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Executive summary

The Africa Programme of the United Nations mandated University for Peace (UPEACE) organized a workshop on “Research Methodology” from 17th September to 28th September 2012 at the African Union, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The workshop was undertaken as one of the activities of the project on “Strengthening Research for Governance and Security in Sub-Saharan Africa”, which is financed by the International Development Research Center (IDRC).

15 Doctoral researchers and PhD Fellows of the UPEACE-IDRC Doctoral Researchers and PhD Fellows programme took part in the workshop. 11 of the 15 candidates were doctoral awardees and 4 PhD fellows, who all are registered at different sub-Saharan African universities. This workshop is the first delivered to the third cohort of researchers. Previously, six similar workshops were delivered to 26 Doctoral Researchers and PhD Fellows, focused on peace, conflict and development.

The workshop had four areas of focus: theoretical foundations in governance and security studies, research methodology, writing policy briefs in relation to governance and security studies, and using software and social media tools to conduct research.

The theoretical part briefly dealt with the philosophical and sociological context of key security theories in international studies and current trends and issues on governance in Africa. The research methodology covered data generation and collection techniques, and analysis. Besides, data analysis softwares such as NVivo and SPSS were discussed. The aspect of social media tools included trainings on mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis together with the demonstration of software packets relevant for undertaking a research.

Policy makers from regional organizations, namely the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the African Union (AU) also facilitated sessions on Governance and Security respectively. The facilitators put light to real issues on the ground as well as conducted sessions on writing policy briefs. Moreover, Mr. Wane EL-Ghassim, Director, Peace and Security Department, African Union Commission also provided an overview of peace and security situation in Africa in relation to the work of the Peace and Security Department of the African Union (AU).

Workshop activities also included participants’ presentations on their proposal with feed backs from peers and facilitators.
I. Welcoming Remarks

The workshop was officially opened by Dr. Jean-Bosco Butera, Director of the UPEACE Africa Programme, with warm welcoming remarks to participants and expressed the pleasure of UPEACE Africa Programme in organizing and hosting the workshop.

He then gave a brief description of the programme stating that 15 Doctoral researchers and PhD Fellows of the UPEACE-IDRC PhD Fellowships and Doctoral Research Awards Programme were selected as part of the UPEACE Africa Programme’s endeavor to build Sub-Saharan Africa’s capacity in governance and security. 11 of the 15 selected were Doctoral Researchers and 4 PhD fellows, registered in different Sub-Saharan African Universities. The Doctoral Researchers came from seven African Universities: Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia; University of Buea, Cameroon; Covenant University, Nigeria; University of Cape Town, South Africa; University of Dar-es-Salem, Tanzania; University of Witwatersrand, South Africa; and University of Yaoundé II, Cameroon. On the other hand, the 4 PhD Fellows come from University of Witwatersrand and KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa; Sudan University of Science and Technology; and Mbarara Science and Technology University, Uganda.

Dr. Butera stated that this is the 3rd cohort since UPEACE and IDRC teamed up to begin the process of strengthening Africa’s research capacity. The first two were part of the first phase of 26 candidates that focused on peace, conflict and development where as the second phase focuses on governance and security. The Director finally thanked, Ms. Njeri Karuru for participating in all of the workshops and for sharing the commitment and passion to build African’s research capacity in peace, governance, security and development.

Ms. Njeri Karuru, Senior Programme Specialist, IDRC Governance, Security and Justice, was the next speaker. Ms. Karuru stated that the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was established by the Canadian Government to build research capacity in the developing world. Furthermore, she stated that IDRC has offices in Africa (Nairobi and Cairo), Asia and Latin America. She further explained that the core objective of the Governance, Security and Justice programme is to generate knowledge, build capacity and influence policy, through capacity building initiatives. In this regard, she expressed her enthusiasm to see the PhD Fellows and Doctoral Researchers produce policy briefs to share their knowledge with policy makers, complying with their commitments.

Ms. Karuru’s remarks were followed by participant introductions. A total of fifteen participants, from ten African countries participated in the workshop.
II. Course Evaluation

The introductory session was followed by a review of course evaluation procedures. In his remarks, Dr. Fidelis Allen explained that he will focus on all of the sessions and the process will be ongoing throughout the training programme. He also said that he would be happy to accept feedback on sessions at any time. This was followed by a request for participants to fill out pre-workshop evaluations forms.

III. Account of Proceedings

Day One, Monday, 17th September 2012
Theoretical Foundation in Governance and Security Studies
by Prof. Kenneth Omeje

The first two days on Monday September 17th and Tuesday September 18th were covered by Kenneth Omeje, Professor of International Relations at United States International University (USIU), Nairobi, Kenya. In these sessions, Professor Omeje discussed the philosophical underpinnings of the social sciences, as well as the historical debates in international studies in relation to the postulates of Positivism, Post-Positivism, Critical Theory, Post-Modernism, Discourse Analysis, and Behaviouralism. Further, the philosophical foundations of governance, conflict and security studies were also discussed.

Philosophy in Social Sciences

The term, ‘Philosophy’ emanates from the Greek word, ‘Philo-Sophia’, which etymologically means ‘Love of Wisdom’. Philosophy is about the generation of knowledge that embodies both the empirical and metaphysical knowledge. According to Karl Popper, “philosophy is an attempt to get nearer to a true of the world, a view that corresponds to the facts” (in Singer, 1974).¹ Philosophy is as old as the existence of humanity; however, scholarly philosophy emerged around the 6th century BC in Greece. It challenged the dominant ecclesiastical and traditional methods like revelation, superstition, and tradition. It also represented a secular departure from the orthodoxy; questioning everything without respect for boundaries and limitations. Originally Philosophy comprised all fields of intellectual inquiry. Later on, different fields branched out at different periods in history. The main branches of philosophy are logic, ethics, metaphysics, epistemology, and the philosophy of different subject areas.

The subject matter of the social sciences focuses on the understanding of human behaviour and relations, social institutions, underlying cultures,

social events and the world around us. Research philosophy centres on the debate about social reality, which is about how people obtain their knowledge and understand issues. Social science researchers have different ontological and epistemological positions. For instance, foundationalists believe that there is a real social world that can be independently investigated. On the other hand, anti-foundationalists argue that the social world and its constituent elements are socially constructed. Between and within the two paradigms are various schools of thoughts.

Meta-Theory is a key concept in social research as it philosophically interrogates the content of a theory. Thus, it explores the underlying assumptions of a theory and attempts to understand the consequences of such assumptions on the act of theorizing and the practice of empirical research. Therefore, social science theorizing is essentially based on meta-theoretical assumptions about ontology, epistemology and methodology. In particular, ontology and epistemology are central to philosophy of social research.

Ontology is defined as the theory of being or existence. In social science research, ontology is concerned with determining the nature of the social world, such as the subject matter of the social sciences; the existence of a social world that is independent of one’s knowledge, will and consciousness; the presence of essential differences between genders, ethnic groups, or social classes irrespective of time and space. On the other hand, epistemology is concerned with knowledge production; how people come to know what they know. Research is always conducted based on some fundamental epistemological assumptions; for instance, the research question/problem one chooses and the manner it is framed can define and influence the findings.

Epistemology is an important aspect of PhD training as it has to do with interrogating and rethinking perceived knowledge in a critical and persuasive way. Thus, the philosophical content of a PhD course is fundamental as it inspires the questioning and rethinking of orthodoxies in a critical manner.

According to Karl Popper, there are different worlds: the physical world, which refers to materials including tables and computers and the world of consciousness that has to do with the mind, spirits, memory, intuition … etc. There are also dualists, who believe in the existence of the two worlds. According to Popper, the world of objective knowledge refers to the world of objective reality that is independent of the will and consciousness of the knower. Thus, the objective world influences the physical world through subjective knowledge. This makes his position very dialectical and irreconcilable.

**Methodology**
Methodology deals with the general approach to studying research topics. At a philosophical level, methodology centres on the means by which social knowledge is created. Some scholars believe that research methodology must be objective, empirical and scientific. Others, on the other hand, argue that the notion of science itself is a contested space as there are different sciences even within the social science both in terms of disciplines and paradigmatic frameworks.

In the methodology of research, the relationship between the researcher and the knowledge s/he is producing raises very serious philosophical issues. It is debatable, for instance, whether researchers are completely detached from the knowledge they produce, given that they are human beings, who have feelings, interest and values that might impact on the research process and ultimately on the knowledge they are producing. Thus, how one designs data collection and analysis can inform the findings. Further, the way one frames his/her research questions and the kind of questions s/he asks can be influenced by the researcher's ideological and scholastic agenda and knowledge.

Research Methodology is divided into three components: types of data, methods of data collection and methods of data analysis. Thus, researchers should ensure that their research processes are logically interrelated. Moreover, they need to be mindful of the research convention and traditions within their universities and the dominant school of thought. Even within the social sciences, some universities are more oriented towards a particular paradigm than another. For instance, social science faculties in most American universities, until recently, followed the tradition of quantitative research, while many European universities follow the qualitative research tradition.

Historical debates in international studies

International Studies encompasses various disciplines, including governance and security, which are the focus of the UPEACE-IDRC Doctoral Research scheme. The field of International studies has witnessed the emergence of various theories over time such as Idealism, Realism and the Behavioural Revolution. Philosophical Idealists emerged after World War I. Moved by the horror of the war, they tried to create a new discipline on how to study international systems, focusing mainly on creating international institutions, laws and conventions. They assumed that if international institutions, laws and conventions are created, then it is possible to regulate how states should behave. Within a few years, however, they were proved wrong by the emergence of World War II, which was more catastrophic than World War I. Then, Realism emerged, which argued that international law can’t manage the anarchic structure of the international system. A leading conceptual
contribution of Realism to research is the argument that ‘the international system is made up of anonymous structures and systems that have their own way of influencing and determining the behaviour of individual social actors or agents’. This argument has ignited the agency - structure debate, i.e. whether it is the structure of an institution or the human nature of the office holder (social actor) that takes precedence in social action.

The Behaviouralist Revolution

The Behaviouralist Revolution occurred from the 1950s to 1970s. David Singer & Morton Kaplan were among the chief proponents. Behaviouralists were mostly concerned about the rigours of our science as opposed to whether or not social reality can be studied scientifically. They criticized previous approaches such as Idealism and Realism, for being enamoured to a more historicist and interpretivist approach to international studies. In behaviourism, adherence to positivist cannons reached a crescendo - collection of sufficient observable data, identification of patterns in data analysis, etc. Quantitative methods, application of advanced statistics and mathematical modelling were key to the behaviouralist epistemology. Behaviouralism was mostly championed by American social scientists. Nonetheless, strong criticisms against the perspective came from many British scholars who inveighed the theory for trying to measure concepts in an empirically quantitative way.

Positivism

Positivism has been the dominant epistemological paradigm in the social sciences since the industrial revolution. It is a theory of science largely premised on an empiricist methodology, which considers data collection and systematizing as core elements. Most positivists believe that valid data for social science knowledge should be limited to what one can observe, measure and experience. Objectivism is another key principle in positivist epistemology. Positivists are empiricists and believe that social laws, akin to natural laws in the natural sciences, can be established about social reality. Positivists do not generally accord any significant ontological value to unobservable entities and any social world independent of humanity. Social knowledge must have an instrumental function; must be objectively useful but not subjectively truthful (Singer, 1974).

A Critique of Positivism

Positivists have been criticized for entirely focusing on the material world, while there are more things beyond, which human beings may not know and understand. Another criticism of positivism is centred on exponents’ emphasis on objectivity. Critics argue that reality is a subjective experience. Furthermore, positivism does not recognize the values human beings hold and
how it can influence research, theories and theorizing. In this regard, Post-Positivists argue that researchers cannot detach themselves from the research they conduct. Thus, both objectivity and neutrality are neither possible nor desirable in research. Another criticism against positivism is that of its rigid adherence to natural science methodology which exponents profess to be a universal methodology applicable to all science. In this respect, Post-Positivists argue that methodologically there is no universal methodology that can apply to every research. Therefore, the whole issue of positivist science and recommending a universal methodology is both a fallacy and infeasible.

**Post-Positivism**

Post-Positivism rejects positivism as a valid approach to the study of the social sciences. In post-positivism, social reality is multiple, subjective, dynamic, and mentally constructed by individuals; thus, they call for multiple methods of study. Post-positivism has been generally influenced by verificationists (Carnapians) and falsificationists (Popperians). Logical empiricists like Rudulf Carnap advocate the necessity of verifying theories and assertions (distinguishing sense from nonsense) with positive examples as a condition for their acceptability. They argue that verification is about interrogating assumptions, theories and hypothesis to make sure that they correspond to empirical facts.

As opposed to verification, critical rationalists like Karl Popper assert that theories can only be corroborated by repeated attempts at falsification (loosely testability and refutation). Popper’s falsification is not about distinguishing sense from nonsense, but is concerned with separating scientific theories from various forms of “pseudo-science” e.g. Marxism and psychoanalysis] (Singer, 1974). Popper argues that by claiming to explain anything and everything with universal applicability, theories like Marxism and Freudian psychoanalysis tend to evade refutation at the cost of their scientific status. Pseudo-scientific theories are inherently defensive and fail to make claims that might be falsified. Due to exceptionalism, Popper argues that most scientific theories cannot be conclusively verified as there is always the possibility of falsifying them.

**Critical Theory**

---


3 Peter Singer, *op cit.*
Critical theory is one of the schools of thought of Post-Positivism, which emerged during the Cold War era. Advocates of critical theory reject key assumptions of positivist social science such as belief in objective discoverable reality external to the investigator; the distinction between social subject (the analyst) and object (the focus of analysis). Critical theory stands for emancipatory knowledge; knowledge to empower and emancipate individuals/groups from the oppressive structures of hegemonic politics and theories. Robert Cox makes a distinction between emancipatory knowledge and the positivist problem-solving knowledge. He claims that the former aims to empower the subalterns while the later aims to maintain the hegemonic status quo, albeit pretending to be neutral. Critics regard the claim of ‘objective theorizing’ as the fallacy of positivist social science in general; they argue that scientific knowledge of international studies in the social world is impossible. Post-positivist social science condemns structuralist explanations and grand theorizing as pseudo-science. They advocate for context-specific knowledgeable explanations, but not objective account.

Critical theorists focus on international political economy like issues of regional security, international security, international political economy, and international organizations like IMF, WB, AU, EU, etc. They contend that international politics and international law are constructed by powerful state actors through a dynamic process. Therefore, the values and interests of the powerful states are reflected in the international institutions and international laws. Consequently, they contest the neutrality of the institutions and the process of research as well.

Post-Modernism

Post-modernism is the other school of thought of Post-Positivism, which started as a rebellious intellectual project in post World War II, France. Post-Modernism is a complicated, nebulous intellectual movement. Chief proponents of post-modernism include Michel Foucault and Richard Ashley. Exponents reject the claim about infinite and universal progress in the modernist and modernization project, the enlightenment philosophy. It is a radical re-appraisal of all modernist assumptions about civilization. They argue that social science is not neutral but historical, cultural, political and therefore biased. Empirical theory of human behaviour [at the heart of positivist social science] is a myth and everything involving humans is subjective.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is an interrogative analysis of the content of language, written texts, theories and institutional structure/behaaviours with a view to revealing their underlying power relations, assumptions and the interests they tend to maximize in society. It is a multi-faceted method that subsumes the various strands of post-positivist approach to investigation and analysis. The
method is used in different fields, notable languages, philosophy, history and in the core social sciences. In its common linguistic usage, ‘discourse’ generally refers to connected writings, speeches or conversation. From a post-structuralist view of language, Michel Foucault defines discourse as ‘a system of representation made up of rules of conduct, established texts and institutions, which regulates the meanings and practices, which can and cannot be produced.’

In discourse analysis, meaning or meaningful reality is not discovered but constructed in the interaction process, which occurs between people. This process is known as social constructivism. Language is central to social interaction and the construction of meaning, including in research. Different people may construct meaning or knowledge in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon. Discourse analysis is interested in power relations between social actors and how it influences the changing constructions of meaning. Hence, discourses set the context and limits of knowledge.

Day Two, Tuesday, 18th September 2012
Theoretical Foundation in Governance and Security Studies with focus on Philosophical and Sociological Aspects of Security
by Prof. Kenneth Omeje

The concept of security is a highly contested one. The contested issues are:

1. ‘whose’ security?; security for ‘whom’ or for which values (i.e. the referent object to be made secure)
2. Security from ‘what’ – the threat object?
3. ‘how’ to provide security
4. Some scholars are also concerned with the degree of security – how much security? – full, absolute, optimum, partial security and how do you measure it – are they achievable?
5. By what means do you provide security and at what cost; over what time frame?

Neo-realists like Arnold Wolfers insist that these empirical specifications are important in security policy (national security). It is debateable how much of these specifications are required in security research.

Writing from various perspectives, most experts argue that security is definitionally concerned with ‘freedom,’ or ‘emancipation,’ from threats to core values for both individuals and groups. Security is valued by individuals, families, communities, state officials, states, regions, etc.
Security complex

Barry Buzan defines Security Complex as “a set of states whose major security perceptions and concerns are interlinked that whiter national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from each other.” The concept is used in the analysis of states and interstate relations especially with regard to politico-military issues.

The General security perspectives in international studies have since the end of World War II been dominated by the theory of (neo)realism which argues that like human beings, states are inherently acquisitive in nature and therefore security can ultimately be attained through military violence or coercion.

In neo-realism, the state is the primary referent of security. According to Stephen Walt’s (1991:212) neo-realist definition: ‘security has to do with the threats, use and control of military force in the context of the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent or engage in war’. Walt, like most neo-realists, privileges military power as the decisive instrument in achieving security. As such, security is conceived by proponents in terms of the management and control of predictable risks and threats to the state. Trying to create security by building military might is likely to trigger insecurity in other countries, which would in turn instigate them to embark on stronger military security policy thereby triggering and accentuating an arms race.

Since security as defined from the dominant realist perspective is essentially state-centric, the end of the Cold War occasioned the need to redefine security from non-military perspectives in order to accommodate the interests and needs of a larger spectrum of humanity. In this respect, the notion of Human Security came to the fore through the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report.

Exponents of the Copenhagen school apply a constructivist approach to the study of security, arguing that security threats do not objectively exist in a positivist sense but are inter-subjectively constructed by powerful actors. The Copenhagen School substitutes the ‘state’ with the notion of ‘society’ as the referent object of security. Ole Waever et al (1993:23) posit that ‘the main

---


units of analysis for societal security are politically significant ethno-national and religious identities.” Furthermore, he argues that if the state falls apart, people will certainly go back to their natural state by clinging to their primordial identity groups. Primordial Identity and people’s conception of what threatens their identity are therefore crucial factors in security. This type of security threat can best be managed through whatever conceptualized as securitization. Securitization is simply concerned with ‘why’ and ‘how’ issues are factored into the state’s security agenda. An issue is defined as a security problem - in Waever’s terminology, securitized – as a way to justifiably & legitimately enable state officials gain a handle on it. It is also the basis for state officials to take extraordinary measures (e.g. allocation of state resources) to control or combat the identified issue or threat.

Another contending theory, Critical Security Studies (CSS), focuses attention on the individual rather than the state, as the main referent of security theory and politics. Approaching security from a post-positivist paradigm, proponents are of the view that nothing can be referred as ‘objective’ while dealing with security circumstances. The theory is highly critical of the (neo)realist approach in which security policies privilege the state as a dominant actor and further argues that, if security intellectuals need to take sides, it is better to identify with vulnerable groups with a view to empowering them. Security of individuals should therefore matter more than that of the state as the state is not trustworthy; thus, bypassing the state by bringing in, and relying on influential community leaders/actors who have the interest of vulnerable individuals at heart is the most reliable strategy to reach the marginalized. This strategy, however, has not been feasible in practice as the state is a formidable actor that cannot be completely dispensed with. Consequently, influential community agents and civil society organizations that proponents have proposed as substitutes for the state are not neutral but also interest-driven actors.

In CSS, security is conceptualized by many exponents like Ken Booth, Wyn Jones and Peter Vale as human emancipation from all forms of economic, social and cultural barriers to enable individuals have the freedom to undertake what they want to do. CSS greatly influenced the human security paradigm with its emphasis on development issues such as poverty reduction, environmental protection, human rights protection; and disease control; issues that generally excite and engage the attention of different Civil Society Organizations.

**Security in the third world context: a subaltern realist perspective**

According to the subaltern realist theory formulated by Mohamed Ayoob, an Indian American, who borrows his nomenclature from the Indian subaltern’s school of history, scholars from the global South must think in the Third World
context while specifically dealing with the subject of security. Ayoob argues that one cannot do away with the state because of its centrality to security politics in developing countries. He sees domestic threats as the greatest threat to the security and sovereignty of Third World states in the post-Cold War dispensation.

When a state is weak as is the case with most Third World states, it cannot assert itself in the international community. Thus, it is important to focus security on ways of capacitating the Third World states to enable them achieve effective statehood beyond just the juridical statehood they presently enjoy. Ayoob argues that (neo)realism is a hegemonic theory that rationalizes and advances the global dominance of powerful states. This is why Ayoob sees the need to propound a theory that can enable the subaltern states of the Third World overcome their internal divisions (mostly ethnic, religious and cultural) to build a strong coherent and developmentalist state capable of asserting real power in the international system.

**Conflict as a Governance Threat**

Conflict is defined as a kind of uneasy relationship or struggle prevalent between parties in pursuit of different or incompatible goals. The incompatibility of goals could be centred on values of money, religion, power, competition for scarce resources, etc. Conflicts occur in all societies such as between employee and employer, co-employees, families, a husband and wife, and so on. Consequently, researchers should critically consider the level in which they are dealing with conflict issues.

There are three major philosophical debates on the issue of conflict: (i) whether conflict is inevitable in society or not, (ii) if conflict entirely has a negative connotation or not, and (iii) whether all conflicts are resolvable or not.

Workshop participants reflected on the three different debates. In this respect, the majority of the participants seemed inclined to the understanding that conflict in inevitable. The issue of whether conflict is nurtured or inherent in human nature was also debated. Furthermore, some of the participants argued that conflict is not inherently negative as some conflicts can have legitimate causes and ultimately positive outcomes. Others, however, espoused a contrary view; whereas a few remarked that it is all dependent on the perceptions of the conflicting parties. Some were of the view that the negative or positive effects of a conflict can only be determined based on the interpretation of its outcomes. On the subject as to whether every conflict is resolvable or not, participants expressed divided opinions which they supported with different examples.

Conflict has different cycles such as conflict formation stage, escalation; summit stage, amicable settlement, de-escalation, zero point and settlement
stage, and the entire process could be revived again based on same, correlated or a different set of interests and parties. Conflict analysts tend to make a distinction between conflict and violent conflict. Violent conflict occurs when parties resort to the use of force to prosecute their case. Most realist and Marxist scholars argue that both conflict and violent conflict are inevitable in modern society.

Conflict theorists also make a distinction between constructive and destructive conflict. The constructiveness or destructiveness of a conflict is to be defined from the standpoint of the victim. A desirable social order is used as a point of reference to help define what a constructive conflict is. Nonetheless, it is debatable from whose perspective a social order can be considered desirable. Most neo-liberal scholars will limit ‘a just social order’ to one that guarantees liberal democratic rights / duties to citizens, and obligations to states.

Many leftist scholars are of the view that for a conflict to lead to constructive and just social order, it must be one that guarantees human security, minimizes or aims to eradicate class inequality, and guarantees wealth redistribution. Further, the issue of constructiveness of a conflict remains seemingly fluid as there is no clear measure to the proportion of violence that can be employed in conflict in order to mitigate collateral damage.

Many participants argued that if a conflict results in a win-win situation, it could be said to have met the test of constructiveness. However, what is meant by ‘win-win’ became a subject of plenary debate. Critics underscored the subjective and temporal nature of ‘win-win;’ what is a ‘win-win’ today might be contested at some other time in future.

Concerning the universal resolvability of conflict, pacifists believe that all conflicts are resolvable by peaceful means. Some of the proponents reason that it is possible to have a conflict-free society. On the other hand, there are other scholars that are of the position that though some conflicts can be resolved, others can only be managed but perhaps not completely resolved.

On the issue of resolvability of a conflict, some theorists stress that a conflict can only be said to be irresolvable in the short-term as in a long run everything is possible. Hence, whether a conflict can be resolvable or not must be seen in its contextual specificity as any generalization could be problematic. A credible analysis should be able to properly contextualize a conflict as there are different parties, states, circumstances, and stakes; therefore, an informed conflict analysis can be made by considering each particular conflict and its underlying context. There are various conventional strategies of handling a conflict, such as conflict prevention, conflict mediation, conflict settlement, conflict management, conflict resolution, and conflict transformation.
Grounded Theory

In grounded theory, the rationale for conducting a research is to originate a problem-solving intervention within a limited or specific context. This approach is very much used in Action Research, which as a matter of structure has both an empirical research phase and a problem-solving intervention component. In philosophical and methodological terms, grounded theory aims to understand a research problem and develop a theory that explains it from the perspective of the researched. Even though a grounded theorist tries to build theory out of empirical data, the method is not inconsistent with triangulation – i.e. the application of multiple paradigms and methods in research data collection and analysis.

Workshop participants were given a practical case study for the purpose of developing and applying a grounded theory.

In addition to the different theories, the Facilitator discussed key aspects that should be included in the process of producing a PhD dissertation, which are explained in the following section.

Content of a PhD Dissertation

A PhD dissertation should include different chapters and aspects. The first section should briefly discuss statement of the research problem, objective of the study and significance of the study. Then, literature review should be covered based on different relevant theories to the study and should be informed by the research questions. In conducting literature reviews, researchers should first try to understand and summarize a study from the point of view of the author before attempting a critique. At the end of the literature review, it is imperative that the student establishes a knowledge gap from the literature as the basis to justify why his/her research should be conducted. Consequently, the research hypotheses should be clearly stated and have to derive from the research questions. The use of research hypotheses is mostly a positivist tendency in research. The research methodology has to cover different aspects like the types of data required for the study, methods of data collection and methods of data analysis. Whether the methodology should be qualitative, quantitative or mixed has to be informed by the subject matter of the research and the candidate’s philosophical orientation.

Theoretical framework is another important aspect of PhD research, albeit a positivist tendency. In developing a theoretical framework of analysis, researchers should give attention to its relevance and application in data analysis. It is important that empirical data are analyzed against the
assumptions of the theory or set of theories advanced in the section on theoretical framework of analysis. The data analysis part is vital to PhD dissertation as it contains the major contribution of the candidate to the field of study. This section must be structured and presented in a coherent and logical sequence.

Researcher should also aim to produce a policy recommendation, usually extracted from the data to guide problem-solving intervention. While doing the policy dimension, it is imperative that each recommendation made must have a sub-title together with detailed narratives. Ultimately, dissertation research and writing is constructed by the researcher. But the structure of a PhD dissertation sometimes depends on each university’s research tradition or regulations. Some universities allow a separate chapter for literature review, while others require that it should fall under chapter one together with research objectives, significance of study, etc. In the same context, some universities insist that methodology must be a chapter of its own whereas others insist that ethical considerations in research must be part of the methodology. In the case of data analysis, it is also advisable and perhaps best practice to use separate chapters to deal with each research objective (or research problem/hypothesis).

Day Three, Wednesday 19th September, 2012
Trends and Current Issues on Governance in Africa
By Dr. Francis Ikome

Day three, Wednesday, 19th September 2012 was covered by, Francis Ikome, PhD, Governance and Public Administration Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Dr. Francis focused on demonstrating the different trends and contemporary notions on governance in Africa. A conceptual clarification and an overview of post Africa’s record on governance were seen in line with colonially inherited governance cultures. Governance within the context of the international community and regional institutions including governance reforms of the 1990s were discussed.

Governance

Governance refers to the behavior and performance of government, including the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority in the management of state affairs at all levels. It consists of a set of legitimate rules and procedures that govern conduct and regulate relationships in all organizations, state and non-state alike. Governance also provides a
framework through which citizens and groups exercise their rights, meet their obligations and articulate their interests.

Governance also refers to the power relations between rulers and the ruled/governors and the governed/ and between organizational heads and their members. Overall, the exercise of power is adjudged as good when it promotes predictability, accountability and transparency on the part of governors; while also providing an enabling environment and a sense of ownership among the governed. Good governance is not just about processes, structures and rules; but also about outcomes in or effects on society.

**Overview of Post-Independent Africa’s Governance Record**

African countries have been faced with the challenge of establishing viable & sustainable governance systems and institutions, since attaining political independence in the late 50s and early 60s. Thus, poor governance has been one of the hallmarks of the post-independence African state reflected in weak and dysfunctional institutions, constricted political spaces, various forms of social exclusion and concomitant social strife.

Governance deficit in Africa has been recognized as a principal source of the continent’s numerous conflicts and its notoriety for political instability; as well as a major explanation to the continent’s inability to extricate itself from near-perennial underdevelopment. Hence, the promotion of good governance has been a permanent feature in Africa’s development policy discourse over the years, particularly from the 1990s onwards.

Despite Africa’s reputation as a poorly governed continent, the continent’s governance record has not been static. Rather, it has evolved over time and space. Therefore, there is need to moderate the general image of negativity about African governance, with the practical reality of remarkable positive evolution in governance practices and institutions.

**Impact of Colonial Structures on Africa’s Governance Deficit**

Pre-colonial Africa’s diverse political organizational forms (centralized/decentralized) had definite safeguards against the arbitrary use of political power and were anchored on strong notions of popular sovereignty, wherein, the people and not their rulers were sovereign. Colonialism disrupted Africa’s traditional patterns of development and budding governance structures. Colonialism was neither democratic nor inclusive, but rather, it was very autocratic and divisive in character, wherein, colonial administration hardly sought consensus from among the usually diverse members of African communities or their representatives and centralized power and tended to
fractionalize African societies, including through its divide and rule policies and the imposition of rigid territorial borders.

Colonial powers grudgingly introduced participatory and competitive political institutions and processes in their colonial possessions in the post-World War II period, following the unrelenting anti-colonial pressures, supposedly with a view to prepare them for self-government. The preparation of African states for self-government was limited in its scope and depth, such that the post-colonial state was borne with very serious flaws that have continued to haunt it till date. Thus, Africa’s post-colonial governing elite were not adequately prepared for the task of governance and they inherited the autocratic character and practices of the colonial state, including its divisive and exclusionary tactics.

**Governance in Post-Colonial African States**

In many African states Colonial administrations were replaced by African governing elites, who were no more than mirror-images of the preceding authoritarian colonial structures including in their constriction of national political spaces, and proscription of opposition parties or organized dissent. Basically, there was a capture of the African state by Africa’s post-independence governing elite, through the acquisition and monopolization of political power, including through undermining national constitutions. State repression, the elimination of political opponents, patronage and opaque management of state resources became very entrenched. Thus, this tended to deepen colonially inherited feelings of mutual alienation and fear of domination in inter-group relations and rendered competitive processes such as elections very suspect to many African leaders.

The centralizing impulses of the state-formation processes of the typical post-colonial African state served to deepen and encouraging the entrenchment of the one-party ideology across much of the continent. The political plurality and diversity were increasingly perceived by African leaders as being inimical to nation building and as potent sources of division and conflict for the newly born African states. This reasoning inadvertently led to increased state repression, the constriction of the political spaces, and the consolidation of authoritarian and personal rule across much of the continent.

**Military Intervention in African Politics**

The undemocratic and autocratic conduct of Africa’s post-colonial civilian governing elite served as the main invitation to and principal justification for the military’s meddling in African political governance, particularly through coup d’ états. Almost every other military regime justified its intervention in politics on the poor management of state affairs by the regimes they replaced and even as they made loud promises about reforming the state, including
through the establishment of inclusive democratic institutions and processes, many of them ended up constricting their national political spaces even further.

**The Role of the International Community/Regional Institutions**

During the Cold War period, the international community paid little attention to issues of good governance on the continent until the late 1980s and early 1990s. Former colonial powers and the rest of the developed world turned a blind eye to poor governance and human rights violations in African countries for fear of losing strategic political allies in Africa to the ever threatening communist bloc. African leaders took advantage of the political shield provided to them by the Cold War to become notoriously unaccountable to their peoples, trampling on their rights for years with impunity.

The OAU, during a greater part of its existence, did not pay adequate attention to issues relating to the domestic governance of its member states, partly because of its policy of non-interference and respect of sovereign independence until the late 1980s and early 1990s, wherein a confluence of factors fundamentally altered Africa’s reality, and heralded important governance reforms on the continent.

**Africa’s Democratic Rebirth of the 1990s and Associated Governance Reforms**

A confluence of internal and external forces propelled governance to the top of Africa’s political agenda in the 1990s. Internally, the dashed expectations and hopes of independence as a result of autocratic governments released unstoppable uprisings from African masses and civil society groupings that insisted on better governance and accountability from their leaders; and externally, the end of the Cold War and with it the removal of the shield which had protected African leaders against any serious external scrutiny of their domestic governance/politics which coincided with the diminished geopolitical significance of the continent, amidst stiff competition for resources and attention from other regions of the developing world, particularly from the newly independent states of Eastern Europe.

**The Governance Reforms of the 1990s**

African governments’ governance enhancing reform measures at the national level entailed broadening of the hitherto constricted political spaces, legalizing multi-party political systems, creating relatively more enabling environments for civil society and other non state actors. Plural electoral politics and participatory governance replaced monolithic political systems across much of Africa. The adoption of new constitutional orders and constitutionalism reflect the shift to plural political systems, including efforts to actualize notions of
separation of powers and associated checks and balances; and efforts were taken to attend to minority questions, including through the adoption of quarter systems in administration, as well as empowering lower tiers of government through decentralization.

At the regional level, the reform measures included the transformation of the OAU to the AU in 2001 and its endowment with governance-enhancing institutions and norms, including replacing the traditional non-interference and unfettered sovereignty norm, with one of non-indifference and interference under certain circumstances. The AU injunction on unconstitutional changes of government and the Charter on governance, democracy and elections and more significantly African leaders establishing the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and its associated African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) in 2002.

The balance sheet of the democratic and governance reforms of the 1990s has been very mixed, with a number of very successful governance transformation experiences such as in Ghana, Mauritius and Botswana. These are however, punctuated with worrying cases of inertia (most countries in Central Africa) or outright reversals (Mali and Niger). The governance reforms that accompanied the democratic rebirth of the 1990s and beyond have not completely resolved the African state’s architectural problems and therefore, some of the well known fundamental governance challenges on the continent continue to linger and new ones have emerged.

**Constitutional Declarations vs. Concrete Policy Actions**

Almost all African countries have now entrenched separation of powers as a key provision in their national constitutions. The executive in Africa has continued to be overbearing, and overshadowing the other branches of government and making the office of the President attractive, which continues to be the most powerful office in many African states. Many African presidents have also shown reluctance to relinquish power, including the desire to tinker with constitutional provisions that set limits to presidential terms of office. The democratic upsurge of the 1990s resulted in many legislatures in Africa acquiring some teeth, even though a number of African legislatures have continued to serve as mere appendages to the executive arm. Moreover, the Judiciary in many African countries has gained greater independence, which is yet to be fully entrenched across the continent.

**Electoral Democracy in Africa and its Challenges**

Although the majority of African governments have adopted plural electoral systems, electoral processes and electoral outcomes have continued to pose serious challenges to many African countries and have emerged as one of the main sources of instability in the continent. Elections have come to be seen as
mere rituals, intended to satisfy international conditionality as opposed to serving the critical internal legitimizing function for leadership. The numerous conflicts that have been spurned by Africa’s electoral processes have revived debates on the compatibility of competitive democratic governance systems with Africa’s plural/fractured societies, a consideration that informed the entrenchment of one-party states in the 1990s in the first place.

Election related conflicts in Africa have also revived questions about what could constitute the most appropriate electoral systems for Africa’s diverse states. In particular, questions have been raised about the legitimacy of the first-past-the post electoral system that is used by majority African states and Public opinion has tended to recommend the proportional representation system or some hybrid electoral systems, including power sharing arrangements.

Managing Diversity in Africa

The issue of diversity management possess broader governance challenges. Some of the difficulties that have been encountered in the management of diversity have derived from the continued attractiveness of central governments, arising largely from its accumulation of nearly all state powers and resources at the expense of other tiers of government, which include federated states, regions, provinces, municipalities and counties. In a typical African state, the battle for representation continues to be stiffest at the centre than at the lower tiers of government.

Moving away from political centralization, political devolution and political decentralization has continued to be a major point of reform debate in several African countries, particularly in those with unitary forms of government.

Groups such as Women and Youth continue to be marginalised from engaging concretely in their countries’ politics, which causes major challenge to governance. Despite achieving constitutional provisions, envisaged quarters are hardly ever met in the case of women’s participation, with a few exceptions such as Rwanda and South Africa. Africa is also witnessing a youth bulge, which is unfortunately accompanied by even higher levels of marginalisation, in the form of growing unemployment that has been a source of political agitation as has been seen in many African countries.

Empowering Oversight Governance Institutions

The role of oversight institutions in the promotion of democracy, diversity, accountability and transparency in public political life and in the private sector in Africa is increasingly recognized. Many of these institutions, such as the Ombudsman’s Office, Independent Elections Management Bodies, Anti-
Corruption Authorities, and Public Protectors Office have been established in many African countries. Some African countries have also entrenched these institutions in their national constitutions, with a view to giving them requisite independence and insulation, particularly from interference and control by the executive and other politically powerful actors in state and society.

The strength of these bodies and their ability to constructively contribute to the promotion of good governance is a function of the support they receive from critical civil society groups and other stakeholders, the character of their leadership, as well as the political will of the national leadership to keep faith with the spirit anchoring the establishment of the institutions.

**Civil Society Organizations**

Civil society emerged as a formidable agent of change and as one of the internal social forces, which combined with external pressures to bring about the historic liberalization of Africa’s political spaces from the 1990s onwards. Civil society has continued to push for the reform of the African state and its body politic, including championing the agenda for political, economic and social inclusivity. It has been active in Africa in raising awareness and galvanizing African peoples to hold their governments accountable, as well as have a say in policy making processes.

Radical civil society in many African countries has taken on the role of contesting political power directly or indirectly and by so doing, probing up Africa’s traditionally weak or weakened opposition parties. The African Union has also become more accommodative of civil society as evidenced in the establishment of an AU organ dedicated to civil society engagement the Economic, Social and Cultural Council of the African Union (ECOSOCC).

**Corruption as Governance Challenge**

Corruption is recognized as an impediment to economic growth because it discourages foreign investments, creates distortion in resource allocation and competitive markets, increases the cost of doing business, and reduces the net-value of public spending. It also reduces the quality of services and public infrastructure and the volume of tax revenues, and encourages the misappropriation and misallocation of scarce resources. Corruption undermines the rule of law, respect for human rights, accountability and transparency and weakens government institutions. It erodes public legitimacy in government and compromises good governance.

Corruption deepens income inequality, poverty and adversely affects good moral values in the society. In general, corruption is a challenge to sustainable economic development, peace and good governance and remains the most daunting challenge to good governance, sustainable economic growth, peace,
stability and development in Africa. Thus, addressing corruption is a priority governance and development issue for African countries and their regional organizations.

**Governance of Natural resources**

Africa’s abundant natural resources have historically been very poorly managed, being indeed the arena of the highest levels of corruption by national, international, state and non-state actors. Some of Africa’s most richly endowed countries have also been the continent’s poorest countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The poor management of Africa’s natural resources and the skewed distribution of the dividends deriving from same has been the source of grievance inspired conflicts in many countries. Africa has continued to suffer from what is generally referred to as a resource curse.

The management of Africa’s land has emerged as another arena of poor resource governance, where large expanses of African land are leased out on ridiculous terms and without the consent of the indigenous owners. Furthermore, differential land use by African countries’ diverse populations, particularly between farmers and grazers has been a serious governance issue because of the violent conflicts it has produced in some countries. Therefore, the development and implementation of appropriate land management policies and strategies is a critical governance challenge for Africa.

**Writing a Policy Brief**

A policy brief is a short, neutral summary of what is known about a particular issue or problem, with a view of facilitating policy intervention. It is a ‘policy document’, which outlines the rational for choosing a particular policy alternative or course of action in an ongoing policy issue or debate. A policy brief may be limited to providing a targeted discussion of available alternative policy options to address an issue, without necessarily motivating or arguing for the adoption of any particular option. Alternatively, the brief may focus directly on providing an argument for the adoption of a particular alternative policy option.

Policy making is about making policy choices, thus, the ultimate purpose of a policy brief is to convince the target audience of the urgency of a current/ongoing problem and the need to adopt the preferred alternative or course of action outlined in the brief.
A Policy brief is a short and targeted document for policy makers, which is devoid of theoretical, methodological and analytical details contained in academic writing. It is also a kind of policy marketing tool, intended to serve as an impetus for action. A Policy brief is also useful instruments to support broader advocacy initiatives, targeting wider but knowledgeable audiences.

There are variations in the way policy briefs are structured, in the function of their types and as well as institutional practices. Some of the common elements that usually feature in policy briefs include title, executive summary, context and importance of the problem, critique of policy option(s), policy recommendations, appendices, and sources consulted or recommended.

Day Four, Thursday, 20th September 2012
Mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis
By Mr. Nick Martin, Institute for Technology and Social Change (Tech change)

Mr. Nick Martin, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Institute for technology and social change (Tech change) Washington DC, USA, covered the sessions on day Four, Thursday, 20th September 2012 and Day Six, Saturday, 22nd September 2012. In this session, software packets that have direct relevance to conducting researches were covered. Particularly, different themes in relation to mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis such as GeoPOll, Episurveyor, Frontline Sms, Google drive, open street maps, MapBox, and Ushadidi were discussed.

There are three main software packets that researchers to undertake study, specifically in data collection, data visualization and analysis. Open data kit, GeoPoll, Episurveyor and Frontline Sms serve for data collection. Google drive, open street maps, and MapBox are software packages for data visualization while Ushadidi serves for data analysis.

Specific tools for data collection and data visualization include:

**GeoPoll**

GeoPoll is an open mobile polling platform that empowers organizations to conduct surveys over their mobile phone. GeoPoll is deployed in countries in Africa and Central Asia. The service gives organizations access to GeoPoll’s preparatory user database, which allows organizations to survey millions of people targeted by location and demographics. GeoPoll allows close to real time surveying, providing organizations the information they need, when they need it.
FrontlineSMS

FrontlineSMS is free open source software used by a variety of organizations to distribute and collect information via text messages (SMS). The software can work without an internet connection and with a cell phone only and a computer. FrontlineSMS enables users to connect a range of mobile devices to a computer to send and receive SMS text messages. The software works without an internet connection by connecting a device such as a cell phone or GSM modem with a local phone number. FrontlineSMS can send and receive messages, group contacts, respond to messages, and trigger other events. If internet access is available, FrontlineSMS can be connected to online SMS services and set up to feed incoming messages to other web or e-mail services.

Open Data Kit (ODK)

Open Data Kit (ODK) is a free and open source set of tools, which help organizations author, field, and manage mobile data collection solutions. ODK provides an out-of-the-box solution for users to:

1. Build a data collection form or survey (XLSForm is recommended for larger forms)
2. Collect the data on a mobile device and send it to a server; and
3. Aggregate the collected data on a server and extract it in useful formats.

EPISURVEYOR

EPISURVEYOR is software with an easy and least expensive way to collect data on mobile phones. Anyone can create an account; design forms and download them to phones and start collecting data in minutes.

Following the presentation, a documentary was viewed regarding the importance of mapping in emergency crisis with a case study of Haiti. Consequently, participants expressed the essentiality of the idea of mapping and its applicability in a crowed source of information.

Social Media: Twitter and Facebook

Social Medias such as Twitter and Facebook gives researchers access to non-traditional sources of information that are relatively more balanced. Developing a frame work for validation however still remains a limitation. Actually, Governments refrain from using Social Media as one of the major means of communication as it gives access to easy spread of non-credible information.

Twitter
Twitter is one of the most powerful tools for research but also the most misunderstood. Twitter is a significant social media to dialogue and link with political figures and use as a tool to social change and to promote articles; it is a channel of communication and a great way to easily connect with current topics of interest.

**Facebook**

Facebook is another social media, which is highly used for entertainment, as a channel of communication, advocacy and so forth. Facebook gives an opportunity to engage in different trending issues for people.

**Day Five: 21st September 2012**

**Current Trends and Issues on Security in Africa**

by Dr. Issaka Souaré

This session focused on overview of the current status of studies in security with special focus on Africa; origins of security/peace studies in the context of the evolution of the discipline International Relations, as well as the contribution of other fields of studies to the development of the field. It was facilitated by Dr. Issaka Souaré, Department of Peace and Security, African Union (AU), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, who also discussed how to write policy papers.

**Origins of Peace/Security studies**

Security Studies come from International Relations (IR), which was developed particularly in the field of comparative politics in the USA. The theory of Thomas Kuhn and Karl Popper about scientific revolutions gives a good analysis of its development. Two main schools of thought, Realism and Liberalism, have dominated scholarly discussions of the field of IR. Realists consider the State as the main actor in the international realm and argue that international relations [with small i and r is international politics, different from the discipline] is an alternation between war and peace, i.e., a country can be either at war or peace, waiting for another period of war. Thus, studies about war and conflict have been the major characteristics of IR. Therefore, Realists define security as the absence of war, where a state is able to protect its borders.

On the other hand, Idealists/Liberalists argue that the absence of war cannot be considered as a situation of peace and war indeed can be prevented or managed. They also argue that the State can’t be the centre of everything; people and non-state actors can also play a role both as actors and victims. Therefore, it is in their interest and in the interest of humanity that people’s
concerns are taken into consideration. The American President Woodrow Wilson is often cited as an important figure in this school of thought, particularly as far as the practical implementation of some of its postulates is concerned.

Studied from a realistic perspective, the sub-field is known as security or strategic studies, while liberal approaches have come up with different names, including Peace Studies, Human Security, Sustainable Security, and Critical Security Studies.

Evolution of Peace/Security Studies

Security Studies is a multi-disciplinary field that has borrowed different perspectives and methods from the different fields of studies. In this regard, different fields of studies have contributed to its development, from Natural Sciences to Social Sciences, and Humanities, which include sociology, physics, biology, mathematics, chemistry, International Relations, economics, law, International Law, political science, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, and history.

According to P. Wallensteen, major global traumatic experiences like World War I, World War II, the Cold War and the Vietnam War have contributed to the development of the sub-discipline of Peace Studies/Security Studies. WWI, for instance, led to the creation of the League of Nations. WWII, on the other hand, particularly the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear bombings convinced scientists like Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein to unite their efforts and campaign against the use of the nuclear weapon and subsequently to write their anti-nuclear manifesto, the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, in 1955. Moreover, the World War II also led to the establishment of the UN. The Cold War era and the Vietnam War also saw the emergence of many peace movements, inspired by the Gandhian approach, and studies on nuclear deterrence and conflict management.

Chronologically speaking, the development of the sub-discipline can be divided into the following:

i. The pioneers, 1918 to 1945, which includes the quest for peace for world order.

ii. The second generation, 1965 – 1985, who are considered the founders that established academic chairs, journals, seminars, expert conferences...etc. At this time, ‘Peace studies’ becomes a fully fledged discipline of IR, having benefited from various other sub-fields of social sciences and humanities, even beyond.

iii. The third generation, 1985-2005, who are considered as the generation of reconstruction. At the end of the Cold War, certain issues and theories (like Marxism) were not fashionable.
Therefore, there was a need to reconstruct theoretical models. Also, civil wars – unlike inter-state wars – became the dominant security concern and there was a need to undertake serious studies to understand their emergence, their dynamics, their ending and aftermaths.

According to Wallensteen, there is no major development after 2005.

In the development process of Peace/Security Studies, the second generation (1965 – 1985) is very important as pioneer journals, research centres and associations started. In this regard, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* was the first academic journal in the field, established in 1957 at the University of Michigan, in the USA. The establishment of the International Peace Research Association was also another major development, which brought together scholars concerned with peace/security studies. This Association also started the *International Peace Research Newsletter*, which publishes the proceedings of conferences organized by members of the Association. In 1964, the *Journal of Peace Research* was also established by the Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO), in Norway.

While it started in northern American and Europe, there are now different journals published in Africa, including the Nigerian Journal of International Affairs, *African Security Review*, *South African Journal of International Affairs*, *African Journal of International Affairs*, *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, and the *Africa Peace and Conflict Journal* (APCJ), which is published by the UPEACE Africa Programme. The 2011 University of Pennsylvania’s Think Tanks Rank in the World also shows that the first three top think tanks in Africa are the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA), the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the University of Cape Town and Institute of Security Studies (ISS) in Pretoria, which are all, wholly or partly, devoted to peace studies.

**Thematic Evolution**

To the emergence of the sub-field of peace/security studies, defining ‘violence’ was very important. In this respect, theories of violence were developed in the 1960s and 70s, which have been very helpful in providing theoretical understandings about the occurrence of conflict and violence, away from the realist perspective. Inspired by Emmanuel Kant’s ‘Perpetual Peace’ thesis, Johan Galtung came up with the idea of ‘Positive Peace’ in the 1960’s, which argues that there should be a situation of Generalized Global Peace. He also argues that peace does not mean the absence of war but the absence of the causes of war, including injustice, human rights violations...etc, which he defined as a situation of ‘Structural Violence’. The Human Needs theory, which was developed by John Burton, has also been a good contribution to the field in explaining the occurrence of conflict.
After the end of the Cold War, negotiation has been used as a major mechanism to handle conflict. This has led to the increase of studies on negotiation, including conflict prevention, mediation and early warning systems. Studies on humanitarian intervention, which is about the responsibility to protect, have also become common. A number of other themes have also been popularized like minority rights, governance, democratization and security, migration, climate change and environmental degradation.

**Geographic Evolution**

A presentation of an analysis of origins of article contributors to the *Journal of Peace Research*, from 1964 to 2006, shows that Africa’s contribution is very limited to the sub-field, which is 7; while 450 contributions were made from North America, 239 from Scandinavia and 207 from the rest of Europe. Different factors contribute to the low contributions including the low value given to research on the continent, which has to do with lack of research incentives. Another major factor is the difference in scholarly engagement between Africans and particularly the West; scholars from developing countries are interested in practical issues while theorizing and abstract writing interests developed countries’ scholars.

**Human security**

Human Security was popularized in the 1994 UNDP’s Human Development Report. This report states that Human Security is not concerned with weapons but rather with human life and dignity. It further argues that States are important but not the only important actors; people’s concerns and needs should be at the centre of the analysis. If we were to take the state centric approach of Security Studies, they argue, issues of justice, human rights and climate change, which affect the existence of human beings, would not have been considered important.

**Sustainable Security**

Sustainable Security has been developed by a group of researchers from Oxford Research Group in 2009. They contend that there is a need to follow an integrated framework, based on an integrated analysis of security threat. They state that the symptoms of insecurity are war and instability and studying war and how it happens might not lead to sustainable solutions. Therefore, they focus on, “Why the war” and “How to prevent the war” but not solely “What the War”. This holistic approach, they argue, is better to directly address issues related to security. However, while the name is catchy, the

---

6 The origins of authors were based on their institutional affiliation.
content is not different from that of human security, hence the terminology, used by some, as sustainably human security.

**Critical Security Studies**

Critical Security Studies was popularized by Ken Booth in his article, “Security and Emancipation”, published in 1991. Then, other scholars from the University of Wales joined him and wrote about the issue of Critical Security Studies in 1997. They emphasise the importance of moving from the state centric approach to critical issues that are overlooked. Critical Security Studies is dominated by two schools of thought: the Welsh School and Copenhagen School. The Welsh School focuses on the emancipation of the individual from the physical constraints, freedom from want. They further state that war and the threat of war is one of the constraints; together with poverty, poor education, and political oppression. On the other hand, Copenhagen School argues that there is no particular definition of security; it is rather constructed by securitizing actors like the State. Discourse analysis is at the heart of the school’s methodology, i.e., anything can be classified as a security issue depending on rhetoric, logic and how one convinces others.

**Research Methodology Issues: Data Collection**

Information is a key ingredient in research. Researchers should, therefore, be very careful in collecting and analyzing information as objectively as possible. News is one source of information, which is of two types: raw news and analyzed news. The first type generally comes from news agencies that have reporters on the ground like the AFP, while analyzed news is produced by news organizations like BBC. One should take caution in choosing media sources. Media is interested in the abnormal/extra-ordinary. It is also guided by the interest of editorial boards and readers. Thus, to verify, one needs to use triangulation and critical analysis.

To triangulate, researchers can use specialized sources like specialized journals. Specialized NGOs can also be one source of information. However, researchers should take precaution in taking it on face value as many NGOs would rely on contacts on the ground that produce reports influenced by their own biases. Reports produced by international and regional organizations can also be another source. Here, researchers should take into consideration the fact that such organizations are political bodies, which might not reflect some of the realities as most of their decisions are made based on consensus.

When necessary, researchers need to consider field research, because depending exclusively on secondary sources might at times be misleading. Field research is particularly very significant to PhD candidates, who are expected to produce the original angle of a certain field of knowledge.
Surveys

Researchers can use surveys undertaken by others. For example, Afro-Barometer produces very good surveys, which is particularly helpful for those conducting research in the realm of Governance. Sometimes, organizations might have huge data sets. If one is using such sources, s/he also needs to disaggregate as the methodology might not be compatible with the researcher’s. Researchers can also conduct their own survey, which should be carefully designed in terms of having the right sampling framework.

Interviews and FGDs

Researchers can also gather data through interviews. One pitfall that one has to avoid in interviews is putting the words in to your interlocutor’s mouth. In gathering data, it is not ethical to lead the interviewee to say something you want; let the person do the talking. On the other hand, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) is very helpful in saving time even if it has its own pitfalls, having some dominating figures.

Overall, researchers should also try to cross-examine information to minimize subjectivity and get closer to objectivity as much as possible. Thus, they need to follow objective, transparent and clear methods of inquiry and try to address biases. Bias is of two types: natural and procedural. Though it is natural to have biases, it becomes problematic when you take such biases to the procedural realm. Ex: when the researcher gives more time to Party A than Party B.

Policy Writing

A policy paper should contain the following key aspects: (I) Clear problem facing a policy maker or a group of policy makers; (II) Basic, relevant information about the problem (why do you think a certain action should be taken about the problem); (III) Analysis of the situation and its dynamics, supported by a scenario building (one can have the best case scenario and the worst case scenario and even sub-scenarios); and (IV) conclusion with policy recommendations including policy options. Policy papers should be brief, however, the length depends on each organization’s guidelines and the issue to be addressed. Policy recommendations should also be as realistic as possible. In this respect, researchers need to be aware of the policy making process and existing constraints. To prepare a policy recommendation about Mali to the AU, for instance, one should know that there is an issue of compatibility between Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and AU. Thus, the policy paper should clearly state how the AU could work with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the concerned REC.
It is recommended to follow the following structure in writing a Policy paper: (i) Executive summary/introduction, (ii) Statement of the problem, which states background, current status, importance for the decision-makers, (iii) Analysis that shows the dynamics and possible evolutionary paths, (iv) Policy Recommendations, and (v) Bibliography/Appendices.

Then, a short documentary film on Climate Change as a security concern was shown to the participants. Afterwards, participants reflected that it is important and timely to consider climate change as a human security issue and governments, the AU and the UN should respond to it. Accordingly, participants recommended policy interventions at three different levels: short, medium and long term. In the short term, policies that mitigate the problem should be addressed like irrigation. In the medium term, actions to maintain forests should be taken, and recommendations on how to go green economy should be made in the case of long term policy interventions.

Day Six- Saturday, 22nd September 2012
Mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis
By Mr. Nick Martin, Institute for Technology and Social Change (Tech change)

There are different mapping methods and data collection tools that are of great relevance to undertaking researches. The major ones are Ushahidi, Google talk, MapBox, Open street map, ArcGIS, and Prezi.

Ushahidi

"Ushahidi", which means "testimony" in Swahili, was a website that was initially developed to map reports of violence in Kenya after the post-election fallout at the beginning of 2008. Since then, the name "Ushahidi" has come to represent the people behind the "Ushahidi Platform". The original website was used to map incidents of violence and peace efforts throughout the country based on reports submitted via the web and mobile phones. This website had 45,000 users in Kenya, and was the catalyst for realizing there was a need for a platform based on it, which could be used by others around the world.

Ushahidi therefore allows you to create a map and report categories in relation with risks. You can read different reports and also gives you different alerts of what is happening in your region.

Google talk
Google talk is an instant messaging service that provides both text and voice communication. It is established by Google where you can do a collaborative editing.

**MapBox**

MapBox helps researcher to design maps and publish them across the web and mobile devices at scale. The distinguishing feature of MapBox is it creates beautiful maps, which are very easy and flexible, which can easily be customized to different contexts.

**Open Street Map**

Open Street Map provides free geographic data and mapping to anyone who wants it. Here, everyone can go in and edit the mapping unlike the Google mapping where everything is fixed.

**ArcGIS**

ArcGIS can be used with nothing to install or setup. Its software delivered as a service, giving you intuitive tools to create and publish maps and apps on demand. You stay in control of your data, and empower everyone with easy-to-use maps on the web. Hence, it is a method where map analysis can be undertaken on in a deeper sense.

**Prezi**

Prezi serves a similar function to PowerPoint, but with more powerful and interesting features. The Presentations are created on a “canvas” rather than on “Slides”. This encourages presenters to focus on combining text, images and multimedia. Prezi has the “wow” factor and it is very easy to use.

Following the presentation a practical exercise was undertaken on different mapping methods and tools by the participants, which was followed by presentations.

Finally a video was shown on crisis mapping as a response to the Haiti earthquake by using Ushadidi. For more information about Ushadidi, please refer to [http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/security/video-crisis-mappers-mobile-technology-helps-disaster-victims-worldwide/9325/](http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/security/video-crisis-mappers-mobile-technology-helps-disaster-victims-worldwide/9325/)
Day Seven: Monday, 24 September 2012
Overview of the Security Situation in Africa
by Mr. Wane EL-Ghassim

Mr. Wane EL-Ghassim, Director, Peace and Security Department, African Union Commission briefly joined the participants and discussed the overview of peace and security situation of Africa in relation to the work of the Peace and Security Department of the African Union (AU). Mr. Wane is serving as Deputy Chair of the Advisory Board of the UPEACE-IDRC Project on “Strengthening Research for Governance and Security in Sub-Saharan Africa”.

Mr. Wane emphasized the importance of the nexus between policy and research to advance issues of peace and security in the continent; policy makers should take advantage of researches that are conducted in this field within and outside Africa. However, there is a divide between academic research and policy; both tend to be dismissive of each other; whereas, there is a lot of knowledge that is generated by researchers, which are beneficial to policy makers and vice versa. Such approaches are detrimental to the work of institutions like the African Union (AU). Considering the importance of bridging the gap between the two, the Department of Peace and Security at the AU provides strong support to researchers approaching it and encourages its staff members to make use of existing researches to advance its agenda of Peace and Security.

Peace and Security is the priority area of focus of the AU, since it has to deal with the fact that Africa still accounts for the largest number of conflicts in the world; despite making lots of progresses in comparison to the early 1990’s. Hence, early in the process of establishing the AU, the heads of states have crafted the Protocol on the Peace and Security Council between 2000 and 2002. This Protocol provided the framework for the African Peace and Security Architecture, which initially referred to certain institutions such as the Peace and Security Department, the Continental Early Warning system, the African Standby Force and later included norms on democracy and governance as well.

The AU has made significant progresses in putting the key elements of the Architecture in place, particularly in adopting policy documents like Convention on Corruption and the NEPAD Principle on Democracy. Institutions are also in place like the African Peer Review Mechanism and the African Peace and Security Council. However, AU faced the biggest challenge in terms of implementation. This shows that there is a clear gap between commitments made and actions on the ground.

In the effort to bridging the gap between policy and implementation, the UPEACE-IDRC Doctoral Researchers and PhD Fellows can contribute
constructively, particularly in the area of Governance; as many of these conflicts are often linked to the issues of governance including issues of minority, political participation, and ensuring institutions’ legitimacy and acceptability by their population. Mali, for instance, was considered as a model of democracy till recently. However, the state collapsed in less than 24 hours in 2012. Some of the factors that led to the collapse are corruption and the gap between the government and the people. These elements can literally be found in many other African countries and can lead to state collapse or at least to a serious crisis. Hence, there is a need to redouble Africa’s efforts in areas of Governance. In this regard, research conducted in the field can make on huge contribution in term of identifying gaps and putting recommendations on how the AU can be creative enough in ensuring the implementation of its policies.

The AU would like play its own role in bridging the gap too. In this regard, it wants to make sure that its institutions are using their power bestowed by legal instruments. The Protocol on Peace and Security, for instance, has given the Peace and Security Council extensive power to monitor issues of governance, democracy, and human rights in the continent. However, the Council has shied away from fully performing the role given to it under the protocol on the issue of Governance based of political considerations. Therefore, the AU believes that the Commission itself needs to be quite active.

Secondly, the AU is working towards ensuring the dissemination of its instruments as the level of awareness is very low. The instruments would be powerful tool in the hands of ordinary people and CSOs, if they were to challenge their own governments on the basis of commitment they have made within the framework of the African Union.

Thirdly, the AU tries to work with CSOs in tracking implementation of commitments made by Governments in terms of Governance. The Institute of Security Studies (ISS), for instance, is working on Compliance Index to indicate to what extent African Governments are complying within the commitments they made with the framework of the African Union. This is a strategy employed to engage governments being forthcoming and proactive in implementing their commitments.

In the years to come, therefore, the AU would like to focus on conflict prevention on the bases of the implementation of existing instruments. There is no need to adopt new instruments as the AU already what the continent requires. In this regard, scholars have a key role to play through their research and field work in elaborating on why it has difficulties in reaching out ordinary African citizens; through recommendation on how to increase its efficiency and effectiveness in disseminating its instruments and ensuring that people indeed make use of them in the development process of the continent.
Then, participants raised different questions on different issues including the role of the AU with special emphasis to the department of peace and security in intervening in constitutional making processes of countries like Zimbabwe; AU’s stand on the issue of political impunity; and the continental body’s perspective on border dispute issues including issues of succession.

Regarding the border issues, Mr. Wane explained that secession issues are not the leading threats to African states. Since 1960’s, there has been only two successful secessions, Eritrea and South Sudan. This means, secession was not successful in the continent. Even countries that are facing very serious challenges like DRC and Chad, where there are so many rebellions, the fight has to do with acquiring power but not secession. Biafra in Nigeria and Somaliland are the other cases, where people wage war against their governments for secession. To deal with this issue, in 2007, the AU has also initiated the Africa Boarder Programme with two objectives (i) to define African boarders to prevent conflicts that emerge in relation of finding natural resources as well as to deepen integration and (ii) to make boarder soft i.e., showing boarders should be bridges but not walls.

The AU strongly stands against impunity with empowerment to people, owning up to their own system and holding their governments accountable to combat it. The issue came in the fore, particularly in the case of Sudan, while the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued a warrant against President Omar Hassan Albesher. AU believes that there is a need to strike a balance between numerous conflicts going on in the Sudan (Darfur, South Kurdufan, Blue-Nile and Eastern Sudan) and the issue of impunity. Peace can’t be achieved in Sudan, if one of the key stakeholders is prosecuted. Besides, AU assumes that there is no single script to handle impunity; each country should deal with it based on its own realities and peculiar circumstances.

On the issue of Constitutional Processes specifically in relation to Zimbabwe, AU works closely with Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), the concerned regional organization. SADC has been taking the leading role for many years as far as Zimbabwe is concerned. The leading role it played in the Global Political Agreement (GPA), which brought violence to an end in Zimbabwe is among the few. The issue of Zimbabwe is among AU’s priority concerns. In this regard, Jean-Ping, the current Chairperson of the AU, went to Zimbabwe, which was one of his first visits. AU supports SADC’s efforts fully and it has also been actively involved during the negotiations that led to GPA, which was held under the auspices of President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa.

He argued that the AU was successful in a number of initiatives, which it has taken. For instance, it sent the first observers in DRC before the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
MONUC took over. Similarly, OAU had been in Burundi since 1993, immediately after the assassination of President Melchior Ndadaye. The African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) is another successful case; where AU forces are doing a great work. However, AU’s default response to conflict should not be considered Peacekeeping, which occurs after damage has already happened. Moreover, it is very complex, time consuming, and very expensive, beyond Africa’s means. As a result, all AU’s peacekeeping initiatives are funded by its partners, which increases its dependency. Therefore, there is a need to refocus AU’s energy to conflict prevention. In this regard, the AU is crafting a Conflict Prevention Framework to mainstream prevention in the entire commission.

Research Process
By Dr. Julius O. Jwan (PhD)

At this point, Dr. Julius O. Jwan (PhD), Assistant Director: Research National Cohesion and Integration Commission, Nairobi, Kenya started his session. He facilitated sessions from September 24th to September 28th, 2012. The session focused on data generation/collection techniques, analysis and ethical considerations while undertaking social science researches. Data analysis technologies with specificity to NVivo and SPSS were also part of the sessions.

Research Topic

Research is a deliberate, systematic, critical and purposeful process of inquiry that is undertaken to make a contribution to worthwhile knowledge within a particular aspect of life. It can be conducted for different reasons including contributing to knowledge, improving the lives of others, increasing commercial success as well as personal and career development.

In the research process, stating a research topic depends on the researcher’s philosophical leaning, which determines whether a study is qualitative, quantitative or mixed. Qualitative study focuses on meanings, perspectives, and understandings of research participants, if the situation to be analyzed. It also emphasizes on the process and works with unstructured data. In most cases, this kind of study works with relatively small number of cases and emphasizes on flexibility. Quantitative study, on the other hand, focuses on testing theories using structured data that involves statistical generalization, causality, and numbers. It also emphasizes on the importance of neutrality, recommending researchers to detach themselves from the research to be conducted. Mixed method uses both structured and unstructured data and multiple sources of data. It is based on mixing, weighting and timing between qualitative and quantitative methods.
Research topic is not static and could change anytime. The whole research process is iterative, especially qualitative. Researchers should make sure that their topics are interesting, topical and researcherable and be able to defend every word in the title. The topic should be clearly state as to why the researcher is using a particular method; qualitative, quantitative or mixed. In this respect, researchers should capture their research topic in three key areas: -

i. The general broad area of the field that the researcher would like to address.
ii. The issue within the broad area that the researcher would like to carry out research/write on
iii. Specific aspect of the issue that the researcher would like to focus on

Problem Statement

At the root of all researches is a problem. As a result, it is important for researchers to analyze the real issues, justify why it is an issue and clearly articulate, if it is feasible to address it through a research. The research problem might arise from current issues, difficulties, or practices. It can be political, methodological, academic…etc. In stating problem statements, it is important to include a very brief relevant literature situated within the study.

Defining Objective in Quantitative Study

Objectives refer to what the researcher aims to achieve through the proposed research; it determines the data collection and analysis procedures as well. It is possible to use the word purpose, aim, and objective interchangeably. It is debatable as to how many objectives, one should have. It is possible to have a broad and specific objectives. A research objective should have the following characteristics: -

i. Specific: Identifies specific variables and activities.
ii. Measurable: It must be possible to determine if the objective has been met by using relevant indicators.
iii. Achievable: Is it feasible or viable in relation to researches, activities and time available.
iv. Reliable: Results must have solved the problem it was intended to and
v. Time bound: A scheduled specific time period to accomplish the activity.

Research Questions
Scholars like John W. Creswell argue that questions and objective will be used to answer more qualitative and quantitative research respectively. Questions are stated in interrogative form; while objectives are statements. Dr. Jawan argued that researchers can use objectives and specific questions. It becomes redundant, however, if the research questions and objectives refer to the same phenomenon. He said researchers can have objectives and research questions when objectives are broader and questions more specific.

**Formulating Hypothesis**

Hypothesis is a declarative statement; an educated guess of a ‘proposition made as a basis for reasoning, without assumption of its truth.’ It should be empirically testable, in a way that shows a relationship between two or more variables. It should be clear, precise, specific limited and related to the purpose of the study. Usually, assumptions are used in qualitative studies. In some cases, you can’t use hypothesis in some studies like identity related researches. Hypothesis should also be consistent with established facts. It should avoid moral judgment, which cannot be verified. Hypothesis in a negative form is known as a null hypothesis e.g. no relationship or no significant difference exists between groups on a variable.

**Variables**

Variables refer to a characteristics/attribute of an individual or organization that can be measured or observed. It varies among the people or organizations that are being studied. They are distinguished by two characteristics: temporal order and their measurement (or observation). Temporal order means one variable precedes another in time because the time ordering probably affects or causes another. In a quantitative study, variables are related to answer a research or make predictions about what the researcher expects the results to show. There are different kinds of variables:

- i. **Independent variables** refers to cause influence or affect outcomes, which is also known as treatment, manipulated, antecedent or predictor variables.
- ii. **Dependent Variables** depend on the independent variable; it referred to as effect, criterion, outcome variables.
- iii. **Intervening/mediating Variables** stand between independent and dependent variables. It mediates the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.
- iv. **Moderating Variables** refer to new variables constructed by a researcher by taking one variable and multiplying it by another to determine the joint impact of both.
- v. **Confounding variables** are those that need to be “controlled” so that true influence of the independent variable on the dependent can be determined.
Probability sampling: is a scenario where the population is specified and the people from whom researchers collect data are listed. Every person and all people in the population have equal chance of being selected and included in the population. Here, the way the researcher pick’s his/her sample is presumed to be free of conscious bias. Stratifying the groups based on specified character such as for example gender has a direct influence on the study that one is conducting. The assumption in this kind of sampling is that everybody has given consent to participate in the study; the case is also the same in random sampling.

Non probability sampling: is employed when dealing with unspecified accessible population; hence, unspecified here means that one doesn’t have a very concrete number where s/he wants to collect the data from. This is a sampling procedure where many people are comfortable with as there will not be thinking as to who, how and where they want to get the people while doing the sampling.

Sampling error in quantitative study

While doing sampling in quantitative study there is always a presumption that there will be a room for a given degree of error. The common example cited while dealing with sampling errors is the US presidential election of 1936. Literary digest predicted that Alfred Landon would win by 57% to 43%, over Franklin Roosevelt. What went wrong was the manner in which the sample was selected by getting random addresses from phone books, subscription lists and automatic registration lists, which tended to exclude the poor who could not afford such things as telephone. The poor who were excluded from the sample overwhelmingly voted for Roosevelt while the rich voted for Landon.

Hence, researchers have to be able to clearly explain the basis of stratification and the proportion of each stratum from the overall data, which will help then in preventing from making generalizations.

Validity in quantitative study

A validity section briefly conveys what researchers have intended to capture in the qualitative study.

Trust worthiness of qualitative research
In qualitative research, the credibility must be done to the extent that the study actually investigates what it claims to investigate and reports what occurred in the field. Elements giving a detailed account of research process such as incorporating excerpts from field notes, and quotes from interviews must establish a chain of evidence.

**Reflexivity:** states the concept of reflecting critically on the self as the position puts researcher in a condition of self praise and subjectivity. When the subject “we” is used in a research, it brings the reader on board and is more inclusive. However, the personalization of the research process can be reflected as strength in some scenarios. In this regard, Epistemology states that as a researcher one is part of the construction of the information that s/he is gathering as the data to be collected will be influenced by the research being interpreted. Consequently, the interpretation will inform the way the research process is conducted. They contemplate that since the researcher is selecting the population, the topic and the area in which the research is to be conducted, the objectivity of a research is contested.

Positivist philosophical school of thought on the other hand holds that the findings must be generalizable, and replicable; in this sense, those parameters exist and they exist fully. However, the researcher is avoided to use himself/herself as a measure of objectivity while undertaking the research.

**Transferability/generalisability (external validity)**

Generalization is one of the ways of generating knowledge; it is not however the ultimate. Hence, not generalizing data does not make the knowledge any less acceptable. Generalizing is hardly possible and any particular event can be knowledge on its own.

**Data generation/collection techniques**

At the time of data collection, questions that fit our study must be asked though precision might not be easily managed. There are two sources of data collection; i.e. primary and secondary sources. In conducting a research therefore, each of them or both can be employed. Primary sources of data are those collected directly from the participants or organizations where as secondary sources of data refer to already documented literatures.

**Questionnaires and Test**

While undertaking data collection, questionnaires and tests are the most commonly used. When using a questionnaire, each question should give you some information that goes towards providing some aspect of the objective. These objectives must thus translate into specific questions. Moreover, extensive reading around the research and getting as diverse perspectives as
possible is imperative to guide you in to formulating the questionnaire. At this juncture, unstructured questionnaires are simpler to formulate and permit a greater depth of response; the process of collecting the responses may give insight in to the background.

When constructing a questionnaire, one must avoid double-barreled questions; which confuse the respondent. Questions that make assumptions of a condition without evidence must also be avoided. Further, using of filter and contingency questions when necessary is important because it provides respondents with a good way of responding. Terminologies such as often, quiet often, not very often, and not at all must be avoided as they are subjective by their very nature. Moreover, excessive use of yes/no questions is not recommended. In this manner, avoiding technical terms, jargon and leading questions is essential. In addition, offensive questions that query respondent’s personal and sensitive socially deviant activities should not be placed at the beginning of a questionnaire. When formatting questionnaires, the vertical is the preferred format than the horizontal as that will make the reader feel at ease to respond to the questions.

**Sequence**

When formatting a questionnaire the questions must be arranged in a logical sequence: and items that have the same theme should be organized together to extract similar responses and dispose them in order. The questionnaire should also be arranged into content sub sections and each section be introduced by a statement about its content and purpose. Hence, the questionnaire must be formatted in an easier manner as they will have psychological effects on the reader.

**Pretest**

Pretesting a questionnaire is essential. While pretesting, a 1% -10% sample should be selected, which is similar to the actual sample that the research will be focusing on. In this regard, the actual sample should not be used. The challenge in pretest is it might be bothering to the sample group as the pilot study will have the same questions as the study to be conducted. In conducting the pilot study, the same procedures that will be employed in the actual study must be used. Moreover, participants must be encouraged to make comments and suggestions regarding clarity and relevance of questions and instructions.

**Response rate**

In terms of getting responses from respondents while collecting data from a questionnaire, a response rate of 50% is adequate and 60% is good where as 70% can be regarded as very good.
Presentation

While preparing a questionnaire, it must be ensured that it is presentable, and invites increased response rates; to that effect, using good quality paper and organizing the layout together with numbering all items and pages to make them easy to follow is vital.

Experiment

There are two main types of experiment; i.e. random and quasi-experiment. Concerning the randomized experiment, both groups under the experiment must remain in the same condition except for the treatment to be applied, which needs to vary. Quasi-experiment, however, deals with a naturally occurring phenomena. After the naturally occurring events, it should be known how much of politics for instance the group can engage in.

Tests

There are two types of Tests; i.e. standardized or non-standardized. A standardized test is one that has consistency and uniform procedures for administering, scoring and interpreting the behavior of subjects e.g. Graduate Record Exam (GRE) and I.Q tests.

Non-standardized tests, on the other hand, are those that have not established a considerable procedure nor gone through the construction process to minimize errors. Examples are classroom tests.

Qualitative data collection technique

One of the qualitative data collection techniques is conducting interviews. Interviews require a lot of negotiating aspect starting from getting the participant to be interviewed. It is noteworthy that paying special attention to the participant and conveying your deep interest in the messages one is sending and in what s/he is saying is relevant for the successful completion of the interview; thus, requiring research should remain keen and friendly in the process.

While conducting the interview, it is necessary to clarify vague statements and reach deeper so as to understand how people order and assess their world. Here, the information that is collected through the interview requires constant follow up.

Regarding the span of time an interview takes, many scholars consider an interview of between 45 to 60 minutes as ample to gather extensive data. While undertaking the interview, there has to be full attention, which is not
distracted by trying to track what the participant is saying, which is why keeping up with listening while in the mean time tracking what they are saying is required.

While undertaking researches, using research assistants to collect data is prohibited by some universities while others allow so. The justification for forbidding the use of an assistant is the expectation from the researcher to go through the experiences of conducting the research on his/her own. While conducting an interview, the environment, the way one is conducting the interview, and also the emotional reactions of the interviewee will be part of the research, which is forwarded as a limitation, if a research assistant is part in conducting an interview.

Categorizing interviews

**Ethnographic interview**: is an informal/situational conversation, which is spontaneous requiring the researcher to await the right opportunity to ask questions. Audio recording is not recommended in ethnographic interview as the conversation must continue spontaneously.

**Informant interview**: is a type of interview, which engages people whose knowledge of cultural scene proves to be valuable for achieving research objectives.

**Electronic interview**: is conducted through setting up a website list of questions on web form which participants send their responses.

**Telephone interview**: is a type of interview conducted through the telephone. A telephone interview is more personal and less intrusive where feedback is immediately received.

**Observational research**

In observational research, researcher observes the behavior rather than rely on report as the basic source of data. The two types of observational research are participant observation and non participant observation. Participant observation is a state where the researcher becomes part of the group to undertake the research. Whereas non participant observation refers to a state where the researcher will be a ‘pure’ observer seeking to be an unnoticed part of the “wallpaper”. When choosing observation, below are the factors that need to be given due consideration.

**Focused Group Discussion**
Focused Group Discussion (FGD) is a foundation for qualitative studies. After conducting a group interview, a questionnaire needs to be developed based on the group discussions. When a discussion emerges, it must be on an issue that the group can engage in. It should also be more of a balanced discussion, which should not be dominated by few. The number of the group in the focused group discussion remains a bit controversial based on different personal experiences. Generally, it is recommended to have 6 minimum and 15 maximum in a group. Attention should also be given regarding the venue where the FGDs will be hold.

Narrative

Narratives are used in studies where lots of emotional issues are concerned. While going through the stories, going back and forth is likely expected as the account is very personal and emotional to the people. The person telling his/her story should not be interrupted.

Ethics in Social Science Research

Ethics in social science research is defined as moral principles that guide research through from inception to completion and publications as a result. Ethics embody individual and communal codes of conduct based up on adherence to a set of principles. There are three basic reasons as to why ethics is considered fundamental in social science research. Those are democracy, respect for truth, and respect for persons.

Research permits participants informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality. In this regard, making the participant’s name or the research site anonymous helps reduce fears while encouraging participation. E.g. a case study of specific institution

The high tendency of losing public trust in research as a result of falsified data was pointed. Further, the privacy of the participants must be maintained regarding sensitive information such as religious practices, sexual activities, income, ethnic prejudices, and the place where data is gathered.

Protection of the participant and the researcher from both physical and psychological harm is also one of the elements of ethical considerations in social science research. If the person is being interviewed about issues of a sensitive nature, caution must be taken with regards to respecting the place where the interviewee wants to be interviewed.

Plagiarism is the other ethical consideration the researcher must give concern to. Presenting others ideas, results or written materials as one’s own without due acknowledgement is illegal. Everything read with a view to making the research stronger must be acknowledged. In this regard, acknowledging as
many references that are read compliments one’s commitment of going through lots of researches to develop their own.

Deception, which is another ethical consideration, lies on a point where a researcher needs to take caution not to provide an environment to the participant, which has the tendency of making him/her tell false stories. (E.g. buying participants drinks)

When dealing with vulnerable groups, such as children, sick, traumatized, and etc…a high level of sensitivity is required to deal with their emotional pain as these people would simply want their stories to be heard with a belief that their stories can be documented.

Ethical considerations in social science research also include faking results, putting a spin on results/manipulating figures, and using payment to induce participants to take part. Moreover, Openness, integrity, and honesty about the purpose and content of research are also other ethical considerations.

**Day Nine, 26th September 2012**

**Presentation of PhD Proposals by PhD Fellows**

**Facilitated by Dr. Julius O.Jwan**

The entire day was dedicated to presentations of PhD Proposals by the four PhD Fellows of the Programme. The first presenter was, Mr. Timothy Aduojo Obaje, whose proposal entitled, “Exploring youth participation in the peace building process in Jos, Plateau state, Nigeria”. Ms. Juliet Ntawubona, was the second presenter, whose topic stated, “Representation of women in Ugandan Politics: Whose representation? 1986 to date”. She stated that the aim of the project is to examine whether the number of women in representative positions have led to representation of women’s issues in Ugandan legislative bodies. The third proposal was presented on a topic “Food security and the politics of development partnerships: A case study of the World Bank” by Stephen Kingsley. He pointed that the objective of the research is to investigate and unpack the underlying development partnership issues that characterize the Fadama (I, II, III) projects(s) in Nigeria, and the construction of power. The final presenter was Ms. Hadelzein Mhoamed, whose proposal theme stated “Wishful Thinking”, decent work for domestic workers, local measures for Sudan”.

Following their brief presentation, fellows received feed backs from the rest of the participants.

**Day Ten, 27th September 2012**

**Using SPSS to analyze data with special focus to key concepts in statistics**

**By Dr. Julius O.Jwan**
While undertaking surveys, there is a group called population from whom the researcher is expected to collect the data. Hence, the population will become the sample, which tries to manifest how things would be in the bigger population, and will represent the parent population. When refereeing to the general population, there is a mathematical value we attach that summarizes a characteristic of a sample. The sample is the sub unit that we deal with to represent the general population. Also, however there is an attitude problem regarding statistics, which is presumed to have mathematical calculation, it is a misconception to think so as it does not have direct link with mathematical calculations.

**Defining SPSS**

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a Windows based program that can be used to perform data entry and analysis and to create tables and graphs. SPSS consists of an integrated series of computer programs, which enable the user to read data from questionnaire surveys and other sources to manipulate them in various ways and to produce a wide range of statistical analyses and reports, together with documentation.

**Layout of SPSS**

The Data Editor window has two views that can be selected from the lower left hand side of the screen. Data View is where you see the data you are using. Variable View is where you can specify the format of your data when you are creating a file or where you can check the format of a pre-existing file. The data in the Data Editor is saved in a file with the extension .sav.

The other most commonly used SPSS window is the SPSS Viewer window which displays the output from any analyses that have been run and any error messages. Information from the Output Viewer is saved in a file with the extension .spo.

After opening a file from the menu, on the left hand side is an outline of all of the output in the file. The right side is the actual output. To shrink or enlarge either side put your cursor on the line that divides them. When the double headed arrow appears, hold the left mouse button and move the line in either direction. Release the button and the size will be adjusted. Finally, there is the Syntax window which displays the command language used to run various operations. Typically, you will simply use the dialog boxes to set up commands, and would not see the Syntax window. The Syntax window would be activated, if you pasted the commands from the dialog box to it, or if you wrote your own syntax. Syntax files end in the extension .sps.

**SPSS Menus and Icons**
File includes all of the options you typically use in other programs, such as open, save, exit. Notice, that you can open or create new files of multiple types as illustrated on the right.

Edit includes the typical cut, copy, and paste commands, and allows you to specify various options for displaying data and output.

Options used to format the data, output, charts, etc...

View allows you to select which toolbars you want to show, select font size, add or remove the gridlines that separate each piece of data, and to select whether or not to display your raw data or the data labels.

Data allows you to select several options ranging from displaying data that is sorted by a specific variable to selecting certain cases for subsequent analyses.

Transform includes several options to change current variables. For example, you can change continuous variables to categorical variables, change scores into rank scores, add a constant to variables, etc.

Analyze includes all of the commands to carry out statistical analyses and to calculate descriptive statistics.

Graphs includes the commands to create various types of graphs including box plots, histograms, line graphs, and bar charts.

Utilities allows you to list file information, which is a list of all variables, their labels, values, locations in the data file, and type.

Add-ons are programs that can be added to the base SPSS package.

Window can be used to select which window you want to view (i.e., Data Editor, Output Viewer, or Syntax).

Using SPSS to analyze data

Analysis proceeds depending on what the researcher plans to do with the data. Hence, once you have reached your decision, you go to the analyze button, which will show you the list of the type of analysis you want to undertake. SPSS has two interfaces on the screen; the variable view and the data view. While starting the work, the variable view is what one normally starts from to describe the data and give it meaning. Here, entry of data is most sensitive while using SPSS as any mistake made might distort the overall outcome.
**Label** is the most critical in SPSS in doing the analysis as it is at that level the researcher is able to give a precise meaning. At this point, researcher is explaining what that specific name stands for.

**Value** is also extremely significant as your study. As the letters can’t be calculated, they must be represented by numbers. Vital in this regard is questions are presented with answers, which are numerically represented. If there are missing values nonetheless, they must be given values to represent them.

**Sampling errors**

Handling the issue of sampling errors is relevant in reaching at valid research finding. If the sampling is erroneous, then one will have a biased sample, which does not allow reaching at valid research findings. As the saying goes, true numbers don’t lie and it is the researcher’s bias that informs the invalid findings and not the numbers.

While analyzing data, statistical generalization states that your data and your calculated needs must be accurate and precise. Accurate meaning we should have some level of confidence that the estimate is in fact correct. And by precise, it is meant that the estimate is expressed within close and clearly specified limits. The more precise the estimate is to a larger population, the better. Thus, if there is sampling error, the margin of error must be clearly stated in the pole; in such cases, the margin of error is clearly stated and accepted.

Statistics is used for the smaller sample to make estimate of the larger population. Thus, what happens to the general population from the sample is what we call inferential statistics. The basic examples of descriptive statistics therefore are the mean, the standard deviation, and correlation.

Following the presentation and discussions there was a presentation that was made by a participant on a theme political institution with regards to using SPSS to analyze data. The participant stated that what one plans to investigate in his/her study must be clearly understood to proceed to data analysis. He also recommended that to employ statistical studies, other similarly conducted literatures must be referred and the basics of feeding data in SPSS must be critically looked into such as using spaces and feeding letters.

In the same manner another participant made a presentation with reference to using ‘R’ to analyze quantitative data with a view to feed in to qualitative approach. He stated that R is free software, which is the most flexible for statistical analysis with the best graphics of any statistical software.
In using ‘R’, the participant said challenges such as not matching with research objectives, missing variables and fragmented variables including irrelevant coding or labeling can be mentioned.

Day Eleven, 28th September 2012
Using NVivo to Analyze Data
By Dr. Julius O.Jwan

Transcribing data

Transcribing data is relevant while undertaking research. In qualitative research, transcribing data is critical through audio recording. In the same manner, taking pictures and giving them meaning is also another strategy of transcribing data. Once data is transcribed, it might in average take about six months to analyze it. While reading the data, one will be trying to make a link between the data and stories for further analysis. Further, discourse analysis can be taken at a data analysis level but mostly used at a higher level.

NVivo

NVivo is a qualitative data analysis (QDA) computer software package produced by QSR International. In Using NVivo to analyze Qualitative data, there are stages that must be followed. Once the analysis part is done, it is flexible to be imported to NVivo while using sources.

Following the presentation and discussion on NVivo, there was a brief presentation by one of the participants on the research he is conducting on, “Boarder Disputes and Relations between Tanzania and Malawi”. He explained that he used three sources of data collection methods: archival sources, personal visits, and review of literatures which will be interrogated with other sources. He further clarified that that cartographic information and map studies will be incorporated to conduct the study together with unstructured interviews for stare ministries, group discussions, and personal observations.

Closing the session, the facilitator emphasized the importance of researchers’ changing their attitude towards SPSS’s, i.e., assuming it requires high mathematical skills. Most software packages are about trial and error, which can be excelled with exercises. Further, as data analyzing techniques are indispensable for undertaking researches, putting on the required energy and patience to be familiar with the techniques and software is required from the students.

After the end of the session, a 30 minutes evaluation was undertaken regarding participants’ feedbacks and reflections on the training.
IV. Closing Ceremony

The closing ceremony of the workshop was led by Dr. Samuel Kale Ewusi, Research Coordinator, UPEACE Africa Programme. He credited the two weeks training as the beginning of a more rigorous process between the participants and UPEACE Africa Programme. He stated that as to whether all expectations of the participants were met is yet to be seen in their evaluations. He further affirmed their stay as the beginning of a long term relationship to work together. Besides, he said that the UPEACE Africa Programme will make close follow up of the candidates as to whether the expectations of the candidates is met. He further expressed his hope that the workshop helped most participants identify very useful skills. He also pointed out that the participants were the beginning of critical mass of resource people and UPEACE will be on their side to set up a platform to link the participants with their mentors with an online system that will be established and be linked with the Africa Program website to create a participatory environment for the participants. In the end, he stated that UPEACE will do its best to help them deliver project objectives and thanked all participants for their active role in the workshop. Then, he invited Dr. Jean Bosco Butera, Director of UPEACE Africa Programme, for an official closing of the workshop.

Dr. Butera started his closing remarks by thanking the participants for their active participation in the workshop. He appreciated the fact that the participants are coming from different countries and universities to deal with governance and security issues. He also called for their attention as to the ownership of their objectives and expectations rather than UPEACE, which is simply a facilitator. He also recommended working together to deliver on their objectives. Asking participants to link UPEACE with their supervisors to work in a better manner, he encouraged participants to think about the possibility of co-publishing with their supervisors. He further reminded that it is through this kind of networks that participants could be connected with the AU, UN and other relevant institutions. Heartening for the interaction to keep going vividly, he said the relationship is the platform to achieve the objectives the students are here for. He mentioned his expectations for the participants to also have the capacity of facilitators when they next come, which brings out quite a lot of knowledge and experience through exchanges. Stating his expectation for the draft of their dissertation for their next arrival for facilitation, he encouraged the participants to work towards that so that the draft can be discussed with their mentors together with a session for policy briefing. He stressed that this mission is an activity endeavor by all. He also stated that our better capacity must be realized to contribute to our continent in the issue of governance and security. Moreover, implying the importance of establishing a network, he said the best networks come through people who have the power to either maintain or destroy it. He said that if networks need to be maintained, it should be the participants that drive it and said that the challenge that follows is on all.
Dr. Butera in conclusion thanked all participants for their attendance for the last two weeks. He also recognized UPEACE staff for their diligent work for the successful completion of the workshop and wished participants a safe journey to their destination.
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Annex 2: Agenda

UPEACE-IDRC RESEARCH METHODOLOGY WORKSHOP
17th – 28th Sept, 2012
VENUE: African Union, Caucus Room 10
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

WEEK ONE 17th -22 September 2012

Day One: Monday, 17th September 2012
Morning Session: Facilitator: Dr Samuel Ewusi (UPEACE Africa programme, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia)

- 08:30: Pick up from the hotel
- 09:15 – 09:30: Registration
- 09:30 – 09:45: Welcome remarks: Dr Jean Bosco Butera, Director UPEACE Africa Programme
- 09:45 – 10:00: Welcome Remarks: Ms Njeri Karuru, IDRC Senior Programme Specialist, Governance, Security and Justice, Nairobi, Kenya
- 10:00 – 10:30: Introduction of Participants
- 10:30 – 10:45: Introduction of the Workshop Programme: Dr Samuel K. Ewusi, Research Coordinator, UPEACE Africa Programme
- 10:45 – 11:00: Introduction to evaluation
- 11:00 – 11:30: Coffee break and Group Photo

Sessions
Topic: Theoretical Foundations in Governance and Security Studies
Facilitator: Kenneth Omeje PhD (Professor at United States International University (USIU), Nairobi Kenya)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 13:00</td>
<td>The subject matter and philosophical underpinnings of social sciences</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 -16:00</td>
<td>Post-positivism as counter</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:30</td>
<td>Health Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:30</td>
<td>• Towards a paradigmatic consensus? From scientific positivism to</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scientific realism</td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF DAY ONE OF WEEK ONE

---

DAY TWO: 18th September 2012
Topic: Theoretical foundations in governance and security studies
Facilitator: Prof Kenneth Omeje (Professor at USIU, Nairobi, Kenya)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>Philosophical and Sociological context of key security theories in international studies.</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Philosophical debates in conflict studies</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 -15:30</td>
<td>Grounded theory: Developing theory from practice</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 -17:30</td>
<td>Theoretical foundation wrap up</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF DAY TWO OF WEEK ONE

---

DAY THREE: 19TH September 2012
Topic: Current trends and issues on governance in Africa
Facilitator: Dr Francis Ikome (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Addis Ababa Ethiopia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 -10:30</td>
<td>1. Governance: A conceptual clarification 2. Understanding the sources of Africa’s governance deficit</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 -11:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day Three of Week One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Africa’s democratic rebirth of the 1990’s: Promise and Betrayal</td>
<td>A focus on positive governance trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Betrayal of the promise of the 1990’s: A focus on new governance challenges and issues</td>
<td>Conclusion and proposal on the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Q &amp; A session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF DAY THREE OF WEEK ONE**

### Day Four: 20th September 2012

**Topic:** Mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis

**Facilitator:** Mr Nick Martin *(President and CEO of Institute for technology and social Change (Tech Change) Washington DC, USA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Introduction of mapping tools in data collection, visualization and analysis (Ushadidi, mapbox, ArcGis)</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Ushadidi</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Ushadidi</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Mapbox</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF DAY FOUR OF WEEK ONE**

### Day Five: 21st September 2012

**Topic:** Current trends and issues on security in Africa

**Facilitator:** Issaka Souare *(Ph.D)* *(Department of Peace and Security, Africa Union)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Overview of current status of studies in</td>
<td>-Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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security with special focus on Africa -Discussion -Q & A session

10:30:11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 Recent trends and challenges in security studies in Africa -Presentation -Discussion -Q & A session

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 The way forward in security studies in Africa -Presentation -Discussion -Q & A session

Health Break

15:30 – 16:00 Tips and guidelines in writing a policy brief in security studies -Presentation -Discussion -Q & A session

19:00 Dinner Yod Abyssinia Restaurant

END OF DAY FIVE WEEK ONE

DAYSix: Saturday 22nd September 2012
Topic: Mapping methods and tools for data collection, visualization and analysis
Facilitator: Mr Nick Martin (President and CEO of Institute for Technology and social change (Tech Change) USA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Mapping method and tools for data collection and analysis: ArcGis</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:30</td>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF DAY SIX WEEK ONE

WEEK TWO 24th - 28th September 2012
TOPIC: THE RESEARCH PROCESS
Facilitator: Julius O. Jwan (PhD) (Assistant Director: Research; National Cohesion and Integration Commission, Nairobi Kenya)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Overview of the Security Situation in Africa by Mr. Wane EL-Ghassim, Director, Peace and Security Department, African Union Commission</td>
<td>-Presentation -Discussion -Q &amp; A session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY ONE 24th Sept, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:00 – 10.30 | Probability Sampling Procedures  
*Implication for data analysis*  
-Presentation  
-Q & A session |
| 10.30 -11.00 | Health break                                                             |
| 11.00 – 12.30 | Non probability Sampling Procedures  
*Implication for data analysis*  
-Presentation  
-Q & A session |
| 12.30 – 14.00 | Lunch                                                                    |
| 14.00 – 15.30 | Using Questionnaires, Experiments, Tests to Collect data  
*Implication for data analysis*  
-Presentation  
-Q & A session |
| 15.30 – 16.00 | Health Break                                                            |
| 16.00 – 17.00 | Using Interviews, Observations, FGDs and Documents to Generate Data  
*Implication for data analysis*  
-Presentation  
-Discussion  
-Q & A session |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10.30</td>
<td>Organising Quantitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 -11. 00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Organising Quantitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Cleaning Qualitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 17.00</td>
<td>Review of the processes of Organising Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF DAY THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900 – 10.30</td>
<td>Using SPSS to Analyse Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 -11. 00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 -12.30</td>
<td>Using SPSS to Analyse Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Using SPSS to Analyse Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 -16.00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 17.00</td>
<td>Review of Analysing data Using SPSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF DAY FOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900 – 10.30</td>
<td>Using NVivo to Analyse Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 -11. 00</td>
<td>Health break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 -12.30</td>
<td>Using NVivo to Analyse Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>- Evaluation (Reflections on the training and feedback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Closing ceremony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>END OF TRAINING PROGRAMME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>