled than the male educators. There is a need to use PEP explicitly as a mechanism for the advancement of women in peace building and in general, and to urgently increase the coverage and involvement of women in PEP through new PEP strategies.

**Conclusion**

Given the considerably higher population of refugees in Dadaab PEP needs to increase coverage there. In all camps the participation of women should be increased to reflect proportional demographic representation and to redress the current imbalance in training opportunities. Data on more detailed profiles need to be kept, for example, on numbers and types of leaders trained in the workshops, and on literate and non-literate participants. In all cases the number of workshops run by each facilitator needs monitoring and increasing (see App.K) to a level where facilitators work full time (between 1.5 to 2 workshops per month, depending on programme policy); and the minimum number of participants should be set at 30. Further, payment should reflect workshops carried out rather than the current system of flat monthly rates unrelated to work completed.

**5.0 FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY ON PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES**

*Description of the survey population*

The 319 respondents constituting the sample population reflected many of the camp characteristics: 53% Somali, 35% Sudanese, 7% Ethiopians, and a total of 1% from Uganda and the Great Lakes regions. More than 60% had been out of their home country for over ten years. The sample included 42 per cent women, satisfactorily mirroring their 45 per cent representation over the two camps. The under 18s were one third fewer than planned in the sample (a final total of 7%). This was compensated for by extra focus group discussions with children at a later point in the investigation. Half of the sample population was currently married, though more men were currently (39%) than women (31%). As many as 36% of the sample were single (never married), which indicated a change in traditional early marriage patterns. Households were generally over five people and 9% had ten or more members (giving some justification to the ‘social contact’ theory). The sample included 29% illiterate people – 39% of the sample were illiterate women, 29% were illiterate men – which probably far below the camp average, since some of the survey categories (21%) deliberately targeted schooled populations. 24% of the sample had completed primary school; 27% had been to secondary school. The post-primary male respondents outnumbered women by four to one. Cash earners formed 43% respondents, of whom 40% were women. Income generating activities included: livestock keeping, firewood collecting and selling, tea kiosk management, donkey cart operators, builders and masons, domestic cleaners, watchmen (no one mentioned vegetable growing and selling, but it is common); community workers in health, water, solar power projects, youth projects, credit schemes and teachers. Church employees and librarians were paid by the community. Elected leaders, that is, leaders of the camp and women’s leaders, reportedly received perks but
no salary. Only 3% received remittances from abroad. Most of the unpaid workers were housewives. By chance, 34% of those responding to the relevant question said they had been through PEP in community workshops or in school, which reflected the current proportion of PEP coverage in the camps (approximately 30 per cent).

RESPONSES
Six questions were asked during the one hour interview and were analysed with reference to the baseline study where data were available (see Appendix D). The answers reflect perceptions and attitudes after four years of the PEP programme. They were subjected to content analysis and to quantitative (SPSS) analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In response to the question: What does peace mean for you? the answers clustered around the following themes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negative peace*, as described by PEP: Peace is ‘living without conflict and violence’, ‘it means lack of anxiety and fear’, ‘living without hatred with myself [feeling comfortable with myself], my family and people in the camp’, ‘teaching my children not to fight with the neighbours’ children’ and ‘the eradication of war and fighting among people… among groups, communities, in my country or in the world’; ‘…being free of any intimidation or discrimination; and freedom from torture and detention.’ ‘Without peace there can be no development.’ ‘Some people here in the camps have a security problem and feel they are targeted and will be attacked or harmed. That is NOT peace. They have a right to life, these people, same as you and me, and that right to life is very important.’

*Personal security, unity and integration:* ‘I see peace as protection against harm’, ‘peace is freedom of mind and it is social, economic, spiritual and political stability’; and safety to enjoy ‘freedom of movement’: ‘when there is peace one can move from place to place freely’. They spoke of economic well-being and strengthening community solidarity: ‘we think that when there is peace, if people have money, they can develop themselves and their relatives. They can also assist their friends when they need something’.

A *philosophical perspective on peace*: Refugees expressed a longing for a state of contentedness, and to live in a society which respects human dignity: ‘peace means being in harmony and living in brotherly love’, ‘peace means forgiveness’, ‘peace means knowing your rights and the rights of others’, ‘it means having freedom of speech, movement by land, air, and sea’; ‘freedom of worship’; and ‘free interaction with others’. Peace ushers in a world governed by ethics and consideration for others: ‘it is knowing good and bad’.

Few associated the notion of peace with fulfilling basic needs (5%). This could have been due to the regular provision of water, food, shelter, and some clothing, in the camps.

An attempt was made to compare the 2001 findings with the baseline survey of 1998 but the 1998 code definitions were not available, which made comparison tentative. It seemed, however, as if the refugees had increasing confidence in the emerging social structures in the camps, the block and zonal leadership, and in the security and welfare committees of various types. They looked to these structures in particular for maintaining peace in the camps (Qu.3): ‘There are many structures and organisations in the camp for keeping peace nicely and they have different functions. Some work culturally, some
religiously and others academically.’ They lauded the inter-communal and international living patterns in Kakuma II and III where, they explained, the experience of living together had taught people to work together, cooperate and integrate. This is a major statement from the refugees to camp planners of the future. There was more expression of a philosophical approach to peace, more reflective thinking in the 2001 responses than before, while reference to home almost disappeared (after increasing years away from home).

A second significant statement in 2001 was that (male) youth were beginning to refuse to fight at the instigation of the elders (a) without justification (b) at all. They had learned to analyse the consequences of fighting and decided that those negative outcomes outweighed blind obedience to authority figures in the community. This was a second incidence noted in the evaluation of a change in tradition but a reminder that the elders are still a strong force to be reckoned with. Overall, concerns with security were now tied to resolving conflict, and to living in a conflict-resolving society where people could manage disagreement and come to a workable understanding. Self-confidence and hope had increased and male personal autonomy. People were more sure than ever of what they wanted to avoid. They expressed this in terms of negative peace.

The peacemakers were a new and significant source of inspiration, as noted by 17% of the respondents. These are the peace educators and the core of activist PEP graduates who have joined the educators in regularly mediating in disputes. ‘Before peace education was introduced we used to mix up the person and the problem’ but ‘[the peacemakers] have good skills for solving problems’. ‘Generally they are helping in changing the character [attitudes] and behaviour of different people.’ ‘The Somali Youth League for Reconciliation was started [by themselves] in 2000. They went through PEP workshops and... they now help us to build peace.’ In schools even some of the children are known as peacemakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Question. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In response to a direct question on a familiar occurrence in the camps: **What would you do if someone pushed in front of you at the tapstand?** many respondents replied that they would try to find out the cause of the provocative act before taking any verbal or physical action, and explained that a queue jumper might have gone without water for three days or have a sick child at home or just find themselves at the end of their tether after years of frustration in the camps. There seemed to be more readiness in 2001 to reflect before rushing into physical action. Others said they would go as far as they humanly could in order to avoid violence, ‘in order not to encourage fighting at the tapstand’. 2/3 said they would reason with the individual and if the action was judged to be intentional they would apply various levels of social pressure, or report to the religious authorities. 9% said they would use their newly acquired PEP skills of assertion. Not one respondent said they would report the offender to external agencies such as the police or NGO/UNHCR officials. Over 10% would have done this three years before. This must be counted as a great step forward. Refugees were recognising that tapstand issues are small matters and should be dealt with at an appropriate low level. Elected leaders and seniors had a strong sense of responsibility:

‘You see, as a Section Leader, leading ten blocks of dwellings... I have to give a good example to other people. I have to show respect to them and appreciate [understand] what so ever they do, so that I can help the community. That is my role’. |
'Because of my age I would not argue with such a person. I would not fight them'. And, as one of the non-PEP teachers said, ‘leaders are expected to play their role of leadership to the full: ‘Each and every person has the responsibility of keeping peace in the camps but the elders, chairmen and chairwomen, and security committee members have got a major role to play in this in the camps.’ (Ans. to Qu.3)

However, 19% of the respondents were ready to fight the offender. Although the investigation was a community impact study rather than an individual tracer study, some analysis was made of the 59 people reporting themselves as ready to engage in a fight. The largest group of aggressive individuals among the 59 were young males. One said: ‘I will either kill him or he will kill me’. 1/3 of those ready to fight had completed or been exposed to PEP. That one third was one third too high. They came from both community and school PEP programmes – but the data could not reveal if they were course completers or drop-outs. A slightly higher proportion of women (52%) than men were involved, young women under 30 yrs. These findings should be matched with data on PEP coverage (see Sect. 4) which indicated serious under-representation of women (22%) in PEP programmes. And women form the highest percentage of illiterates in the camp.

There was a dramatic correlation between educational level and peace preparedness: the lower the educational level the more readiness to fight. The literature is replete with developmental/economic arguments for educating women. This study adds to the literature and has produced a peace-related thesis: women can retard peace building if they remain uneducated. Women leaders have a profound sense of responsibility for peace making. Fig.2 indicates the educational level of respondents who are ready to fight at relatively small provocation.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the findings so far:
1. Too many PEP learners leave the programme - community workshops and schools - with continuing aggressive tendencies. Records need to indicate course drop-outs.
2. PEP will need to identify aggressive attitudes among participants at the start of a workshop/school programme, to confront and deal with aggression more explicitly during the course, especially in schools, and to follow up not only at the end of the course but months and years after the workshop. The learning of young males should be carefully monitored.
3. Women participants in PEP should be increased, better targeted.
4. Attempts could be made to identify people (a) with aggressive attitudes in the camps and (b) those in a state of hopelessness, so as to deliberately invite such people to PEP workshops.
5. One of the most effective peace building actions is provision of schooling. Neglect to give women access to education retards the overall peace effort.

It was recommended that rapid learning assessment tests or simple observational tools for teachers/facilitators need to be developed to help educators identify inefficient learners. In future PEP could produce threshold competence profiles, describing the learner’s position or peace competence at the start, at mid-course and at the end of the course. This would assist PEP educators diagnose learner needs and achievement at different points in time.

**Response to Question. 3**

When asked: *Whose responsibility is it to maintain peace in the camps?* 2/3 recognised individual responsibility for peace: ‘Every individual is responsible for maintaining peace in the camps and applying their understanding of peace to their own individual lives… all fathers and mothers in the camp, children, community leaders, CSM\(^\text{st}\) committees, security committees and NGOs.’ ‘To maintain peace is the responsibility of each and every individual. Each one among us has a responsibility to do what he or she is supposed to do for peace’ ‘I should regard community members as part of myself. I should respect their rights, the norms of society, and the rules and regulations that society has set for the community’, said a woman gender promoter, of 43 yrs, with incomplete primary education, ‘that is the way to build peace’. Respondents reiterated the importance of containing disputes and dealing with them at an appropriate low level: ‘fathers and mothers… have to solve family problems there within the family rather than letting family matters reach the community level’; ‘the role of the refugee security committees is to maintain peace at community level through cooperation and consolidating with other responsible residents of the camp’.

Religious leaders took a prime role in promoting peace and linking peace to religious values: ‘I tell them what religion says about conflict, war or any other problem. I preach on religion in the community and read to them some verses on peace from the Holy Qur’an’. Customary conflict resolution methods are still used: ‘The two parties [in the conflict] will get together, as is our custom, sitting under the acacia trees. The elders will listen carefully to each side…’. ‘However, what is new is that some of the elders are trying out mediation techniques instead of the traditional arbitration methods of resolution.

**HALIMO’S PERCEPTION**

The official view is that there are committees and structures for maintaining peace in the camps. But my own personal view is that each and every person in the community, young and old, is responsible for peace because the responsibility given to us by Allah is more important and precious than any responsibility given to us by the community. [Halimo*, 40 yrs, married, primary education completer, vice chair of one of the large camps]

**Response to Question. 4**

The practice of discrete peace building skills such as good communication skills was seen as crucial to peace building, as reflected in answers to the question: *What do you do and what does the community do to keep peace in the camp?* They said: ‘[I must] stay in good communication with my neighbour’; ‘communicate with one another in order to understand each other’; make a ‘positive change in my lifestyle… to stay in
peace; ‘everybody must work together for peace’; and work towards acceptance of common rules: ‘I would tell [troublemakers] about the rules... such as standing in queues’. They considered education in general and peace education in particular to be more significant than three years before. The response rate on peace education rose from 9-15% to 46-77%. Significantly, they chose to work proactively with their community structures to build peace. Refugees in 2001 seemed to say that they would do more than before and be more active in bringing about peace: ‘I am trying to campaign against beating and domestic violence... ’; ‘I recite poems about peace every day at the tap-stand’; ‘I can learn to be a truthful witness, without showing bias, when giving evidence on incidents’; ‘to help build peace I have to control myself’ [noted by a secondary school completer, woman of 39 yrs]; ‘I must be friends to all people, not fearing some and being familiar [friendly] with others, which would limit communication which is necessary for peace. Friendship among many builds unity among people... ’. The black columns in Fig. 1 below reflect the action-oriented stance of 2001 as compared with the more visionary and vague approach of 1998. In 2001 people were more actively engaged in building peace. There was recognition by 2001 of the importance of individual action; and behaviour change had spread across the camps (responses were up from 27-31 to 35-57% on this issue). In short, refugees were more pro-active for peace in 2001.

Fig. 1: Actions to Ensure Peace in the Camps 1998/2001

In 1998 the host country police were regarded as a separate, alien, outside force. By 2001 refugees saw them in more collaborative terms, welcoming the growing rate of arrests, charges and imprisonment of offenders with improved refugee security. UNHCR was regarded increasingly as a partner: ‘We can work for peace but we need the continuing support of UNHCR.’ To the credit of camp managers, the UNHCR and NGOs, there were repeated reports by refugee respondents of sound co-operation between the agencies and themselves.

The responses to Question 4 demonstrated a general picture of proactive peacebuilders in Dadaab and Kakuma, even among the 2/3 of the respondents who had not yet attended a peace education workshop. Responses indicated, above all, that refugees had internalised the message of individual responsibility for peace building.
Response to Question. 5

With regard to readiness for future peace building, in response to the question: **What can you do to keep peace in the future? (a) in the camp? (b) in your country? (c) in the world?** respondents said that they would spread peace education, they would consciously develop good relations in the community and beyond, through their own individual peace building acts and through developing a positive and proactive attitude to peace building. A new development in 2001 was the determination to take positive political action. Also, the last three years of PEP saw a strengthening of commitment to peace founded on religious belief. Plans of action included the following: ‘I will obey the laws of the government in order to maintain security in the country’; ‘I will appoint the right leader for the country’; in future ‘we’ll elect leaders from people [who have demonstrated in the camps that they are responsible] and who have internalised peace education’; ‘I plan to start a nationwide newspaper to promote peace’; ‘Let us take PEP to Somalia, for those in Somalia to learn peace’; ‘I will cooperate with my neighbouring countries for human rights’. Vows were made – and PEP can encourage them to be written out, recorded, and to be kept for the day when they can be enacted: ‘If I go home to my country, I will tell my fellow men to respect each other, and to remember what has happened in our country – tragedy and bloodshed’. ‘If we continue peace campaigning and peace work here it will affect the world we are living in’, said an illiterate middle aged man, a Security Committee Member with a strong sense of action.

Not all refugees had hope. Some felt helpless due to their perceived low and powerless status in the community. The numbers seemed to have increased since 1998, from 10 to 15% over three years, after longer and longer years spent away from home. None of those expressing hopelessness had been through the PEP programme. They said:
- I can’t do anything because I have no power.
- I cannot do anything in my country because I am a lady.
- If you interfere you will be killed.
- I can’t do anything in this situation because of clan bandits.

Problems in the camp make people feel hopeless and, as a result, they start thinking of bad things.

Some viewed action in the home country as beyond the realms of planning: ‘I can’t do anything in my country now because I’m in exile and I’m already a refugee.

It is recommended that those without hope should be identified in the community and special attention could be given to them through PEP by the peacemakers.

Response to Question. 6

Among the survey population more than 83% of the respondents had heard about the Peace Education programme. The remaining 17% had not heard of PEP or said they were unaware of any positive effects of the programme. 12% expressed negative views. They said that PEP graduates did nothing visible or were not useful to the camp. Two respondents stated that PEP educators were unfit and corrupt. The perception of PEP was, overall, as indicated below and reflects a correct understanding of programme aims:

- The nature of the peace education programme:
  1. PEP has provided opportunities for acquiring skills in problem solving, conflict resolution and conflict mediation. PEP is skills and behaviour-oriented.
2. PEP teaches about peace. It also targets cognitive and affective learning, that is, knowledge, attitudes and values.

- PEP has prevented conflict in the camps
- PEP has reduced conflict occurrence:
  1. Resolved small problems
  2. Contained problems (eg. reduced tapstand conflict)
  3. Stopped conflict escalation
  4. Improved camp security overall
- PEP has increased community integration

Respondents said that PEP had already brought some measure of peace to the home country due to the return home of some PEP facilitators and teachers who had started to informally teach PEP.

6.0 REDUCING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL THREAT, CRIME AND TENSION – AND BUILDING PEACE

The maintenance of security in refugee camps is the obligation of the host government while UNHCR, within its mandate of protection, provides material support where... inadequate’. The major obligation of the camp authorities, that is, the UNHCR and the IPs, is to ensure sufficient and regular supplies of basic necessities such as water, food, and non-food items Camp reports constantly reveal their struggle do this in the face of an increasing refugee population and declining agency resources: ‘The continued and steady growth of the number of persons... continues to add a strain to the resources available in the camp... Many seem to be permanently housed in the reception centre since there are no materials for their shelter’. Increasing and systematic efforts have been made over recent years ‘to resolve the problem of insecurity...’ through collaborative action between the Kenya Government UNHCR and the IPs. The main roads north and south of Kakuma were reported less dangerous after an intensification of police escorts organised by the District Security Committee liaising with the UNHCR team. However, in 2000, the IP supportive security section experienced budget cuts: ‘LWF/DWS security have suffered a major disability in terms of budget..... We had to approach other departments for batteries and other accessories...’

Tension among the refugees in the camp is created by fear. These fears include: fear of crime and insecurity, fear of domestic violence, fear of lack of water, fear of lack of food, fear of lack of shelter. Conflict occurs at an individual level and in the family. It also occurs, at the other extreme of the continuum, between communities and groups of people who do not know each other. The most common inter-community type of conflict is inter-ethnic violence. Table 3 overleaf depicts the hierarchy of conflict in the camps.
### Table 3: The Hierarchy of Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Conflict</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict in the family</strong> or in the private domain between people who know each other well; disputes involving pairs or small groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Conflict in the family</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Children</strong> quarrel and fight, spreads to the mothers, then whole families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Between close neighbours:</strong> unwillingness to share resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Between people in same block/zone:</strong> straying animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>In a neighbourhood:</strong> at water/food queues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Between camp communities:</strong> at election time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Between ‘traditional’ antagonists</strong> in home country: whole communities and clans fight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict in larger groups in the public domain between strangers**

### What Causes Tension and Violence in the Camps?

The experiences causing tension in the camps are listed, detailed and described by the full report as:
- Queuing
- Festivities
- Problems in the home country
- Competing interests of refugees and the local host population
- Marauders
- Deprivation, frustration, overwork/idleness, despair
- Specific incidents
- Political and traditional feuding.

There is a specific account, and arguably the most telling, of the direct and positive effect of PEP on a potentially serious confrontation, recounted below. It provides a significant example of conflict prevention by PEP. The tale involves two ethnic groups in Kakuma which were called on by their respective elders to fight in order to sort out a relatively minor altercation in the camp. But on each side were PEP graduates, who, uncoordinated, and with no prior planning, just individually withdrew from the dispute, leaving behind those who wished to fight. Their withdrawal led to the fizzling out of the conflict. This was a great day of PEP success, and recognised as such.
Two rival groups of Dinkas stood on the ridges of Kakuma Camp, summoned to fight. Theirs was not to wonder why. Their role was to obey, to fight, unquestioning. A variety of weapons had been collected, unearthed from their hideaways. They were ready. But something strange was happening? What was it? What was happening? Imperceptibly, one by one, some of the fighters were drawing away from the group. Silently, they turned aside and, one by one, they separated out from the others. More followed. They looked over to the opposite ridge. To their amazement the same thing seemed to be happening. One by one the fighting groups grew smaller. It was true! The peacemakers were moving! One by one! Something was afoot. For sure! One by one, the peacemakers dropped their weapons, turned and left the scene.

Those who remained could see the futility in standing their ground. They left, too.

This day is known as the first time peacemakers ever stopped a large fight. And it is interesting to see how they did it, almost unconsciously, spontaneously, silently, one by one. There had been no plan, no planning, no talk at all.

[Story contributed by at least seven people, peacemakers and PEP manager, who remember the occasion.]
[p.77, abridged from the Long Report]

Later, when they looked back on that day, some explained it this way: ‘Well, there on that ridge I began to wonder why I always obey the elders and fight when they tell me to. I wondered why I have to put myself in danger and get hurt.’ Another said: ‘I wondered why I should risk my resettlement plans which are almost through.’ And another: ‘Last time this happened many of my friends were injured and seven of them were left dead on the field. I began to ask myself, there on the ridge, why me? Why jeopardise everything I have been working for, and the peace that we have all been working for? I just couldn’t do it. I just couldn’t fight again. Something inside me was saying: “No, don’t do it.” So I left the ridge! I just left!’

‘Yes,’ said a fourth, ‘I felt the same. And when I saw my peace friends on the other ridge walking away just like we were doing, I knew we had to be right. I knew we shouldn’t just blindly follow those orders to fight.’ ‘What does peace mean, after all!’ said a fifth. ‘Are we to fight just because someone tells us to fight? Who is telling me to fight? For what? For whom? I won’t do it again. I shall listen to my own head!’

There had been no plan, no prior discussion. The withdrawal of the peacemakers had been spontaneous. They simply pulled away from the fight, one by one, on each of the warring sides. What was amazing was that as this happened on one side, it happened simultaneously on the other side. It was some time before the peacemakers on one side noticed the very same action on the other side. Then they knew that peacemaking was being enacted before their very eyes.

Crime rates have been reduced by 29% in Kakuma between 1999 and 2001 and by 66% in Dadaab during the period 1998-2001, as indicated in Tables 4 and 5. PEP is not absent from conflict resolution mechanisms used, as an official letter from the Dadaab Police Station indicated, reproduced in the full report (pp.1-2), noting the involvement of a PEP peacemaker in mediation.
The conclusion drawn by the evaluation is that many agencies, institutions and individuals have worked determinedly in reducing conflict in the camps – note Tables 4 and 5. The Peace Education programme has proactively joined in this effort, and targeted peace building and conflict prevention in particular.

### Table 4: Analysis of Security Trends, Kakuma Camp 1999-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decreased by 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Decreased by 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abduction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decreased by 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Decreased by 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decreased by 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Decreased by 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increased by 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increased by 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Decreased by 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Also called ‘interclan clashes’
Sources: Kakuma SITREPS 2001

### Table 5: Analysis of Security Trends, Dadaab Camp 1998-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Decreased by 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Decreased by 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Decreased by 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Decreased by 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Incidents per month</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Decreased by 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Security Analysis UNHCR Paper of SITREP Nov 2001
7.0 OBSERVATIONS IN SCHOOLS  

The Environment of the PEP Schools Programme

This report would not be the first to point out the very difficult conditions under which teachers and learners are working in refugee camp schools. It is also important, however, to note that compared with classrooms across Africa, physical learning conditions in Dadaab and Kakuma are average. The main characteristics of the camps are the extreme heat and dust; the wind in Kakuma; and the noise level from next door classes (learners left without teachers for whole days at a stretch, or the unnecessarily strident voice of the teacher in the next class). Playground noise is not a problem since school discipline provides for simultaneous breaktime for all classes. The classrooms are much too small for the number of current pupils, especially in Kakuma. The refugee schools generally have better furniture than the average rural school in eastern Africa/the Horn region. However, ironically, this makes for a very crowded environment and one has to clamber over furniture to reach the third row or the back of the class, as the consultant was doing all the time.

Refugees have the benefit of totally free schooling, Heads keep the schools clean and orderly and, where there are shade trees, the compound becomes an attraction for all. One major recommendation would be for teachers to make an effort to acquire more shade trees for schools so that more activities, reading and discussion, could take place outside the very hot classrooms, and to make the children responsible for the seedlings.

In conclusion, education is well run in the camps, relative to national systems, and special commendation is given to the providers. It is evident that a great deal of effort and thought has gone into setting up schooling. In Kakuma the community has managed to assist in walling the classrooms with recycled food tins. This is an impressive achievement and says as much about the efforts of the community as it does about IP/UNHCR success in promoting community involvement in education. However, the GER of 44 per cent in Dadaab and 79 per cent in Kakuma needs to be increased:

(a) Raising enrolments to 100 per cent net enrolment ratios, given the high level of need and the unusual circumstances in refugee camps.
(b) Learning resource acquisition and management, to involve the children and the community in improved maintenance and utilisation of resources; reduction and review of short-life supplies.
(c) Girls’ education, through the development of an all-encompassing policy for the camps and a strategic plan to pro-actively address women’s needs and circumstances in the camps.
(d) Use of child-to-child programmes not only for health education but to enhance the quality of the school, the community and the overall environment.

PEP in Schools

The PEP curriculum and PEP lessons have a clear structure, which is reflected in the work of the teachers across their 28 peace lessons per year in each primary class. Teachers recognise and use the official lesson stages and are aware when they omit stages. Lessons have a start and a conclusion. Teachers and advisers know their way around the teacher guides and they are familiar with the conceptual features of the programme. Some excellent teaching was observed – which indicates that the
programme promotes this and that the teacher training can be effective. The full evaluation report gives details on lessons observed in Grades 5 and 8 which were particularly effective, in extremely overcrowded classrooms, against a great deal of noise from adjacent classrooms. Such lessons demonstrated that the complex concepts of a peace education programme can be taught in simple English, to children, through class activities, question and answer techniques, and through exceptionally well facilitated discussion. It is all a matter of teachers developing a focus, sticking to it through well-prepared open questions, giving the floor to the students and listening attentively to them. In the classroom observed, class attention was riveted on the teacher. Children felt they were being listened to very seriously by a fascinating adult.

After observing 13 lessons, the evaluation concluded, however, that few teachers reached this level of skill. First, most teachers exhibited poor questioning skills. Second, insufficient time and attention were being given to skill practice, which jeopardised skill acquisition. It was recommended:

- that most teachers needed urgent upgrading on questioning skills;
- that the teacher’s level of English was not a decisive factor – beyond a functional level which can be readily acquired;
- that practice on organising PEP Activities was needed (even some trainers misunderstood the Activities or conducted them erroneously);
- that teachers needed to name the skill of the lesson, and plan for appropriate skill practice time in each lesson;
- that focus could be given to skills practice and out-of-class practice through the use of ‘skill memos’;
- that it is important for teachers to be explicit in naming ethnic issues in PEP classes instead of skirting vaguely around unnamed issues;
- and that observation of the best teachers within the camps would be a good way of improving teaching skills.

Provision of reference materials in the camps would encourage teachers to read more around the concepts of peace, as they expressly said they would like to do, in order to help them clarify for themselves and for the children the complex issues involved in peace building.

Massive lower primary classes of up to 130 children needed an adapted curriculum and modified methodology - to be planned within the school or with colleagues from neighbouring schools - giving more place to song and activity than to verbal exchange. Both these experiences could be used in later years as experiential input into PEP learning. To give more time to skill practice, it was recommended that writing and exercise books (all 45,000 of the annual exercise book supply) be replaced with little 8 x 12 cm or smaller notebooks for copying down only the weekly skill memo (see full report). Funds saved could be used for increased teacher education. It was observed that some PEP teachers were particularly gifted in leading children in song and poetry, or in drama. The children loved this and it is recommended that these talented teachers be given more leeway than others in determining teaching/learning methodology, seasoned at some point in the learners’ careers, to be complemented by a more structured approach in the last classes of upper primary. Sect. 7 of the full report devotes space to the distinction between drama related activities in general and role play, which has received little attention in PEP to date but which has great potential for adoption into the programme.
The language issue persists and is debated at some length in the full report. It is recommended that the linguae francae of the children in the camp be used more often and that encouragement be given to learning English effectively as a significant tool in peace building: for refugees, to know English is to be better qualified for employment, to increase income opportunities, to further one’s life interests and to have the capacity to read world literature on peace issues.

Gender issues in the classroom have received little or no attention judging by the incessant put-down of girls in schools, ranging from the seating arrangements, to the total lack of communication by the (male) teacher with girls in some classrooms, and the lack of change expected by teachers. Yet during the evaluation a male teacher took the initiative of changing his own and the behaviour of girl learners in a significant manner over a 48 hour period as a result of a general discussion analysing classroom behaviour. It was no coincidence that the most competent teacher in the camps ran classes with mixed seating arrangements between boys and girls right through the primary cycle with no negative outcomes whatsoever. His classes demonstrated clearly - yet unconsciously on his part - that change is possible, as long as the cultural context is carefully taken into account.

PEP needs to be institutionalised in schools. It needs to permeate the authoritarian, undemocratic managerial school practices. And, over the period of one year, PEP needs to assist refugee schools outlaw violence, and banish corporal punishment, which is anathema in a peace promoting setting. Such a campaign should move slowly, ensuring that all teachers in the schools feel confident with new sanctions and new attitudes towards teaching desirable behaviour and it also needs strong leadership from UNHCR/IPs who have used leverage before in, for example, promoting change through their programmes against gender based and sexual violence and in fostering the democratic election of camp women and men leaders.

To keep PEP on track and to give more solid support to schools, constant observation and analysis of classroom practice needs to be done, together with a mechanism for ensuring feedback of lessons learned by observers into the programme in some definable and formal way.

The evaluation concluded, in view of the training and upgrading needs of PEP teachers, that the programme should devise:
(a) a different form of initial training;
(b) a different type of advisory support;
(c) more and continuous advisory support.

PEP school teachers should regard themselves as pioneers, agents of change in a sea of customary practices and attitudes that is the school. School is a difficult context to change since it has its own ‘school’ traditions, prejudices and malpractices as well as its positive aspects. It is significant that while PEP teachers have managed to avoid practising corporal punishment – and do not even point to the blackboard with sticks – this peaceable approach has had no impact whatsoever on the other teachers (and Grade 2 prefects!) who openly carry whips around with them, on school camp planners or on some UNHCR senior managers…. A new type of initial training and encouragement to institutionalise PEP may produce a change within the educational system. PEP should strategise for this. [Note: Early in 2002, CARE in Dadaab, instituted a non-corporal punishment rule and have requested the PEP teachers to train their colleagues in constructive classroom management techniques.]
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PEP is being piloted in secondary schools in 2002 and the consultant was able to observe some lessons in one of the camps early in the year. It was recommended that PEP should:

- Develop a new look PEP at secondary level
- Make it intellectually challenging
- Organise individual and group action outside school.

At secondary level, a happy medium might be found between teaching PEP in class and supporting peace skills development and peace related project work in the community. It would be useful for PEP to arrange a short seminar on the goals and approach to PEP at secondary level. Specifically:

1. *Teaching/facilitation materials* at secondary level must be focused and skills oriented.

2. A small student memo book or notebook on peace building skills could be used, to be purchased by learners.

3. Some *reading materials* for learners and teachers should be identified, collected and made available in libraries - and possibly new materials developed, with the assistance of secondary students - for concept development among students.

4. *PEP learners* could be given *more responsibility* and more freedom to direct the peace education programme in their class and in out-of-class activity.
The most exciting component of PEP was undoubtedly the community workshops. There was something particularly fascinating in watching young facilitators, with an incomplete secondary education, master the techniques of unobtrusive workshop facilitation for a group of mixed age men and women, several of them the newly elected leaders of the camp. It was a demonstration of how minimally educated youngsters can succeed, by dint of high quality training and after only 11-15 mths experience, in providing an enriching learning environment for heads wiser and more experienced than themselves. The atmosphere was good. It was cordial but intense, informal, giving participants the floor but ensuring that no one of them prevented other speakers from participating. The most impressive aspect of all was the facilitators’ thorough conceptual grasp of the programme and understanding of the methodology. The observer could detect this through the facilitators’ questioning skills.

They continuously and tirelessly listened to, analysed and weighed up the conceptual direction of the discussion which was being led by the participants. If the discussion strayed too far from the topic or seemed to be affirming some concept or view contrary to PEP’s view of peace, the facilitators had a subtle way of posing a question which would command attention. Discussion would stop for a moment while participants pondered a response – and this evidently challenged them to consider things from yet another angle. The participants were never disturbed by the questions.

At times, the facilitators guided the topic of discussion but they never imposed their views. They determined the structure of the discussion but were not strict on pace. The facilitators did not necessarily achieve closure on every point during the session. They would come back to some of the outstanding issues in a subsequent session, sometimes from a new angle. The important point is that the facilitators were aware of the current stance and of the ongoing conceptual development of the participants as regards peace. They were taking mental note. Perhaps facilitators should remain behind for 10 mins after each workshop to confer with each other and to make a few notes on the unfinished conceptual business of a session. There then would be more likelihood of covering the topic satisfactorily during the totality of a workshop.

The energisers, one of the activities that workshop participants and trainee facilitators and teachers enjoy, are gone from the programme. Materials development needs to take into account the phenomenon of what could be called programme emasculation when monitoring either fails to pick up such points or when monitoring is minimised - or when funds do not permit the making and distribution of sufficient supplies. The temptation of programme developers and agency decision makers is generally to go for a full range of materials rather than allocate more funds to teacher training. This point should be noted by future programme developers.

The Learning Environment of PEP Community Workshops
The community workshops have the advantage of being conducted in spacious social halls, with no noise impediment, and the freedom to use a time unit of three hours according to the needs of the session, instead of being physically, temporarily (in the sense of being time-bound to about 30 mins) and audibly crowded out, as PEP constantly is in school settings. Learners can, however, be disadvantaged when the group is too heterogeneous. Illiterate participants can find themselves confronted with a facilitator who uses the blackboard, or participants literate in Language A can find the
facilitator writing on the blackboard in unknown Language B, despite the presence of an interpreter. Second, since there has been no strategy for providing support systems for participants with heavy workloads or dependent children, some participants have to visibly struggle during PEP sessions with babies who claim their constant attention, albeit it quietly, while others do not attempt to attend. The result is low numbers of women participants or semi-participants, and no doubt concomitant lower levels of peace skills learning among women (note the conclusions of Section 5). Certainly, they were addressed less than men participants during workshops and they participated less than men in the discussions, or not at all. As urged elsewhere in this report, the needs of all learners require the attention of PEP programme designers.

10.0 OTHER PEP ACTIVITIES

In addition to the schools and community Peace Education programmes there are two complementary activities: the Public Awareness component and Further PEP Activities. The first comprises shorter or longer workshops, to introduce the notion of PEP in the camps and to gain supporters in new (or old) camps; small or large meetings; posters; and performances of drama, song and poetry.

10.1 Drama-related Activities
(a) Participatory Education Theatre (PET)
(b) Puppetry
(c) Drama-oriented workshops

It is difficult to find PET and puppet groups in the camps today and still more difficult to arrange for them to perform. It took repeated and determined effort during the evaluation exercise to find proof of their existence and performance skills. When PET and the puppeteers do perform, they produce a sound theatrical and communication act, particularly in the case of PET in Dadaab. This is the best public awareness troupe that Dadaab has and all departments should be brought together to try to use them more. At the same time, they should be assisted to be more creative in marketing their product and in creating demand so as to become self-sustaining and getting some pay for what they do from the general public.

The Amani drama-oriented work has left no trace in terms of performance capacity in Kakuma. At best, it may have been of some transitory benefit to some individuals.

Puppetry
The Dadaab puppeteers were a team of young men and women. They gave a lively performance with a good sense of drama, on a peace theme which was concocted only the night before. The story had pace and shape. The performance was not interactive but with some training this element could be introduced. The problem with the group is that they do not perform – almost never. They are unable to organise themselves and are handicapped by their insistence on using heavy, unnecessary and almost-untransportable props donated by some misguided donor. They need urgent help in techniques for becoming independent and, like PET above, for becoming a self-sustaining activity. Puppets could go fast and successfully into schools and into PEP work.
Endnote
Given that both PET in Dadaab and the puppeteers in Kakuma had to devise their plays on peace at 24 hours notice, this indicates: (a) that they do not have a repertoire of even one performance on peace; (b) that they are capable of devising performances at very short notice. The latter skill could be used for performers to depict specific themes or situations at short notice at the request of PEP. In future, NGOs/IPs training such groups in the camps should focus as much on the sustainability of group activity as on drama techniques.

10.2 PEP Outreach Programmes and Services
Outreach Programmes
Outreach programmes are reportedly run ‘continuously and consistently throughout the camps’ through home visits for ‘the elderly and disabled’ and others who cannot reach the community workshops, according to the Dadaab IP PEP Adviser (and Sect. 1). However, there is no record of their frequency, the facilitators and learners involved, the content, the number of hours worked, nor the outcomes.

Peer Counselling/Mediation Services
Given the lack of programme or planning as regards counselling, and the lack of systematic reporting on these activities, it was difficult for the consultant to describe or assess them - and no observation sessions had been arranged. This does not mean that the activities do not exist but it means that the programme is not planning or recording them. People talk about peer counselling and youth or children who use mediation skills, the PEP youth groups, youth peacemakers, and so on. Adults make frequent reference to the peacemakers in the camp and it is the conclusion of this evaluation that there are indeed a critical number of PEP graduates trained in conflict prevention and peer mediation whose services are used and appreciated, as recorded by numerous incidents throughout the report. Attention needs to be given to some planning and some recording of peacemaking/counselling/mediation in the future.

10.3 The Peacemaker – The Peace Education Newsletter
The Peacemaker has found a niche. It was greeted with great acclaim when it first appeared in 2001, from the camps to the refugee diaspora, and among PEP workers and agencies. It seems to be networking effectively and has a good variety of articles from refugees, PEP practitioners and experts, in clear simple language. The quarterly publication is a welcome and dynamic new development in the programme. PEP should consider putting extra copies on sale in the camps and providing back numbers for sale. It would be interesting to find out if it is more cost-effective to send copies of Peacemaker to schools as supplementary reading material, instead of the present crates of exercise books.

10.4 Spontaneous Services and Activities Emanating from PEP
While youth groups seem to exist – people talk about them - they are mainly male youth bonding groups, with no discernible activities at present. This is true also for the Somali Youth League for Reconciliation. It is recommended that PEP literature should remain silent on these groups and their planned activities until they become reportable and that, more importantly, PEP/IP collaboration with IP community services departments should assist the groups in developing clear aims, envisioning outcomes, naming targets, and in
planning and carrying out activities, and in encouraging girls to bond in similar fashion. In contrast, the Peace Education Stars Football Team seems active – it plays football. They are apparently a group of PEP youth graduates that have chosen this marvellous name for their team. It is hoped that *Peacemaker* can trace the fortunes of the team to find out how they fare, and report on whether they get to building more peace!

**PART III - CONCLUSIONS**

**11.0 CONCLUSIONS ON THE IMPACT OF PEP**

To return to the parameters outlined at the start, the outcomes expected of the Peace Education programme included:

- Increased peace in the camps
- Peace-promoting behaviour
- Peace-promoting attitudes
- Peace-promoting knowledge
- Strategising for the future

The conclusion of the evaluation indicates that the following objectives are being attained in the sense that there is progress and development. The reduction in fear, violence and crime in the camps cannot be attributed solely to PEP since many agencies and individuals have been involved in the concerted effort to make the refugee camps a more secure and peace building environment.

However, there is growing evidence of the direct contribution of PEP to mediation processes in the camps, as illustrated by the letter below.
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN
REF: ABDIKADIR SHEIKH OMAR

Please be informed that the above named Somali adult person working with UNHCR/CARE-RAP as Peace Education Incentive Worker, has been called at the above named Police Station to facilitate an agreement between two clans who had a dispute after a road traffic accident. He played a good role for the peace solution whereby the case ended in success. Please I kindly request you to consider for his absence from duty. I thank you for you co-operation in advance.

(JOHN N..... illegible under official stamp) IP
OIC DADAAB P/STAT.

The above letter is reproduced in its original handwritten form in the full evaluation report. It shows that a credible security authority, the Kenya Police in this case, considers the PEP peacemakers capable and useful in solving disputes of a serious nature.

Other significant contributions to the Peace Education programme, to conflict prevention and to the well-being of refugees are listed here:

**PEP Contributions to Camp Measures Taken to Enhance Conflict Prevention**

- Strategies for Queue Management
- Managing Festivities in the Camps
- Managing Problems Spilling Over from the Home Country
- Anticipating/Managing Competing Host and Refugee Community Interests
- Managing Marauders
- Managing Deprivation, Frustration, Overwork/Idleness, Despair
- Managing Specific Incidents
- Managing Political and Traditional Feuding
- Crime Reduction

Many PEP graduates are credited with peace building skills and they regularly practise them. The most skilled among them are known as *the peacemakers*, a band of highly committed, enthusiastic, active and increasingly visible individuals. They are young and old. According to the philosophy of PEP, peace starts in the mind and heart of the individual. It conditions her actions and her life. The refugees say that PEP has promoted peace in Dadaab and Kakuma, and the camp authorities are beginning to give official recognition to this. The refugees would like official support to take the programme
back to Sudan and Somalia, and their leaders are starting to make this request official (letter from the Buale elders, pp.100-102).

The conceptual framework used in this study to categorise the effects of PEP on peace building in the camps is also a neat way of summarizing those effects. The framework is reproduced below:

Table 6: Conceptual Framework: PEP Impact on Peace Building in Dadaab/Kakuma Refugee Camps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resolution of small problems, quarrels and fights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Containing small disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conflict escalation prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improved camp security: less crime, lawlessness; safety levels increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More/better intergroup interaction and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Emerging spontaneous/unplanned effects: several refugee-initiated activities, action and groupings for peace building in the camps sowing seeds for peace building in the home country (Somalia and Sudan) initial peace networking and peace action visioning among resettled refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-on-one interviews with the refugees and camp authorities provided evidence of peace prevention mechanisms now operating in the camps. They were developed into a seven-point organising framework and this remains the most concrete statement of PEP outcomes. Progress in peace building is discernible. Nevertheless, increased attention to skills teaching, skills learning and skills practice is required of the programme in the future (noted in Sects.6-8).

12.0 PROGRAMME ISSUES

PEP Staffing at Field Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dadaab:</th>
<th>18 facilitators 16 teachers</th>
<th>IP/HCR admin/adviser &amp; 3 assts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma:</td>
<td>11 facilitators 26 teachers</td>
<td>Refugee admin/advisor HCR adviser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, schools need to be increased in both camps, but particularly in Dadaab, in order to augment the current primary school GER of 45% in Dadaab and 80% in Kakuma, both ratios being driven directly, as noted above, by supply rather than demand factors. Given the relatively low GER in Dadaab, an immediate injection of more facilitators is needed to increase the number of community workshops in order to complement PEP in schools. In both camps the rate of workshops given per facilitator needs monitoring and increasing to a rate of two workshops per month in order to utilise trained PEP staff
optimally and to reach a maximum number of refugees (see App. K). Pay should reflect the number of workshops run. The relatively lower number of workshops run in Dadaab - which is also lower relative to the number of facilitators - could be directly attributable to the lack of monitoring, that is, to lack of a refugee or permanent camp administrator/advisor and to the particularly acute UNHCR/IP staffing problems experienced over the four years of the PEP programme. There has been severe discontinuity and change in staff appointed from Nairobi, and the absence of a refugee counterpart.

A new problem has arisen since the completion of the full evaluation report, which points even more pertinently to the need for refugee counterpart administrative and professional staff in Dadaab. This relates to the 2002 mid-year problems with the IP chosen to take over the management of PEP from UNHCR. It is reiterated here that due to the newness and unique character of PEP, to the importance of the programme, and the failure of the Dadaab IP experiment in 2002, (a) a modality for appointing refugee counterparts in Dadaab has to be found (a mechanism was described in the full evaluation report) and (b) the choice of a PEP IP managing agency and procedure for inducting the IP into PEP has to be fundamentally rethought in Dadaab (and in potential other sites), in full consultation between national, regional and UNHCR HQ PEP experts/programme managers and branch, regional and UNHCR HQ administrators. Refugee educators declare that they are willing to implement the PEP whoever administers it - IP or UNHCR - as long as the quality of the programme is maintained, and despite their preference for direct management by UNHCR.

It is recommended that staffing needs be planned in future, funds permitting, and that a strong PEP management presence be maintained in each camp. For this, commitment from HQ Geneva is needed together with regional and branch office backing. It is hoped that this report, which notes the tremendous achievements of PEP over the years, will go some way towards convincing HQ, regions and branch offices of the value of PEP and that the outcome of the evaluation will be that very support and guarantee of continuity of funding which is required to staff PEP.

**Capacity Building in PEP**

The categories of PEP professionals requiring training in the programme include: teachers, facilitators, trainers, advisers, monitors, programme developers; and managers at field, national and regional levels. The report emphasises that PEP stands or falls on the quality of the teaching and facilitation. Training programmes needs should be drawn up, listing all types of training required, their periodicity, need for TOT, etc. A career structure identifying six levels of aspiration has been mapped out in the full report for facilitators who have successfully completed a minimum of one year in post. A clear map or strategy provides the milestones to reach in career development and it provides a pool of human resources for PEP at every level.

**PEP across Eight Countries**

It was not in the terms of reference of the evaluation consultant to review the extension of PEP but brief reference was made to (a) the supplementary and unplanned work placed on the shoulders of the International Peace Consultant in addition to (b) the consolidation of PEP in Kakuma and Dadaab. The emerging typology of PEP across Africa is depicted in Table 7. These include the programmes in DRC, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya (Kakuma and Dadaab), Liberia, Tanzania and Uganda. Both East Africa and West Africa now have Regional PEP Advisers. It was recommended that baseline
studies in new sites should record the type and frequency of violent incidents and negative behaviour in the camps for use in subsequent evaluations of programme impact. UNHCR was urged to appoint regional advisers with long experience in teacher training so as to provide the type of support which Dadaab and Kakuma enjoyed for four years.

Table 7: Four-Mode PEP Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEP TYPOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode A - The Dadaab model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To refugees only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode B - The Kakuma model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To refugees and host nationals near camps,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode C - The Uganda model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To refugees and nationals integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode D - DRC/Eritrea Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To refugees and nationals the integration into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national school systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Jan 2002 during the all Africa or cross-region PEP meeting in Nairobi much enthusiasm was evident in the eight countries and varying levels of implementation.

PEP Administration and Development

This report appeals to the very senior officials in UNHCR to give time once again to the Peace Education programme and to recommend it to all its agents, from the level of Geneva to the field. For the good of the programme, it will be necessary not only to recommend it but to instruct HQ, the regions, the branch offices and the suboffices to give the necessary support to the programme. In particular, they could be asked to expedite the paperwork, and to release funds on time; to give faster attention to staff postings and staff development issues; to work with PEP staff to develop a more sound funding base for the programme which would respect UNHCR priorities and mesh with its policies on funding and fund raising. What exceptions can the agency make for PEP fund raising? Education interventions are not one-off quick fixes. PEP has been a specific UNHCR creation and creature which deserves nurturing within its originating agency if it is to spread beyond UNHCR.

There are structures and individuals from the top to the bottom of UNHCR who gave strong support to the Peace Education programme from the start. The movers and shakers of PEP say that they owe these individuals and offices a great debt of gratitude. There are today leaders in UNHCR in sub-offices through to HQ who continue to work for the development of PEP, and newcomers to PEP who have quickly and spontaneously taken up the cause of PEP in their offices. There are former UNHCR leaders and workers who have left the agency but whose legacy to PEP will not be forgotten.

The aim of this report, as it can be stated at this concluding stage of the document, is to provide a record of work well done, for those who continue to work with PEP, a
statement on the tremendous efforts of many UNHCR staff within and outside PEP who have continued to work for PEP over many years. It is also a wake up call to those in UNHCR who may have forgotten or who may never have appreciated the vital role of the UNHCR Peace Education programme. Many refugees will owe their lives to the humanitarian relief work accomplished by UNHCR. Many refugees will owe the health of their soul and their hope in the future in a special way to the Peace Education programme.

Programming
Given the reposting of staff and extension of PEP across the Africa region, the time has come for formal, effective and timely programme planning. The development of workplans are needed at all levels of the programme in order to facilitate planning, implementation, the achievement of goals, and periodic analysis and assessment.

Budgeting
It is recommended that a larger proportion of funds be allocated to training, particularly teacher and facilitator training in the programme, to ensure the quality of PEP delivery, simultaneously reducing or eliminating exercise book supplies. While it is important to develop capacity in the Africa region it is also, in the light of experience, useful to use global staff inputs in selected posts. This mix has worked well so far in PEP. The evaluation has stressed the importance of developing a career structure for refugees within PEP. It is strongly recommended that planning and budgets reflect measures to keep the best peacemakers and educators from the camps and from the diaspora in the Peace Education programme.

Fundraising
The UNHCR Peace Education programme is far too effective and exciting a programme to be left solely to the funding of the founding agency. It is hoped that many other partners will join not only in networking and encouraging PEP but will also fund an expansion of the Peace Education programme. First, within-house, the UNHCR needs to devise ways of raising and absorbing increased funding to the programme. This report urges UNHCR to find creative ways of increasing funding to PEP within the parameters that the agency has set itself. The leverage of INEE could be used to increase funding to peace education. Second, partnerships need to be developed to share the cost of the programme, not only partnerships with those agencies who work in the specific sites where PEP is operating but in collaboration with agencies and foundations who wish to promote peace through assisting in consolidating a proven peace education programme.
13.0 FINAL CONCLUSION

PEP has contributed to the learning and practice of peace building skills in refugee camps and to the reduction of conflict. The programme is a rewarding and positive experience for the refugees, a welcome and sometimes a fun change from the dreariness of daily camp life. It inspires hope and renewed faith in humankind; it bonds people, particularly the peace facilitators, teachers and the core active graduates. It provides a practical agenda for action. For the peace educators it is simply exhilarating. PEP is a well designed programme, flexible, and can easily cross borders. One major explanation for the success of the programme is the very participatory way in which it was designed, with refugees as principal actors.

The main findings of the evaluation are:
A positive impact on peace building skills and documented contribution to peace in the life of the camps
Targeted coverage achieved: more than the 10% camp population in 4 yrs; PEP has exceeded extension expectations (unstated at the start), and operates in a total of eight countries
Increased confidence and skills of PEP educators: some outstanding educators with no more than twelfth grade schooling
Daily demonstration in schools of non-violent, supportive teacher/pupil relations in a context rife with corporal punishment, etc
Growing agency recognition of PEP
Handover of PEP from UNHCR to IP achieved in first site (Kakuma), after initial problems

PEP’s contribution to building peace in the camps includes the following seven elements:
- Conflict prevention
- Resolution of small problems, quarrels and fights
- Small dispute containment
- Conflict escalation prevention
- Improved camp security: less crime; safety levels increased
- More/better inter-group interaction and integration
- Emerging spontaneous/unplanned effects: in the camps, initiatives by refugees to follow up and spread PEP; in the home country, sowing seeds for course development, peace building and initial networking.

Constraints to the programme include:
- High agency and PEP refugee staff turnover – camp/context occupational hazard (20% teachers left Kakuma schools in 2001)
- Continual need for upgrading teaching skills
- Current budget allocations inadequate for quality teacher/facilitator training
- Insufficiently focused and structured monitoring of teacher/facilitators; and advisory services
- Departure of regional senior trainer and planner in early 2002
- Need for capacity building in programming
- Insufficient awareness among some senior agency managers of programme objectives, processes and targets
- Avoidable problems in handover to IPs
The main recommendations re-emphasise skills learning and teacher education:

- Re-focus on skills learning, the skills of peace building
- Increase attention, Programming space and funding for teacher/facilitator education
- and strengthen capacity building and training at all PEP professional (and management) levels

Further recommendations are organised under the following headings in the full report:

- Gender in PEP – need to address gender and the PEP power structure through recruitment measures, gender training, curriculum review, method development and class administration/management.

- Collaborative and Joint Peace Activities in the Camps - to promote joint organisational activity, sports, youth and culture activities, the promotion of women’s rights, modification of male behaviour, environmental education.

- Information Dissemination, Advocacy Inside and Outside UNHCR/IPs; Briefing Mechanisms – to review PEP staff awareness programme for new staff, updating regulars

- Networking and Gaining Recognition for PEP – in-camp, in the diaspora; badges or armbands, integrating PEP into official camp security activities

- Schools/Workshops, Pedagogy and Learning in PEP – the full report details further recommendations over six pages on: PEP in Schools, PEP Pedagogy, PEP at Secondary Level, PEP in the Community Workshops, Teacher/Facilitator Education – Monitoring Educators, Assessment

- Programming, Staffing, Budgeting and Financing PEP

- Extension/Consolidation of the Peace Education Programme

Challenges ahead include the need to:

- Consolidate the programme at this stage, in each site, with an eye on high staff turnover
- Focus on skill learning; and improved teaching skills
- Increase programme focus on elders and traditional leaders; on women; on illiterate people
- Increase numbers of workshops and participants per workshop
- Establish a regional post for senior experienced trainer and training planner
- Re-allocate budgets to increase budget for teacher/facilitator training and advisory support, reducing funding for supplies
- Increase funding to PEP
Plan the induction of new PEP managers, in programme design and implementation, workplan development, monitoring, developing new initiatives, etc.

Develop a PEP career structure for senior refugee PEP staff across the region, to demonstrate the career potential of PEP and the genuine commitment of the international community to providing refugees with professional employment.

Re-strategise in order to gain support of senior agency managers: administrative collaboration at all levels for consolidation on training needs, staffing, funding

Anticipate and plan future handovers to IPs after thorough consultation.

For children PEP is a fun learning experience, full of activity, varied from lesson to lesson with competitions, outside activities, song, drama and groupwork. Adult learners are surprised to find themselves intellectually stimulated and enjoying a range of new learning activities followed by intense discussion. Elders and youth, illiterate women and secondary school leavers, all find their place in the PEP workshop and classroom. Demand from the refugees far outstrips supply. The programme is a remarkable contrast from the dreariness of daily camp life. For both adults and child learners PEP inspires hope and renewed faith in humankind; it bonds people, particularly the peace facilitators, teachers and the core active graduates. It provides a practical agenda for action. For the peace educators it is simply exhilarating. PEP is a well designed programme, flexible, and spreads easily across national borders. One major explanation for the success of the programme is the distinctly participatory way in which it was designed, with refugees as principal actors.

It is concluded as a result of the evaluation study that the UNHCR Peace Education programme has contributed significantly to peace building skills in Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps, to the practice of those skills and to reducing conflict in the camps. PEP has worked alongside the several other organisations and units in the camps working on security, conflict resolution and prevention. UNHCR, the Kenya Government, the implementing agencies and NGOs in the camps, and the refugees themselves, have joined forces through a number of well designed measures and activities to improve security. The most recurrent term used in these endeavours is indeed ‘security’ which is closely related to but different from the pursuit of peace. Peace for PEP is not merely the absence of war or conflict. It is deliberate and sustained action on the part of all citizens to promote the well-being of all, acknowledging and working positively with and through conflict as it arises in human life but avoiding physical violence at all costs.

This is a high quality programme in terms of focus of design and implementation, with an unusually high rate of success so far, despite numerous obstacles encountered along the way. It nevertheless runs the risk of what might be called programme deterioration unless sound supportive measures recommended here are carried out, due to its very newness and lack of solid staffing mechanisms and funding. The team of PEP originators, developers and current implementers - refugees, nationals and internationals - are professionally sound, committed and enthusiastic. Refugees involved in PEP teaching, facilitation and administration would like to continue their work indefinitely. They would welcome the opportunity of giving lifelong service to peace education and it is my own hope that this study will go some way towards achieving that aim.
A peace education programme is not just a sum total of budgets, crates of supplies, numbers of workshops or even amount of effort. It is the quality of those efforts. It is the original inspiration of Margaret Sinclair; the indefatigable leadership of Pamela Baxter, the International Peace Education Consultant in the region, 1997 to early 2002; the camaraderie between Pamela and her colleagues in the camps; the vision developed by Adamu, Murayo, Blackie, Sarafino, Abdul-Kadir, Tiberious, Ismail, Halimo, Emmanuel, Deka, Gebeheyu, Abdirizak, James, Marwel and others. The field workers are joined by their friends in the diaspora and by the great team of Victor Ikobwa in the Regional Office, Anne Musomba in the Nairobi Branch Office, and Adamu and Rosie Okoth as Peace Advisers in the camps. Chris Talbot was Senior Education Officer in Geneva after Margaret left and has been a devoted and indispensable supporter of PEP in HQ for many years.

This is an exceptional programme. These are exceptional people.

Peace building skills are being learned. The impact of PEP is growing. PEP needs our increasing support in the future.
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*UNHCR PEP Publications* – many now reprinted as of late 2001 under the sponsorship of INEE Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies

**A. For the School Programme**

*Teacher Activity Book (TAB)* comprising guidelines for 26 lessons for eight grades (208 lessons)

*Story Book* – collection of ten stories, mainly traditional, used in peace lessons

*Poetry Book*, poems, essays and speeches written by the refugees

*Ten Peace Posters; Proverb Cards* (84), from the refugees’ home countries and from many nations around the world; *Ten Role Play Cards*. Nairobi: Regional Office, UNHCR;

*Charts* summarising key points of some of the importance lessons/sessions. The school *poetry and story books, charts, posters, proverb and role play cards* are also for use in the community workshops.

**For the Community Programme**

*Community Workshop Manual (CWM)* guidelines for facilitators on the 10-12 workshop sessions

*Course Booklet* for graduates at the end of the course, with pointers as reminders

[Handouts in brochure not observed in the camps or available during consultation]

*Effective Peacemaking. A Booklet for Facilitators* - authored by refugee François R.

Handbook, tips. INEE

*Youth Manual*. Handbook for youth workshop facilitators. INEE

**C. Training materials**

*Teacher Training Manual*

*Teachers’ Resource Notes*

*Facilitator Training Manual*

*Facilitators’ Resource Notes*

**D. Miscellaneous**


UNHCR PEP (2001 and 2002) Two videos on PEP. Nairobi: Regional Office, UNHCR
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1 UNHCR *Peace Education Programme Brochure* 2001 Vers. 1, p.3

2 The 2001 total Dadaab-Kakuma camp population of 216,000 minus 35,000 children under school age = 181,000. PEP has reached approximately 55,000 of the 181,000.

3 The Windle Charitable Trust must be the exception, since their English classes have a major component targeting women in terms of skill acquisition and advancement in general. SGBV action targets coping
strategies rather than root causes and may certainly have been justified in doing so at the onset of the rape crisis.

iv An example of the effectiveness of setting targets is the target in the current evaluation to reach a minimum of 40 per cent women respondents, since women represent 45 per cent of the total two-camp population. Surveys frequently fail to incorporate the voices of women sufficiently. In the current survey 41 per cent was achieved through setting firm and explicit goals and holding all evaluation team members to them. It can be done.

v The first indication of social change was the apparent delayed age of marriage for girls.

vi Community Self-Management Committees of refugees set up through LWF in Kakuma Camp.

vii 27-31 and 35-57 per cent refers to the

viii Obuya ibid., p.4

ix SITREP (Aug 2001) Kakuma, UNHCR

x Due to the mixed nationalities in the camps and the lack of Somali or Sudanese curriculum or textbooks in the home countries in the early 1990s, the Kenya curriculum and examinations are offered in the camps.