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I. Background

The University for Peace (UPEACE) is a United Nations affiliated University established in December 1980 as a Treaty Organization by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 35/55 of 5 December 1980.

UPEACE received from the UN General Assembly the mandate “to provide humanity with an international institution of higher education for peace with the aim of promoting among all human beings the spirit of understanding, tolerance and peaceful coexistence, to stimulate cooperation among peoples and to help lessen obstacles and threats to world peace and progress, in keeping with the noble aspirations proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations”.

Headquartered in Costa Rica, UPEACE currently offers ten MA Programmes in fields related to peace and conflict studies. In previous years, it has graduated more than 100 students every year coming from 40 countries. Today, this figure has increased to more than hundred a year. For example, during the 2009/10 academic year alone, UPEACE has enrolled 196 professionals from 57 countries. Furthermore, since 2008, UPEACE has been actively involved in pedagogical capacity building activities through a model of “Co-teaching” in selected African and Asian academic institutions (universities) under the UPEACE Programme in South Asia, the Middle East and the Horn of Africa (UPSAM). UPEACE had also maximized its impact on the teaching of those participating institutions. Currently, it is developing its distance learning curricula and expanding its activities worldwide.

The UPEACE Africa Programme was launched in 2002 with the central mission to stimulate and strengthen capacities in Africa for teaching, training and research on peace and conflict related issues. At that time, the programme was built on extensive consultations held in ten countries around Africa to define the needs, aspirations and obstacles to developing an Africa Programme for peace education.

Right from the inception of the Programme, research was identified among key areas of focus. The consultation process also reinforced this priority in order to develop a strong basis for peace and conflict studies in Africa. Hence, the Programme initiated its first training on building research capacity in Dakar 2005 and the second in Addis Ababa 2007.

To support research activities of the UPEACE Africa Programme, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) through its Training and Awards Program has given a three year grant in 2007. The grant sponsors a project that aims to strengthen peace research capacity building in Sub-Saharan Africa. In this regard, the project offers awards to African PhD students pursuing their studies at African Universities. The Award is of two types. The first, Doctoral Research Awards supports students finalizing their PhD dissertations. The other one, PhD Fellowships offers full study grant to conduct a doctoral level study in the area of Peace and Conflict. So far, two rounds of award competitions have been organized. As a result, 22 Doctoral Research Awardees and 4 PhD Fellows have been granted.

Under the same project, IDRC also sponsors the publication of the Africa Peace and Conflict Journal (APCJ), a peer-reviewed journal published by the UPEACE Africa Programme. Parallel to this project, the UPEACE Africa Programme runs a Peace Researchers Training Programme. The major objective of the project is to build capacities of researchers from Eastern Africa both
in and outside of the academic. 15 researchers have been participating in this programme, which is also supported by IDRC through its Peace, Conflict and Development Program (PCD).

Participants of both programmes, first batch of the PhD Fellows and Doctoral Research Awardees and the Peace Researchers took part in three trainings workshops that have been organized so far viz. March 2008, December 2008 and March 2009. After going through the trainings, 8 peace researchers, 2 doctoral research awardees and 2 PhD fellows have submitted their papers for publication in the third edition of APCJ. The remaining participants are expected to submit their publishable works in December 2009.

Pursuant to the accomplishment of the programme’s previous activities, IDRC agreed to continue its support for another batch of doctoral and PhD fellow trainees (until 2011). Therefore, this workshop will be the first of a series of three workshops, whereby all PhD fellows and Doctoral research awardees selected in the second round are required to undertake as part of the endeavor to strengthen their research skills and preparation for writing an article for the APCJ. The group will participate in the next Peace Research Training Workshops that will be convened in 2010 and 2011.

Workshop’s Objectives

The main objectives of the workshop included:

- Providing participants with general methodological applications and Peace-Research skills;
- Exposing issues related to contemporary Peace and Conflict research;
- Creating a platform to share and exchange new research agendas and knowledge between participants.

Focuses of the Workshop

The Peace Research Capacity Building Workshop aimed at covering the following key topics:

- The theoretical foundations of Social Science Research, and its fit to Peace and Conflict studies;
- Synapses (background) on Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed Research methods;
- Emerging thinking on Peace Research;
- Challenges and opportunities of Peace and Conflict Research Methodology;
- Ethical and Moral Considerations in Peace Research;
- Developing Research Skills and Conceptual Capacity for Peace and Conflict Studies (processes of developing researchable proposal, collecting the data, interpretation/analysis, and sharing findings).

Expected Outcomes

After the Workshop, participants were expected to:

- Increase their understanding of different methodological applications and Peace Research skills;
- Learn issues related to contemporary peace and conflict research;
- Share their research agendas and reflect on others.
II. Opening Ceremony

The opening ceremony was composed of welcoming remarks by Dr. Jean-Bosco Butera, Director of UPEACE–Africa Programme, and opening remarks by Ms. Njeri Karuru, Senior Programme Specialist of the International Development Research Center (IDRC), and Ms. Rita Bowry, Senior Program Specialist of IDRC—Training and Awards Program.

Dr. Jean-Bosco Butera began his welcoming remarks by forwarding warm greetings to all participants and welcoming them to Addis Ababa. Dr. Butera added, on behalf of UPEACE Africa Programme, that it was a pleasure to host such a workshop on Building Capacity for Peace Research.

He also extended his gratitude for the IDRC for supporting this endeavor to develop peace research in Africa through the partnership with UPEACE. The Director introduced Ms Njeri Karuru, Senior Program Specialist on the Peace, Conflict and Development Program (PCD) from Nairobi and Ms. Rita Bowry, Senior Program Specialist, Center for Training and Awards Program (CTAP) from Ottawa. Dr. Butera then thanked them for their commitment and continuous effort to taking part in the trainings, getting to know the participants, the trainers and the methodology, in addition to sharing their experience and lessons. He also appreciated their collaboration which is participatory rather than supervisory.

Dr. Butera further thanked the workshop facilitators, Prof. Susan Van Zyl (University of Witwatersrand) and Prof. Owen Sichone (University of Pretoria), who have accepted to take some time from their busy calendar. He mentioned that their first time participation as facilitators shows how the network is expanding.

The Director then extended a warm welcome to the new group of 13 Doctoral research awardees and 2 PhD fellows. He further pointed out that there are currently a total of 37 researchers (11 peace researchers, 22 doctoral research awardees and 4 PhD fellows) across the continent sponsored through the UPEACE-IDRC partnership.

Dr. Butera continued his remarks by stating that the principal mission of the program is to stimulate and strengthen capacity for peace and conflict studies in Africa through teaching, training and research on the continent. Finally, he thanked his colleagues at UPEACE who, under the leadership of Dr Elias Cheboud, had been working tirelessly for eight months to make this workshop a reality. He concluded his speech by requesting participants to forward any difficulties they encounter and wishing all participants to have a very fruitful workshop and a pleasant stay in Ethiopia.

Following the Director, Ms. Njeri Karuru made remarks; she stated that PCD has been giving support for training researchers working in the fields of peace and conflict in Africa. Ms. Karuru added that PCD has also collaborated with the CTAP to support the program by giving PhD Fellowships and Awards, which has facilitated for holding joint training sessions for awarded researchers. She then mentioned that the PCD has actively been working in four thematic areas namely democratic governance processes, political economy and conflict, security and insecurity, as well as in areas of trauma, justice and violence.

Ms. Karuru moreover stated that the support rendered by PCD to give trainings in peace and conflict research has also been directed to incorporate researchers from other disciplines by recognizing that the field is interdisciplinary so that they could be introduced to peace and conflict theories in order to enrich and broaden their research perspectives. On a final note, she
expressed her hopes that the researchers going through the programme would form a network that can contribute to the field of peace and conflict from an African perspective.

The next speaker, Ms. Rita Bowry began her speech by providing an overall explanation on the activities supported by IDRC, which include financing applied researches conducted by researchers in developing countries, providing expert advice to the researchers and building local capacity to undertake research and make policy decisions. Ms. Bowry further noted that the programme areas focus on environment and natural resource management, information communication technologies for development, innovation and policy, as well as on science, social and economic policy.

She also explained that IDRC used to support hundreds of international students in the 60s and 80s to study for Master's and PhD Degrees in Canada, USA and Europe. From 1990s, however, the programme has shifted to supporting mostly doctoral level students pursuing their studies in their regions.

Ms. Bowry added that although IDRC launched the UPEACE-IDRC programme in late 2007 by merely focusing on Sub-Saharan Africa, there is a plan to extend it to Latin America and Asia. According to Ms. Bowry, the current programme has already committed to support 168 doctoral researchers, 8 PhD Fellowships and 8 Masters Degrees up to 2010.

In her conclusion, she appreciated the excellent achievements of UPEACE Africa Programme in handling the UPEACE-IDRC Project under Dr Butera’s and Dr Elias Cheboud’s leadership, as a result of which IDRC has committed to the support of 26 PhD students in peace and conflict studies.

III. Introduction of the Workshop

Dr. Elias Cheboud, Research Coordinator of UPEACE Africa Programme, began his speech by welcoming participants to the workshop. Dr. Cheboud stated that UPEACE currently offers ten MA Programmes in fields related to peace and conflict studies. The university has also graduated more than 100 students every year and the number is increasing. He added that in the current (2009/10) academic year 196 professionals from 57 countries have been enrolled. Moreover, UPEACE, under the UPSAM programme, has, since 2008, been actively involved in pedagogical capacity building activities in selected African and Asian academic universities through a model of “Co-teaching” with encouraging results. The Research Coordinator also stated that UPEACE is currently developing its distance learning tools and expanding its activities worldwide.

Dr. Cheboud then explained that the UPEACE Africa Programme was established in 2002 on extensive consultations with 10 African countries so as to define the needs, aspirations and the obstacles to develop an African program for peace education. Pursuant to the consultation process, building research capacity was considered as one of the key areas of the Programme activity, whereby consecutive trainings were initiated and held in Dakar in 2005 and in Addis Ababa in 2007. Consequently, the Programme received a three year grant from the Peace, Conflict and Development Program (PCD) of the IDRC in 2007, where 15 peace researchers from East Africa were selected to pursue training programs composed of three peace research workshops and the publication of a paper (an article would be better) in the Africa Peace and Conflict Journal.
In addition, he mentioned that the IDRC-CTAP gave a grant to UPEACE to support the doctoral research of PhD candidates registered with universities in Sub-Saharan Africa. Accordingly, consecutive training workshops were organized and took place in March 2008, December 2008 and March 2009. He further gave a detailed overview of the outcomes of the trainings whereby 8 peace researchers, 2 doctoral researchers and 2 PhD fellows have submitted their research works for publication in the third edition of African Peace and Conflict Journal.

Dr. Cheboud went on to state that the IDRC has continued its support for another batch (until 2011) of doctoral research awardees and PhD fellows where this particular workshop was the first one of a series of three training workshops. He noted that the next two workshops are to take place in 2010 and 2011. He took this opportunity to re-congratulate all participating awardees on their success so far.

He then gave a detailed account of the application and screening process. A total of 92 applications were received from 16 countries out of which 2 PhD Fellows and 13 Doctoral researchers were selected, after vast scholarly debates, assessments, and serious academic evaluations. He also provided a summary of the country of origins of the awardees which includes five Ugandans, three Nigerians, three Kenyans, two Zimbabweans, one Rwandan, and one Ethiopian.

Dr. Cheboud wrapped up his speech by outlining the objectives of the training workshop, the key topics to be covered, and the lessons to be learnt from the training workshop as indicated in the background part of this report.

Dr. Cheboud’s introduction was followed by self-introduction of participants. Twenty-three participants from different African countries as well as from Canada took part in the workshop. They included lecturers from various universities, and representatives of IDRC and the UPEACE Africa Programme. After which, a group photo was taken (See picture on cover page).

IV. Methodology

The Training Workshop was facilitated by Professor Susan van Zyl and Professor Owen Sichone, and was composed of presentations and discussions, group works and an excursion. Most importantly, participants were encouraged to share their experiences and take advantage of a wide range of experiences to enrich their knowledge and learning on peace research especially in the African context. To enhance structured interaction, participation and exchange of experience, daily sessions were introduced and closed up with reflections from participants.

The activities of the workshop were evaluated by Professor Ayele Meshesha, Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology at the Addis Ababa University. The evaluation methodology included the completion of a Participant Pre-test Form (which was distributed to all participants before the beginning of the workshop), observations, and the filling of an Evaluation Form to Assess Instructors and a Workshop Assessment Form (at the end of the course).

Mr. Selahaddin Nur-Hussein (Research Assistant at UPEACE—Africa Programme) was the rapporteur of the workshop. He was assisted in this task by Ms. Edda Zekarias, Intern at UPEACE—Africa Programme.
V. Summary of Sessions

Day One: Monday 26\textsuperscript{th} October, 2009

Plenary 1 (Morning): Research Proposal Presentations by Doctoral Researchers

This section presents a summary of each research paper presented by the participants. Presenters were provided with extensive feedback and comments by facilitators, and other participants with the intention of enhancing their respective research works and paper writing process.

Presenter: Mr. Ayo Whetho, School of Politics University of KwaZulu-Natal Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.

Mr. Ayo Whetho began his presentation by stating his research problem. He explained that Multinational Corporations (MNCs) have become powerful economic actors in the developing nations. Particularly, since the end of the Cold War, MNCs have expanded their spheres of influence in these states, including conflict-prone countries. A number of MNCs operate in zones of conflict to access natural resources, strategic assets and larger markets for the purpose of maximising their commercial interest. The presenter argued that MNCs have ambivalent roles to play in zones of conflict i.e. the roles of MNCs in initiating/sustaining conflict vis-à-vis corporate peace building initiatives. Hence, this research, on the nexus between MNCs and the conflict in the DRC, is located in the context of this emergent and empirical tradition.

The research rationale is to break new grounds in conflict analysis by examining the motivations and roles of profit-seeking non-state actors in zones of conflict, as there has been no systematic analysis of the role of the private sector or multinationals in the DRC conflict and peace process. In so doing, he claimed, the study can make a significant scholarly contribution to the literature on the political economy of war.

The main research question is: what context-specific (local, national and international) factors undergird the strategic behaviour(s) of MNCs in conflict zones?

Specific research questions are:

- What are the specific causalities, motivations and roles of MNCs in the DRC’s conflict and conflict transformation process?
- To what extent has corporate behaviour sustained the conflict or facilitated peacebuilding in the DRC?
- What conclusions do MNCs’ roles in the DRC’s conflict engender regarding the promise and perils of corporate peacebuilding?

In his research methodology and design, Mr. Whetho discussed that the research intends to employ historical and analytical methodological approaches. He further stated that the research shall use qualitative research method, and also aims to assess both primary (interviews and questionnaires) and secondary data sources (books, journal articles, government legislations, company reports, etc). The presenter finally noted that the data analysis will be based on content analysis mode.
Proposal: “The Impact of EAC and COMESA Regional Integration Arrangements on Uganda’s Economic Growth”
Presenter: Ms. Daisy Owomugasho, Makerere University

In her research background, Ms. Daisy Owomugasho explained that trade, particularly export growth, is critical for economic growth and poverty reduction in Africa. To this, RIAs have roles to play especially in accelerating export growth, diversification and rate of economic growth. She added, although RIAs may be panacea for conflict resolution, they can also cause conflict.

Focusing on her case in Uganda, she stated Uganda is a member of COMESA and EAC, which have promotion of peace, security and stability as objectives. However, no study has been done so far to establish link the RIAs in question with economic growth and peace in Uganda. As an example, the presenter mentioned that in 2000, half of COMESA states were embroiled in wars internally, and with either their immediate neighbors or states far beyond their boarders. The research attempts to see to what extent the COMESA countries can forge peace through regional integration. Additionally, it tries to explore how doubling trade between two countries lowers the risk of conflict by about 17%.

According to Ms. Owomugasho’s research problem statement, the study investigates the impact of EAC and COMESA on Uganda’s economic growth. In so doing, the research can provide an explanation of why growth may or may not be achieved through trade creation or trade diversion, export diversification, reduction in vulnerability and peace.

The main objective of the research is to examine the impact of the EAC and COMESA on Uganda’s economic growth, through export performance and diversification into non traditional exports, reduction in vulnerability and achieving peace and security.

Specific objectives include:

- Examining the impact of EAC and COMESA on Uganda’s economic growth;
- Determining whether the EAC and COMESA have been either trade creating or trade diverting;
- Assessing the extent to which the two RIAs facilitate export diversification for non traditional exports;
- Assessing the extent to which non traditional exports to the two RIAs have reduced Uganda’s vulnerability to trade shocks;
- Assessing the extent to which increased trade between Uganda and EAC and COMESA has reduced conflict and therefore promoted peaceful growth

In order to understand the nature and scope of the problem, the research shall employ non experimental and quantitative methodological approaches by using secondary data both in series and levels, apart from qualitative data. In addition, the study intends to utilize various adaptations of the Log linear gravity model so as to address each of the research objectives.

Presenter: Mr. Shimelis Tsegaye Tesemma, University of South Africa

Mr. Shimelis Tsegaye began his presentation by describing the background of his study. According to his report, it is estimated that 10% of all children worldwide are disabled. For
example, in Africa, 35% of children between 2-9 year-olds in Djibouti, 31% in Central African Republic and 23% in Sierra Leone lived with at least one reported disability amid 1999 and 2006. Despite their large number, fewer than 10% of disabled children in Africa receive education.

According to the presentation, reasons for the staggering level of exclusion are the total absence or limitations of laws and policies in addition to the lack of clear strategies for the delivery of these services. Furthermore, research reports on the laws and policies have limited practical pay-off, in that they “seem to be written in the form of manifestos—heavy on the polemic, strident warnings of impending crisis, and urgent pleas for immediate collective action. In some cases, the propaganda value seems to outweigh the attention given to conventional standards of evidence and argument”.

It is not possible to “borrow” Eurocentric legislative, policy and pedagogic models of the education of disabled children from the West because borrowing requires looking for “approaches which involve neither the embrace of an artificial and sterile universalism nor the acceptance of an ultimately self-defeating cultural relativism”. In addition, it was explained that such attempts may lack cultural appropriateness; hence may prove “worse than the illness” because of the highly local and culturally-infused flavour of disability. Mr. Tsegaye also argued that imported models may also be short-lived as transplants from other cultures and societies; even though they are cemented with money, they may not last beyond the last cheque or the departure of the last volunteer. Yet, even laws and policies of the so-called “advanced countries” are not completed and inclusive in the strictest sense. Actually, all countries are developing countries when it comes to disability rights.

In addition, the presenter mentioned the drawbacks existing in laws and policies by stating that they are often driven by the rights and equality rhetoric, giving little appreciation to classroom realities, school dynamics and teachers’ competence. In most cases, educational policy makers emphasise the principles of equity in responding to political demands, succumb to the habit of analysing school issues in sociological and economic terms. Moreover, laws and policies may sometimes be more concerned about political correctness than practical pedagogic soundness.

In line with this, the presenter continued to outline the study's three main objectives as follows:

- To examine the existing laws and policies and their implications to the schooling of children with disabilities in Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone and South Africa;
- To draw from the laws, policies, and strategies of other ‘progressive’ countries, as well as from the existing human rights and education literature on the schooling of disabled children towards developing an appropriate legislative, policy and pedagogic strategy for the schooling of disabled children in Africa;
- To proffer usable packages so as to complement the efforts in the re-integration of child soldiers living with war-related disabilities that are being demobilised in large numbers across the continent.

The research questions which the study will attempt to answer include the following:

- What are the requirements and principles enshrined in the existing international and regional instruments in relation to the rights of education of children with disabilities?
• What is the current level of global knowledge and practice on the effective schooling of disabled children including former child soldiers living with war-related disability as reflected in recent educational, psychological and disability literature?

• What is the status of Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone and South Africa in terms of ratifying international and regional instruments related to the educational rights of children with disabilities and to what extent are these instruments incorporated into the national laws and policies of these countries?

His subsidiary questions are as follows:

• To what extent are policy makers, executives, provincial and school level implementers of these laws and policies knowledgeable on the rights, responsibilities and obligations attached to human rights instruments, laws and policies related to the schooling of disabled children?

• To what extent are these selected countries implementing the strategies they put in place including through the formulation of sectoral plans, the choice of the appropriate schooling approach/model, curriculum development and funding made available for the schooling of disabled children and teacher training?

• What is the practice in the use of educational services in the proper reintegration of former child soldiers living with war-related disabilities in the conflict-affected study countries?

• What lessons can we draw from the laws, policies, and strategies of these countries as well as from the existing human rights and education literature on the schooling of disabled children towards developing an appropriate legislative and policy strategy for the schooling of disabled children in Africa?

Concerning the research methods, Mr. Tsegaye stated his study will employ both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The qualitative research design is the conceptual-descriptive design, which involves the collection of empirical data on each country, its laws, policies, teacher training curricula, school bylaws, and the description of the data vis-à-vis currently acceptable pedagogic and human rights thinking and practice. The main data collection instruments for the qualitative design will be document reviews, in-depth interviews and observations (school visits). Similarly, the quantitative design will be survey of a limited scope by employing questionnaires to collect primary data on the level of awareness of policy makers and implementers on the existing International and Regional Human Rights Instruments, as well as on the laws and policies in their respective countries, including available limitations and major challenges in implementation of the laws and policies.

Explaining the data analysis methods, Mr. Tsegaye remarked that the provisions in the laws and policies and in the teacher training curricula will be systematically categorised based on the four ‘A’s scheme borrowed, with modifications, from the General Comment No. 13 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). According to this framework, education must exhibit the features of availability, accessibility, acceptability and adaptability. Additionally, the collected quantitative data will be analysed using SPSS. He finally concluded that the whole exercise will be structured to develop a strategy for informing legislative and policy formulation in the selected countries and improving the implementation of International and Regional Human Rights Instruments related to the schooling of disabled children in Africa.
Proposal: “Effective Reintegration of Female Ex-Combatants: Rwanda as Case Study”

Presenter: Mrs. Rosemarie Aurore Umurerwa, School of Politics University of KwaZulu-Natal Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

As part of the statement of problem for her research, Mrs. Rosemaire Aurore Umurewa explained that the post-conflict situation is problematic for ex-combatants as governments at all levels look to connect productive resources for the reconstruction of their communities. Typically, she said, such reconstruction involves a range of crucial but competing areas and issues viz. the restoration of social services; the development of human capacity; the recovery or improvement of devastated infrastructure; and the resurrection of economic activities and productivity. Mrs. Umurewa further noted that the UN Security Council recognizes that achieving gender justice is as a central necessity to social transformation as any other form of reparation after war according to Resolution 1325 of October 2000 on Women, Peace and Security. The Resolution draws from a growing body of feminist scholarship and proposes that once demilitarization starts after violent conflict ends, understanding the effects and implications of gender dynamics becomes essential to successful peace building.

According to her presentation, the objective condition of women is that they constitute a highly vulnerable class of citizens. Usually, this translates into poor access of economic opportunities and social welfare facilities such as education and healthcare. Not surprisingly, women are often among the least educated and poorest persons in their communities. This also relates to female ex-combatants.

For the presenter, dealing with women ex-combatants is a crucial challenge that needs an effective solution in the process of post-conflict reconstruction, peace building, and general development of the country for a sustainable peace. The study, hence, seeks to assess the reintegration process by taking Rwandan women ex-combatants as a case of study. In so doing, issues to assess how well they are re-adjusting and re-integrating into the mainstream of the Rwandan society will be raised by putting the social, economic experiences and perceptions of female ex-combatants into context.

In connection with the research rationale, Mrs. Umurerwa argued that the perception that the society and the former female combatants have with each other is crucial to the effectiveness of any reintegration process. The work undertaken by female combatants and their contributions are frequently overlooked after the end of conflicts. She further noted that Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) processes seem to mean that for the sake of peace or the end of conflict, women and girls are reintegrated into societies that are unlikely to treat them as equals. DDR programs can be good entry points if they are designed as a part of the National Poverty Reduction Program (PRP). Finally, the researcher indicated that some studies have been conducted to assess the impact of the program of demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants. However, such studies lack the investigation of issues specifically to female ex-combatants, within the broader framework of DDRP and the National gender policy, which has left many questions unanswered. Hence, the research seeks to fill this gap.

Accordingly, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- Are female ex-combatants properly trained in new skills suitable for employment in a civilian environment before and after demobilization?
What is the role of female ex-combatants in both the design and implementation of RDRP?

How accessible and appropriate are RDRP benefits to female ex-combatants?

How are the Rwandan female ex-combatants faring after demobilization in comparison with male ex-combatants and the average Rwandan woman?

How are ex-combatants’ newly acquired role in the military impacting on the traditional gender relations in society?

To what extent are female ex-combatant reintegration efforts (after demobilization) affected by their military experiences and trainings?

What are the existing intra-household dynamics within families of female ex-combatants? And how do they affect demobilization and reintegration?

Regarding the sources of data, the research shall rely on primary and secondary data (books, internet, journals, and government’s reports). The major techniques of primary data collection will be interviews and close-ended questionnaire. Focus group discussions will be used to generate and complete the quantitative data. Following the fieldwork, the researcher will collect and analyze the collected data within the frame of stipulated objective in focus. The data will be carefully read, analyzed, related to the questions asked, and transposed into a computer after editing. The researcher will then arrange the data in relation to the objectives of the study. A statistician will also be hired to perform computer based analysis and statistical calculations by using the SPSS software.

Proposal: “Integration of Indigenous Social Healing Approaches into the Western Models of Psychosocial Healing for the Southern Sudan Victims of Armed Conflict”
Presenter: Mr. Alex Kamwaria, Kenyatta University

In his research problem statement, Mr. Alex Kamwaria explained that trauma healing among the Southern Sudan victims of war has been largely addressed through PTSD discourse, which raises concerns out of which the following are the major ones.

- It is problematic to talk of war experiences as post (past), since the experiences may be perceived as vicissitudes of normal life;
- The ways in which people embody, give meaning and manage their afflictions is largely contingent upon their social, cultural and religious contexts;
- All trauma therapies are effective to patients when embedded within their socio-cultural specificities;
- Talk therapy is in total contrast to the African culture which perceives “talking” about past traumatic events as a conduit for intervention by the malevolent spirits.

The general objective of the research is to identify indigenous social healing approaches which should be integrated into the Western psychosocial models of healing for the Southern Sudan victims of civil war.

The specific objectives also include the following:

- Analyzing traumatic experiences that the Southern Sudan victims of civil war have undergone;
- Finding out the notions of health and illness in the cultural context of the Southern Sudan society;
- Showing the extent as to which indigenous social healing rituals can be revitalized and integrated into;
• Applying Western psychosocial models in order to provide effective in healing of the victims;
• Developing a blue-print emic model for trauma healing for use by stake-holders and policy-makers working on the plight of victims of armed conflicts in Africa.

Explaining his research rationale, the presenter stated that the application of Western models of trauma healing has largely been brought to question across the African societies. Trauma healing, in the African context, is holistic. Thus, Western discourses of trauma healing such as PTSD cannot continue to be blindly imposed on traumatized and afflicted populations in Africa. This is because the way in which people embody, give meanings and manage their afflictions, is essentially shaped by their specific social, cultural and religious contexts. Mr. Kamwaria further explained that while Western biomedical models may have some roles to play in the African context, they should, however, be complemented with ethno-medicines and therapies. This is due to the fact that African healing rituals are therapeutic in mediating and enhancing emotional and spiritual catharsis.

Describing the significance of emics and etics in trauma healing, he stated that emic perspectives underline that healing approaches are effective if and only if the natives in a given culture are the sole judges to its usefulness; in this case focus is on intrinsic cultural distinctions. Whilst in relation to etic perspectives, he remarked that they rely on the universal concepts and categories that have meaning to scientific enquirers; hence focus is on extrinsic concepts and categories.

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

• What kind of traumatic war experiences have the victims of civil war gone through?
• What do the concepts of health, trauma, and illness entail in the context of the southern Sudan society?
• To what extent are the indigenous healing rituals able to enhance social, emotional and spiritual catharsis among the victims of war?
• How can indigenous social healing approaches be integrated into the Western models of psychosocial healing?

In his research design, Mr. Kamwaria explained that the research intends to use explorative design, which is concerned with the formulation of research questions and objectives, literature reviews, and forwards suggestion for appropriate model for social healing in the African context. Descriptive design will also be used for data analysis and presentation. In the same vein, survey design shall be used in formulation of research instruments and identification of samples for interviews.

The data collection methods include interviews, which shall be conducted in the vernacular of respondents, semi-structured and structured interviews with victims, victims’ relatives, perpetrators, leaders, policy makers in Ministries of Justice, members of civil society, religious, and experts on peace-building. Using FGD, the study intends to obtain new data and test it in a group setting data already obtained through individual interviews. In addition, child mapping will be used to map out elements of trauma or illness through play activities, re-enactment, singing, story-telling and drawing. Further literature such as local diaries, periodicals, bulletins and official reports shall also be consulted. In addition, photographs and video clips will be used to supplement the collected oral data.
Proposal: “Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Security Sector Reform in West Africa: the Liberian Experience”
Presenter: Mr. Chris, M.A. Kwaja, Dep’t of Political Science, University Of Jos, Nigeria

According to Mr. Chris M.A. Kwaja, the research dwells, by and large, on the Liberian conflict that took place between 1989 and 2003. Mr. Kwaja noted that after years of violent intra-state conflict, Liberia, which emerged from a major humanitarian disaster and complex emergency, embarked upon the task of post-conflict peacebuilding, following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in August, 2003. Explaining the legacy of the violent conflict, he stated that the conflict affected all aspects of life in Liberia, to the extent that the state became a major threat to the security of the people. This was also evident in the factionalisation of the security sector, the splintering, factionalisation and emergence of rebel groups, as well as the weakening of internal security, destruction of the judicial system, the polarisation of economic and social relations in addition to cohesion, social decay and political instability. The presenter further noted that because of the high intensity of conflict in Liberia and the neighbouring Sierra Leone, the West African sub-region was emerging as a new threat and strategic danger to international peace, security and stability.

On this basis, the study’s main objectives are:

- To examine the nature of the security sector in pre-conflict Liberia;
- To examine the extent to which the conflict affected the security sector in Liberia;
- To examine the post-conflict peacebuilding programme in Liberia;
- To examine the nature of the security sector in post-conflict Liberia;
- To examine the impact of the post-conflict peacebuilding process on the security sector;
- To identify and analyse the challenges to the post-conflict peacebuilding process and security sector reform;
- To identify lessons from the Liberian experience with post-conflict peacebuilding and security sector reform for other countries.

In addition to the objectives, the research questions are as follows:

- What was the nature of the security sector in pre-conflict Liberia?
- To what extent did the conflict in Liberia affect the security sector?
- How is the post-conflict peacebuilding process affecting the security sector in Liberia?
- What is the nature of the security sector reform in post-conflict Liberia?
- What is the impact of the post-conflict peacebuilding process on the security sector in Liberia?
- What are the challenges to post-conflict peacebuilding and security sector reform in Liberia?
- What lessons exist from the Liberian experience for other countries?

Regarding research methodologies, the research employs various data collection methods to generate data from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data shall be generated by applying survey methods such as Focus Group Discussions and interviews. The secondary data shall be generated through the analysis of existing literature related to the issue under investigation.

Presenter: Mr. Jephias Mapuva, University of the Western Cape, School of Government

The statement of the problem for this topic states that the political and economic melt-down in Zimbabwe over the last decade has opened up space for civil society to become more assertive and occupy the vacuum created by the breakdown of governance in general, and local governance in particular. Subsequently, civil society are called upon to act as a buffer between the state and citizens, apart from their role of 'strengthening the rule of law', 'monitoring human rights', 'educating citizens about rights and responsibilities', 'building a culture of civic engagement', 'enhancing state responsiveness to societal interests and needs, and building a constituency for economic as well as political reforms.

Basically, the rationale of the research is to determine the extent and impact of involvement of selected civil society groups, such as Zim Rights, WOZA, CHRA, and NCA, have with regards to exploring formal and informal participatory spaces to enhance and promote citizen participation in governance processes in Zimbabwe from 1987 up to 2010. The period was chosen due to the political and economic melt-down in Zimbabwe over the last decade.

The study will attempt to answer as to what extent have the selected civil society organisations exploited formal and informal participatory spaces to enhance citizen participation, particularly from 1997-2010.

Mr. Jephias Mapuva intends to use a case study method as research design so as to gain an in depth understanding of the issues being investigated. The main focus will be on multiple cases. For instance four case studies will be used as microcosm of civil society in Zimbabwe.

The research shall employ methodological triangulation approach, which is concerned with the use of different research methods on the same investigation for purposes of cross-validation. By so doing, the study will ensure maximum attainment of validity and reliability of results. On top of this, the major tools and methods of data collection will be in-depth interviews, open and closed ended questionnaires, and documentary analysis.

Mr. Mapuva also intends to utilize purposive and simple random sampling procedures to identify intentional participants and participants from members of the public respectively. According to the presenter, the research shall, in its conclusion part, suggest the following points: civil society has potential to influence citizen participation through advocacy and outreach programmes, and a strong civil society can enhance the creation of participatory spaces for citizens and the building of a healthy democracy.

Proposal: “Small Arms and Human Security among the Pastoral Communities in the IGAD Region: the Case of the Turkana.”

Presenter: Mr. Kizito Sabala, Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies, University of Nairobi

In his statement of the problem, Mr. Kizito Sabala argued that limited or total lack of effective government administrations in ASAL (Arid and Semi-Arid Lands) areas of the IGAD region is a major problem confronting human security of pastoral communities since pre-independence days. Despite this, the pastoral communities were initially, at least, able to cope with the situation through migration and split of livestock. This was possible because of their low population size, less occurrence of drought until after many years, the availability of vast grazing
land. However, due to increased population, frequent droughts and acquisition of land by governments, the portion of available grazing land has been greatly reduced. Consequently, the pastoral groups are unable to cope with the situation by migrating and splitting of livestock, as they used to do. Hence, they are compelled to compete over limited water and pasture resources with neighbouring communities. In so doing, they provoke conflicts with their neighbours. As a result, acquisition of small arms to facilitate raids and protect themselves and their livestock against other armed communities has become inevitable, despite interventions by the communities, CBOs, INGOs, governments, and regional organizations. Accordingly, the research attempts to examine the nexus between small arms and human security among the pastoral groups in the IGAD region. The rationale of the research is basically aimed to exploring the link between small arms and human security, for there seems to be no link between the existing regulatory framework and demand dimension.

The study will attempt to answer to the overarching question as to what extent do small arms affect human security among the pastoral communities.

The research will apply various data collection methods in order to generate data from both primary and secondary sources. The data analysis will be more of qualitative and some quantitative.

Presenter: Mr. Sadiki Maeresera, School of Politics, University of KwaZulu-Natal Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.

Stating the problem for his research, Mr. Sadiki Maeresera argued that the 20th century was basically dominated by military interventions by states in conflicts occurring in other countries. Examples of these are the 1990s multilateral level military interventions mandated by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) in Bosnia, East Timor, Haiti, Iraq, Lebanon, Sierra Leone, Somalia etc; at regional level NATO’s 1999 “Operation Allied Force” to prevent Serbian atrocities in Kosovo could be cited; and at sub-regional level ECOMOG intervention in Liberia and Sierra Leone could be mentioned in addition to SADC member states’ intervention in Lesotho and the DRC in various times.

According to his presentation, there are scholarly and academic debates on intervention by the armed forces of some countries in the domestic affairs of their neighbors. Accordingly, questions were raised on the 1998 SADC allied decision to intervene militarily in the DRC conflict in terms of legal and moral correctness under international law. To this, there was scholarly disagreement on the motives behind the AZN allies’ decision in 1998 to intervene militarily in the DRC. For the purpose of the study, it is, hence, important to ask the following questions:

- How then can we understand the rationale or motive behind that intervention?
- Was it driven by the personal quests by the leaders of Angola, Zimbabwe and Namibia to secure their share of the vast mineral wealth of the DRC?
- Or was it merely a case of governments pursuing their varied national interests?

By posing these questions, the research seeks to ascertain the central motives of the AZN states with a view to determining the principal factors that formed the decision to intervene in the DRC between 1998 and 2002.
Explaining his research rationale, Mr. Maeresera argued that there has not been any scholarly and systematic objectivity in regard to the linkage between intervention and interests of the intervening states, aside from the absence of in-depth research and analysis as to what motivated the allies to intervene in the conflict. He went on explaining the rationale for his research, noting that systematic and logical demonstration that the varying interests of the intervening countries can be achieved through a collective military intervention strategy in an effort to add impetus to the existing body of literature on military interventions. In addition, his research rationale mentions that meaningful scholarly contribution to the foreign policy decision-making literature by demonstrating why and how different strategic concerns resulted in a single intervention strategy.

The research aims to give answers to the question “What were the interests of the respective governments that intervened in the DRC?” In addition the following subsidiary research questions are also aimed to be answered by the outcomes of the research. These include:

- How were these interests the prime motivating factor that informed these governments' decisions for military intervention?
- Were these varying interests retained or they shifted with circumstances during the course of the military intervention?
- How did the varying interests of the allies translate and develop into common interests during the military intervention?
- What are the policy suggestions for future military interventions in African conflicts particularly at SADC sub regional level?

The research shall employ historical and qualitative methodological approaches. In line with this, data will be generated from primary and secondary sources, whilst data shall be collected through questionnaires and unstructured interview methods. Its data analysis is on the basis of content analysis.

**Proposal: “Women in the Peacemaking and Peacebuilding Process in Northern Uganda”**
**Presenter: Ms. Sidonia Angom, University Of KwaZulu-Natal**

The problem statement for this research states that most women’s initiatives and strategies have not been acknowledged and their work towards peacemaking and peacebuilding has inadequately been documented. As a matter of fact, women’s role in Northern Uganda’s conflict has not been an exception to this observation. The purpose of this research is, hence, to have a deeper understanding on the peace process by investigating the participation of women, and evaluate their potentials by using the data from a number of case studies from Northern Uganda.

In line with this, the research aims at responding to the following three research questions:

- During the civil war of more than 20 years, various attempts to peacemaking and peacebuilding have been made but with limited success. Is one reason the limited role that women have been allowed to play in the northern Uganda conflict?
- Did women make any distinct contribution to the peacemaking and peacebuilding process? If not why not? If yes, How?
- What important issues did government handle well in the peacemaking process and which ones were left out which could have improved the peacemaking and peacebuilding process in northern Uganda?
In her research methods, Ms. Sidonia Angom discussed that the research intends to use qualitative approach based on a case study design. She further stated that the main data collection methods will be personal interview and focus group discussions. Personal interviews will be conducted with 40 purposively selected respondents, whilst focus group discussions shall be used to cover 60 purposively selected respondents.

The research is expected to be conducted in Northern Uganda: Gulu, Kitgum and Pader districts, for these were the worse hit areas by the conflict. According to Ms. Angom, the research findings will be disseminated to the community leaders, government and non-governmental organizations, the policy makers in Uganda, and the research institutions interested in new insights that contribute to the body of knowledge.

Presenter: Mr. Denis Musinguzi, Uganda Martyrs University

With regard to the background of the research, Mr. Denis Musinguzi argued that the LRA conflict in Northern Uganda is most protracted and devastating conflict in the history of post-independence Uganda. The conflict, which broke out in August 1986, is least understood, misconceived, wrongly portrayed, and ignored. He further noted that the LRA conflict has persisted for so long, raging on for more than two decades, despite the various attempts to its resolution.

The statement of the problem for this research states that the LRA conflict has caused a lot of socio-economic and political destruction to the Ugandan population. Military intervention and other peaceful resolutions have been attempted to resolve the conflict but to no avail, due to which, even in moments of cessation of hostilities especially during peace talks, people still live in a situation of fear, insecurity, and lack of peace. For this reason, people are reluctant to return to their homes from IDPs; whilst others are less willing to forgive and accept back the LRA returnees. Consequently, people still experience the full gravity of the conflict, and are also deeply wounded by its consequences. Hence, there is a need for finding alternative approaches towards resolving this conflict; Lederach’s Integrated Framework for Peacebuilding is adopted in this quest.

The study will attempt to answer to the overarching question as to why the LRA conflict in Northern Uganda has persisted, and which lessons could be drawn from Lederach’s Integrated Framework for Peacebuilding to best inform engagements in conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

Specific research questions are as follows:

- What are the main approaches that have been used so far in the attempt to resolve the LRA conflict in Northern Uganda?
- What factors have contributed to the failure of the peace approaches used so far hence leading to the persistence of the conflict?
- Which lessons can be drawn from Lederach’s Integrated Framework for Peacebuilding in the LRA conflict?
- Which alternative approach can be drawn from the above lessons that would best inform engagements in conflict resolution and peacebuilding in future?
Mr. Musinguzi intends to use cross-sectional, analytical and case study methods as research designs so as to easily tap into people’s perceptions, experiences and contribution toward the resolution of the conflict. The research is largely a qualitative study with minimal use of quantitative methods.

The major data collection methods will be in-depth qualitative interviews with government officials, NGOs’ top leadership, religious and traditional leaders, among others. Face-to-face interviews shall be conducted with academia, research institutions, and the media, as such interviews are informative, enriching, and could enable increased interaction and stimulate richer responses. In addition, questionnaires will be designed for NGO workers and district councilors. Likewise, focus group discussions will be used to cover the community members, while strong documentary review shall be utilized by taking stock of the progress of the conflict and the various conflict resolution approaches that have been attempted.

Regarding data analysis methods, Mr. Musinguzi stated that qualitative data analysis will be an on-going interactive process. Field transcripts, notes and reflections shall be analyzed as they emerge and latter compared. The research shall employ methodological triangulation approach to enhance validity and reliability. Additionally, quantitative data will be organized in tabular/figurative form for further analysis.


Presenter: Mr. Tom Ogwang, PhD Fellow, Makerere University

In his introduction of the study, Mr. Ogwang explained that Northern Uganda has a long and complicated history of war where its root causes are embedded in Uganda’s troubled past. The official starting point, however, is resistance in Northern Uganda to the overthrow of the Government of Tito Okello Lutwa by Museveni’s National Resistance Army in 1986. Since then, the war has undergone several transformations but it has almost exclusively been confined to the Acholi and Lango sub-regions i.e. Gulu, Kitgum, Pader, Lira, and Apac districts respectively. Mr. Ogwang also noted that the total number of IDPs in northern Uganda stood at 921,000 (UNHCR 2008) from 1.8 million, three years ago. As of 30 September 2008, there were approximately 562,000 IDPs remaining in camps across Northern Uganda, primarily in the Acholi sub-region, and a further 359,000 displaced persons living in transit sites.

Talking about the concept of State Security, the presenter opined that the classical understanding of security, often referred to as “national security,” meant different uses of military force to defend the integrity of the state, generally in a strategically oriented, rational-choice analysis perspective. State security, therefore, has been seen to be threatened by any change aimed at undermining its monopoly of violence, whether through external violence or internal rebellion. He further argued that security in International Relations was traditionally defined in terms of national security, a concept with roots stemming from the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia and Realist ideology, where states are the primary actors, and their survival is the main preoccupation.

Defining Human Security, Mr. Ogwang stated that it is achieved when and where individuals and communities have the necessary options to end, mitigate, or adapt to threats to their human, environmental and social rights, and have the capacity and freedom to exercise these options besides actively participating in attaining these options. He went on to explain that human security applies most at the level of the individual citizen, as it amounts to human wellbeing i.e. protection from harm and injury in addition to access to other basic requisites that are due of every person on earth.
Therefore, the statement of the problem of the research indicates that whereas the government wants people to return to their homes, there are little signs of support from the government in terms of resettlement packages like farming equipment and seeds for planting. The land is feared to contain Explosive Remnants of War (ERW), which were left behind by the combatants of the conflict. Moreover, there are cases of land disputes over border demarcations and ownership. Accordingly, many young returnees do not know where their land is located because their parents were killed in the war, or they were too young when they were displaced from their land to remember its location. Hence, all these factors are potential indicators of fresh conflicts leading to insecurity and death in the region.

According to the presentation, the general objective of the research is to analyse the centrality of State Security versus Human Security by examining the challenges for resettlement of the IDPs in Northern Uganda.

Specific research questions are:

- What are the causes of the conflict in Northern Uganda?
- What are the mechanisms of resettlement programmes put in place by the stakeholders in Northern Uganda?
- How are the different resettlement-programmes conceived and implemented in Northern Uganda?
- What is the link between state security and human security in the resettlement programmes in Northern Uganda?
- What are the challenges and prospects for peace building in Northern Uganda?

Mr. Ogwang explained that the research design will be a case study and qualitative by nature. A qualitative design uses methods and techniques which measure descriptive and non-quantitative data. Both primary and secondary data sources will be used.

The researcher argued that this method is appropriate to the study because in-depth responses from the respondents, based on their own words, experiences and interaction in natural settings could be observed and gathered. Moreover, he justified that qualitative approach is a method that refers to a range of techniques including participant observation and intensive interviewing.

The study will use focus group discussions, interviews, documentary analysis and observation as instruments of data collection. In so doing, the research can reach a vast variety of the study population which include, among others, officials from the central and local governments, diplomatic community, women’s group, NGOs, former abductees and rebels. Purposive sampling will also be employed based on the premise that careful selection of stakeholders in this study is a good criterion for matching interviews with a total of 300 respondents. The data interpretation and analysis shall be based on the content analysis developed from the specific objectives.

**Discussion on Research Proposals**

Regarding Mr. Ayo Whetho’s proposal, it was stated that the research has an interesting dimension of looking at the role of MNCs in conflict areas, with special emphasis on the DRC. Concerning the role of private military companies, which are actively engaged in providing security to MNCs, participants mentioned that the MNCs *per se* cannot entirely guarantee the safety of their staff, due to which they are forced to rely on the services of private military
companies. It was, in addition, stated that private military companies may benefit from prolonged conflicts. A practical example cited was the case of Sierra Leone, where private military companies attained levels of power and influence that could topple the established government. Hence, it was concluded that private military companies could act as double agents; on one hand dominating the lucrative ‘business’ of providing security for MNC employees while, on the other hand, could also become a threat to the incumbent government. Therefore, participants commented that in order to further elaborate or make readers understand the conflict dynamics in the DRC, it is imperative to include the active engagement of private military companies operating in the conflict area of the country by highlighting their links with the MNCs and the rebel faction groups.

Additional argument raised in the discussion emphasized the lack of an existing quotable international legal framework on the extraction of coal tan (a mineral used in cell phones and nuclear reactors, found only in the DRC) and its trade as a leading factor in the continued unchecked exploitation of the mineral in the DRC. A question was raised pertaining to how the researcher views other already operational organizations that control such illicit resource exchanges with special focus on other minerals such as diamonds.

Another issue pointed out during the discussion was a quotation stated in the proposal where an author characterized the DRC as ‘a failed state’, which was considered as requiring a contextual clarification for the claim being made. It was argued that the quote implies that the author has made the statement in a sense that this claim entails a past characteristic/condition of the DRC as opposed to the statement made in the present, thus making the condition a current truth in the DRC. In addition, the perceptions of the DRC government in relation to this claim were questioned.

The researcher responded that the absence of a recognizable international legal framework is the main concern of the thesis. Hence, this renders the MNCs or other active role players in the trade, unaccountable for their actions, particularly when it comes to the direct negative impacts their actions have on the civilians living in conflict areas. Moreover, at present, it has become difficult to establish a checking mechanism, since the only evident and available mechanism is the OECD guideline that may not be entirely applicable in the area of concern.

Concerning Mr. Tsegaye’s research proposal, participants pointed out that the researcher has suggested borrowing experiences from the West, for existing laws in Africa regarding disabled children have been observed as having gaps. However, it was commented to consider other international conventions such as those issued by the UN, where there may not be an inherent need to borrow from Western practices. Consequently, African governments could be pushed to endorse these conventions (if they are not already one of the signatories) and to follow-up on the process through subsequent ratification(s) within their respective countries. In terms of the sampling target of the research, a question was raised regarding the importance the researcher attributed towards child soldiers. This issue was indeed considered as a key issue that the initial proposal has claimed to draw attention to and was the major factor in the selection of the candidate’s topic. Concluding the discussion, participants noted that the issue of child soldiers has not been stressed enough in which case it was commented that it needs to be more elaborated since it constitutes one of the major components of the thesis.

In response to the questions and comments forwarded, Mr. Tsegaye stated that African countries, particularly Central Africa and Sierra Leone, have relatively high number of disabled children from the continent. Therefore, he suggested that a visit to these countries would provide grounds for speaking to child ex-combatants, who have been disabled as a result of the
violent conflicts in their respective countries. This would be followed by an investigation on existing laws and actions undertaken to deal with the issue of these children. He further mentioned that even though the conventions exist, they may be mixed with the politics of the country. In addition, he illustrated that although some schools have laws for integrating and protecting disabled children, they sometimes lack the capacity to implement these laws. In conclusion, Mr. Tsegaye stated that in many African countries, including Sierra Leone and Ethiopia, one cannot cite any clear strategy for stipulating models that facilitate disabled child engagements.

With respect to Mrs. Umurewa’s presentation, participants asserted that while DDR is a comprehensive system, the research should further include the shift and linkages forged in Rwanda between DDR and the Rwanda Poverty Reduction Scheme to provide a clear understanding of what has so far been accomplished in Rwanda. Mrs. Umurewa argued that the link is an important part of the paper, which is based on the argument detailing that when people are more engaged in economic activities the advantages are twofold. The first being poverty reduction in the country, while the second is a notion that people stay out of war if pre-occupied. Questions were also forwarded regarding the tactics to be employed in locating specific informants, ex-combatants in this case, for the study by considering their large numbers as well as the fact that they may have already integrated themselves within the civilian population. The problem highlighted here was, therefore, that the nature of representation is already reflecting bias resulting from the researcher’s selection of informants, who are both ex-combatant women and members of an association of ex-combatant women in Rwanda. In conclusion, it was urged that the researcher needs to show or justify the selection of the sample.

Regarding Mr. Kamwaria’s research proposal, participants suggested to consider highlighting some of the indigenous healing processes mentioned in the brief presentation with greater emphasis on the coping strategies related to traumatic past experiences amongst the community under study. In addition, it was commented to include local names of terms and concepts, for instance, the concept focused under the study which is post-traumatic stress. It was also urged to articulate the problem(s) that affected the research as a result of the unavailability of an equivalent term(s) in the local language for some of the Western psychological terms used in this study. Participants further suggested highlighting the exact boundaries of this research as well as exploring whether there could be possibilities to develop new words in the process. This being a relatively complex study, a question was raised regarding the underlying mechanisms the researcher intends to use with informants, if a relapse is triggered in the course of collecting information. In conclusion, it was commented that the study could benefit greatly from a consideration of the learning invoked or fusions created as a result of a combination of two therapeutic options provided by the Western and the local healing practices within the community.

Pertaining to Mr. Kwaja’s research proposal, it was remarked that there is a need to restructure Social Security (SS) to play a constitutional role that involves protecting the masses. In the proposal, a clear manifestation on the differences of using terms like Social Sector Reform and Social Sector Transformation is not evident. A question raised was whether the aim of the paper is to transform social security, which requires national as well as political backing with a long term goal of spreading it to the whole region, given the researcher’s statement of violent conflict in Sierra Leone and Liberia were once dominant regional security infringing causes. Participants also noted that there is a need to highlight the legal frameworks operating on the ground that would be analyzed, in addition to the effect arising from the fact that the largest proportions of funding to effect SS Reform comes from abroad; a concern emanating from experiences in other fields where funding countries dictate the direction of funded projects. Moreover, it was
suggested that the researcher should inform how a transformation in social security sector, in this context, takes place under the overarching framework of peace-building.

With regards to Mr. Mapuva’s presentation, participants forwarded that there is a need for stating a clear distinction in the study, particularly between local communities’ notions for community based initiatives juxtaposed to CSOs which are deemed to be donor driven organizations.

In Mr. Sabala’s proposal, it was observed that when speaking of small arms prevalence in the study area, it would be beneficial to first define the concept since in Africa bows, arrows, machetes, etc. still play a key role in violent conflicts. It was further commented that it is best to clarify that Turkana people of the Turkana District in Kenya is the major emphasis of the study. In addition, participants suggested that clarifying the aspect of governance, whether there is no or weak governance in the region of interest, is vital. The IGAD region, mentioned in the title, was regarded to create confusion to the reader in terms of how the concept under study is further narrowed down to the Turkana District of Kenya.

As regards to Mr. Maeresera’s proposal, participants commented that the presentation has invoked a number of questions, including whether the researcher would visit all the countries that belong to the region stated in his study; hence constituting a careful analysis of the geopolitical context is significant. It was also noted that Uganda and Rwanda’s military involvement and its implications should be included as part of the research, in addition to mentioning the challenges of acquiring information in a situation where even the local population of Uganda found out about their country’s involvement in the DRC through the international media.

There was also a discussion in relation to Ms. Angom’s proposal. Participants discussed that it is important to consider other gender researches as a yard stick for the research so as to be able to have a strong theoretical grounding on the appropriate gender theories and parameters, and present a clear and distinctive definition of terms like ‘peacebuilding’ and ‘peacemaking’. Additional questions raised included whether the research was concerned with empowering women in North Uganda or whether it was a general study on the seclusion of ex-combatant women. It was also commented to highlight the role of women in terms of their involvement as peace builders thereby balancing out their role in instigating the conflict initially. A final comment made on the sample size considered that the sample’s representation of the whole population was inadequate.

Regarding Mr. Musinguzi’s proposal, it was suggested that he should provide examples of cases where the selected J.P Lederach model has been a success in acting as a gauge for its probable suitability in the context of North Uganda, and also to further state whether he is using only one or all of the three models.

Mr. Ogwang’s proposal was suggested to consider the ‘floating population’ which, in this case, are people born within the refugee camps possibly looking at the contributions they could have for the research in addition to surfacing the gender dimension if any occurs during the process of research. It was, moreover, remarked that a clear definition of situations should be incorporated such as the forced removal contrary to refugee camps in a context where human beings were at times resettled to serve as buffer zones between conflicting parties.
VI. Seminar on Peace Research

Plenary 2 (Afternoon): Research paper presentations by Peace Researchers - End

Session 1: Key Ingredients of the Research Proposal (Protocol)
Presenter: Professor Susan van Zyl

This session focused on literature review, which is arguably the most challenging aspect of any doctoral level proposal. It aims to help participants identify possible ways of organizing the bodies of literature that they will be working with to ground their proposed research.

Professor Zyl began her presentation by mentioning that the previous session, comprised of PhD candidates’ presentations of their research proposals, has demonstrated participants’ level of understanding of thesis research proposals. After a brief introduction about her personal background, she proceeded to her lecture by discussing the Literature Review section of a thesis. The Professor noted that the key ingredients of a Literature Review essentially constitute collection of relevant literature in the field of interest. She stated that Literature Review is divided into two, viz. Literature Review for a research proposal (LR I) and; Literature Review for the final doctoral thesis (LR II).

Although the two types differ with reference to content and weight, both serve the purpose of demonstrating the extent to which a researcher is substantially acquainted with the existing empirical and theoretical knowledge available on the subject of interest. However, in many cases, an inherent challenge of showing the role of theory may develop. Moreover, a literature review doesn’t have to be modeled in a consistent set of literature, for adding and dropping is very constructive.

In empirical research, a three years period seems a bit unrealistic and limited. Research, in this context, can be a continuous process based on an incorporation of newer relevant information with adequate considerations of boundaries within the intended research. In line with this, the lecturer cited an example from a case in South Africa where a student sought to establish the relationship between money and conflict. In this case, the assumptions that the student had initially, before embarking on the field research, were found to be completely different from the facts obtained. One of the opposing discoveries from the study has been that there has to be a certain amount of income generated within a household in order for conflict to develop. In this case, LR I failed to fit into the context; hence Literature Review need not be stagnant. LR I, for instance, can help determine the clear distinction between non-researchable questions and non-researchable topics. Similarly, LR II allows continued conversation with existing participants but it is common for LR II to follow the field research.

Discussion

A majority of the participants agreed that they thought Literature Review was a difficult process. To this, Professor Zyl explained that the idea behind a literature review is to demonstrate acquaintance with existing body of literature, but does not necessarily have to be filled with opinions of the researcher. She added that it should, however, articulate the strengths, limitations and consequences of the literature.

There was also a discussion regarding the traditional writing technique where researchers are advised to write using the pronoun ‘we’ as opposed to the newer writing methods that require using ‘I’, which has the tendency of making the research more researcher-owned. Throughout
the discussion participants agreed that it would be safer, in research, to use ‘I’ sparingly, since there is no conclusively established preference for the use of either pronoun in research methodology as yet. Selection of wording was also deemed crucial in research; for instance, when claiming to use a theoretical instead of a conceptual framework.

With regard to topics related to issues of theory, models and approaches, it was noted that peace research is a discipline that heavily relied on theory meaning that dealt extensively with causation, though in some contexts it would be possible to have an active practice not necessarily backed by a theory. An example from one research was given where illness was considered to manifest partly as social constructionism. Models, on the other hand, were explained to be ‘how to’ instruments, usually used to demonstrate ‘how to implement’ and often broadly related to an approach to a given task. To add a better understanding of the importance of being selective in using technical terms in research, more definitions as well as differences between seemingly similar terms and often loosely used words like norms, laws and principles were employed.

Reflections on the Day

The training approach was characterized as having been an impressive discussion on the qualitative research methodology that had been based, by and large, on definition of terms to minimize irrelevant or indiscriminate utilization. It was mentioned that such an approach was encouraging in terms of highlighting the need to revise research works done so far by the research awardees. Participants also noted that the lecture on the distinctions between LR I and LR II had contributed to new learning prospects. The researchers’ presentations were commended for having created a forum for sharing a variety of experiences that have added constructive comments. Participants further argued that such presentations have created encouragement and open mindedness about research methodology in addition to a chance to reaffirm the strengths, weaknesses and vitality of the works done so far with the intention to yielding a prominent significance-based research. Finally, the UPEACE-IDRC partnership was acclaimed not only for providing funds but also for backing with opportunities for further learning, through credible facilitators, on the methods crucial for producing sound research works.

Day Two: Tuesday 27TH October, 2009

Plenary 3 (Morning): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 2: Assessing and Interpreting Qualitative Data
Presenter: Professor Susan van Zyl

This session was devoted to a detailed discussion of the nature and types of qualitative research, and some of the ways of assessing the quality of the material gathered. It also explores, amongst others, the question of the relationship between the qualitative and quantitative data and the ways in which the two forms of data collection can be most effectively combined.

After an insightful observation, it was stated that a majority of the research candidates had a basic understanding of qualitative research methodology, composed of a combination of the focus group discussion (FGD), the interview and the observation approaches in addition to research proposal writing. For this reason, Professor Zyl focused her lecture merely on FGD method.
She began her presentation with a brief historical background of the FGD which has, over the past decade, been substantially developed as a research instrument. Researchers were, however, reminded to take caution while using the FGD method because of its seemingly loose use in research today. Professor Zyl further stressed that researchers should be cautious of respondents’ activity in which case biases could likely be high if a single respondent dominates the FGD. Therefore, if information obtained in such a manner is claimed to be representative of the whole population then the collected data would be biased.

This entailed a discussion on the issue of bias whereby the vitality of establishing a balance between epistemological and practical usage of data collection instruments was set as a prerequisite before embarking on the field research, which could be facilitated through a thorough acquaintance with previous researches done on the topic of concern. It was also asserted that articulation of prevalent bias in research could also benefit a given research.

The notion that qualitative research may be filled with biases, a past but still widespread notion, was overruled as being an unessential question, and thus defending the qualitative paradigm in the initial stages of developing a methodology is not necessary. This was placed against the fact that human beings tend to articulate lived experiences orally, especially in the African context where literacy can be low and where written records may be unavailable; hence necessitating a need for collection of attitudes and values. Regarding observation as a tool for data collection, it was stated that it can be extensively helpful in contexts where it would be literally impossible to obtain information through words and where there is a distinct difference between observing as a researcher and observing as part of the research. The quality of translators in research was identified as a key to be focused while conducting a research.

Moreover, the application of mixed methodologies in a research was also discussed whereby a researcher could use both the qualitative and quantitative research methodologies to collect data for a given research project. To this, Professor Zyl noted that in order to help foster a deeper understanding of the basic disparities between the qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, a system of identifying differences should be applied. Such an approach is based on analyzing differences backed with an extensive array of practical experience and context based examples in research. She further argued that qualitative research methodology is associated with its strengths in explaining human behaviors and attitudes; in this case the explanation is based on a causal-effect relation in addition to providing an access to values which otherwise be difficult to obtain using the quantitative methodology.

Plenary 4 (Afternoon): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 3: Assessing and Interpreting Qualitative Data Continued
Presenter: Professor Susan van Zyl

Throughout the session, questionnaire—a quantitative data collection tool—was partly examined by focusing on the word ‘other’ as a response choice often given by researchers to their respondents. To this, it was observed that in the initial stages of developing a research tool, it would be of paramount importance to consider that ‘other’ as a response may necessitate the formation of a previously unanticipated category of responses that could affect the information collected by the researcher. It would also be important to bear in mind that this preference for ‘other’ as a response option could also entail that respondents might feel more at ease in choosing the option thinking that it would minimize any indications of views regarding the topic in question.
Another aspect highlighted in this regard was to give emphasis on the usage of open-ended questions as compared to close-ended questions while collecting data using the interview method. In essence, therefore, a contrast between using the survey and the interview methods for collecting data in a large corporation was made. Accordingly, the survey method was identified as being, in this case, useful as a representation in strict use of the word; however, the interview method may be a better option in a case where the researcher don’t have language barrier issues or has a set of more than ten open-ended questions. Much attention was, moreover, given on the need to minimize the inclusion of questions that would not, at a later stage, originate basic information and that will not be used for analysis.

Additional subjects discussed include the use of snowball sampling in research. This sampling method was described to be both advantageous and disadvantageous at times. In the former case, it was noted that the respondents could help a researcher identify previously unknown informants with important information. On the contrary, the disadvantage is that the respondents’ recommendation may disarray the researcher and confine the information obtained to be within a specific category, or when shared values between respondents exist, it may cause the researcher to obtain a seemingly cyclical collection of information. Nonetheless, there can be exceptions, for instance, in obtaining information from a group of experts in a given field which may minimize bias, as opposed to collecting opinions on a given subject. Final concerns in relation to snowball sampling were addressed, noting that the researcher could consider using the saturated method when information being obtained from a variety of informants would become repetitive, or the researcher could make an epistemological decision based on whether or not there are any remaining unattained information, and depending on whether other sampling methods would conjunctively be in use.

Furthermore, the difference between ethnography and phenomenology research approaches was discussed. The former was identified to rely on a systematic approach of observation in part of the research while the latter was identified to access people’s experiences through in-depth interviews, which was noted to be a very demanding process.

The topic of action research was also discussed in which the facilitator explained that she has been amazed by the fact that she could not identify many action based researches from participant’s presentations in the previous day, though peace-building research is essentially an action based research. Hence, it was stated that peace-building research is linked to action research in that they are both oriented towards embittering existing practice(s) by creating consciousness or awareness. An example was cited in this case through which a researcher could aim at effecting behavioral change to mitigate conflict through peace-building research with an action research theme. However, it was mentioned that as action research is typically associated with NGOs, it is of no surprise that many universities do not encourage students to embark on action based research, which is inherently time consuming and demanding.

Apart from these, Professor Zyl argued that the main problem of conducting a thematic analysis lies on the identification of what recurs, thereby constituting a theme. This was further demonstrated through discussion based on examples drawn from participants’ topics, which consisted of themes or case studies.

**Reflections on the Day**

Participants agreed that they had obtained more in-depth learning on qualitative research methodologies from the sessions held during the day. Some of them, in addition, revealed that they have acquired a deeper knowledge on qualitative research methodologies. They explained
that methodologies had been chosen by virtue of the fact that most of the participants had already been engaged with research based on the type of methodology in question. For this reason, they added that they greatly appreciate the fact that they were exposed to new learning, as well as to controversial and contradicting issues in qualitative research. Accordingly, the discussion on case studies and thematic analysis among other components of the qualitative research methodology had been really helpful and had sparked eagerness amongst participants to re-examine and polish the already adopted methodologies for appropriateness to the information sought by the researcher. Also, participants said they have been incited to think about the general flow of research in terms of making a decision on the order of research methodology, whether to choose qualitative or quantitative method, in accordance with determining the sequences of data collection. In a nutshell, participants declared to have gotten a deeper reflection on qualitative research methodologies and had gained much inspiration to rethink methodology choices to establish relevance. In the end, the facilitator was gratified for creating an understanding on the contradictions and other issues taken for granted, with respect to the qualitative research methodology.

Day Three: Wednesday 28TH October, 2009

Plenary 5 (Morning): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 4: Quantitative Methods for Peace Research
Presenter: Professor Owen Sichone

Professor Owen began his lecture by making a brief self introduction. He pursued his presentation focusing on frequently arising questions regarding researches on peace studies. Professor Owen further cautioned the researchers to attentively consider and systematically choose appropriate methods for obtaining responses for questions set in the research. He briefly revisited basic concepts and procedures for initiating a research. He advised the participants to commence on a research by asking or adopting broad research questions, which may develop from reading, observation, experiences and the like. The Professor particularly highlighted that extensive reading could stimulate the formulation of questions for a given research. Elaborating on the issue of formulating research questions, he stated that a research question is primarily based upon a theory, which he illustrated by citing a general claim that states “unemployment can cause crime”.

Continuing his lecture, Professor Owen mentioned that broader questions formulated at the initial stages of a research will further be narrowed down for analysis and value judgment. When questions are narrowed down, a researcher can work with a hypothesis thus creating an advantage of directing what the study intends to do, and also easing data collection at the stage of data collection. In addition, it was stated that research questions can further be supported by the observations of the researcher. At the data analysis stage, a researcher will once again encounter generalizations similar to those evident at the beginning of the research. Moreover, a researcher may sometimes collect more information than is needed, thus facing a problem of deciding to choose between the relevant and irrelevant information. At the conclusion stage, a researcher will present the obtained generalizations by linking them with the initially proposed questions but followed by statements that can be applied to improve the situation under study. In conclusion, the Professor stated that peace research does not deviate from such procedures; however, he noted that it highly involves social relationships in peace and conflict.

Regarding the cause and effect relations in the research process, Professor Owen disclosed that a researcher essentially formulates the thesis through an identification of the cause and
effect of a given phenomenon. This cause and effect should, however, be based on experimentation, a condition rather difficult in peace research. While policy interventions and their impact on the population can be measureable or quantifiable, similar assumptions cannot be made for peace researches. In the end, Professor Owen pointed out that even if the aforementioned issues exist, it does not mean that peace research should entirely rely on qualitative research methodology.

In the continuing discussion, participants were asked to define quantitative research methodology. The definition linked quantitative research methodology with numbers. In agreement with the basic interpretation of quantitative research methodology, Professor Owen added that numbers are the basic requirement in conducting a quantitative research and that the political sciences, and science in general, are most often linked to this methodology. The participants, on the other hand, disclosed a fear for numbers, hence dreading excessive reliance on quantitative research methods. Nevertheless, Professor Owen further affirmed that anything worth researching ‘can be quantified’. Illustrating this he reflected on the possibility of quantifying people’s values in the USA, a condition literally impossible in Africa taking into account the lower standards of literacy. He also described that quantitative data is ideologically known as ‘hard data’. However, quantitative methods offer a researcher an advantage of analyzing issues like unintended policy intervention effects. Furthermore, it is more ‘nuanced’, can be flexible and versatile even when less numerate.

On further discussion, it was stated that in order to employ quantitative methodology in a research, a researcher is first required to determine quantifiable items in the research. To illustrate this, the concepts of democracy, human security and development were identified as being harder to quantify, since there could be different value systems. In further illustration, Professor Owen compared the World Bank and UNDP, which have their own and different standards for measuring the levels of development, though the standards are essentially based on a multiplicity of indices. Furthermore, he spoke about Ibrahim Mo’s publication on good governance in Africa which is a research based on much reliance on numbers. In his publication, Ibrahim questions people’s perceptions on governance in Africa and has come up with interesting outcomes that have been compared with the findings of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). For instance, Ghana scored high in the APRM but low on Ibrahim’s index on good governance. Nonetheless, sub-Saharan African governments failed to obtain the annual prize for good governance in 2009. Some critics of Ibrahim’s index question his methodology, contending that he has failed to interview the local population in countries like Ghana.

On the other hand, the Professor added that some are of the opinion that the results for Nigeria, as reported by the APRM, could have been subjected to politicization with government officials being the prime respondents. This shows the complexities that may arise from developing varying standards by a number of organizations that have the goal of producing results on the same topic(s) but using a variety of measuring tools. Ibrahim’s index, however, does not produce a ranking of African countries that is very dissimilar to UNDP’s ranking. When analyzing good governance results for the two there seems to be a repetitive theme in addition to revealing that some small Africa countries performed better than larger countries. By and large, in this context, size is quantifiable and hence a major factor for determining democracy.

It is, consequently, possible to interpret quality in terms of quantity. Professor Owen shared some of his experiences in anthropological research. He gave an example of rural societies and the debate on stratification processes. During the era of the Russian revolution, land distribution was based on a calculation that if an individual was found to having a large plot of land, the
supposed ‘extra land’ would then be taken away by the government to be redistributed. Accordingly, the development cycle was tied to a notion that farmers with many young children produced less but consumed more, by Russian standards such a farmer would be distinguished as poor. Once these children have reached a productive age, a farmer would be considered as rich, resulting from the increased labor input in the farm. Again, once these offspring started lives of their own the father would have to allocate part of the land to them, thus rendering the farmer to become poor again as a result of the reduced labor and land. Lenin would, therefore, claim that growth is a continuous process with farmers growing and trading agricultural products; which are both quantifiable. In concluding this example, it was stated that a researcher, in such cases, may question the growth of nations at the expense of poor farmers, democracy and human security.

In a nutshell, peace and conflict studies was considered quantifiable. To elaborate this, an example from conflict study was considered where the number of deceased offer opportunity for quantification. As a point of discussion, it was noted that since contexts vary, researchers are required to quantify qualitative data with precise categorization. In this regard, it was illustrated that a single death in the US carries a different value from multiple deaths in many African countries such as the genocide in Rwanda. In such a context, the death of a certain number of civilian populations would necessitate for the case to be considered as a crisis and as such that requires an intervention. Therefore, questioning human security in such a case is important and fitting. In parallel with this, good governance or human security can be associated with questions like ‘what measures have been put in place by the local governance in a given locality’ and not necessarily in terms of ‘how many measures’ to obtain the required information. Such a differentiation may prove difficult to a researcher; however, it can be avoided by being specific. On the other hand, contexts do matter if a researcher is studying, for example, pastoralists’ concerns of being underrepresented or under employed by the government whereby the researcher may adopt a combination of the two questions mentioned above.

Another example given as being a quantifiable phenomenon was the question of billions of aid pouring into Africa, though the continent continues to be impoverished. Intrinsically, it seems like pouring money into Africa is of no use because barely little gets to be done in practice. A researcher may also commence upon a research by examining existing methods of resource allocation to undesired sectors. Furthermore, it was noted that a careful analysis of the intervening (unforeseen) variables could benefit the research, since a researcher can not anticipate, beforehand, all factors at play to identify cause and effect relationships. Intervening variables could also emerge from the non-responses in questionnaires where respondents leave certain questions blank, in which case they are considered as new categories. Such cases result from the initial questionnaire design and organization. Participants subsequently questioned whether there is a ‘tolerable number of non-responses’. Professor Owen responded that it is of vital importance to clearly state questions in the questionnaire because non-responses often occur when respondents fail to understand what response is required of them, which could arise from the framing of the question.

Additional topic of interest for the participants was the possibility of using quantitative methods for analyzing secondary data. To this, Professor Owen opined that it is possible and in fact it could be useful for the research previously carried out, for this could open opportunities for arriving at more enhanced results through the use of more developed or improved research instruments. In addition, it was noted that questionnaires form an important segment of the quantitative research methodology. However, a researcher can take a head count in situations where literacy is low, for instance, by examining the population of a village or by measuring the size of the land. Professor Owen also considered cases where a researcher may find strictly
qualitative information but might require substantiating results with numbers. This can be done through appointing people who can probe into the questions and provide the required quantifiable numbers.

Professor Owen also indicated that concepts like gender can be quantifiable automatically, as the concept involves only two values, male or female, thereby enabling the manipulation of numbers obtained in the desired direction. He added that working with a large number of questionnaires for research may be a daunting task. However, a systematic categorization of the questions into related groups could highly ease the work of the researcher during the analysis stage. Furthermore, he suggested that a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies would be beneficial in producing a good peace research and reminded participants that the quality of the results depends on the quality of data obtained.

The issue of handling sources for research was also discussed through a reflection on what is a relevant data for a given research. An elaboration was made through examining an article published by Ron Smith, which specifies that large datasets create opportunities for errors. As an example, post-election violence in Africa was mentioned. In line with this, it was stated that a researcher can obtain information from public media sources such as the BBC or local Medias, at the same time, exercising much caution for bias and intended outcomes of government policies, especially if the local media is predominantly state-owned. Therefore, a researcher would need to speak with the local population and/or, if in time of negotiations, seek information from those involved. In addition, a researcher would need to prioritize sources. For instance, within a peace-building process framework, taking the Middle East as an example, it was noted that quoting sources as opposed to presenting interpretations of media statements would minimize fears of exhibiting bias for a researcher. Professor Owen also mentioned that it is common to have errors even with hard data; hence, a researcher needs to be cautious when prioritizing data sources and question the media’s (including newspapers) motives when reporting incidents. Biases are usually not absent in researches; it, therefore, falls upon the researcher to identify and outline competing variables. Africa has often been characterized as a place where there is a lack of producing credible data sources. However, even if this situation exists, researchers of the World Bank and UNDP are still able to produce reports about African conditions, a reason for a need to encourage continental researchers.

Participants forwarded a question regarding whether it would be advisable to use both hypothesis and research questions in a particular research. The Professor replied that a more practicable choice would be to use one of the two for a given research, since a researcher needs to be, if possible, absolutely clear about what s/he intends to obtain during the data collection stage on top of clearly affirming what specific research tools are going to be applied.

**Plenary 6 (Morning): Seminar on Peace Research Continued**

**Session 5: Research Variables and Hypothesis Testing**

**Presenter: Professor Owen Sichone**

After a tea break, Professor Owen started the second session of discussion by requesting the participants to define the terms variable and hypothesis. From the responses of participants, it was gathered that variables are entities that can take on different values or attributes. For instance, gender is a variable with two attributes including ‘male’ and ‘female’. Variables are further associated with typical response patterns or choices in questionnaires such as ‘agree’, ‘disagree’, ‘strongly agree’ and ‘strongly disagree’. In addition, coding variables by using corresponding computer programs, before analyzing them makes a researcher’s task easier.
Variables are further broken down into ‘dependent’ and ‘independent’ variables. Professor Owen then explained that in a hypothesis, a researcher might have a combination of both independent and dependent variables. At the theorizing stage of research, he affirmed that a researcher needs to outline as many variables as required for the research. Illustrating this further, the concept of gender was given as consisting of two variables known to all. This is not to disregard people who may biologically belong to both categories. However, he asked how a researcher would go about researching the concept of religion, where a respondent may claim to belong to two religions or even more. Under religion there are many variables such as age, gender, etc. As part of the solution to dealing with respondents claiming to belong to two separate categories, the professor suggested coding the obtained information to quantifiably determine how one could possibly belong to two religions at the same time. This claim was contended by a participant who asserted that quantifying such double values would be extremely difficult and perhaps cannot be quantitatively analyzed.

On the contrary, this discussion entailed suggestions to ‘throw out’ one of the categories in order to be left with one, in an effort to ease and ensure the continuity of the research process. This suggestion was, however, objected by referring to research ethics, which would mean the purposive exclusion of a subject for differing from the expected or known norm. In such a situation, a researcher may be at fault for widening the margin of error; hence it would be sensible to revisit the pilot tool to make necessary modifications to suit contexts in question.

In further discussion, a hypothesis was defined as a proposed explanation for an observed phenomenon, particularly used in scientific research. However, hypothesis testing, when looking at human conditions, is not advisable, thus it is not wise to put people’s lives at risk in an attempt to produce a hypothesis. Moreover, it was discussed that when evaluating a process, a hypothesis could be designed through looking at unintended consequences of a particular situation, event, etc. An example given in this context was with respect to the economic benefits of sending girls to school. According to this example, the expected positive outcomes would be increased development, strengthening women capacities, etc. While on the other hand, the unintended negative outcomes would be increased Gender Based Violence (GBV). In this case, there is a need to further test the unintended negative outcomes. In conclusion, it was stated that a researcher may have a combination of dependent and independent variables in a hypothesis. In instances where unforeseen variables may develop while collecting data, it was urged to revise the research tool so as to minimize ethical concerns emanating from the exclusion of content for being different from what a researcher has initially stated and/or identified.

Participants were then asked to point out what the prior probability of the models they intended to use in the research would be; hence answering a question of theories they have decided as fitting for their respective researches. Responding to this question, participants suggested that at the initial stages of the research, they would show procedures that may provide a model for the research and in addition mentioned that researchers are obliged to make their readers know that the models they use in a given research are the most appropriate to represent the substance in a research, contrary to only demonstrating the statistics. Professor Owen further highlighted that conclusions at the end of a given research may deviate from the theory adopted at the beginning of a research. When faced with such a situation, he advised the participants to re-examine the data sources or the entered data.

Participants were also concerned about cases where a researcher may find expected outcomes after conducting research where it would be found to be laden with bias. For this, the presenter responded that such a condition may not be interpreted as biased from the onset of the
research but rather driven by a ‘hunch’. In addition, testing a hunch is a common practice in research and can be built through adding on the information or data collected. In relation with this, an example given highlighted Nigeria’s trade performance, whereby a researcher could seek information from the Nigerian export promotion office and crosscheck it with information obtained from the customs authority or banks in the country. Participants were also reminded that field data may fail to provide information that has initially led a researcher to adopt a certain theory. Consequently, participants were cautioned to check whether the models they would be choosing to conduct their research fits the data they seek to obtain. The participants were, therefore, advised about the need to frame the questions in terms of an ‘assumed model’ and other ‘alternative models’; further checking the relevance of the model to the collected data and the extent to which this ‘assumed model’ performs better than the ‘alternative models’.

Professor Owen subsequently raised the issue of replication in research and questioned whether it is really significant. He then stated that replication can have the advantages of correcting research errors, in addition to proving whether the specific tools used for a given research are fitting or appropriate, if the conclusions drawn after multiple re-doing of the research remain the same. However, the process of replicating scientific results is not worth the effort; only really important results like cold fusion justify the effort of replication. The presenter, moreover, noted that it would be very difficult to replicate researches in the social sciences and it would, in practice, be of little importance. In particular focus to peace research, it was remarked that replication may produce very little benefit but substantive issues in international relations, political science and peace research can be phrased in terms of bets. Descriptive statistics and graphic data presentation:

In the first few minutes of the afternoon session, Professor Owen continued on the discussion regarding Ron P Smith’s observations. He asked the participants to identify whether there are distinct variations between statistical and substantive significance in quantitative data. Referring to Ron Smith’s thesis, he mentioned that academic quantitative research focuses less on ‘the importance of the result’ compared to ‘the statistical significance of the result’. He further explained with an example where a government establishes a system of micro financing for farmers. In this case, instance record expenditures are required but this was hampered by the fact that farmers do not know how to go about spending the money in an investment. At this point, a statistical significance is lacking but there could be substantive significance. He, in addition, stated that ‘any difference, however small, will be statistically significant if the sample size is large enough’.

Plenary 7 (Afternoon): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 6: Descriptive Statistics and Graphic Data Presentation
Presenter: Professor Owen Sichone

The main discussion topic of the afternoon session was initiated with a general definition of sampling. This was followed by a breakdown of sampling methods into random and non-random, with the former being explained as a sampling based on an assumption that all the members of a given population stand an equal chance of being represented in the sample. Some of the participants commented that they would prefer using random sampling in their researches, upon which they were advised to strike a balance between obtaining information from local populations and respective influential individuals or groups. Other types of sampling were also given as examples including cluster sampling, stratified sampling, among others.
Familiarity of participants with elements of quantitative research methodologies such as frequency distribution, tables and variance facilitated the discussion on the question of biases in research, reflecting on the role of sampling in this regards. Professor Owen recommended that participants should be observant of response patterns by informants to avoid the over-representation of the most vocal individuals or groups, which may result in a situation that could deteriorate into bias. In addition, he cautioned researchers against reliance on information from a particular source extensively. For instance, he noted, in anthropological research it is not advisable to entirely rely on information provided by elders of a given community. In any case, however, one should not rule out the possibility of obtaining a sampling frame from such a setting. Another aspect worth the consideration of a researcher derives from the fact that a given category of people may refer to similar populations, which implies that a researcher may find similarly shared values or information. Therefore, as part of bias correction, a researcher needs to minimize the chances of exclusion within a population. For instance, families with two or more children are most likely to lie about the issue in order to avoid government reprisal for breaking the rule of having one child in each family.

Furthermore, a researcher needs to structure questions in a manner that is not confusing to respondents, thereby avoiding the collection of biased information which can affect research. To illustrate this point, it was mentioned that household censuses are mostly affected by this problem. Accordingly, it was remarked that a family with a disabled child failed to ‘count’ the child as part of the family. In this case the respondent, which is the grandmother, did not count the sick child because in her own understanding the disabled child does not qualify to be treated as a human being worth counting. In Africa, it was explained, many examples can be referred where respondents misunderstand questions or the researchers do not develop questions which would allow respondents to provide answers comfortably. An additional case in point referred to some African tribes who consider cattle head counts as a misfortune that brings the death of cattle. Similarly, in some tribes, counting children is linked with bringing ill-health and a possible death of the offspring. In another example, it was asserted that a remarried woman may be faced with dilemmas of declaring which offspring is from the previous and which is from the present marriage. In such cases, a researcher may embark on a lengthy field research, stay with the given community to build trust and then commence the research if conditions permit. On a related discussion, if results obtained in a research depend on the purpose of the researcher’s sampling, this is not seen as a biased work. Moreover, a researcher can minimize instances of bias by stating that s/he used purposeful sampling. Participants were finally reminded to bear in mind that researchers themselves can also be sources of bias.

At the onset of the last session of the day, Professor Owen focused his remarks on the role of ethics in research. Participants were actively engaged in the discussion, highlighting on real experiences of situations where respondents might offer hospitality to the researcher and how this can affect his/her judgment towards the research. One of the participants disclosed that he had given money to a respondent while conducting a former research because the respondent had been a bed-ridden ill person and asked whether this is unethical. Another researcher shared an experience where they offered refreshments to respondents. This was rendered as a debatable issue. However, Professor Owen explained that budgeting for refreshments for respondents does not contradict any ethical standards in research procedures; subsequently elements of reciprocity but deviating from giving money and offering assistance in the form of kind would be more ethical.

The final topic of the day was plagiarism which is basically concerned with presenting other individual/s written material as one’s own work without proper citation.
Regarding this, it was noted that plagiarism is, nowadays, becoming an increasing problem in many higher learning institutions. In a further description, cases that result in plagiarism like failing to quote an internet source and using students’ data by supervisors to produce published materials were discussed. In the African context, it was mentioned that institutions of higher learning should carefully examine their existing policies where students are required to copy material for use; however, they may not be cautioned against plagiarism and its implications. As a concluding remark, Professor Owen proposed that participants should publish any produced literature soonest possible; an exercise which can curtail susceptibility to plagiarism.

Reflections on the Day

Reflections from participants primarily concentrated on the topic of ethics. Participants acknowledged that they had acquired immense knowledge, backed by a wide variety of substantive examples and interaction amongst the workshop panel. Most of the trainees also declared that prior to the discussion on quantitative research methodology procedures and applications, there was a general fear for working with numbers; however, the training given during the day has greatly helped to minimize some of these fears. It was, in addition, stated that the trainees acquired a better understanding of data source prioritization and its benefits for research, bearing in mind that all sources are useful but the task of separating relevant sources lies solely on the researcher.

Day Four: Thursday 29th October, 2009

Plenary 8 (Morning): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 7: Model Building in Peace Research
Presenter: Professor Owen Sichone

The day’s session began with a presentation on Je Vincent’s theory that states ‘it appears management problems at home may lead to conflicts abroad’. In other words, it means the fragility of a country within can result in the insecurity of a surrounding region. Moreover, it was noted that Vincent’s thesis proposes the notion that the incidence of conflict in conflict prone countries can be averted by shifting the dimensions of aid assistance, thus applying the assistance coming to a country to facilitate on agricultural production. Theoretically, therefore, conflict can be averted through shifting focus from assistance easily convertible into militaristic expenditures to assistance directly targeting farmers.

On a parallel discussion, other authors linking conflict to indicators of quality of life were also examined. Subsequently, critical issues concerning the works of Rummel were discussed. Critiques agree with Rummel on the prevalence of a strong relation between international conflict and the lack of freedom, but disregard Rummel’s failure to support his datasets with alternative datasets. Rummel’s dataset is only interpretable by himself, due to which other researchers needing to replicate his work would have to tune the model. Another subject of criticism for Rummel’s work stems from the fact that shifts in conflict are not viewed against shifts in freedom, hence their correlation is not regarded as a cause for conflict. In conclusion, it was noted that Rummel uses a ‘single variable approach’, which is also subject to scrutiny.

Regarding Vincent’s alternative approach, it was observed that there would be challenges in attempting to isolate a single variable as a cause for a set of events, particularly in the social sciences. An example cited in this regards questioned how a researcher would study Uganda’s growth by isolating the impacts of COMESA/EAC. This demonstrates that correlation does not
have to show the cause; however, there would be an occurring challenge regarding how one could include a cause where a correlation did not necessarily manifest the cause. Consequently, while looking at policy interventions, it was mentioned that a researcher may not encounter a problem in this respect. A correlation, therefore, may be affected by a multiplicity of intervening variables as well as through using the wrong instruments for data collection. Part of the discussion also dealt with the difficulties encountered while conducting peace researches relating to causal factor(s); for instance, when looking at interventions aimed at mitigating conflicts, it would be impossible to single out one factor only.

i) Vincent’s Improvements on Rummel

In the course of the discussion, it was argued that Vincent explores the quality of life over time to reflect on freedom and the availability of peace; hence, depicting dynamism as opposed to Rummel’s static thesis. It was further explained that Vincent used a three year timeframe in contrast to the one year timeframe used by Rummel. Additionally, Vincent manifests increase in taxation, less population growth, loss of key indicators like male life expectancy, etc. Among the points highlighted about Vincent’s thesis were the role of external parties in the conflict and the non-reduction of the conflict or the decrease of warfare expenditure within some of the countries, which were observed as a result of growth of internal revenue. The conclusions drawn were, thus, linked to the need for an in-depth analysis about the linkages between growth of national revenues and reduction of warfare expenditures. In order to support this argument, an example was provided regarding aid in Africa where large amounts of aid in the form of cash and kind pour into the continent, yet so little seems to be done. This case was examined in the context of governments at war, where the systems of accountability would become liable. The second conclusion dealt with the issue of heavy reliance of countries on taxes. In this context, it was discussed that aid coming into many African countries would be tied to the ‘peacefulness’ of the country receiving the aid. The peacefulness may be linked to whether the country receiving aid is making any structural adjustments, in which case reductions, restrictions or even complete cut offs in donor assistance may be imposed.

Two major contradictions were highlighted; the first looking at conflict prone countries. In this case, the discussion focused on the growth manifested in conflict prone countries but with seemingly decreased government expenditure or inclination to a single mode of expenditure, which is on the military. Secondly, a heavy reliance on taxes was also associated with a conflict prone country along with stagnation of some quality of life indicators such as the growth of industries. In such cases, it was noted that the issue of accountability and/or transparency would collapse inherently and almost completely. On the contrary, in peace prone countries, revenue may seem to increase at a slower pace but with expenditures increasing in key life changing areas for the masses; for instance, on issues like infant mortality, a key indicator for quality of life. Moreover, debts could increase unless a peace prone country is spending the income generated locally. Uganda was cited in this regards, where there is a low GDP and areas for collecting taxes are limited, the major characteristic considering Uganda as, by and large, a peasant agriculture oriented economy.

As part of the discussion that ensued, an observation was made stating that a high dependency on foreign aid would develop, but this, in turn, could be affected by high rates of corruption with adverse effects on the expenditure of key life changing sectors of the population. A major issue to be examined here would, therefore, be the relation between management of a country’s macro-economic sectors and the interests abroad. While high GDP tends to be liked with improved standards of livelihood, caution would be required when presenting such a statement as valid for a variety of countries. To further illustrate this case, an example was provided which
examined the case of Guinea where per capita income is the highest in Africa, though it ranks in 8th level in terms of infant mortality.

Consequently, it was discussed that resource abundance may not necessarily assure a good quality of life for the masses; instead it may require an assessment of resource distribution through examining who is in charge of managing the resources and whether there are resource expenditures in less reproductive sectors. In many sub-Saharan countries, therefore, GDP based analyses might be a misleading. Although quality of life indicators may naturally seem low in sub-Saharan countries, participants advised on the importance of acknowledging poor countries that may be performing better in certain life indicators compared to the economically advantaged countries, thus reflecting on the work of Amatya Sen. Overall, Vincent’s model, in most cases, proved the theory stated but suffered from a lack of replication. The strongest point of Vincent’s thesis lies on the span of time allotted to conducting the research.

ii) Discussion on Rummel

Rummel’s thesis was characterized as a limited on the model of analysis, although it confirms the notion that the lack of effective internal resource management within countries facilitates and creates favorable conditions for external factors to fuel conflict. The main improvement seen in the Rummel model is the relation evident between freedom and increased quality of life indicators. However, this thesis could benefit from an inclusion of other variables; in essence, vesting much of the research on freedom alone imposed a limitation on the resulting outcomes of the thesis. Amatya Sen was again referred in order to demonstrate this issue. When Sen examined hunger in Africa and Asia, he discovered that while people were at the brink of starvation and even at the height of starvation, the cause was not decreased agricultural output, as agricultural produce was actually being exported without securing the local needs and demands. At this juncture, a participant gave an example from a situation in Uganda where the population had been exposed to starvation because maize, one of the staple food crops and also a major source of the country’s income from exports, rotted in granaries awaiting favorable international market opportunities.

Therefore, examining Rummel’s thesis was intended to remind researchers to consider a variety of variables and inspect the implications of these variables when conducting peace research. Accordingly, a researcher, for instance, may consider the reasoning of governments in using the media to obtain foreign humanitarian assistance in times of crises, the roles and motives of humanitarian aid agencies operating on the ground and whether the extent to which media coverage of the crisis is exaggerated. This claim, however, is not to disregard significant media contributions in exposing famine, drought, and many other human life devastating conditions such as providing information which, in the end, brought the much needed assistance to people in dire need as occurred in Ethiopia in 1984.

In addition, discussants observed that foreign researchers may not find fully comprehend local models operational in many African contexts, a fact that calls on the need to produce many more local researchers in Africa. For instance, a researcher studying the administrative structures in Somaliland and Somalia can find distinct similarities in the chieftain and clan systems that govern the local population. Somalis worldwide are recognized for their close ties with respective clan lineages that are based on Somali traditions. However, the fact remains that Somalia is a country torn by war between factions affiliated with clans, while its neighboring Somaliland, with similar clans systems, is thriving in peace, better governance and better economic performance. In such a case, a local researcher with a better understanding would be an advantage, being familiar with the existing clan systems and how they operate.
Integrated Data for Events Analysis (IDEA) was initially defined as ‘a data development project designed to provide a comprehensive events framework for the analysis of international interactions using old and new event forms, civil and inter-state monitoring political trends’. In line with this, Professor Owen explained that IDEA has been substantiated with new methods, at times, automated to simplify research; typical examples being armed conflict reports. He added that peace and conflict research often may provide a huge amount of data, making the task of a researcher difficult in giving meaning to the collected data. For this reason, new and simpler alternative research methodologies involving automated machines might be used in retrospect to traditional event analysis processes, the results of which failed to enhance early warning systems performance or aid much in conflict escalation studies. One of the basic advantages of IDEA is, therefore, stated as being its contributions for early warning and conflict studies.

The limitations of international events analysis frameworks were also highlighted. Human coding was considered as time and resource consuming, which renders international event analysis frameworks subject to ‘instability’. To alleviate such shortcomings, Professor Owen noted that IDEA provides an advantage of incorporating the old frameworks with newer events in conflict research such as suicide bombings, with relative speed. Participants were also reminded to be wary of the fact that machines cannot record attitudes and have a tendency of duplicating results even when multiple sources are inputted for the same event. Having this said, he cautioned participants to further remember that events can be omitted in research, which could result from human fatigue, biases or basic human errors; hence these are the conditions that a researcher can easily evade by using automated systems that utilize coding of data. It was also noted that a researcher can classify events analysis in both quantitative and qualitative terms and that IDEA has long been used in international conflict research and that most peace research articles exhibit a tendency of looking at patterns of events over time in an attempt, for instance, to establish behaviours of state policies.

When examining the importance of media sources for research, Professor Owen advised participants to cross-check local and ‘representative’ international media sources against each other, so as to seek and obtain an in depth information and avoid repetitions in content. For early warning and conflict study, it was recommended to track news reports with situations in the field. This type of information is aimed at preventing disasters as can be seen through the work of CEWARN in IGAD. However, critiques argue that bureaucracies and protocols in the IGAD system as well as IGAD’s dependence on member state execution of proposed early warning strategies make the process of acting at the warning stages of a crisis literally impossible. Effective early warning systems in Africa are, therefore, generally incapacitated by ineffective and fast responding state agencies, not to disregard successful endeavours of IGAD which appears more developed than other regional early warning systems, making a contribution of its experiences invaluable yardsticks for the rest of the continent.
This session concentrated on Cold War Era coup d’états and the role of external factors, a condition that was common in Africa and South America. These coups were associated with tribalism, army officers who established themselves as agents for modernization in respective countries and at times carried out by US trained military personnel with the aims of combating the influence and spread of communism. Coups could be considered to have been at a peak in the Cold War Era Africa. Statistics given revealed that ‘in thirty-five sub-Saharan states independent between 1956 and 1970, 267 coup events occurred’ making the average number of coups per annum amount to nine. The incidence has decreased but the likeliness to occur is not diminished as happened recently in Gabon.

According to Wang’s thesis, arms imports may have an impact on the likeliness of coups occurring in sub-Saharan countries, thus, initiating the questioning of the link between arms transfers and facilitation for coups and the nature of the effects. Wang used a combination of events analysis and conventional regression methods for estimating arms transfers’ effect on coups in sub-Saharan Africa. The coups described here were carried out in defense of ‘military corporate interests’. In such cases, a proposition for reducing military budget expenditure cannot be accepted or negotiated, but may actually necessitate or justify a coup. On the other hand, large expenditures on the military could provide conditions that quell the likeliness of a coup occurring.

It was also observed that the expenditure does not only cover the costs of acquiring warfare but also budgets are allocated for training personnel abroad to attain skills for operating any weapons with new technology. In Wang’s thesis, a causal model for coups in sub-Saharan Africa translated the independent variables as arms transfers, whilst the dependent variable as the coups. Other socio-economic factors at play, like social mobilization, were also given equal emphasis. Professor Owen reported that former French colonies were designed to curb coups per se when one examines: the treaties signed between France and former colonies to deploy French soldiers within these countries to protect French interests and; these colonies are signatories to an acceptance of French intervention at any time.

He added that the period under study (1981-90) was backed by reliable data both reflecting the independent and dependent variables for the conflicts under analysis. Media sources were used in a combination of event count analysis and regression techniques used in Wang’s thesis. The resulting outcomes showed that the hypothesis was extensively tested and hence the results were conclusive. If the results of Wang’s thesis would be examined against other researches on coups in contemporary times, one would find Wang’s results to be consistent. Professor Owen also highlighted another result of Wang’s thesis to be the lack of social mobilization roles in the coups, perhaps since coups were mostly enclosed within particular circles of interest.

A group work session started after dividing the participants into two groups. These two groups were asked to reflect on Wang’s thesis and discuss on issues of the methodology adopted, the proposed theoretical information and how this was linked to practice in the thesis. After a half hour of interactive and vigorous group discussions, participants were asked to present their observations. The groups shared a combination of similar observations that agreed with Professor Owen’s presentation. However, there were specific comments set forth by either group; for instance, Group II found two methodologies in the thesis namely qualitative (factor
behind coups) and quantitatively (numbers of coups over a period of time). The weaknesses identified by the groups lay in fact that the thesis failed to consider coups plotted by military personnel without success, perhaps because these were not disclosed by the media. It was also recognized that the thesis lacked multiple source input and demonstrated a great reliance on newspaper sources, and that military commanders directly involved in the coups were not interviewed—a factor that both groups made much emphasis on. Even though the thesis proposed a minimal or lack of social mobilization participation in coups, the groups enlisted many instances in the thesis that reflected elements of social mobilization fueling coups.

The assumption that coups were less likely to occur in French colonies was dismissed, for this does not translate as true for Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, and Chad etc. The time frame of 10 years used for this article was also subject to criticism from the groups; this was observed to lack an important historical background. Ethnicity as a factor in the coups seemed to be missing in the article as identified by the groups. Alternatives suggested for broadening the data collection mechanisms included interviews, though it is unrealistic in the contexts of the coups. In essence, therefore, a reader could not see much decisive factoring arms in relation to the coups mentioned in the article. A major point of discussion was, hence, that the title of the article did not necessarily match the content.

Reflection on the Day

Participants declared that they had acquired more in-depth critical skills to analyze the relation between arms transfer and conflict, and a deeper understanding of the use of quantitative research methodology in largely qualitative research, apart from gaining much benefit from the discussion about early warning systems and implications for human security. The guidance offered by the facilitator was appreciated and referred to have been ‘thorough’. The group work session was deemed to have been one of learning and reflection on literature review practices. Also some participants said that they had benefited from the discussions on variables, the strengths and weaknesses of data, events analysis and triangulation. UPEACE/IDRC collaboration in making the training a successful event was also commended and the facilitator, Professor Owen, was thanked for effective delivery of content backed by relevant examples and discussions along with providing opportunity to deal with researcher fears about the quantitative research methodology and its meaning for peace and conflict research.

Day Five: Wednesday 28th October, 2009

Plenary 11 (Morning): Seminar on Peace Research Continued

Session 10: Using Theory to Analyze the Results of Findings of Qualitative Research
Presenter: Professor Susan van Zyl

This session focused on a detailed discussion on research components. It also explored, inter alia, the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the participants’ research projects, focusing on the relationship between theory and interpretation in qualitative and mixed method researches.

Professor Zyl mentioned that research components are broken down into five fundamental parts. These five parts of a body of research, however, do not necessarily reflect five chapters/sections. The parts were elaborated by comparing them with the fingers of the human hand, with the length of each hand hinting the amount of content the corresponding part of research should have. The thumb symbolizes the first part which constitutes the *background*. 
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Here, the researcher is expected to demonstrate past events gearing the topic of interest as well as the rationale for the study. The second part, depicted by the index finger, corresponds to the literature review, where the researcher is expected to reveal previously existing literary works on the topic. The literature review gives the researcher a sense of what to expect at the later stages of data collection. In some cases, the researcher may be required to combine the literature review and methodology in one chapter. The third part represented by the third finger contains the findings section in which the researcher presents the results of field work or evidential content; this part tends to be bulky. The fourth part represented by the fourth finger is the discussions/analysis part of the research. In this section, the researcher discusses the information produced following the field work by essentially articulating this with the reviewed literature and methodology. In addition, one may discuss the input previously implicit in the proposal, so that a drift back into the initial thoughts of the researcher could produce what is called a ‘model’ in research. The research questions may also be used to structure this section for there is a probability that one may find new categories of information that has not been included in the research tools. The fifth part that corresponds to the little finger on the human hand is the conclusion and recommendation section of the research. In the conclusion, hence, the researcher declares what s/he has set out to find so as to support the content in the first part of the research paper. On a final note, it was stated that it is important to bear in mind that these five sections/components articulate each other.

Another issue discussed was concerning the usage of theory as a guide to writing the discussion section of a research paper. Here, it was explained that the use of theory primarily involves establishing a relationship between the reviewed literature and the methodology used in the research. The concept of using an overarching theory followed by more specific and related theories was also highlighted. This was backed by comments from participants regarding theories they had chosen for their researches and how they intended to articulate these theories. A number of researchers mentioned that they have chosen the John Paul Lederach’s integrated frameworks in peace and conflict for their respective research works. Other theories mentioned include the livelihood theory, location theory, theory of Multi-National Companies (MNCs), social movement theory and post-traumatic stress theory, amongst others. On a final note, the Professor urged the researchers to make an important consideration on how they could fit a selected set of theory/theories into the field work.

**VII. Closing Ceremony**

The closing ceremony was composed of closing remarks by Dr. Elias Cheboud, Professor Ayele Meshesha and Dr. Jean-Bosco Butera. In addition to these remarks, final comments from participants were also incorporated in this session.

**Closing Remarks by Dr. Elias Cheboud**

Dr. Cheboud began his remarks by declaring that this first training, which is part of three consecutive trainings intended to build the capacity of the PhD fellows and doctoral research awardees, had come to an end. He then thanked the UPEACE staff for their devotion and hard work in materializing the training. The facilitators were also commended for delivering insightful presentations that provoked thought and formed a basis for further learning in topics related to qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. He further declared that in addition to meeting the training objectives, the training had also created a platform for PhD awardees to present and discuss their research topics in detail. Dr. Cheboud also forwarded encouragement for the researchers by stating that their research works would be of paramount significance not only in contributing to the emerging issues of peace research in the continent but also in
narrowing the gap that exists in peace researches on Africa. Concluding his remarks, Dr. Cheboud announced that the initial plan to have the next training in March 2010 had been substituted with a new schedule for the last week of May 2010 or early June, after considering the inadequate time span the initially proposed date would impose on the researchers before coming back to Ethiopia for the second training. The agenda for the next training was briefly discussed and was made to include an experience sharing session between the new batch of awardees and the former ones.

**Evaluation of the Training**

The evaluator, Professor Meshesha, indicated that he had witnessed a considerable learning experience amongst the participants and further expressed his gratitude to the facilitators, for he, in the process, was also able to receive a learning experience from the training. Professor Meshesha then explained to the participants about the second evaluation method that would involve their inputs. Subsequently, he requested the participants to reflect on the outcomes of the training which would be compared with the initial evaluation done at the start of the training.

**Final Comments from Participants**

Some of the participants, after thanking UPEACE and IDRC for organizing the training workshop, affirmed that the training has exceeded their previous expectations. They, in addition, mentioned that the training was characterized by a positive atmosphere which has provoked their thought and encouraged them to engage in discussions. Furthermore, participants noted that there was an abundant knowledge sharing experience caused by the reflections of the research proposal presentations made by their fellow PhD awardees. What the participants termed as an ‘impressive standard’ was the style of presentation adopted by the facilitators and the materials selected to back the training. There was also much appreciation for the encouragement given by the organizers to publish research works that the researchers might have done in the past or intended to do in the future.

Additionally, the participants thanked the UPEACE staff for assisting them with accommodation, transportation and the overall hospitality they received starting from the initial stages of communication to attend the training. The training was praised as well for having been well organized in terms of logistics, timing and delivery. The exposure to the different types of research tools was also commended and termed to have been a source of new learning with new opportunities to fortify research. Furthermore, the participants emphasized that one of the goals of the exercise had been to create networks of African researchers that some of the researchers called upon the need to produce more research that would not only present scientific information but would also help impact the lives of the ordinary African population. At last, they thanked the evaluator for creating a basis to capture events of the workshop that would serve as a yardstick for similar events in the future.

**Concluding Remarks by Dr. Jean Bosco Butera**

Dr. Butera remarked that he felt the training has imparted great benefits to the participants, judging from the comments he gathered from participants and colleagues. He stated that, in addition to the fact that the training had been able to considerably contribute towards a successful academic achievement, it had also achieved the other major objective of UPEACE-IDRC workshop, which was to bring researchers together and create networks amongst increasing numbers of African researchers in peace and conflict studies. He further thanked and congratulated the participants for their contributions, and reminded them of the competitive
nature of the ensuing research they embarked on. Dr. Butera noted that the outputs from the researches will be valued as a representation of their respective universities and communities. He also expressed his hope of seeing the product of this interaction, which he advised should be driven by the goal of creating conditions to impact and/or change communities. Dr. Butera then proceeded to offer his gratitude to the facilitators for their commitment and delivery of the training. He further quoted Professor Owen’s remark regarding the need for research publications and added that UPEACE-IDRC would initiate work to bring together previous PhD awardees in contact with this new group of awardees so as to share experiences and explore opportunities for publications and strengthening the initiated endeavor.

In addition, he called on the researchers to be ‘focal points’ for engagement and involvement with UPEACE as well as with their respective communities. He also encouraged researchers in all levels (graduate and undergraduates) to involve in the capacity building processes of peace and conflict studies. In fact, Dr. Butera gave some highlights about the upcoming workshop; he has indicated that two peace researchers, eleven Doctoral Research Awardees and two PhD Fellows will be included in the workshop training.

This will be more interesting because the researchers can share experiences of the work done and modalities of submitting articles for peer review and possible publication in the APCJ. In conclusion, Dr. Butera thanked the facilitators, participants and colleagues both at IDRC and UPEACE for a successful workshop. Last but not least, he extended his gratitude for the evaluator, Professor Meshesha, for committing his time and effort to evaluate the training. In the end, Dr. Butera bade the participants’ farewell with final words of encouragement.
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Annex Two: Workshop Agenda

UPEACE – Africa Programme:
Peace Research Training Workshop
October 26 - 30, 2009
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Venue: Hilton Hotel

Day One: Monday, October 26, 2009

07:00 – 08:15 Breakfast
08:15 – 08:30 Participants Pick-up from Jupiter to Hilton Hotel
08:30 – 09:00 Registration
09:00 – 09:05 Welcome Remarks – Dr. Jean Bosco Butera
   Director, UPEACE Africa Programme
09:05 – 09:10 Remarks by Ms. Rita Bowry, Senior Program Specialist, IDRC Training and
   Awards Program, Ottawa
09:10 – 10:00 Introductions of the workshop and Participant's
   Self-introduction (Dr. Elias Cheboud)
10:00 – 10:30 Introduction on Workshop Evaluation
   (Prof. Ayele Meshesha)
10:30 – 11:00 Group Photo & Tea Break
11:00 – 13:00 Research Proposal Presentation
   (5 minutes maximum with 2 minutes reflection)
Doctoral Researchers

1. **Ayo Whetho**: “Natural Resources, Profit and Peace: Multinational Corporations and Conflict Transformation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.”

2. **Daisy Owomugasho**: “The Impact of EAC and COMESA Regional Integration Arrangements on Uganda’s Economic Growth”.


4. **Umurerwa Rosemarie Aurore**: “The Effective Reintegration of Female Ex-Combatants: Rwanda as Case Study.”

5. **Alex Namu Kamwaria** “Integration of Indigenous Social Healing Approaches into the Western Models of Psychosocial Healing for the Southern Sudan Victims of Armed Conflict”

6. **Chris, M.A. Kwaja**: “Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Security Sector Reform in West Africa: The Liberian Experience”.


8. **Kizito Sabala**: “Small Arms and Human Security among the Pastoral Communities of the IGAD Region: The Case of the Turkana”


10. **Sidonia Angom**: “Women in the Peacemaking and Peacebuilding Process in Northern Uganda”.

PHD Fellows

11. **Denis Musinguzi**: “Conflict Resolution and Sustainable Reconciliation in Northern Uganda: Using John Paul Lederach’s Integrated Framework for Peacebuilding”.

12. **Tom Ogwang**: “State vis-à-vis Human Security: Examining the Challenges and Prospects of Resettlement and Integration of the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Northern Uganda”.

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 **Professor Susan van Zyl**
Key Ingredients of the Research Proposal (Protocol):

The workshop will focus on the key components of a research proposal, including the Aim, Rationale, Methodology and the Literature Review; participants will be taken step-by-step through the processes that are needed to produce a coherent proposal.

15:30 – 16:00 Tea Break

16:00 – 17:30 Professor Susan van Zyl

This session will focus on what is arguably the most challenging aspect of any doctoral level proposal, namely the literature review. During this session, participants will be asked to describe the bodies of literature that they will be working with to ground their proposed research. Thereafter, possible ways of organizing this literature will be discussed.

Day Two: Tuesday, October 27, 2009

09:00 – 10:30 Professor Susan van Zyl

Assessing and Interpreting Qualitative Data:

The training will begin with a discussion of the nature of qualitative data, and some of the ways of assessing the quality (or usefulness) of the material already gathered. Using interview transcripts, responses to open-ended questions on questionnaires, life stories and policy documents as examples, the workshop will suggest ways in which the preliminary processing of qualitative data can be undertaken.

10:30 – 11:00 Tea Break

11:00 – 13:00 Professor Susan van Zyl

This session will be devoted to a detailed discussion of the different methods which could be used to interpret interview transcripts and policy documents. It will, for example, consider some of the ways in which Thematic Content analysis and Discourse analysis can be combined to produce credible, in-depth interpretations of the data yielded by means of interviews and document collection.

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 Professor Susan van Zyl

This session will explore the question of the relationship between qualitative and quantitative data and the ways in which the two forms of data collection can be most effectively combined.

15:30 – 16:00 Tea Break
16:00 – 17:30 Professor Susan van Zyl

Building on the previous session, this workshop will focus on Case Study research as one of the research traditions most often associated with Mixed Methods approaches.

19:00 – 21:00 Reception – Yod Abyssinia Cultural Restaurant

Day Three: Wednesday, October 28, 2009

09:00 – 10:30 Professor Owen Sichone

Quantitative Methods for Peace Research: Peace research is inherently quantitative as researchers need to measure substantive issues such as the frequency and intensity of conflict or the determination of military expenditures in different countries. This seminar will discuss Ron Smith's seven questions for quantitative researchers and relate them to U-Peace Fellows' research projects.

10:30 – 11:00 Tea Break

11:00 – 13:00 Professor Owen Sichone

Research variables and hypotheses testing (RE: keywords – estimation, hypothesis, null hypothesis and parametric statistics)

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 Professor Owen Sichone

Descriptive statistics and graphic data presentation (RE: keywords – frequency distribution, upper and lower limit, variance, normal distribution, standard deviation)

15:30 – 16:00 Tea Break

16:00 – 17:30 Professor Owen Sichone

The use of international conflict, war and related datasets in peace research (RE: Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset)

Day Four: Thursday, October 29, 2009

09:00 – 10:30 Professor Owen Sichone
Model building in peace research
(RE: Analyzing Shifts in International Conflict from Quality of Life Indicators)

10:30 – 11:00 Tea Break

11:00 – 13:00 **Professor Owen Sichone**

**Events Analysis**, (RE: Integrated Data for Events Analysis (IDEA): An Event Typology for Automated Events Data Development)

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 **Professor Owen Sichone**

**Quantitative - Case Study for Open Discussion** (RE: Arms Transfers and Coups d'Etat: A Study on Sub-Saharan Africa)

15:30 – 16:00 Tea Break

16:00– 17:30 **Professor Owen Sichone** (Continued)

---

**Day Five: Friday, October 30, 2009**

09:00 – 10:30 **Professor Susan van Zyl**

Using Theory to Analyze the Results or Findings of Qualitative Research:
This workshop will begin with an exploration of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the participants' research projects, focusing on the relationship between theory and interpretation in qualitative and Mixed Methods research.

10:30 – 11:00 Tea Break

11:00 – 13:00 **Professor Susan van Zyl**

Using Theory to Analyze the Findings of Qualitative Research:-
This workshop will apply the more general guidelines discussed in the earlier session to the participant’s own research with a view to considering what particular theories each researcher could most profitably use in analyzing his/her research findings or results.

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:00 Reflection

15:00 – 16:00 Evaluation & Closing Ceremony