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Abstract

Interethnic conflict in schools may be destructive, passive, and/or constructive. This case study examined how the Burundian formal education system incorporated ethnic difference and conflict into schools, throughout three time periods: the three pre-civil war Independent Republics, civil war (1993-2005), and post-civil war. It looked at education policy and planning documents from each time period and compared these documents to the remembered, lived experiences in schools, obtained from semi-structured interviews with ten Burundian immigrants currently living in Canada. Results showed that destructive conflict and passive conflict, in particular conflict avoidance, were often present in Burundian schools during the Independent Republics. The interviews suggested that the avoidance interethnic conflict in schools may have contributed to the direct violence in the 1990s. Thus, constructively engaging with interethnic difference and conflict in schools, through critical dialogue and incorporating multiple experiences, may help to build sustainable peace in the country in the future.
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NOTES:

(1) Spelling: throughout this thesis Hutu, Tutsi and Twa will not be pluralized by adding an ‘s’. Officially, the plurals are Bahutu, Batutsi, and Batwa. If participants specifically referenced these terms in their interviews, then the nomenclature was retained, however, most policies and individuals do not add the ‘ba’ prefix. The intention in omitting the prefix when referencing a group is not to essentialize individual members of the groups into one identity or experience group, but rather to maintain spelling and grammar used within the Burundian community. Additionally, Barundi describes people from Burundi.

(2) Country names: The term Ruanda/Urundi is used in this thesis in order to denote the territorial and administrative authority under both the German and Belgian colonial rule. Burundi and Rwanda are the names of both the traditional kingdoms (before colonization) and to the countries after they achieved independence.

(3) Timelines:
   a. Independence in Burundi: Officially, Burundi achieved independence from Belgium in 1962, however it retained the structure of the traditional kingdom and administered as a constitutional monarchy until 1966, when a military coup overthrew the king and started the First Republic of Burundi. As such, unless otherwise specified, this thesis uses the 1966 date as the start of analysis.
   
   b. ‘Post’-conflict Burundi: Unlike some violent conflicts, where the end of a war is marked by the signing of a peace agreement, there is some difficulty in assigning an end date to the civil war in Burundi. While the Arusha Peace Reconciliation Agreement was signed in 2000, the final rebel groups did not sign the agreement and were not fully disarmed until 2005. Furthermore, the Burundian Constitution was signed in 2003, where post-conflict policies in developing peace in the country began to take shape, and some scholars and articles use 2003 as such. However, given that most scholarly literature and other formative policy documents use the year 2005 as the end of the civil war, I will use 2005 as the end of the civil war and, thus, 2005-present as the ‘post’-conflict period throughout this thesis.
CHAPTER 1

ETHNIC DIFFERENCE AND CONFLICT IN BURUNDI

How strange to find that the present contained such a bright shard of the living past,
Damaged and eroded, but not destroyed.
(Tartt, 2013, p. 470)

Researcher Background and Purpose of the Study

I first visited Burundi in the summer of 2010, as part of a vacation from my work with
Aegis Trust Rwanda at the Kigali Genocide Memorial (KGM). Over the previous two summers
in Rwanda, I learned about the hope that Rwandans and the Rwandan Government were placing
on education to build sustainable peace in the country. I was fortunate enough to visit the new
Ministry of Education, MINEDUC, and meet with the Minister of Education. He explained
ministry plans for formal education programs across the country in peace, social cohesion, and
reconciliation, and the hope the government placed in the formal education system for building
sustainable peace in the country, a sentiment echoed by international representatives, such as the
then Canadian High Commissioner and the High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. I was
also fortunate to meet with other diplomats, local politicians, and representatives from local and
international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). There was an overall promise of peace
and prosperity in those meetings and visits: a promise that through education and development
Rwanda could overcome its traumatic and violent conflict-ridden past to build a bright future.

I expected a similar energy in Burundi, a country that had been marked by similar ethnic
tensions and was emerging from a brutal civil war. I knew very little about Burundi when I first
crossed the border into the country on a small thirteen passenger bus. I rapidly realized that I had
fallen into the “false twin” trap that many Westerners, tourists, international NGO and private
workers, and scholars experience: Les Faux Jumeaux (Obura and Bird, 2005). I assumed that
Burundi – a country with similar ethnic and religious make-up, as well as similar geographical areas and populations to Rwanda (CIA Factbook, 2014) – would be similar to Rwanda in appearances and nature. Everything – from the social climate, to the security atmosphere, to the political climate and government infrastructure – was, however, markedly different to Rwanda. I realized that though Rwanda and Burundi appear similar at first glance, as you begin to look closely at the countries, you see just how different they are. Nowhere was this difference more pronounced, in relation to my interests, then at the Ministry of Education, MINEDUC, in Burundi. I was shocked to see a building covered in mould and run down: it stood in stark contrast to the brand new Rwandan Ministry of Education building with reflective glass walls and modern architecture. While the outer appearances of buildings are not necessarily an indication of the functionality or importance placed an institution – and certainly Burundi was and, as of this writing in 2014, is much poorer than Rwanda – that building demonstrated the magnitude of the post-civil war reconstruction that Burundi is now faced with. This visit to Burundi (and in particular when I visited a couple of primary schools in Bujumbura, the capital city) caused a pivot away from the work I had been doing in Rwanda and towards this current work in Burundi.

My fascination with Burundi increased as I began to parse out the details of the Burundian interethnic violence and its history. The ethnic and civil conflicts that have been ever-present in Burundi since it achieved independence are dramatically under-studied in published literature compared to Rwanda. Rwanda’s genocide in 1994 is responsible for the deaths of 800,000 to 1,000,000 Tutsi and moderate Hutu over the course of just 100 days, the violence and destruction is on a scale that is incomprehensible to most people. Comparatively, the scale of the twelve year civil war in Burundi seems less dramatic: around 300,000 people were killed
between 1993 and 2005. However, the civil war’s persistence in Burundi left the country in a state of disrepair – structurally, culturally, and socially. There have been two other significant episodes of violence and genocide since independence: a genocide against Hutu in 1972, which resulted in 300,000 deaths, and an outbreak of violence in 1988 that left somewhere between 20,000 to 150,000 dead (Call, 2012). The combined impact of these events on the consciousness of the Burundian people is no less significant than the violence in Rwanda.

At the heart of the violence in Burundi, as in Rwanda, lie the relationships between the majority Hutu and minority Tutsi ethnic groups. Destructive and inequitable governance structures created a southern-Tutsi monopoly of power after independence in 1966. This monopoly of power fostered fears and animosity across ethnic lines (LeMarchand, 1995) and created a so-called ‘culture of conflict’ in the country (Ross, 2007). Episodes of mass violence, when predominantly Tutsi government forces killed Hutu in large numbers, scarred the post-independence landscape and created a country marred by the effects of such devastating violence. The purpose of this thesis is to make sense of the roles social institutions, in particular Burundi’s formal education (school) system, played in fostering (and/or mitigating) the animosity, fears, and stereotypes between ethnicities. I seek to develop an understanding of the ways that schools helped to shape ethnic difference, and consequently how ethnic difference contributed to conflict (either destructively, passively, or constructively) within those schools. I show that it is possible to constructively engage with interethnic conflict in a manner that may create spaces for peace, and that maybe those spaces can be developed using current education policies that are already in place in Burundi.

To develop an understanding of how education may have contributed to the problem makes it possible to understand how education could be used in such a divided context as a
uniting force, one that mitigates rather than exacerbates conflict. Elisabeth King (2014a), describes education as a *reflector* and *amplifier* of societal conditions, that is, pre-existing messages of cross-group difference and binary ‘us/them’ social categories exist and are often strengthened in schools. She argues that messages about those social conditions, identities, roles within society and relationships between groups can “prompt students to act in certain ways” (E. King, 2014b). She also argues that schools act as *signals* for acceptable social behaviours and attitudes: they can work to change attitudes and behaviours towards difference through curriculum content and learning activities that promote peacebuilding (E. King, 2014a). Her study was based in Rwanda, but the ideas and analysis throughout are no less applicable to Burundi: schools in Burundi have the potential to act as signals for constructive, not destructive, interethnic relationships and these interactions in schools may be one (of many) pathways to building sustainable peace in the country.

**Introduction to Burundi: Ethnic Difference and Conflict in the Heart of Africa**

Burundi is a small, landlocked country in the heart of Africa. It borders the economically and geographically dominant East African countries of Democratic Republic of Congo, Tanzania and Rwanda. As of 2014, Burundi has a population of over 10 million (CIA Factbook, 2014), that and its small land area combine to make it the second most densely populated country in Africa, after Rwanda (UNDP, 2014). The 2011 UNESCO Education for All *Global Monitoring Report* on education and armed conflicts identified Burundi as one of 35 conflict-affect countries, and specifically it was ranked as a “low-income conflict-affect country” (UNESCO, 2011). Burundi is, as of this writing, ranked 180 out of 187 on the Human Development Index (UNDP, 2014).
Ethnically, Burundi’s population contains three groups: the majority Hutu (85%), minority Tutsi (14%), and pygmy Twa (1%) (CIA Factbook, 2014). The divisions between Tutsi and Hutu ethnic groups were traditionally fluid: they were often blurred as a result of historic clan alliances and intermarriages (Ndkiumana, 2005; Theron, 2011), although the distinction between both groups has reified over time. Burundi is also relatively unique in Africa in that it has a largely homogeneous culture: the majority of Burundians share a common language (Kirundi), with French as a second language (predominantly spoken in the capital city and other urban centres) and some spoken Swahili in the eastern regions and in the capital city (CIA Factbook, 2014), over 86% of Burundians are Christian (Daley, 2006).

After independence from Belgium in 1959, ethnic tensions in Burundi resulted in multiple civil wars or violent outbreaks the longest of which lasted from 1993 to 2005. Notably, Burundian and international experts disagree about what counts as a civil war and what counts as genocide in Burundi: Fearon and Laitin (2003) count civil wars in 1972, 1988 and from 1993-2002; Uvin (1999) describes ‘mass atrocities’, not civil wars, in the 1960s and 1972; Sambanis (2004) describes civil wars in 1972, 1988 and the third starting in 1991 (cited in Call, 2012); Obura (2008) identifies the start of the latest civil war as 1993 and lasting until the new government was sworn in, in 2005; and LeMarchand (1995) describes the violence in 1972 as a civil war with mass atrocities. In this project, I take the killings in 1972 and 1988 as both civil wars with mass atrocities and genocide (while killings occurred on both sides, the government was responsible for mass targeting and killing of Hutu, particularly educated Hutu elite, in both instances), and the latest civil war starting in 1993 and ending in 2005 with the swearing in of a new government. This (last) civil war has resulted in the deaths of over 300,000 and
displacement of an additional 687,000 (estimated, Collier & Sambanis, 2005, cited in UNESCO 2014a).

Research Questions

This thesis builds on upon previous studies from Rwanda (e.g. E. King, 2011 and E. King, 2014) and other conflict-affected countries such as Israel/Palestine (e.g. Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010) and Northern Ireland (e.g. Barton & McCully, 2007) to examine the impact that schools had in fostering destructive interethnic conflict in Burundi in the years leading up to the protracted civil war (1993-2005). It also sheds light on how schools have changed in the post-civil war era and potential areas that may promote constructive conflict between ethnicities in schools. The study was guided by the following question:

1. **How did the Burundian school system teach about ethnicity and conflict during the three Independent Republics leading up to the 1993-2005 civil war, and in the post-civil war era?**

The following sub-question facilitated my understanding of how official government policies and official reports constructed ethnic difference and conflict in schools (the explicit curriculum) and also what the lived experiences of students were in those very same school settings (experiences with the hidden curriculum that go beyond what is specifically written down in official documents).

a. **How did the Burundian government’s official education documents (policies, curriculum guidelines and mandates, textbooks, teacher guidelines and training material) in each of these time periods address ethnic difference?**

b. **How do former Burundian students living in North America describe their lived experiences in schooling with regards to ethnic difference and conflict?**
Justification

Burundi is a particularly good country to study in this context for several reasons. First, since the start of the republic in 1966, Burundi has experienced episodes of overt violence (broad in both scale and scope): genocides and mass atrocities in 1972 and 1988, and the civil war from 1993-2005, followed by relative non-violence throughout the country. At the time of this research, the country seems to be experiencing minimal overt violence. However, ‘peace’ is more than just the absence of violence and there are recent, worrying trends in the country that suggest there is a continuing potential for the violence to recur.

Second, while there is no direct evidence to suggest that there was no violence between ethnic groups prior to colonization by Belgium (Turner, 2010), the escalated violence since independence can be traced to specific colonial policies and practices that facilitated the reification of Hutu and Tutsi ethnicities, as static and essentialized social constructs (Call, 2012; LeMarchand, 1995; Prunier, 2009). This locates the violence temporally and allows for detailed analysis of specific times in Burundian history. The inequitable colonial practices included limiting access to schools for Hutu, and thus limiting the role of the Hutu majority in government and the private sector.

Third, both the Arusha Peace Accords of 2003 and the Burundian Constitution of 2005 explicitly reference the formal education system, particularly the unequal distribution of school access and school resources (quality teachers, textbooks and training), as a direct cause of the ethnic violence (Dupuy, 2009). Thus, the structural link between school and ethnic violence is well established in Burundi, however the link to the content of formal education (what was taught in schools) is not nearly as established and the educational content may have had equal if not greater significance to creating a ‘culture of conflict’ in Burundi.
Fourth, few prior (published) studies have attempted to understand the Burundian formal education system. The little work that has been published focuses primarily on the structure (access and enrolment figures, teacher numbers, resource and textbook allocation) of schooling (e.g., Obura, 2008; Jackson, 2000) or on possibilities for formal education in the future (e.g., Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009a; Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009b). Some older studies exist on school language policies in the 1970s and 1980s (Greenland, 1974; Ndayifukamiye, 1996). However, these studies paid little attention to the role of government-run public schools in driving (or mitigating) interethnic conflict and/or to the students’ lived experiences within those schools. The purpose of this thesis study is to develop an understanding of the intersections between government policy and the lived experiences of Burundians in schools.

Finally, while studies currently exist on how ethnic difference and conflict are addressed in schools in other so-called ‘post’-conflict (i.e. post-war) countries, few exist on Burundi. For example, studies on peace and conflict education in relatively non-violent countries (eg. Canada, US, and UK) argue that when constructive conflict education is injected into the classrooms through dialogue (Nagda & Gurin, 2007) and discussion of controversial issues (Hess & Avery, 2009; Johnson & Johnson, 2009), it can help to reduce prejudices across groups. Research has recently begun to extend these theories and programs to conflict-affected countries, such as Israel/Palestine (eg. Bekerman & Zembylas, 2011) and Northern Ireland (eg. J. King, 2009; McCully, 2012). However, the school systems in these countries remain mostly segregated: only an extremely small percentage of students from different (ethnic or religious) groups go to school together. There are studies on the integrated Rwandan school programs (E. King, 2014a; McLean-Hilker, 2011; Warshauer-Freedman, 2008) but current social and political conditions there differ from Burundi: in Rwanda labelling ethnicity is now officially censored, whereas in
Burundi ethnic difference is openly discussed (Samii, 2013). This study extends the field to countries that have relatively integrated ethnic communities, although there are still instances of segregation along socio-economic status and urban/rural divides.

The need for this research, unfortunately, became even more acute in the months immediately preceding data collection. Evidence emerged through diplomatic cables to the UN from Bujumbura, the capital city, that Hutu-run militias and youth groups, were being armed and mobilized by the Hutu-led Nkurunziza government (Power, 2014). These events have gone under-reported and unacknowledged in the press (Lees, 2014) and are analogous to the actions taken by the Hutu-led Rwandan government as it armed militias in the months leading up to the 1994 genocide. In that case too, diplomatic cables from Kigali UN representatives to UN headquarters urged action, but the UN and international community subsequently refused to intervene and stop the violence (Melvern, 2004). As Rwanda commemorated the 20th anniversary of a nightmare, and as international leaders speak about their failure to act in Rwanda with cries of “Never Again”, there are clear signs that Burundi may be falling back into a cycle conflict escalation. Understanding the role schools may have in interrupting or sustaining such cycles of violence may help to ultimately break the cycle and help to develop a sustainable peace within the country.
Overview of the Thesis

This thesis project examines the role that formal education, or schooling, may have in contributing to or mitigating interethnic conflict in Burundi in two time periods: before the civil war from 1993-2005 and after the war (2005-2014). It is by no means a complete investigation, with a small sample size and most participants coming from one group (relatively privileged male Tutsi from Bujumbura), nor does this work attempt to claim generalizability. The research reported within describes particular events as they were experienced by the individual participants in the study.

In Chapter 2, I examine and critically review prior research pertaining to the role of schools in forming and contributing to ethnic difference and conflict. I start with an examination of how ethnicity is conceptualized in the literature and in particular focus on the theory that ethnicity is a social construct, that it is not primordial or inherent and inflexible. I move on to describe the aspects of education that are pertinent to this study: I focus on the formal education system (schools) and also the intersection between official curriculum (documents, policies, textbooks) and the hidden curriculum (norms, values and behaviours transmitted implicitly to students) in schools. I then present and develop the conceptual framework for this thesis: I focus on what I feel are three types of approaches to conflict in schools – destructive conflict, passive conflict and constructive conflict (adapted from Davies, 2005) – what I call a typology of approaches to conflict in schools. Woven throughout the literature review is an examination of the socio-structural aspects (educational access and governance, control and distribution of resources, and formal curriculum structure such as language of instruction) and psychocultural content (courses of instruction, norms, values and dispositions of teachers and school officials, pedagogical practices) of schooling (drawing on E. King, 2014a and Ross, 1993). Finally, I relate
these themes to the Burundian context to situate this study in relation to both the Burundian education literature and the wider conflict (in) education literature.

In Chapter 3, I discuss and justify my methodology and research design. Here I start by describing my own standpoints and biases, as well as my initial concerns surrounding the research. From there, I describe the data collection process and sources of data: primary educational resources from government sources (policy, planning and curriculum documents) and secondary analyses from UNESCO or scholarly sources; ten semi-structured interviews Burundians currently living in North America; and my own personal research journal. In all cases, I initially started examining the primary school system. I analyzed both sets of primary and secondary data according to the typology of approaches to conflict in schools that I developed in the literature review. Finally, I summarize some of the limitations of this methodology, and what could have been done to improve the methods.

In Chapter 4, I examine the socio-structural aspects of Burundian schools as they relate to interethnic conflict. I focus on four aspects of formal education: school access, resource distribution, language of instruction, and the primary school exit exams, the concours nationales. I start with an introduction to educational practices under the Belgian colonizers, who laid the foundations for the inequality present in Burundian schools later. I then provide an overview of the three Independent Republics (1966-1976; 1976-1988; and 1988-1993) in order to examine how the structure of schools during the Independent Republics worked to formalize socio-structural grievances. I then describe the effects the civil war had on the formal education system in the country. Finally, I discuss formal education policies in the post-2005 era, and what space may exist to create constructive interethnic conflict, by means of creating more inclusive formal
education practices. In this chapter, I rely primarily on documents, however I also use some interview data to elaborate on my findings.

In Chapter 5, I offer insights into the psychocultural interpretations and experiences described by the Burundian interview participants about the types of conflict they saw in primary school. I show that aspects (however large or small) of all three types of conflict were present in Burundian schools throughout its post-independence history. For example, Burundian children of different ethnicities often constructively interacted on lunch or before school by playing football (soccer) together. I also examine how certain aspects of conflict dominate each time period (pre-civil war republics, and post-civil war). I describe how in the immediate lead up to the violence in 1972: youth groups and militias were armed and mobilized, and during the violence, Hutu that had education were often eliminated. After the violence in 1972 a program of conflict avoidance through omission and censorship emerged – and in many ways that culture of conflict avoidance continues to this day (although it is not explicit as it was in the 1970s and 1980s). I argue that this passive approach to interethnic conflict in schools did little to quell the fears and stereotypes that permeated Burundi at that time – that, if anything, the avoidance served to drive ‘ethnic’ issues underground and led to a system of ‘ethnic codes’ that helped to perpetuate those fears and stereotypes through society. Where formal education could have helped to mitigate violence, it instead directly and indirectly contributed to the violence that erupted in 1993. I also describe the post-war school system and some curriculum aspects that may help to build peace in the country.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I examine the combined impact that the socio-structural interests and psychocultural interpretations had on conflict in Burundian schools, and note that while the current Nkurunziza government is working to address the socio-structural aspects of conflict, it is
doing little to address the psychocultural aspects of the conflict, even though there are small spaces through which constructive interethnic conflict can be integrated into schools.

I also discuss future avenues of research that may arise from this thesis study. I designed and conducted this study in a North American setting and I interviewed Burundians who have been removed from the violent interethnic violence for a long time, in most cases for the majority of their lives. As such, I conclude this study with a call for more research on Burundian formal education, in particular a plan to operationalize this study to a full longitudinal, single country case study in Burundi, with greater interview sample variation and a larger document analysis. A study of that magnitude would include several members from each demographic (ethnicity, region, socio-economic class, and gender) in order to develop a more complete and nuanced understanding of the lived experiences in schooling of Burundians as they relate to destructive and constructive interethnic conflict. Furthermore, I conclude that a larger study could also extend beyond the scope of interethnic relations and conflict in Burundi (and Rwanda), to other relatively de-segregated countries that have experience interethnic violence – where actions taken by the governments in schools to mitigate or exacerbate interethnic violence is paramount to building sustainable peace around the world.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW:
ETHNIC DIFFERENCE IN SCHOOLING – A TYPOLOGY OF APPROACHES TO INTERGROUP CONFLICT

In the sense of dispute, conflict is of course universal in the politics of family, community and nation. In that sense, any dynamic human system is by nature a conflictive one, encompassing the play of opposing interests. The crux lies in how conflict is managed. (Agerback, 1996, p. 27)

In this chapter, I review the prior research pertaining to the relationships between ethnicity and education, and between education and conflict. I examine how constructive conflict might be a useful educative tool, and, by extension, might lead to sustainable peace in countries emerging from periods of sustained violence and/or intergroup conflict. This literature review unfolds in three parts. The first part focuses on the intricate nature of the relationship between education and society and education’s role as a socializing mechanism throughout society. Next, I describe some definitioning issues surrounding ‘conflict’ and ‘peace’ in society as a whole, and education in particular. Finally, I describe the role of formal education (schools) in promoting destructive, passive, or constructive conflict between groups, and by extension the role education can have in promoting positive or negative interethnic relations. I use these concepts to build a ‘typology of approaches to conflict’ in schools, the conceptual framework of this project. I apply these concepts to Burundian schools in order to examine the role that they may have in promoting violence or peace in the years leading up to the civil war (1966-1993) and in the post-civil war era (2005-2014). I also use this literature review to situate this single-country case study on the Burundian formal education system in relation to the larger body of scholarship on conflict (in) education.
The first part of the literature review focuses on two fundamental concepts to this thesis project: *ethnicity* and *education*. I first introduce the concepts of ethnicity and identity, drawing primarily on the work of Gellner (1983), in order to demonstrate the malleability of ethnicity and identity from a constructivist perspective. From there, I discuss the various forms of education across society: from non-formal (planned teaching and training in settings other than schools), to informal (cultural and less bounded socialization), to formal (institutionalized schools) (Stromquist, 1999). Here, I argue for the centrality of formal education, or schooling, in shaping of both individual and social identity, not only through the *formal curriculum*, but also through the *lived or experienced curriculum* (Aoki, 1993) and the *hidden curriculum* (Apple, 1979).

In the second part, I review research on practices in formal educational settings as they relate to intergroup conflict, drawing on the work of Bush & Saltarelli (2000) and Davies (2005). I first examine theory and research on what causes the perpetuation of intergroup conflict, particularly the dimensions of *psychocultural interpretations* (shared worldviews that help identity groups to make sense of daily life, such as perceptions of identities, ‘others’, and threat levels across identity groups) and *socio-structural interests* (such as inequalities in resource distribution across groups) (Ross, 1993; Ross, 2007). Then, I examine how these socio-structural and psychocultural factors may interact with ethnic difference in schools, and how these differences can be exacerbated or mitigated by schooling practices. I discuss three pathways through which conflict may be approached in formal education settings:

1. Conflict can be *destructive*: interethnic tensions are aggravated in schools, by creating exclusive identities and stigmatizing groups in classrooms (E. King, 2014a), promoting biased curricula (Hodgkin, 2006; McLean-Hilker, 2001), and inequities in resource distribution and access (Jackson, 2000);
2. Conflict can be approached *passively*: ethnic difference and conflict are avoided, omitted and/or censored from the curriculum (Magendzo & Toledo, 2009; McLean-Hilker, 2011; Rutayisire, Kabano, and Rubagiza, 2004; Tawil & Harley, 2004) or interethnic differences are minimized or, at best, pacified through programs of tolerance (Zembylas, 2011);

3. Conflict can be treated *constructively*: students engage with knowledges, issues, and members from different groups in order to mitigate interethnic tensions (Barton & McCully, 2007; Davies, 2004; Johnson & Johnson, 2009) through discussion and dialogue (Hess & Avery, 2009; Nagda & Gurin, 2007) or by generating multiple perspectives (Funk & Said, 2004).

I synthesize these approaches, combined with psychocultural interpretations and socio-structural interests, to build a framework for understanding how conflict may be approached in schooling, called a ‘typology of approaches to conflict in schools’, in order to understand what opportunities may exist in Burundian schools to positively engage with interethnic conflict and build peace in the country.

Interwoven throughout are applications of the ‘typology of approaches to conflict’ to Burundian schools in existing literature. Conflict can be a powerful tool in classrooms, and is not necessarily a negative force. Conflict can be used in schools to ease intergroup tensions in countries where there has been intractable violent intergroup conflict. I conclude that constructive conflict practices can provide learning opportunities for engaging groups that have been in situations of entrenched conflict, to help develop within them the knowledge, skills and relationships that may help them to build peace within a community.
The Role of Formal Education in Socialization and Shaping Ethnic Identity

Theories on ethnicity and ethnic identity have shifted over time. In contrast to theories that assume ethnicity as primordial, where ethnicity is rooted in collective experiences and more or less unchanging (Brown, 1989; Geertz, 1973), or instrumentalist theories, where ethnicity is an “ad hoc supplement to political strategies” (Hylland-Erikson, 2001, p. 44), in this study I conceptualize ethnicity as a social construct. To say that ethnicity is a social construct implies that ethnicity is situational, that it is not an inherent or inflexible determinant to a person’s identity (Fearon & Laitin, 2000, as cited in E. King, 2008; Hylland-Erikson, 2001). Hall (2006) promotes a post-modern construction, in which ethnic identity is experienced differently at different times and in different circumstances. Together, this post-modern constructivist framing implies that individual and group identities are malleable: they can evolve and change over time, depending on social, political and economic influences (E. King, 2005; E. King, 2014a).

Ethnic identity often reflects a sense of unity within a group and enables groups and individuals to differentiate themselves from one another: such inclusion within a group also builds codes of exclusion and distinction between and among groups (Brass, 1991; Rutayisire, Kabana, & Rubagiza, 2004). Ethnic identity can therefore create boundaries through which social categories are set up, to include some and exclude others from a group (Brewer, 1999). Once these categories are set up, members of the groups are often assigned essentialized identities, where members are perceived to possess certain characteristics (Brown, 2000). Often this leads to binary, non-overlapping identity categories, where “we” and “they” are fundamentally different from each other (ibid.) Categorization often leads to the creation of both in-group favouritism and out-group antagonisms, which is a fundamental feature of most destructive conflict, especially when society is divided according to primary identity categories,
such as Catholic/Protestant in Northern Ireland, and Hutu/Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi (E. King, 2014a).

Consequently, ‘education’ is one of the many influences that can play a powerful role in shaping and molding ethnic identities amongst a complex web of daily interactions among individuals and institutions. While there are several types of education – formal (school), non-formal (other planned teaching and training) and informal (cultural and less bounded socialization) (Stromquist, 1999; Williams, 2004), this study focuses on the formal education sector: the institutionalized curriculum and structures in schools that attempt to transmit a particular type of knowledge and understandings (Apple, 1993). Learning opportunities in formal education can have a significant effect on the general population for several reasons: schooling is, increasingly, required; it takes place during the early, formative years of a child’s life; it reaches large segments of the population in a short period of time; and children are often required to treat the content they learn as truthful (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Lall, 2008). As a result, schools can, explicitly or implicitly, work to promote peace between groups, or to exacerbate interethnic tensions, through institutional structures (e.g., access, grouping, streaming, and management), and through the content of curriculum goals and classroom practices (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000).

In formal education, the learning opportunities that exist (as they relate to ethnicity and identity) reach far beyond what is explicitly taught in classroom. The official curriculum consists of any explicit curriculum mandate, policy, teacher training manual, and/or textbook that organizes a set of intended learning goals in the formal education system (Tawil & Harley, 2004). However, there are additional (important) learning opportunities that occur in what is known as the hidden (or implicit) curriculum (Jackson, 1968). The hidden curriculum, according
to Apple (1979; 2004), refers to the aspects of education that are not explicitly stated in curriculum mandates or goals, and implicitly convey the norms and values of a society indirectly through the actions, attitudes, models and practices of those in the classroom and school environment (also Tawil & Harley, 2004; Williams, 2004). The official and hidden curriculum intersect in the (implemented and) experienced curriculum, or the so-called lived curriculum (Aoki, 1993). Consequently, schools are much more than just vessels to transmit knowledge: they socialize children (Williams, 2004). These curricula work in concert with each other to shape ethnic identity. In situations of entrenched intergroup conflict, the hidden curriculum may embody bias, absence or non-representation in the curriculum, and/or unfavourable teacher attitudes towards particular groups. For example, often there is a hidden curriculum of obedience and conflict avoidance in schools, in which teachers often imply that what they say is the truth and thus silence or ignore conflicting viewpoints (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Novelli & Lopez-Cardozo, 2008; Williams, 2004). It is because of this hidden curriculum that no curriculum is ever completely neutral (Apple, 1979; Freire, 1970; Freire, 1994). Perspectives, attitudes, biases and beliefs of teachers, school administrators and governments filter into the learning environment and can influence students’ learning and practices and, by extension, their ethnic identities.

Aspects of education and curriculum, both explicit and implicit, can therefore play a significant role in constructing social and cultural values and norms, socializing children as social beings and as citizens (Williams, 2004). This claim – that formal education contributes to the construction of social identity and young people’s understanding of ethnicity – is foundational to how this study conceptualizes and addresses education’s role in interethnic conflict. In 1983, Gellner famously noted that for national governments having a legitimate monopoly on the use of force was no longer as important as maintaining a legitimate monopoly
on education (as cited in Tawil & Harley, 2004). This stated monopoly on education is increasingly relevant with the advent of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), specifically with universal primary education, and many international and multilateral aid agencies, such as UNESCO, identify education as a key factor in promoting peace within a country (Boutros-Ghali, 1992).

Education’s role in building peace or reinforcing destructive conflict is much more nuanced than previously thought, particularly in post-conflict countries: peace is not promoted simply by virtue of the fact that children and youth are in school: what and how they are learning in school matters (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2005; E. King, 2014a; Smith & Vaux, 2003). The following section outlines some of the relationships between education and conflict in order to develop an operational framework for understanding how peace may be fostered or impeded in schools, and then relates these processes to current literature surrounding interethnic conflict in Burundi.

**Defining Conflict and Peace in Formal Education**

**Defining Interethnic Conflict**

*Conflict* has been conceptualized in many forms and is ever evolving. The multiple levels – from interpersonal to international – make defining conflict difficult at best. In its broadest form, it can be defined as any disagreement or competing interests, perceived or real, between individuals or groups (Bickmore, 2005; Davies, 2004). In this sense, conflict is ever-present and a feature of everyday life. This also implies that conflict and violence are not interchangeable terms (conflict does not necessarily have to be violent but violence can be a result of conflict). Types of violence include: *overt direct* violence whether at personal, intergroup, or international
levels (Bickmore, 2008); *structural violence*, meaning inequitable structures that marginalize, stigmatize and harm selected groups in a society (Galtung, 1969; Galtung, 1990); and *cultural violence*, in which aspects of a culture (such as norms, beliefs and media) legitimize structural and overt direct violence (Des Forges, 1999; Galtung, 1990).

All three forms of violence can be, and often are, present in educational settings. While obvious forms of overt violence, such as bullying and harassment, are often present in any school setting, interethnic clashes can manifest in schools as sites of large-scale violence and government oppression (Bickmore, 2008; Gladden, 2002; E. King 2011; Williams, 2004). Structural and cultural violence can operate through the implicit and explicit practices that sanction violent and oppressive behaviour - such as hate, stereotyping, harassment, unequal access for different groups, unfair language practices, and in perpetuating exclusionary narratives and antagonistic identities (Bickmore, 2008). For example, governments in India and Pakistan have created textbooks and curricula that perpetuate images of the ‘other’ to suit their adversarial political dominance and goals (Lall, 2008). Similarly, Rwanda’s education system, particularly its history curriculum, stigmatized and differentiated Tutsi and Hutu for the sake of legitimizing cultural and structural violence in the country in the years leading up to the genocide (E. King, 2011).

However, conflict does not have to be violent. Davies (2004; 2005) posits that conflict can be constructive, destructive, and/or passive. Destructive conflict manifests as developing non-binary and exclusive identities and stigmatizing groups, promoting bias, and inequities in resource distribution across groups. Passive conflict manifests as conflict avoidance and/or censorship (Magendzo & Toledo, 2009) or interethnic differences are minimized or, at best, pacified through programs of tolerance (Zembylas, 2011). Conflict can also be constructive,
where members of different groups with different knowledges and experiences come together in order to mitigate interethnic tensions through critical thinking and peacebuilding programs (E. King, 2014a).

In his seminal works on how conflict and peace can occur within a culture, Marc Howard Ross (1993; 1995; 2007) cautions that “culture is neither the root cause of ethnic conflict nor an epiphenomenon.” (Ross, 2007, p. 21). Rather, ‘conflict’ results from differences in material interests and collective cultural identities. He calls these social-structural interests and psychocultural interpretations. Social-structural interests that contribute to conflict include inequitable resource distribution and access to societal institutions, such as schools and government. Psychocultural interpretations include in-group/out-group identities, perceptions of ‘others’ (fears, mistrust, and negative stereotyping), competing narratives of conflict, and categorization and essentialization of groups.

An understanding of the causes of interethnic conflict and what constitutes peace can help to drive education policy in countries or communities that are attempting to rebuild after violent conflict. Violence and destructive conflict can have detrimental effects on formal education; both can disrupt normal schooling processes and tend to reduce openness, promote polarization and defensiveness, and compromise students’ willingness to engage in learning activities (Williams, 2004). Developing learning opportunities that attempt to re-engage students in learning and to increase openness to new ideas might reduce the tendency of education to perpetuate destructive conflict: paradoxically, this means opening up educational spaces to more opportunities for constructive conflict in order to foster peace (Bickmore, 2005; Bickmore, 2008; Davies, 2005).
Approaches to Peace in Education

Johan Galtung (1969, cited in Bickmore, 2008) recognized two kinds of peace: negative peace (the absence of overt physical violence) and positive peace (pervasive and consistent patterns that promote justice and non-violent conflict resolution within a community). That is, peace is a dynamic set of processes for ensuring justice and minimizing harm. Furthermore, peace theorists have defined a continuum of conflict management processes:

1. Peacekeeping: control to achieve cessation of violence and security in the community;
2. Peacemaking: dialogue, negotiation to develop resolutions to satisfy both/all sides;
3. Peacebuilding: a long-term, complex, systemic process in which all parties work to overcome the causes of cultural, systemic and overt negative conflict and to develop equity and healthy, trusting relationships between former antagonists (Bickmore, 2008; Galtung, 1969; Maise, 2003).

These approaches build on each other: peacekeeping is the simplest form and peacebuilding is the most complex and comprehensive (Ramsbothan, Woodhouse & Miall, 2011). Sustainable peacebuilding cannot occur without (some) peacekeeping and peacemaking, reflecting the establishment of justice in a community.

While many studies exist on particular peace education programs in countries experiencing sustained and intractable violent intergroup conflict (see Du Preez, 2014; Nasser, 2014; Saad Khalef, 2014), each program depends on the particular needs of the community (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Harris, 2004; Salomon, 2002). Peacebuilding education often addresses the (structural, relational and personal) roots of violence and facilitates dialogue across difference to
help learners understand alternative perspectives and alternatives to violence (Barton & McCully, 2012; Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010; Harris, 2004; Maiese, 2003).

Bar-Tal & Rosen (2009) describe two models of peace education. In indirect peace education, explicit curriculum does not directly address the divisive local conflict and instead focuses primarily on peacemaking skills and concepts applied to more distant conflicts. In direct peace education, explicit curriculum works to directly address the themes and the history of the difficult local conflict in order to change social beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. Bar-Tal & Rosen argue that both forms of peace education can be effective in helping to develop sustained peace within a community, because even indirect peace education may allow students to apply skills and themes learned to the local divisive conflict, and thus open the door for conflict resolution and peace building in a community. Barton & McCully (2007) would disagree with this assumption. They claim that there is little evidence to support the notion that analyzing conflicts that are distant in time or in space will allow students to link to current conflict (Barton & McCully, 2007). Nevertheless, in his study of the Close Encounters program in Northern Ireland, John King (2009) notes that what he calls ‘cognitive distancing’ eventually can help direct attention to the divisive conflict: that is, that direct and indirect peace education can work together towards building peace in situations of intractable conflict. The final section of this review critically examines how these facets of conflict and peace can be incorporated into schools, either destructively, passively, or constructively, and finally how constructive conflict may help with building sustainable peace in Burundi.
Moving from Destructive Conflict to Constructive Conflict and Peace Building

Formal education can play a critical role in constructive and destructive social change - it can create an atmosphere that may promote violent conflict, or it can work to promote peacebuilding within a community. The choices made in the distribution of and access to education (the structure), and what and how it is taught (content) can have a significant impact on the social landscape within a country (ibid and Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; E. King, 2014a; Ross, 1993). The ‘negative’ face of formal education (practices and structures promoting or legitimizing violence and/or enmity) is often present in societies where there is intractable interethnic conflict – that is, where a ‘culture of conflict’ is embedded in a community or country (Ross, 2007). While it may be a difficult task to overcome a culture of conflict, steps can be taken in order to transform education systems to promote the ‘positive face’ features in formal education that can generate and support peacebuilding (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). This is especially necessary in communities experiencing difficult interethnic violent conflict.

This section outlines the relationships among formal education, conflict and peace, particularly as they relate to interethnic relations. I describe three types of approaches to conflict, drawing on a framework from Davies (2005), as they relate to education and schools – destructive conflict, passive approaches to conflict, and constructive conflict – and relate them to both socio-structural interests and psychocultural interpretations of conflict in or to build the conceptual framework for this thesis.
Destructive Conflict in Schools: Exacerbating Intergroup Tensions and Increasing the Likelihood of Violence between Groups

Given the influence that formal education can have in the socialization of youth and children, schooling presumably is an important factor in creating and maintaining a culture of destructive interethnic conflict (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Ross, 2007). Davies (2005) argues that, when destructive conflict is present in schools it increases the likelihood of active responses to that negative conflict (such as violence and war). Such destructive conflict may reinforce socio-structural inequalities, such as unequal access based on interethnic differences including the denial of education or inequitable quantity, quality and distribution of educational resources. For example, in Burundi, educational resources were disproportionality allocated to the Bururi province in the south of the country, where large concentrations of the Tutsi minority and, perhaps more importantly, many members of the Tutsi-dominated government, lived (Jackson, 2000). Similar experiences in uneven schooling distribution occurred in other conflict zones such as Rwanda, Kosovo, and East Timor (E. King, 2014a). In both Rwanda and Burundi, limited and unequal access to secondary school in the post-independence era was based, either directly or indirectly, on ethnic quotas designed to suppress educational attainment for marginalized groups (ibid.). Furthermore, the government’s choice of language of instruction has been ‘used’ as a tool to further entrench interethnic divisions in both Rwanda and Burundi (Greenland, 1980; Weinstein, et. al., 2007). For example in Rwanda, differences in language have resulted in a recoding of Tutsi and Hutu identities along the lines of those who speak English and French (Tutsi), or who can speak French (Hutu), in addition to Kinyarwanda (Weinstein, et. al., 2007).

Very little educational research has been conducted in Burundi. However, Jackson (2000) documents a difference in language of instruction, Kirundi in rural (predominantly Hutu) areas and French in urban (predominantly Tutsi) areas, that resulted in a significant barrier for children
attempting to move beyond primary school in rural areas, as the final year of primary school and the exams required to enter secondary school were in French (also, Eisemon & Schwille, 1991; Eisemon, Prouty & Schwille, 1989; Ndayipfukamiye, 1996). As such, Tutsi who had access to years of French education were more likely to be successful in their secondary school entry exams (which followed Belgian curricular guidelines, and contradicted the Burundian ones) and move on to secondary school. Additionally, Jackson’s study (2000) demonstrated structural inequalities in the distribution of educational resources. Promoting equitable distribution of educational resources, to ensure that similar access across ethnic lines, may help to remove some interethnic tension (Bush & Saltarelli, 2008; Novelli & Lopez-Cardozo, 2008).

Psychocultural factors in educational settings that exacerbate patterns of violence in educational settings include the collectivization, categorization, and stigmatization of ethnic groups (E. King, 2014a; Staub, 2001; Straus, 2006) Exclusive, collectivized identities can lead to reified ethnic categories, which may prevent interaction across groups, particularly in conflict zones with sustain interethnic violence, and may limit willingness on both sides to see members of the ‘other’ group as individuals and not just members of a group. Education that promotes hate, stereotyping and non-recognition may contribute to the adversarial collectivization of groups through the spread of unchallenged, biased cultural narratives that may exacerbate violent conflict (Davies, 2005; Funk & Said, 2004). The effect of large, mandatory national education policies means that intended and hidden curricular messages may be broadcast to large segments of the population in a small amount of time (for example via textbooks, and classroom beliefs, behaviours and attitudes). It follows that how psychocultural elements of curriculum and schooling influence and shape identity and ethnicity (including differences and enmity) plays an important role in driving conflict.
Passive Approaches to Conflict: Omission, Tolerance and Conflict Avoidance in Education

The role that education can have in driving peace in a community became particularly important with the advent of Boutros-Ghali’s *Agenda for Peace*. As a country enters the so-called post-conflict phase (meaning after episodes of escalated violence or war), school practices can have a transformative (or non-transformative) effect on in-group and out-group relationships. Generally, one of the first tasks of reconstruction after widespread, violent war is re-establishing the education system (Tawil & Harley, 2004). Formal education systems are often quickly re-built to provide education a ‘sense of normalcy’ for young people (Winthrop & Kirk, 2011). In Rwanda, after the genocide, there was a push to get schools and the Ministry of Education up and running as quickly as possible: by September of 1994 (just two months after the cessation of direct violence) primary schools were re-opened, and by the following May secondary schools re-opened (E. King, 2011). However, the struggles surrounding the next phases in the reconstruction (i.e. what should be taught and how) often leads to ‘quick fixes’ such as purging textbooks of ‘objectionable material’, refusal to teach history, and firing teachers who were found to have fostered what the government considered to be negative and destructive views on the conflict (Weinstein, et. al. 2007).

That is, the interethnic conflict and its causes are often removed from the explicit curriculum and the violent conflict itself is downplayed in order to not inflame ethnic tensions and attitudes of violence and conflict (Davies, 2005). Passive responses to conflict include tolerance, omission, and avoidance. While these methods may contribute to negative peace in the immediate aftermath, they may not address the socio-structural or psychocultural causes of or alternatives to violent conflict, and thus opportunities are missed to confront problems and build sustainable peace within a community.
**Omission, Censorship and Conflict Avoidance**

When curricula specifically omit or censor the causes and history of a conflict, it can be counter-productive to developing peace through education. One of the principal postulates of peace education is that it should address the roots of violence and should include the voices and direct participation of various groups in discussion of the conflict (Bickmore, 2005; Bickmore, 2008; Bickmore, 2014; Harris, 2004; Magendzo & Toledo, 2009; Tawil & Harley, 2004). For example, in Rwanda in the decade and a half after the genocide, there was a moratorium on teaching the history of the country in the period preceding the genocide (Hodgkin, 2006; Warshauer-Freedman, Weinstein, Murphy & Longman 2008). While the Ministry of Education eventually developed a history curriculum at both the O-Level (Junior Secondary) and A-Level (Senior Secondary) that discussed the genocide, there has been little to no implementation across the country, as of 2011 (McLean-Hilker, 2011). As a result, children and youth presumably only learned about the genocide through non-formal education sources, such as genocide memorials across the country, or from informal education and other socialization factors, such as family, church and market places across the country (Weinstein, et. al., 2007).

Weinstein, et. al. (2007) studied the role of formal education in four post-conflict countries – Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Croatia, and Rwanda. Countries emerging from interethnic violence often take one of two divergent pathways in discourses about ethnic groups. One path is the representation of differences become more pronounced and reified, such as in the former Yugoslavia where ultimately separate countries emerged with different majority groups in each, within each new country, separate groups have formed insular communities. This segregation of ethnic groups in education has resulted in minimal interactions between warring groups. This “reified separateness” (Weinstein, et. al. 2007, p. 53) effectively amounted to passive peace or peacekeeping in schools, at best. In the Burundian context, along a similar
pathway, there was an almost ‘Balkanization’ of schools, wherein Tutsi and Tutsi-dominated areas received the bulk of educational funding and often school populations consisted of separate, or nearly separate, ethnic groups (Greenland, 1980). This segregation in schools further reified group difference and provided little opportunity for intergroup discussion, effectively removing the conflict from the explicit official curriculum and driving it underground into proxy issues.

Alternatively, governments may seek to remove ethnic identity labels from the daily discourse in the community, or even to deny the existence of ethnic groups or to forbid public discussion about issues of ethnicity. In Rwanda, such a government attempt to construct a ‘superordinate’ identity of ‘Rwandan’ was supposed to supersede ‘Tutsi’ and ‘Hutu’ identities and unify the country: while the government denounced labelling and discussing ethnic conflict and ethnicity as promoting genocide ideology (Weinstein, et. al., 2007). However, many would argue that disallowing ethnicity from public discourse may do little to ease interethnic tensions. Differences rooted in language, religion and economic stratification (see above) often become proxies for ethnic difference (LeMarchand, 1995; Rutayisire, et. al. 2004). Experiments in re-categorization into superordinate identities via education ultimately do not address the fundamental causes of the destructive conflict, either socio-structurally or psychoculturally. As a result, they could lead to a country falling back into violent conflict, as happened in Burundi in 1988 and again in 1993 (E. King, 2011; E. King, 2014a; LeMarchand, 1995; McLean-Hilker, 2011). In contrast, educational practices that seek to engage students in interethnic discussions, instead of ignoring them or entirely separating groups, may help to facilitate students building understanding between groups as they engage with each other. Such curriculum and interaction may create opportunities to constructively engage with group differences and to generate
dialogue between groups, and may allow for the critique of adversarial psychocultural narratives and/or socio-structural inequalities experienced by various groups (Novelli & Lopez-Cardozo, 2008; Weinstein, et.al, 2007).

Unfortunately, in Rwanda there has been a moratorium on teaching controversial issues surrounding the genocide. At the time of this thesis research, teachers were allowed to teach their students one dominant, approved narrative (or sometimes none at all) about the genocide; there is no allotment of time in the formal curriculum for discussion, or debate, nor contrasting viewpoints (McLean-Hilker, 2011; Hodgkin, 2006; King, 2014). These curricular constraints minimize the chance for expression of disagreement among students, and reflect a culture of conflict avoidance, as well as a culture of obedience, in classrooms. This controlled, regulatory framework for teaching in Rwanda has been widely criticized as ineffective, and sparked worries about returns to overt violent conflict in the country, as it has been argued that one of the reasons why the genocide happened so quickly may have been that Rwandese had learned a culture of obedience as well as ethnic division through schooling (ibid, and Weinstein et. al., 2007; Uvin, 1999).

**Tolerance**

UNESCO’s 1995 *Declaration of Principles of Tolerance* defines tolerance “as a virtue of respecting and accepting differences in order to create peace” (Zembylas, 2011), and argues that education is the “most effective means of preventing intolerance” (UNESCO, 1995). Tolerance can be seen, in some regards, as a kind of peacekeeping tactic, in which everyone is encouraged to accept difference without necessarily engaging with unfamiliar groups. There may be an inherent power imbalance implied in tolerance – the tolerator approves of what is be being tolerated not vis versa – thus, simply tolerating difference does not necessarily move towards any
understanding of difference (Davies, 2004; Davies, 2005; McGlynn, et. al., 2009; Zembylas, 2011). Education is a powerful tool of the nation state. Governments may (and often do) actively promote *intolerance* and undermine efforts to build peace within a community (ibid. and Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010). Thus, while promoting tolerance may be useful to ease tensions in the immediate aftermath of an escalated violence, it does not address root causes of violent conflict or work towards generating an understanding between groups – key tenets of peace education. In Burundi after the violence in 1988, programs of ethnic tolerance and unity were implemented in schools. However, the piecemeal and inconsistent nature of the programs did little to ease interethnic tensions, which erupted again in 1993 with a protracted civil war (Jackson, 2000; Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009a; Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009b).

Separating groups, promoting tolerance between groups, and avoiding conflict and controversial issues discussions in school, in the name of peace, may actually help to reify inter-group difference, instead of helping to generate positive, sustainable peace (Barton & McCully, 2007; Donnelly & Hughes, 2006; Niens & Chastenay, 2008; Weinstein, et. al., 2007). The following section illustrates some pedagogical practices that may help to build sustainable and democratic peace through constructive conflict in schools.

**Constructive Conflict in Education: Building Peace through Conflict and Dialogue**

It is possible that indirect hidden curricula can bring constructive conflict influences to the forefront in some educational practices: for instance critical discussions more distant concepts and narratives surrounding narratives of conflict, war, and ethnic categories could make space for the inclusion of multiple perspectives and histories in the classroom (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010; Bickmore, 2007; Zembylas & Kambani, 2012). While conflict can be destructive, it can also be treated constructively and confronting it is often necessary for both
peace and democracy within education and society (Bickmore, eg. 2008; Davies, 2004; Davies, 2005; Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Barton & McCully, 2007). Actions to bridge psychocultural aspects of intergroup divides include critical dialogue in classrooms, intergroup contact, discussions of controversial issues, and incorporating multiple perspectives to challenge hegemonic narratives (Barton & McCully, 2007; Davies, 2005; Gill & Niens, 2014; Donnelly & Hughes, 2006; Hess & Avery, 2008; McGlynn, et. al. 2009; Reilly & Niens, 2014; Zembylas & Kambani, 2007). Actions to mitigate social structural aspects of intergroup tensions in education include equitable access to education and educational resource distribution for all groups, including language of instruction. Jackson (2000) described how equitable access to education for Hutu and Tutsi is a critical piece imperative for Burundi. However, there is a dearth of the literature about the psychocultural actions that Burundian education may take in order to build sustainable peace in the country.

**Critical Dialogue and Controversial Issues Discussion**

Davies (2004) described “dialogue (the two acts of speaking and listening) [as] actually about emergence: the bringing out of new and previous hidden meaning and understandings” (p. 216). Dialogue in constructive conflict involves the inclusion of all groups experiencing negative conflict, for members of both groups to both listen to the other and their experiences and for each group to express, constructively, their experiences, wants and needs. Nagda and Gurin (2007) found that well-facilitated intergroup dialogue in higher education classrooms can help to build bridges across differences in power, culture, and experiences, and also help learners to explore similarities and differences across group lines. Productive dialogue can also foster empathy and develop connections between members of different ethnic groups, as well as help participants to develop mutual respect and understanding across groups and experiences (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). Engaging students in critical dialogue and controversial issue discussions means that
diverse students are offered opportunities to speak and be heard, and to hear and understand the perspectives of individuals from other groups. Such a method has the potential to develop de-essentialized ethnicity, because it can work to engage students in sustained discourse that can challenge assumptions about the ‘other’ while not promoting erasure of deeply felt cross-group differences (Nagda & Gurin, 2007; see also J. King, 2009).

Johnson and Johnson (2009) described controversial issues as “those on which society has not yet found consensus and which are considered significant, that each proposed way of dealing with them has ardent supporters and adamant opponents” (p. 39). Hess and Avery (2008) distinguish two types of controversial issues: settled issues, in which teachers believe there is one acceptable answer; and unsettled issues, in which dominant opinion is still widely split (Hess and Avery, 2008). They argue that unsettled issues are the best topic for issue discussions, because they provide the opportunity to take a “legitimate” stance on either polarized side of the question. While these authors consider issues of bullying, and racism to be settled, in a post-conflict country, such as Burundi, to address particular events and narratives regarding the history of the country and the conflict as a whole would presumably be considered unsettled. John King (2009) noted in his study of the Close Encounters inter-group contact programs in Northern Ireland, sometimes engaging with relatively distant issues that offer less risk to teacher and student identities can be a way to develop understanding and mutual trust through dialogue and discussion about conflictual issues that later could be related directly to the contentious conflict. As controversial issues discussion and dialogue may not necessarily engage with interethic conflict themes and histories, it can be at times implemented as what Bar-Tal & Rosen (2009) might call indirect peace education.
While there are apparent benefits to critical dialogue about controversial issues for many students in various contexts, it does have the potential to have negative impacts on some students. One of the principal critiques of dialogue and critical pedagogy comes from Ellsworth (1989). She notes that when there is a difference in power relations between groups in a discussion (i.e. dominant vs. marginalized groups), it is possible that discussion of that intergroup conflict may be damaging for students who are or have been marginalized (Ellsworth, 1989, also Apple, 2004; Hess & Avery 2008). Furthermore, marginalized and/or groups with dissenting or unpopular views, may fear engaging in discussions if there is not proper support within the classroom to do so (Bekerman, 2009; King, 2009).

Dialogue that does not include marginalized perspectives may have limited pedagogical potential (Davies, 2004). Finally, teachers often do not feel confident in facilitating open dialogue about conflictual issues (Bickmore, 2005; Bickmore, 2008; Yamashita, 2006). However, free, open and equitably facilitated dialogue and discussion of controversial issues may help to create spaces to include diverse viewpoints and may help to contribute to peacebuilding within a community.

Multiple Narratives

Conventional discourses in conflict scenarios are “laden with presuppositions of ‘otherness’ and tend to reinforce the idea that ‘we’ cannot work with ‘them’ until ‘they’ become like ‘us’” (Funk & Said, 2004, p. 17). One of the consequences of critical dialogue and discussion may be the inclusion of multiple perspectives and narratives in the formal curriculum. In Rwanda, and other countries where there is a contentious past, the government often promotes a particular narrative about the conflict. This dominant narrative provides little room for alternative perspectives or experiences, and in-and-of itself ignores perspectives of many groups.
For example, Rwandan curriculum ignores that in north of the country, many Hutu were killed by the Tutsi-dominated Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA) as it advanced towards the capital, Kigali (Hodgkin, 2006; McLean-Hilker, 2011). This dominant national ‘true’ narrative of the conflict is designed produce a unified ‘Rwandan’ history as a way of promoting national unity and reconciliation in the country (ibid. and King, 2014a). However, it promotes the stereotype that all Tutsi were victims and Hutu were perpetrators and has set up victim/perpetrator binaries throughout the country. These victims/perpetrator identity binaries may dichotomize interpretations of the conflict into us/them, victim/perpetrator, Protestant/Catholic or Muslim/Christian, or, in the case of Rwanda and Burundi: Hutu/Tutsi identities (Bekerman, Zembylas, and McGlynn, 2009).

In developing historical narratives through education, then, it is important to include multiple perspectives and to work to ‘de-essentialize’ those identity categories (Bekerman, et. al., 2009; Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010), and to reconstruct the worldviews of students in ways that (re)story the narratives in order to instil values, beliefs and attitudes that favour conflict resolution and peacebuilding (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). This may help students to move beyond the dominant or exclusionary narratives that are socially constructed – through images, symbols, histories – towards a genuinely new set of narratives that are inclusive. It is only “active engagement through sustained dialogue [that] can help us to discover the common humanity concealed by symbols and obscured by fear, anger, and insecurity” (Funk & Said, 2004, p. 18).

Intergroup contact and discussion may help to generate new narratives of conflict. That is, well designed, sustained and equitable intergroup contact between members of groups in contact can help participants to re-imagine essentialized intergroup identities and help to overcome the victim/perpetrator narrative binaries that often exist (during and) after violent
conflict (Allport, 1958; Tal-Or, Boninger & Gleicher, 2002). Through sustained constructive cross-group contact, including integrated education and ‘de-essentialization’ of ethnic categories (Bekerman, et. al., 2009). Therefore, the inclusion of multiple perspectives may challenge dominant narratives of conflict and contribute to peace, through re-categorization (de-essentialization) of identity categories. However, intergroup contact theory stipulates that in order for cross-group contact to help with peace building in a community, cross-group contact must: 1) involve cooperation and constructive competition; 2) have an environment offering social and institutional support for building understanding between groups; 3) have groups that have equal status throughout the contact; 4) and be sustained over long periods of time (Allport, 1954; and Tal-Or, Boninger and Gleicher, 2002).

Furthermore, a significant challenge to the inclusion of multiple perspectives in classrooms is that legitimizing ‘other’ narratives’ may run the risk of challenging the teachers’ own stories, memories and narratives (Bekerman and Zembylas, 2010). However, giving teachers enough support to enhance their confidence in the subject material and practices of classroom dialogue and discussion (in particular whole school initiatives and professional development) in classrooms, facilitates the successful incorporation of multiple perspectives into classrooms (Bickmore, 2005; Torney-Purta, Barber & Richardson, 2005).

Towards a Conceptual Framework for Approaches to Conflict in Schools

Thus, just as there are many faces of education in interethnic conflict, there are also many faces of interethnic conflict in formal education. This thesis project draws on each of these aspects to build a ‘typology of approaches to conflict in schools.’ Here, I include both vertical and horizontal axes: the horizontal axis represents the types of approaches to conflict in schools
– destructive, passive, and constructive (based on Davies, 2005) – and the vertical axis represents the dimensions of interethnic conflict (adapted from Ross, 1993), shown in Figure 1 below. The framework serves as an analytic tool through with the Burundian school system in the three Independent Republics (1966-1993), and the post-civil war (post-2005) are analyzed for their role in contributing to and/or mitigating interethnic conflict. Thus, this framework serves to elucidate the types of conflict in schools, but also may serve to help find pathways through which constructive approaches to conflict may be incorporated into schools – either directly or indirectly – in order to build sustainable peace in Burundi.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework – A Typology of Approaches to Conflict in Schools
Conclusion: Working with and through Conflict in Burundian Schools

Ever since it became an Independent Republic in 1966, Burundi has suffered through rounds of repeated violence and conflict, culminating in the 1993-2005 civil war. While formal education may not have been a direct cause or the only cause of the violence, elements of structural and cultural violence were present in the education system. Aspects of the ‘negative face’ of education factors that seem to exacerbate destructive conflict outlined by Bush & Saltarelli (2000) were noted throughout the formal education system of post-independent Burundi: unequal distribution of resources and biased curricula geared towards promoting Tutsi dominance in politics and the military are prime examples (eg. Jackson, 2000; Samii, 2013).

While there have been some studies that have examined attempts in other ‘post-conflict’ countries to shift interethnic discourse from destructive to constructive (eg. Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010; Bekerman & Zembylas, 2011; E. King, 2014a; Zembylas, 2011; McGlynn, et. al. 2008; Weinstein, et. al., 2007), there has been little published effort to examine the Burundian context of formal education. Furthermore, several studies examine such possibilities in the structure of the Burundian system, finding discriminatory barriers along ethnic and regional lines that created tensions throughout the country (eg. Eisemon & Schwille, 1991; Jackson, 2000; Obura 2005); yet few studies examine the content or pedagogies of education as they relate to how and whether ethnicity and cross-group difference may have been mobilized and acknowledged as unifying or divisive factors in curriculum and formal education processes.

Older scholarship conducted in the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s in Burundi, focuses primarily on socio-structural aspects of education, in particular, the use of French and Kirundi as language of instruction in primary schools during the three republics. Eisemon, Prouty and Schwille (1989) and Ndayipfukamiye (1996) both argue that the use of French as the medium of
instruction in primary schools, and particularly the shift from Kirundi to French in Year 5, created social distortions and reinforced the hegemony of the Tutsi elite of south-western Bururi and urban (Bujumbura City) Burundi while restricting social mobility of students from the countryside including Hutu and other Tutsi, who would not encounter French in their daily lives and whose access to trained French teachers was limited. This structural inequality was documented by Eisemon & Schwille in a comparative study of primary education in Burundi and Kenya (1991): these authors documented how the switch to French as the principal language of instruction in Year 5 was detrimental to rural students taking the primary exit exams (which are in French), and thus restricted access to secondary schools.

The little educational research recently conducted in Burundi focuses on non-formal initiatives, moral education, or the potential role that education could have in building peace in the country – with little examination of the content in the formal school system and explicit curriculum. For example, Elavie Ndura-Ouedraogo has recently conducted studies using multicultural and peace education frameworks, as well as transformative paradigms, to shed light on students’ and educators’ perceptions and hopes on the role that education may have in building sustainable peace in the country and concludes that youth should be engaged in the critical conversations surrounding their education (Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009b). This study was similar in findings to one she conducted in 2008 on educators’ perspectives about education in Burundi (Ndura-Ouedraogo, 2009a). The Youth Intervention for Peace Project (YIPP) (Bigirindavvyi, 2004) and Moral Education Program (Rwantabagu, 2010) describe content of informal and non-formal peace education initiatives found in churches or other parts of the country. While insights from both of these initiatives are relevant to the current state of formal
education in the country, as configured, such initiatives may only reach small percentages of the population.

This thesis study, then, applies the conceptual framework (Figure 1) to formal education policy and planning documents (formal curriculum) and lived curriculum of Burundian immigrants in school during the analytical time periods (1966-1993 and post-2005) in order to shed on how ethnic difference was and is being addressed within the formal school system in Burundi.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY: THE INTERSECTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCES AND EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

“The relation of the event to its preceding conditions at once sets up a history, and the uniqueness of the event makes that history relative to that event… All of the past is in the present as the conditioning nature of passage, and all the future arises out of the present as the unique events transpire.”
(Mead, 1959, p. 32)

This study is designed to examine how ethnicity and conflict were incorporated or ignored in the formal Burundian school system, and how this inclusion and/or exclusion may have helped or hindered interethnic relations throughout two time periods: the post-Independent Republics from 1966-1993, and the so-called ‘post’-conflict era, after 2005. The project obtained data from two different sets of primary sources: first, I analyzed selected educational policy and planning documents from each time period, in order to develop an understanding of the intended and explicit curriculum in formal education; I then conducted ten interviews with Burundian immigrants currently living in North America in order to develop an understanding of the lived curriculum of Burundian students in school and tease out aspects of the hidden curriculum that these participants witnessed. I analyzed data collected in interviews, policy documents, and secondary sources according to the conceptual typology – destructive, passive, and constructive conflict – outlined in the literature review, informed by Ross (1993) and Davies (2005), and examined both structural and content aspects of education. Finally, data was triangulated in order to develop an understanding of how educational policy compared and contrasted to the lived experiences of Burundian participants (interviewees) in the school system.
My Role as a Researcher: Considerations, Assumptions and Biases

My goal as a researcher throughout this project was to develop a feel for and understanding of how to perform qualitative research studies. This is my first experience as a qualitative researcher and the learning curve for developing these skills was steep. I was particularly interested in learning how to work with and how to interview participants. I learned how to build on and refine my interviewing skills. I was also able to critically analyze my own role and privilege as a research, especially while asking particularly difficult questions about schooling in conflict zones. This learning process was challenging – and I have found that later interviews were richer in information than earlier ones – and required a decent amount of critical self-reflection throughout the process.

This reflection was ever-present in my personal research journal. I took the time to write down notes to myself after interviews took place and after each transcription about my interviewing techniques. I continually analyzed my own skills, asking myself questions such as: What happened in interviews where I was able to build a great rapport with participants? What types of questions allow for the greatest variety and richness of answers? What questions were participants unwilling to answer? What happened in interviews where I didn’t connect with the participants? Were there any words or topics that most participants declined to talk about? Why? At the very end of the process, I compared what I thought was my best interview and what I thought of as my worst interview and conducted a side-by-side comparison. I hoped that in conducting this side-by-side comparison, I would be able to learn about my skill as a researcher and interviewer, and by extension, start to hone these abilities for future qualitative research projects involving human research subjects.
I was also cognizant throughout the time spent with interview participants about how different their lives and experiences are compared to my own. I took the time to critically reflect throughout the journey on how these differences may impact my interpretations of their experiences. I’m a white, female researcher from a relatively privileged background in Canada – one that afforded me the ability to travel to Burundi, Rwanda and the rest of East Africa with little financial strain or risk, and one that I am in many ways thankful for. Consequently, I have never experienced civil war or (other) overt manifestations of violence on the scale and magnitude that I knew the interview participants would have experienced.

When I was in Rwanda, several of my friends shared their stories with me about their time in the genocide and civil war in the early 1990s in Rwanda, but in all of those cases I was talking to my friends with whom I had built up relationships throughout my time there. What worried me in this project was that I was explicitly asking sensitive questions to people that I had not met prior to the first recruitment e-mails or phone calls, a completely different task and one that I was afraid to embark on at first. I was worried that many of the participants would not be willing to share their stories with a relatively unknown person, no matter how honest and genuine I came across. I was genuinely surprised at the openness of most participants. I learned a lot throughout the interview process and consider it in some ways to be a journey into the Burundian culture and community here. Most participants expressed that they felt a connection to me in some way during the interview. One said that he knew I would “do [Burundi] right and treat our story well” (Noel\(^1\)) and another told me that he felt as though I was “becoming Burundian” (Cadeau). Several others told me early on in the project that they were excited to have someone tell their stories and that they knew I would “do [them] justice” (Julien). These

\(^1\) All participant names given throughout are pseudonyms
comments all helped to ease my worries throughout the process of working with the interviewees and interpreting and analysing their words.

I am aware that what I present throughout the analysis is my interpretation of the data: an interpretation that ultimately reflects my own experiences, culture, history, and traditions (Gallagher, 1992), and this cannot be erased, that is to say that while “traditions operate for the most part ‘behind our backs’, they are already there, ahead of us, and conditioning our interpretations” (Gadamer, 1975, p. 91). As such, my interpretations of the interviews and policy documents reflect those biases, preconceptions, and prejudices. I often sought help and guidance from several of the participants and key informants (discussed below) to ensure that these interpretations were consistent with their experiences and interpretations. I also tried to be open throughout the entire process, to hear their narratives, and also to look for potential interpretations that may be different to my initial ones, with the understanding that these new lenses might risk and challenge my own prejudices and biases throughout the process. As Bernstein (1983) noted, it is “[o]nly in a dialogical encounter with what is not understood, with what is alien, with what makes a claim upon us, [that] can we open ourselves to risking and testing our preconceptions and prejudices” (as cited in Schwandt, 2000, p. 195). I hoped that through continuous dialogue I would be able to take those tests and risks in order to challenge any preconceptions I had about the content and its analysis.
Justification of Methodology

The thesis project is qualitative in nature. That is, it uses documents and open-ended, semi-structured participant interviews to help guide and interpret the analysis of a particular series of events (in this case the relationships between formal education and interethnic conflict) and these interpretations cannot be measured in any empirical sense, either in quantity, amount or frequency (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative research is difficult to define, given the varied nature of data sources and methods of data representation, however the ultimate task of any qualitative researcher is to “study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 3). Thus, qualitative studies stress how, not how much. It is in this context that I conducted a qualitative study: I did not seek to quantify the relationships between formal education and interethnic conflict, nor did quantification seem appropriate, given the nature of the subject material.

I approach this thesis as a hybrid of critical theory and constructivism. I find similarities between the two paradigms: both come have beliefs as subjective, and both generally rely on methodologies based on dialogue. I draw primarily from a critical theory ontology, where there is a sense of historical realism and a “virtual reality, shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values [that] crystallize over time” (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 168). Thus, critical theory seeks to examine and critique the hegemonic narratives that exist on a subject. However, constructivism as research paradigm in that it seeks understanding and reconstruction (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Given that this is my first foray into qualitative research, I am still struggling to find my voice in the current research paradigms.
Burundi as a Case: Initial Considerations in Selecting Burundi Education and Research Design

This study on the Burundian school system has proven equal parts invigorating and frustrating. I selected Burundi as a case not only because of my personal experience with non-formal and formal education in East Africa, but also because of a gap I noted in the literature on content in Burundian schools. In particular, literature from the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s considered the implications of the current language policy in generating and sustaining strained interethnic relations, and recent literature examines the non-formal educational structures while providing minimal analysis on the current content of the formal educational sector or how the content prior to the civil war may have exacerbated or mitigated the interethnic strife. As such, there is potential with this thesis to contribute new insights to the schooling and conflict literature, by relating known research to the Burundian context.

This study focuses on the primary school system in each of the two selected time periods – although some participants provided insights into their experiences in the secondary and tertiary school systems. The purpose of choosing to examine the primary school system as the principal sites of analysis lies primarily in demographics: the Burundian school system has long-suffered from low enrolment and high drop-out rates – even at the primary level, but particularly at the secondary level, as I elaborate on in Chapter 4. As a result of these low enrolment, repetition and drop-out rates, it was more likely that Burundians would have experienced primary school in some capacity rather than secondary school. Consequently, formal primary school education policies would reach greater numbers of students than secondary or tertiary policies. The trade-off was that, in general, students in primary schools are young, and therefore memories of these experiences are potentially more difficult to access and remember. “History is perpetually suspicious of memory… and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it” (Nora,
That is, time and distance have a tendency to distort memory. Thus a balance between exploring distant memories and number of participants was necessary to complete this project. Additionally, distortions in access to schools and retention rates (see Chapter 4) created significant sample bias when finding and selecting participants to be interviewed for this thesis project.

Data Collection

Education Policy and Curriculum Documents

The first source of primary data for this project was educational program and planning documents published by the Ministry of National Education (MEN), throughout the time periods under study. Here, I examined document texts for themes relating to ethnicity, difference, conflict and peace, in order to develop an understanding of the government’s desired representations of ethnicity and conflict throughout the school system. I analyzed each document and coded them for emergent themes according to the typology of approaches to conflict presented in the literature review: destructive, passive, and constructive. I examined both socio-structural aspects – resource allocation, access, and language of instruction – and psychocultural aspects – content, attitudes and behaviours, teacher training – in the document analyses. I used constant comparison to continually examine these representations across documents and time periods in order to see how representations may have changed across time with respect to overall policies, and also how these concepts changed across the three republics (1966-1993) and in the post-civil war time (2005-2014). Figure 2, below, describes the document analysis framework. The document analysis attempted to answer the first research sub-question: How do the Burundian government’s official education documents (policies, curriculum guidelines and
mandates, textbooks, teacher guidelines and training material) address ethnic difference in schools?

Figure 2. Document analysis for government official curriculum/policy/planning documents on Burundian primary schools

Where possible, I analyzed documents published by the Ministry of National Education. However, official ministry documents from Burundi are hard to come by, even today and particularly as you move further into the past. As such, I also used secondary sources including UNESCO analyses and Centre D’Étude et de Documentation Africaines (CEDAF) papers, to examine in particular the education system in the late 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. I obtained most of the documents from online searches in library and other databases, such the UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO/IIEP) document database. In general, documents were in Portable Document Format (.pdf); the older ones (from the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s) had been scanned. A notable exception to this was the Politique et Action du Government en Matiere d’Education (MEN, 1984), which I found in hard copy in the OISE/UT
library. Also, Elisabeth King, a noted scholar in Rwandan education, provided a hard copy of Jeremy Greenwald’s CEDAF paper (1980). I was unable to find educational documents and policies from the early 1990s, although some exist for the late 1990s and early 2000s, as regional overt violence began to subside and certain educational processes started to rebuild. Formal education policy documents and curriculum guidelines exist for the later time period (2005-present) as the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, Vocational Training and Literacy, commonly called the Ministry of National Education, began to develop an online catalogue of resources. Ultimately, the minimal nature of the government documents meant that I had to use additional secondary sources on the structure of Burundian schools, such as scholarly journal articles and online newspaper articles, in order to supplement the documents. These limitations are discussed further, below.

**Participant Interviews**

Interviews are one of the most common and powerful ways to understand different experiences and histories. Unstructured interviews can provide a great breadth of information (Fontana & Fey, 2000). While interviews were designed to only be 30-45 minutes in length, they in many ways turn into life history interviews, “any retrospective account by the individual of his life in whole or in part, in written or oral form, [which] has been elicited or prompted by another person” (Watson and Watson-Franke, 1985; as cited in Tierney, 2000, p. 539). Often the interviews would go above and beyond the scope of primary school to secondary and tertiary schooling – one participant talked at length about their experiences for over three hours, another called me back days after the interview to continue telling his story, several interviews took well over an hour, although sometimes they veered off course to other topics about their lives and
families since they moved to Canada. Some of the follow-up conversations were recorded, some were not, as in many cases it felt as though the participants just wanted to share their stories with someone.

*Semi-Structured Participant Interviews*

I conducted semi-structured, one-on-one interviews with each of the ten participants. Each interview was scheduled to last approximately 30-45 minutes, although many continued on well after the allotted timeframe. Interviews took place in person, by Skype or by telephone. Eight (8) interviews were conducted in English. When the participants indicated that they preferred to use French in the interviews I was able, given my fluency level, to arrange and conduct interviews in French, without the presence of a translator. Therefore, one interview was conducted in French and one interview ended up being a hybrid of both English and French, when a participant originally chose to speak in English to me, but then could not find the right words and defaulted to French to complete their thoughts. I provided each participant with an informed consent form prior to the interview in either English or French (Appendix A), and informed them of their right to withdraw from the study at any point during or after the interview. Each interview was recorded using a digital recorder and (translated then) transcribed for analysis, other than the noted exception with Fabrice (below). For in person or Skype interviews, I included observational notes in my research. I offered participants access to transcriptions and translations of their interviews and offered them access to the final research report. The interview protocols were designed to answer the second research sub-question: **What lived experience of schooling is described by selected former students in Burundian schools with regards to ethnic difference and conflict?**
The protocol consisted of 12 open-ended questions, sub-divided into two categories (Appendix B). The first category of questions explored participants’ perceptions of structural aspects of schools (access to schooling and differences between and within groups) and provided introductory information in order to develop an understanding of the contexts in which participants went to school. The second part of the interview explored the implemented curriculum from the perspectives of these learners (what was taught about differences in ethnicity, how these differences were addressed in history or language classes, how conflict and peace were addressed in schooling, and how teachers interacted with various students). Figure 3, below, outlines how the interview questions were structured in order to understand the remembered lived experiences of Burundian primary students.

Figure 3. Interview Analysis: Ethnic Difference and Conflict in Remembered, Lived Experiences of Burundian Primary School Students

I transcribed each interview immediately afterwards, as best as possible, and I additionally typed up any notes that I took during the interview, using Microsoft Word 2013. Where necessary I translated interviews from French to English (myself), and in order to ensure
accuracy I asked a Rwandese friend, who speaks both French and English fluently, to check the translation for any errors. I kept an additional Microsoft Excel 2013 file that indicated the participant pseudonym and code for each participant, and logged when each interview took place and when the transcription was finished. This file was locked and stored separately from the transcripts and translations. I created a file for interviews and observations of each of the participants, protected by password settings. After the transcription (and translation, where necessary) I provided each participant with a copy of their transcript for verification (unless the participant specifically requested to not see the transcript). Here, participants were provided the opportunity to add further detail to the transcript or remove anything that they ultimately did not wish to describe in their interviews. However, only one participant, Bonheur, took the opportunity to edit his transcript.

Overview of Recruitment Procedures, Selection Criteria and Participants

Participant Recruitment and Selection Criteria

This research project employed two sampling strategies to gain access to the communities of Burundian immigrants in Canada and thereby to identify and recruit participants. First, I identified potential participants with the help of known contacts in the East African community in Toronto and Ottawa, Ontario. These contacts were able to help identify community leaders and community groups as well as specific Burundians who might be interested in participating in the interviews. I used a snowball sampling strategy – where further participants were identified by people who were interviewed or had previously been contacted (Creswell, 2013) – to gain access to more participants. I also contacted community groups and leaders found through Internet searches. I attempted to recruit a maximum variation sample, in order to ensure varied experiences were represented by the sample (ibid); however, due to limitations (discussed below)
certain groups (Male, urban Tutsi) were over-represented in the sample and others (Female, Hutu) were under represented.

Prior to contacting any participants, I talked with each primary contact in order to outline and get their feedback on the study and its intentions, as well as discuss interview structures and participant criteria. These primary contacts suggested potential participants and provided preliminary information to each interested party, prior to participants contacting me. Potential participants were given contact information to contact me directly. In some instances, I contacted the participants directly after I was given their e-mails or contact information. However, especially if I had contacted them first, I specified the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses and only interviewed them after they had time to read over information packages and informed consent forms, which were sent after the initial contact if the person was interested in participating. I e-mailed and contacted significantly more people than participated in the study. If a potential participant did not respond to the first e-mail, I followed up with at most two e-mails each a week apart, and if after that there was still no response I considered the contact uninterested and moved on.

As a final avenue for participant recruitment, I contacted the head of the United Burundian American Association, who forwarded my contact information to the group’s mailing list server, using a recruitment e-mail (Appendix C). From there I was able to contact a Burundian, currently back in Burundi but who lives in Washington, DC, who put me in touch with several Burundians and also provided some basic information about the current school system in Burundi and as well as the situation in Burundi now, for context. Furthermore, I contacted two Burundian’s currently conducting research at Georgetown University in Washington, DC, both of whom are considered experts, one of whom provided contact
information for potential participants and also helped with certain aspects relating to the
timelines and history of the country, as well as provided information about current (2014)
education and programming in peacebuilding, and information on the social context of Burundi
in the post-civil war era.

Initially, I conceptualized this study as focusing on schooling and school experiences
during the civil war (1993-2005) and post-civil war (2005-present) time periods. The reason to
focus solely on these two time periods was to help with establishing the reliability of the
interviews: participants who had been in school recently (the 1990s and early 2000s) seemed
more likely to accurately remember their time in schools than those who had been in primary
school in the 1970s and 1980s. However, the first participants that contacted me were in primary
school in the early 1970s. These participants had vivid memories of their time in school and they
recalled specific instances of daily and individual events. I immediately revised my plan to
include participant interviews from Burundians who had been in school during any of the three
republics (1966-1993) and adapted my analysis in order to develop an understanding of how
ethnicity, difference, conflict and peace were addressed during any of the time periods under
study. My hope was to get a fairly balanced number of participants (four) from each of the time
periods. However, as the snowball sampling progressed, it became apparent that I was going to
get a majority of participants from the Independent Republics (1966-1993), one from the post-
conflict time period, and none from the civil war period (1993-2005). As a result, the study was
modified slightly, so that interview analysis only occurs for the Independent Republics and the
post-2005 era, whereas civil war formal education is only analyzed from the standpoint of
secondary sources analysis relating to the access and resource distribution. Given that broad
range of potential interviewee categories, the intended sample size was eight to ten participants; I managed to include ten participants in the study (see below for participant information).

All of the participants were treated in accordance with the University of Toronto Ethics Review Board (ERB) protocols. There were several potential risks for participating in this study and therefore a couple of considerations that were kept in mind during the interviews and any subsequent discussions, specifically since the interviewees came from a country that has experienced sustained interethnic violent conflict since independence. Since this study examines schooling in Burundi, there was a potential risk to interviewing people that had experienced violent conflict. Interview questions hoped to understand education in the context of a post-genocide (post-1972) country and in the years leading up to a massive civil war (pre-1993), as well as in the years immediately following that war (post-2005). As such, while the focus was on their experience in the Burundian schools, it was possible that the interview could have invoked memories of the violence and war itself – experiences that may be difficult for interview participants, particularly with those who had been in school in early 1970s. I informed all the participants of their right to not answer any questions they did not feel comfortable answering and specified their right to withdraw from the interview and study any time. In order to minimize this potential risk, I consulted a former trauma counselor from the Kigali Genocide Memorial, currently living in Ottawa on techniques for working with and talking to survivors of war and violence. He also offered to make himself available to any participant by telephone during and after the interviews, in order to help with potential psychological and emotional risks associated with the interview. I stressed to participants that if they chose to talk to him after, he would keep their conversations (with him and with me) anonymous and confidential, even to me.
**Participant Information**

I designed this study to develop a broad understanding of the many experiences surrounding ethnic difference in schools, and how these were experienced by (former) students as either destructive, passive, or constructive. I felt it necessary to recruit both Hutu and Tutsi for this project because their experiences in schools would, predictably, be different from each other, in particular given the dominant role that (some) Tutsi played in governance and suppression of Hutu formal education during the republics, and the shift in governance and policies towards the Hutu majority after the civil war. Therefore, I tried hard to recruit multiple participants from each group to examine these multiple perspectives. Further variations I predicted could make a difference included: urban/rural, socio-economic status, provincial location, and male/female. Initially, I took all of these factors into account in participant selection. Burundians living in Canada are inherently a lopsided population (ethnically, economically, and by gender differing from the broader range of citizens living in Burundi). In particular, as I mentioned above, access to formal education in Burundi was severely restricted during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, enrolment ratios were higher in Bujumbura town, Bururi, and Muramvya provinces. Furthermore, females had lower enrolment in primary schools during the times of analysis. Finally, schooling was more readily available to Tutsi and to those who held a higher socio-economic status (see chapter 4).

The ability to emigrate from a country is also generally linked to higher socio-economic status and educational attainment, which was closely linked (though not exclusively) to Tutsi ethnicity during the republics. Likewise, the traditionally Tutsi-dominated government lost political power in the 1990s with the advent of both independent elections and violence (even though they still controlled the military). As such, male Tutsi from higher socio-economic levels were much more likely than other Burundians to live in Canada, and consequently were easier to
recruit for this study. While there is a Hutu participant in my interview sample, and two others from Hutu and Tutsi parents, none were of low socio-economic status or from exclusively outside the Bujumbura area. Also, males were more open to participating in this research study and, while some of them spoke about what they saw in women and girls’ education, it is hard to authentically speak about experiences of others. Table 1 below shows the number of participants in each of the selection criterion. It should be noted that while some participants openly identified as Hutu or Tutsi, one chose to leave out their ethnicity. While it was often possible, given the context and descriptions provided in the interviews to make a guess at ethnicity, I did not want to presume as such, therefore a category exists for ‘unidentified’ in the table.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hutu 0</td>
<td>Tutsi 4</td>
<td>Mixed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 5</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Urban 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Urban 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Urban 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 0</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>Urban 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Year denotes first year in primary school

Participant Descriptions

Each participant was assigned a nine character code, consisting of five letters (indicating gender, ethnicity, and province) and four numbers indicating the decade they first started primary school and the participant number in that category. For example, a male, Tutsi from Bujumbura who started school in 1995, would be coded as MTBuj-90-03 (if he was the third participant that
belonged to those categories). In addition to code numbers, I assigned each participant a proper name pseudonym, used in reporting the data below. What follows is a brief overview of each participant – all identifying criteria have been removed to conceal the identities of each participant.

Schooling during the Three Republics (1966-1993)

1. **Cadeau** is a male Tutsi born in 1966 in a relatively middle-class area of Bujumbura. He started primary school in 1973 – the year after the genocide in 1972. He was kicked out of two primary schools before finally finishing in primary and moving onto secondary school in the 1980s. He started university in 1989, the year after the 1988 massacres. He went to university to study law in the early 1990s, and left Burundi in 1996 to go to Rwanda and to escape the violence in Burundi. He moved to Toronto in 1999 before settling in Gatineau. The phone interview with Cadeau was several hours and often went beyond my initial interview questions, when he elaborated more details and other experiences beyond what I had specifically asked of him. He detailed his experiences in education through his university years, which gave an interesting perspective on how the policies changed or became more acute over time. He additionally called me a second time to continue the conversation. He also made a point throughout the interview TO continually to remind me that his experiences are very different from Hutu or others from rural regions, as he wanted to make sure that I would not be generalizing his experiences. Both phone conversations were recorded.

2. **Eraste** is a male self-identified Tutsi, although his father was Hutu (as he self-identified as Tutsi, he is counted in the “Tutsi” category, rather than “Mixed” in
Table 1) and attended primary school in Bujumbura in the 1970s (dates unspecified). He attended a French school exclusively for Tutsi and richer Hutu, Congolese and Rwandese. As such, his experience in school describes a situation unique to the upper-middle and upper class in Burundi during the 1970s and 1980s. He moved to Toronto in the very early 2000s. This interview was conducted in person and audio recorded.

3. **Julien** is a male Tutsi. He was born to a modest family, the son of a brewer, in the hills of Bujumbura in 1965 and attended a relatively mixed primary school in Bujumbura in 1970. He went on to secondary and tertiary school in Bujumbura before immigrating to Canada in the 1990s. He is now a French Language teacher in Ottawa, ON. This interview was conducted over the phone and audio recorded.

4. **Bonheur** is a male who was born in the late 1960s to a Hutu father and Tutsi mother. He started primary school in Bujumbura shortly after the 1972 violence and continued on to secondary school in Burundi before completing university in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo). He moved to Canada in the late 1990s and has settled in Toronto. His father was killed in 1972 as a result of the violence against Hutu. Bonheur took the time to edit his interview transcript for clarity and to add additional comments or elaborate on his initial answers.

5. **Fabrice** is a male who went to primary school in the early 1980s. He is from Bujumbura. He moved to Toronto, Ontario in the mid-1990s in order to escape the violence. He did not wish to disclose his ethnicity during the interview, nor did he want to partake in the entire semi-structured interview. He had very specific topics that he wished to discuss on the subject of ethnicity in schools, and said exactly
what he wanted to say, with very minimal input from me. This interview was conducted in person, and as he did not want his voice to be recorded only my interviewer notes in a researcher journal were kept and immediately transcribed. Therefore, any information used from Fabrice’s interview in this thesis is a result of my interpretations and may not be exact transcripts. While I tried to remain as faithful as I could to what he said, there is a potential for misquotes.

6. **Michel** is a male Hutu, born in Bujumbura. He attended primary school in Bujumbura starting in the early 1980s, however his mother moved him to Kayanza province, in the northwest, for protection during the later years of primary school and he completed primary schools and the *concours nationale* (national primary school exam exit) there. He moved to Canada in 2003.

7. **Thierry** is a male Tutsi from Bujumbura. He attended primary school starting in the early 1980s. He finished university at the University of Bujumbura before moving to Canada in the late 1990s. He currently lives in Gatineau, QC.

8. **Noel** is a Tutsi male born in the early 1970s. He started primary school in Bujumbura in the late 1970s. He chose, specifically, to discuss his time in secondary and tertiary school at the University of Bujumbura. He attended secondary school in the mid-1980s and started university in 1988, where he pursued education and teaching. However, his time in university was interrupted because of the civil war that started in 1993, and he did not finish university until 2003 as a result. His experiences as a teacher proved invaluable as he had experience from ‘practicum’ teaching in both the urban, Bujumbura, setting, and in the rural setting of Kirundo – a traditionally marginalized and poorer province.
in the northeast. He moved to Canada shortly after he finished university and became a teacher in a Catholic school board in southern Ontario.

9. **Redempta** – is a female Tutsi from Bujumbura. She attended public school in the city starting in 1984 and continued her schooling in Burundi until 1996, when she moved to Rwanda before coming to Canada in 2005. She currently lives in Toronto.

Schooling during and after the Civil War (1993-2005)

10. **Rozette** is a female Tutsi from the suburbs of Bujumbura. She attended a private school in kindergarten before transferring to public school for the rest of primary and secondary school. She comes from a family of moderate wealth. The schools she attended consisted of mostly Tutsi from her area, but also some Hutu from further away attended. She moved to Toronto in 2011 live with her aunt to finish high school and pursue university studies in Canada.

**Research Journal**

The final data source was my own research journal. Throughout the course of the research project I kept detailed notes of on-going procedures and perceptions. I endeavoured to take notes during and after each interview, adding my own observations about behaviours and responses to questions as analytical observations to further expand on any responses from the participants. These notes also acted as a formative tool: I learned to reflect on my own skills as a researcher and interviewer in order to improve throughout the journey. I also added my own experiences and thoughts to the post-interview observations about the experience of the interview – where certain questions were uncomfortable or seemingly so and why I thought that was. This helped to develop an understanding of my own role as a researcher from Canada, who
identifies as such, working with and talking to immigrants that have moved to Canada for a variety of reasons, in particular to escape violence and destructive conflict in their home country. This continuous reflection after each interview improved my understanding of both the context of their descriptions and, in turn, helped to shape the analysis of those interviews.

**Data Analysis**

I analyzed the documents, interviews, research journal and secondary sources described above according to the *typology of approaches to conflict in schools*. Accordingly, I examined each source for evidence of *destructive conflict, passive conflict, and constructive conflict*. In Table 2, I show some of the key ‘look-fors’ that served as indicators for segments of text, however big or small, from interviews and documents, however this is by no means an extensive list, and sometimes it is the case that larger segments of text reveal more than a word or phrase, whereas at other times a single word can be more meaningful than a paragraph. A third dimension, not shown for simplicity’s sake, is time. In each of the time periods (the Independent Republics of 1966-1993, and the post-conflict phase from 2005-present) I sought to understand the salient themes of conflict (in) education and develop an understanding of the key features of the school system throughout that time period (the explicit, hidden, implemented and lived curricula). I compared each of the cases across time – that is, I wasn’t just interested in how formal education addressed conflict in each specific time period, I was also interested in the changes in how schools addressed conflict: what are the similarities and differences, the complexities and nuances, the ebbs and flows in these experiences over time.
Table 2

**Ethnic Difference and Conflict in Burundian Primary Schools, Look-Fors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destructive Conflict</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destructive Conflict</td>
<td>Differential Access, Structural Violence, Language Barriers, Exclusion, Teacher Background</td>
<td>Hate, Violence, Stereotyping, Oppression, Differential Treatment of Students, Bias, Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Approaches</td>
<td>Control, Omission</td>
<td>Tolerance, Censorship, Omission, Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Conflict</td>
<td>Equitable Access and Retention across Groups, Equitable Resource Distribution, Teacher Training</td>
<td>Inclusion, Unity, Peace building Activities, Peace Education, Controversial Issues Discussion, Multiple Perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data analysis process involved ‘sitting with’ the data collected, particularly the interviews, for quite a while. Agar (1980) describes how working with transcripts in interview analysis involves reading “the transcripts in their entirety several times. Immerse yourself in the details, trying to get a sense of the interview as a whole before breaking it into parts” (p. 103, cited in Creswell, 2013). Thus, I conducted preliminary analysis with each of these first ‘read-throughs’ to get an idea of the overall picture before breaking the transcripts down into smaller parts. With each transcript I wrote notes and memos in the margins in order to convey initial thoughts, ideas and concepts, and also to remind myself of thoughts that I had during certain instances, such as a long pause or reversal of words. As the analysis progressed, I developed the key-coding lexicon that consisted of 8 codes through which I was able to draw out the themes for each time period and how they relate to each other. These codes, in Table 3, led to 8 categories of data, as they relate to the typology of conflict (based on Davies, 2005 and Ross, 1993).
Throughout my analysis, as I worked with the data to develop the codes and found patterns, I compared and contrasted my results to relevant literature on conflict (in) education and worked to incorporate my findings into the typology. I spent time reflecting on how these emergent themes related to my research questions. As the analysis progressed, I used three methods for working with the transcripts. First, I physically cut up the transcripts and slotted the quotes or key points into envelopes. This helped me to visualize the themes as I initially saw them, and helped me understand redundancies in my coding. Furthermore, it helped in visualize which themes cut across the time periods, and which ones were present in only one (each cut out section was label with the time period on the back for simplicity). Secondly, I used Microsoft Word’s “Track Changes” and “Comments” functions to delve further into the coding and produce in-depth analyses. Finally, coded sections were added to a Microsoft Excel file to increase ease of access during the write-up. Any computer-based document was encoded and locked for security, in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of the interview participants.

At each point throughout the analysis I reflected on and examined the codes I had been working with, in order to inform my analysis and note any changes that occurred in the process.
Throughout the process, input from my supervisor about the ways in which the data was being interpreted and the categories was used as a formative tool to evaluate the effectiveness of my coding strategies, and enabled me to adapt and change these strategies where necessary.

**Validation**

This project involved with only a small set of ten participants, who described schooling experiences over very long time periods. This means that, as I described above, certain experiences are unique to the participants and thus are, at their core, un-generalizable. However, within each interview I tried to develop an understanding of each participant and worked to try to develop, within the confines and limitations of a Master’s-level project, a reasonable picture of their experiences. I offered each participant access to the transcript of their interviews so that they could make any adjustments they saw necessary. However, only one participant chose to change their transcript, and all indicated that they appreciated the accurate reflection in their transcripts and their feelings and words at the time.

I feel as though the data collection methods I used throughout this thesis helped to increase the validity of the analysis I present in the following chapters. Multiple data sources, peer review and debriefing, clarifying research bias at the outset, member checking, and soliciting the participants views of the credibility of the findings, all help to present rich descriptions in the analysis and allow for increased validity (Creswell, 2013). A post-modern metaphor for such validity is a crystal: crystals have many sides, and often appear different from different angles, “crystals grow, change, alter, reflect externalities, [and] refract within themselves… what we see depends upon our angle of repose” (Richardson, 2005, p. 934). That is, validation is hard to pin-down, although one can make a case or study clearer. Multiple data sources and the analysis the researcher provides can only serve to demonstrate certain facets, or
sides, of ever changing contexts and interpretations. A principal tenet of chaos and complexity theory (originally from quantum mechanics) states that matter is at its core fundamentally unknowable, and as we become more precise and increase the ‘validity’ when examining one of the piece of the puzzle, we start to lose sight of the other pieces – the other facets of the crystal become less easy to interpret (see Heisenberg, 1927 and Davies, 2004). The analysis presented herein reflects isolated events and experiences, isolated sides, reflections and refractions of a bigger crystal – and it is only through more interviews, more embedded observations and analysis, and a greater variety of sources that one may get a better idea of the larger crystal.

**Limitations**

There are some limitations to this case study with regards to the types of documents I could access from Toronto, Canada via the Internet, and with regards to the sample size and character. Creswell (2013) described a case study as a “qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g. observations, interviews, audio-visual materials, and documents and reports)” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). While this study of the ‘case’ of Burundian education and its relations to ethnicity and conflict involved several data sources – documents and reports, and interviews with diverse individuals – they were ultimately limited in scale and scope to very specific instances and experiences due to both the relatively small scope of this study and its location in Canada, far away from Burundi itself.

I designed this project to develop an understanding of the Burundian school system throughout the three time periods, however, as described above, it was challenging to find Ministry of Education documents dating back to the 1970s and 1980s – with a few notable
exceptions. These documents, as they relate to official experiences would have helped to create a more holistic picture of the intended and explicit curriculum. Access to textbooks and teacher training material from each of the time periods would have helped in creating this overall picture of the formal education sector.

I also only interviewed ten people. These participants were mostly middle- to upper-middle class, male Tutsi from Bujumbura, although not exclusively so. In particular some demographic categories contained only one participant (for example Male, Hutu, 1970s, Rural), and some categories had no participants at all (for example Female, Hutu). This was a result of the study location (in Canada) and the snowball sampling methods used: the sample ended up being primarily a convenience sample, with whoever was available to participate, and I contacted most participants through other participants. Ethnic groups of Tutsi and Hutu populations have tended to cluster together in Canada: Tutsi tend to know Tutsi, and Hutu tend to know Hutu. Thus, while I was able to triangulate some of the experiences in the male, Tutsi group, as the descriptions of lived experiences in formal education were similar across the participants, the experiences described by the participants are very limited. As a result, the picture I present in the analysis is limited, and specific to these participants and what the participants shared in their interviews with me.

Nevertheless, I feel as though the experiences and analysis that I present throughout the next chapters are in-depth and rich enough in content to describe some of the lived and government-planned schooling experiences of Burundian students, within the parameters of a Master’s level thesis project. These limitations, while recognized and important, did not prevent me from being immersed in the remembered Burundian school system and experiences therein, conducting a relatively thorough qualitative study, and learning to design and conduct qualitative
research. If nothing else, the confines of this study have encouraged me to pursue this project further and to “fill the gaps” in experiences and documents of this project in later research.

**Conclusion**

Overall, this study of Burundian schools provided an interesting opportunity to extend and develop my skills as a researcher and to engage in collecting and analyzing original data in conflict (in) education research. The interviews and document analysis, with a critical lens, allowed me to develop an understanding of the effects of schooling on interethnic conflict in Burundi. My involvement of ten participants and analysis of educational policy documents from each of the time periods allowed me to compare and contrast the various experiences, however un-generalizable, both across and within time periods. Lastly, this project contributed to filling the noted gap in the conflict (in) education literature and in the Burundian education literature, in that it combined these two strands to help elucidate the role that schooling in Burundi may have had in fostering destructive or passive conflict, and how this may be changing to encourage more constructive conflict in schools. In the following two chapters, I will present the typology of conflict as it relates to Burundian schools. In chapter 4, I discuss the structural aspects (access, resource distribution, language policy) of schooling as primarily described by education policy and planning documents, but some interview data is used where policies were thin in description in order to fill the void. I structure chapter 4 temporally in order to demonstrate changes across different student generations and also to provide context for each section and theme. I use the typology of conflict in schools to determine the structural manifestations of interethnic difference and (destructive, passive, and constructive) conflict in schools. In chapter 5, I discuss the psychocultural interpretations of schooling as they are perceived by the interview participants,
and analyze the interviews of lived experiences in schools according to the *typology of conflict* in schools and present the analysis thematically.
CHAPTER 4
ETHNIC DIFFERENCE, CONFLICT AND SOCIO-STRUCTURAL INTERESTS IN FORMAL EDUCATION

Society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of interrelations, the relations within which these individuals stand.

(Marx, 1859)

Burundi’s history since independence (1966) is marked by extended episodes of negative peace (the absence of escalated intergroup violence) punctuated by dramatic episodes of overt violence (1972, 1988, 1993-2005): each period is defined by different policies and social conditions that influenced the structure of the formal education system. To understand the role of schools in contributing to destructive, passive, or constructive interethnic conflict, it is necessary to understand the political, economic and social conditions in each period. This chapter provides brief descriptions of four time periods (Colonization, 1899-1966; the Independent Republics, 1966-1993; the Civil War, 1993-2005; and the Post-Civil War, post-2005) and socio-structural aspects of formal education in each period. I look at four aspects of education structure: (1) educational resource distribution, (2) access to primary schools; (3) inclusive and exclusive language policies; and (4) primary exit/secondary entrance exams. I examine the impact of the socio-structure of education to the ‘typology of approaches to conflict in schools’, or the presence of destructive, passive, and constructive interethnic conflict within schools. I argue that, while the structure of education negatively impacted interethnic relations in Burundi between Hutu and Tutsi in the years leading up to a civil war from 1993 to 2005, the current government under Pierre Nkurunziza (2005-present) is taking some (small) steps to address those grievances and move towards constructive inclusion in schools.
First, I look at formal education in the kingdom of Ruanda-Urundi (now Rwanda and Burundi) under the Belgian colonial administration. I argue that the policies and practices of the colonial authorities, including educational policies, laid the foundations for deteriorating interethnic relations and interethnic violence after and during independence (see. Greenland, 1973; LeMarchand, 1995; Melvern, 2004; Uvin, 1999). That is, while it is unlikely the kingdom had no violence prior to colonization, there is little evidence to suggest that violence was strictly along ethnic lines (Turner, 2010). I focus on the role that the colonial administration played in solidifying once-fluid ethnicities\(^2\) through programs that categorized Burundians according to status and looks (LeMarchand, 1995; Uvin, 1999). Formal education was exclusive to sons of Tutsi chiefs (ganwa) and excluded everyone else, and in particular Hutu. As such, formal education was structurally destructive according to the ‘typology of approaches to conflict’ (See Chapter 2). These policies formalized and reified disparate socio-structural interests between Tutsi and Hutu.

Next, I describe formal education during the three Independent Republics (1966-1976, 1976-1988, and 1988-1993) and show that there was minimal formal education change between them. Structurally, I analyze inequitable educational resource distribution, educational access, biased national exams, and language policies and argue that they contributed to destructive interethnic conflict, even though on the surface these policies advocated for unification under a ‘Burundian’ identity. Furthermore, a two-tiered education system developed: those who had access to additional resources and privilege (male, Tutsi\(^3\)) advanced through the school system to

---

\(^2\) Some sociologists and political scientists argue that Hutu and Tutsi were not technically separate ethnicities during the pre-colonial times, where intergroup marriages were common and social promotion and demotion allowed for Hutu to become Tutsi and vice-versa (LeMarchand, 1995).

\(^3\) Throughout the analysis I use the term “Tutsi” instead of “Tutsi-Hima” or “Tutsi-Banyaruguru”. My intention is not to essentialize the two groups into one. Rather, as Hutu-Tutsi enmity solidified in the post-Independent Republics, the distinction between Hima and Banyaruguru minimized in favour of the superordinate “Tutsi” identity. Further, interview participants and most primary and secondary sources did not distinguish between Hima
secondary and tertiary school, and those that did not have that access ended their schooling after primary school. These exclusionary social, political, and educational policies set the stage for the violence that erupted in the 1990s.

Next, I describe the violence and destruction of the civil war from 1993-2005, a turning point in the governance and social structure of the country. Notably, the government shifted to a Hutu-dominated system after the war and thus the opportunity arose to address the chronic exclusion in the Independent Republics. I use this section primarily as a transition point: formal educational infrastructure (schools, the Ministry of Education, and classroom resources) was effectively destroyed in the opening months of the civil war, and recurring violence contributed to the continued destruction of these institutions. As such, there were no significant new education policies or curricula during that time.

Finally, I describe Burundi’s attempts at building peace through formal education after the Arusha Peace Accords were signed (2000), a new constitution was enacted (2003), and the new government was sworn in (2005). I examine formal education policies from this period that pertain to structural aspects of resource distribution, school access, and language of instruction as they move from exclusive and destructive, towards inclusive and constructive.

Burundi is a largely integrated country where Hutu and Tutsi live side-by-side, increased enrolment in integrated schools may allow for greater constructive, cooperative and equitable contact between ethnic groups (Allport, 1954; Tal-Or, Gleicher & Boninger, 2002). These new policies represent a starting point for integrating constructive conflict education into schools. In my analysis, I relate these socio-structural aspects to the typology of conflict – destructive, passive, and constructive conflict in schools – and describe how the current move to address the

and Banyaruguru, unless specifically discussing enmity between both groups in the early independent years under the constitutional monarchy.
former socio-structural grievances represents the redistribution of resources, a pillar of social justice (Fraser, 2000). This is therefore a small, but necessary, step towards integrating constructive conflict in schools.

What I present represents analyses based on policy documents, accessed directly from the Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research (MENRS) in Burundi, UNESCO or indirectly through secondary analyses in other literature. I use interview excerpts to provide a more complete picture of formal education where documents pertaining to school access, distribution and language policies were thin. This is particularly relevant for formal education in the 1970s and 1980s, where documents were hard to come by and did not present much detail.

**The Colonial Period (1899-1966): Institutionalising Ethnic Exclusion**

Before it was colonized by Germany in 1899, Burundi was a traditional kingdom with a Tutsi king (in Kirundi: mwami). Tutsi from Muramvya Province (a central province) held positions of chiefs and princes (or ganwa) in the country, Tutsi from other regions – particularly those from the south – made up the middle class and Hutu were the traditional farming class (LeMarchand, 1995). However, traditional intermarriage and social promotion blurred the lines between ethnic groups (Turner, 2010). The pre-colonial era was relatively non-violent and when there was violence it rarely fell strictly along ethnic lines (Greenland, 1973; LeMarchand, 1995; Ndikumana, 1998). After Belgium gained control of Ruanda-Urundi in 1919, the Burundian kingdom was allowed to continue its system of kinship, and it was administered by indirect rule (LeMarchand, 1995). The colonial administration gradually introduced a series of policies that eroded the relative traditional ethnic, regional and political unity within the kingdom and led to greater interethnic antagonism and reified ethnic divisions throughout the country (Turner, 2010; Reyntjens, 1995). For example, the colonial administration favoured the traditional Tutsi
monarchy from central Burundi, and installed many of the Tutsi princes (ganwa) as members of the subaltern colonial administration, favouring Tutsi for work and other positions over Hutu (LeMarchand, 1995). Belgium ceded control of Burundi on July 1, 1962, and Burundi subsequently formed a constitutional monarchy.

**School Policy in the Colonial Era**

The colonial administration was responsible for developing and implementing the first school system in Burundi (Obura, 2008; MEN, 1984). Formal schooling was primarily church-based, and thus the responsibility of church missionaries. The purpose of schools was principally to develop “subaltern colonial assistants” (MEN, 1984, p. I) and as such, schools transmitted Christian and Western values to Burundian children and youth (Gahama, 1999, as cited in Obura, 2008). The colonial administration modelled its school system after the Belgian system: the principal language of instruction was French, with Kirundi (the local language) as a subject, and the structure was similar to education in European schools (Rwantabagu, 1999). However, access to schooling was restricted primarily to the sons of the Tutsi chiefs from the Muramvya province, and even as admissions began to open up towards the end of colonization, schools categorized students into *Sons of Chiefs, Hutu, Sons of Soldiers, and Half-Castes* (Gahama, 1999, cited in Obura, 2008). From the outset, the Burundian school system was inequitable. The legacy of the colonial system was to set up an inequitable formal education, which continued throughout the Independent Republics to the start of the civil war in 1993 (Jackson, 2000).

The First Republic (1966-1976)

Burundi officially became an independent country from Belgium on July 1, 1962 (LeMarchand, 1995). While the king continued to rule, a parliament was established with an interim Hutu Prime Minister as the head of government (ibid.). The monarchy’s grasp on power was tenuous at best and a rival Tutsi group (from the south) opposed the constitutional monarchy (ibid). Tutsi republican and monarchist groups antagonized each other during the early independent years, but greater fears of a Hutu rebellion simmered in Burundi as a result of the political situation in Rwanda, where wide-spread violence by Hutu against Tutsi led to several pogroms and massacres and resulted in massive numbers of Tutsi refugees in Northern Burundi. Eventually the Tutsi from the south capitalized on these fears and staged a coup in 1966 which resulted in the Presidency of Michel Micombero and left the King in exile (Uvin, 1999).

The Micombero coup marked the beginning of almost 30 years of Tutsi-dominance in government through the Union of National Progress (UPRONA) party. However, the government outwardly claimed that “Hutu and Tutsi were figments of the colonial imagination and it was not in the interest of the nation to mention ethnicity” (Turner, 2010, p. 27), thus concealing the Tutsi (minority) control of government. Nevertheless, ethnic tensions between Hutu and Tutsi escalated during the initial years of the Micombero regime (Uvin, 1999). After Micombero dismissed every Hutu from government in 1972, the country erupted in mass violence. Hutu communities and rebel groups killed some 2,000-3,000 Tutsi in Bururi on April 29, 1972 (LeMarchand, 1995) and the government acted quickly and violently to suppress the Hutu revolt: government forces killed approximately 100,000-300,000 Hutu (about 18% of the Hutu population), and 150,000 Hutu refugees fled the country (Call, 2012; Nkurunziza and
The selective genocide (government forces targeted primarily educated and elite Hutu) was an “avenging furore [that] swept across the entire country and lasted months after [the rebellion] had been brought under control” (LeMarchand, 2008, p. 2). Tutsi soldiers and youth militia groups rounded up scores of Hutu students in primary, secondary, and tertiary schools to kill or jail indefinitely (LeMarchand, 1995; Uvin, 1999). In the end, the Tutsi-dominated UPRONA party consolidated a clear political and military hegemony in the country, when nearly all Hutu from top-level military and government jobs were removed from their positions or killed (LeMarchand, 1995; Ndikumana, 2005).

After the violence, the government released a ‘White Paper on the Real Causes and Consequences of the Attempted Genocide against Tutsi Ethny [sic] in Burundi’ (MIN, 1972, as cited in Turner 2010, p. 27). This paper defended the government response to the Hutu uprising in the south-west and argued the real cause of the massacres in 1972 was colonialism and neocolonial conspiracies (Turner, 2010). Furthermore, it labelled the violence as “attempted genocide against Tutsi”, which is blatantly propaganda, given the relative numbers of Tutsi killed compared to the number of Hutu by government forces. This document also laid the political, social, economic, and educational foundations of Burundian society for the next 20 years, until civil war broke out in 1993.

The Second Republic (1976-1987)

Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, a military leader from the UPRONA party, deposed Micombero in 1976. Throughout what came to be known as the Second Republic (1976-1987), interethnic tensions appeared to ease somewhat: there were no episodes of sustained violence between ethnicities, groups or regions. However, the discussion and expression of ‘ethnicity’ (Hutu and
Tutsi) in public was considered a ‘taboo’ during Bagaza’s regime: Burundians could be thrown in jail for discussing the ethnicity or the violence in the 1972 genocide (LeMarchand, 1995). As with other post-conflict countries, particularly Rwanda after its 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, the removal of ‘ethnicity’ from allowed public discourse did not erase ethnicity from the consciousness of Burundians: a coded language developed in Burundi to help identify ethnicity. For example, as Fabrice described in his interview:

“If you spoke French or if your father survived 1972 killings, [then] you were Tutsi, but if you were a refugee who spent time in Tanzania or Zaire, spoke only Kirundi or your father had been killed, then in all likelihood you were Hutu and treated that way.”

Additionally, fear of another violent outbreak was ever-present throughout the Second Republic. Thus, Bagaza’s regime was one of “control, rather than integration” (LeMarchand, 1995, p. 107), and fear rather than reconciliation and positive peace.

The Third Republic (1987-1993)

Major Pierre Buyoya from (Micombero and Bagaza’s) UPRONA seized power from Bagaza in a bloodless coup in 1987, marking the start of the Third Republic (LeMarchand, 1995). Buyoya implemented one fundamental policy change throughout his term as President: he reduced the restrictions on freedom of speech, and began a conversation about the “question of national unity” (LeMarchand, 1995, p. 119). The stated goal was to bridge the interethnic divide “with a view of bringing to an end the numerous forms of division that have undermined concord and harmony among all ethnic, regional and clanic components of the Burundi nation” (Radio Bujumbura, December 5, 1987, as cited in LeMarchand, 1995, p. 119). Buyoya was committed to power sharing and consequently started to appoint Hutu to government posts, and offered to

4 All names are pseudonyms to protect anonymity of participants
free select Hutu political prisoners (Call, 2012). However, these reforms did little to address imbalanced policies and destructive actions by previous regimes (see LeMarchand, 1995; Prunier, 2009). Evidence suggests two motives for greater political inclusivity under Buyoya besides genuine national unity interests: first, a resurgent Hutu intelligentsia, those who had been exiled after the 1972 killings, was starting to speak out against the regime and demand a share of the power in government and the military; and second, Buyoya’s regime was not as repressive and controlling as previous ones and ‘unity programs’ were required to ‘keep the peace’ (LeMarchand, 1995; Ndikumana, 1998). However, in 1988, the government acted to suppress a resurgent Hutu intelligentsia, a perceived threat to the Tutsi monopoly on power. This time, Hutu fought back against the government actions and somewhere between 20,000-150,000 people of both ethnicities died (Call, 2012) and over 50,000 refugees fled the country (Uvin, 1999).

After the violence in 1988, the Buyoya government once again started the process of ‘democratization’, and a government-sponsored National Commission for Unity developed the “Charter on National Unity” (LeMarchand, 1995). This charter proclaimed that the Burundian national identity should supersede ethnic, regional and clan identities (without ignoring them) – a so-called ‘superordinate identity’ (Brewer, 1999) to unite the different ethnicities under a single identity – and additionally stated that ethnic parity (even or proportional distribution of Hutu and Tutsi) should be the principal goal of political, social and economic institutions (including in schooling) (Prunier, 2009). This charter, however, directly contradicts itself by claiming that the “Hutu masses were not interested in ethnicity unless incited by divisive and selfish leaders… it is the obligation of any progressive leadership to guide and educate the population and protect it from such divisive agitation” (cited in Turner, 2010, p. 29). At best, this statement is discordant to the policy itself, and at worst it is inflammatory, divisive and counter-productive.
Nevertheless, Buyoya did appoint the country’s first Hutu Prime Minister since 1961 (Call, 2012). Furthermore, in 1992 the government banned political parties that were associated (explicitly) with any ethnic group, region, or clan (Prunier, 2009).

In 1992, Burundi adopted a new constitution and the country held its first democratic elections June 1993 (Uvin, 1999). The results marked a turning point in Burundian politics: Melchior Ndadaye, a Hutu moderate from the Burundian Democratic Front (FRODEBU), won the presidency, and a Hutu majority was elected to parliament (Call, 2012, Prunier, 2009). Buyoya accepted the results and resigned and Ndadaye created a coalition government, with members of the UPRONA as part of the cabinet (ibid).

**Formal Education in the Independent Republics**

Throughout the First Republic, the ‘White Paper’ mandate to avoid ethnic difference and blame the colonial administration (i.e. Westernization) manifested as a three-pronged policy in formal education: *Bashingantahe* (community/local influence in schooling and resource distribution), *ruralization* (ensuring schools and curricula were locally relevant), and *kirundization* (transferring language of instruction to Kirundi, the local language) (UNESCO, 1974), what I refer to collectively as *Burundization*. The Second Republic was in many ways a continuation of the First Republic, with little political change and the policies established by Micombero continued on (MEN, 1984). In 1978 the government released a document called *The Plan: 1978-1982*. It called for universal literacy by 1990, and consequently an increase in schools and school programs (UNESCO, 1978). School programs and curricula, for the most part, continued in the same vein in the Third Republic under Buyoya. The most notable changes were increased education enrolment, though not necessarily in formal schooling through the
introduction of more double shift programs and new *cocos* (community junior secondary schools) and *Yaga Makuma* (informal learning centres) (UNESCO, 1992).

Inclusive though these policies appeared to be on the surface, in particular during the first and Second Republic, they ultimately masked significant regional and ethnic distortions and covered up serious socio-structural grievances by declaring a moratorium on public discussions about ethnicity. Any unifying effect that these educational policies and curricula might have had on Burundian unification were negated by difficult national exams at the end of primary school that were necessary for secondary school entrance. The exams were all in French and covered subjects such as literature, science, and economics – subjects not covered in the ruralization curricula (Eisemon, Prouty, & Schwille, 1989). Their difficult nature created a two-tiered formal education system, with under-resourced and ill-equipped primary schools in rural regions (predominantly Hutu) and well-resourced private schools in urban centres (predominantly Tutsi). This divided system perpetuated many of the socio-structural grievances present in Burundian society, including inequitable access to government, business, and military jobs.

**School Access**

*School Access in the First Republic*

The Micombero government opened up schools compared to the colonial administration to ensure greater school access compared to the colonial era, generally through double shift programs (Eisemon & Schwille, 1991), although enrolments still remained relatively low across the country. Data on schooling in Burundi prior to 2000 are hard to come by, but a relatively current Ministry of Education report describes the historical gross enrolment rates (GER) as

---

5 Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER): “Total enrolment in a specific level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the eligible official school-age population corresponding to the same level of education in a given school year” (UNICEF, 2014a)
follows: in 1962, on the eve of independence, GER was only 20%, it peaked in 1972 at around 47%, before falling back to 25%, (MEN/ADEA, 2002, cited in Obura 2008).

Interview participants from this time period noted that, for the most part, all of the children in their area went to primary school in some capacity, as Cadeau described:

There were not a lot of private schools or things like that [in my area], so wealthy people still went to public schools. My area was middle class so everyone went to school.

I stress that all of the interview participants from this period were Tutsi from middle- to high-socioeconomic status, and all of the participants from this time period went to school in Bujumbura, as described in Chapter 3, where school enrolment was generally higher than in the provinces to the north and east of the country.

To increase school enrolment, the government also implemented ruralization policies to make school more relevant to farmers (the main trade in most of the provincial regions outside the capital city), with courses in agricultural and cattle rearing (Greenland, 1974). These courses were, however, only taught in years 1-4 and had little impact on students wishing to continue their studies beyond primary school (Eisemon & Schwille, 1991).

School Access in the Second Republic

Gross enrolment figures generally improved throughout the Second Republic: initially enrolment hovered around 23% for the whole country in 1976 (UNESCO, 1978) and increased each year to about 52% in 1988 (Obura, 2008)⁶. The government planned to have all children literate by 1990 and embarked on massive school expansion across the country. It primarily accomplished this by adding more double-shift schools and increasing student/teacher ratios

---

⁶ I was unable to locate data on relative male/female enrolment numbers during this period.
(consequently decreasing teacher/student time and quality of education). They also established a set of schools called ‘literacy centres’ primarily in rural areas, which made up the bulk of rural education (UNESCO, 1978). These centres tended to have un- or lower-qualified teachers with little teacher training, accordingly students in these schools were at a disadvantage compared to students in regular public or private schools (ibid.).

Participant descriptions of their schooling during this time period described how the majority of children went to school. Michel, a male Hutu who started primary school in 1984, talked about his schooling in the Second Republic:

“In my time in school, I studied with everyone… well maybe 80% of people went to school – Burundians and Congolese (there were a lot of Congolese in Burundi). All of us went to school. There were no problems, because there was no war, so everyone went to school and didn’t worry about it.”

Michel went to kindergarten in Bujumbura and primary school in Kayanza, and thus reinforces the claims that the government was increasing school access across the country.

**School Access in the Third Republic**

Buyoya did little to change any curriculum mandates or policies regarding formal education. The most significant policy was the continued primary school expansion, particularly in rural areas, by adding more double shifts to rural area schools (and thus straining already strained resources in those areas), and also through a focus on funding and building more **cocos** (community junior secondary schools) and **Yaga Mukama** (non-formal education centres, which were free and required attendance only twice a week) (Obura, 2008). By the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, 400 new classrooms were being built each year (MEN/UNICEF, 1999, cited in Obura, 2008). A UNICEF report shows that because of population growth and increased school

**Resource Distribution in Schools**

*Resource Distribution during First Republic (1966-1976)*

The Micobero government significantly shifted the former colonial era inequitable formal education to Tutsi from both southern Bururi and the capital city of Bujumbura and away from the traditional monarchy stronghold of central Muramvy. Primary school enrolment figures from the first school year after the start of the First Republic (1967/1968) show a high proportion of students enrolled in Bururi, Bujumbura, Gitega, and Muramvy provinces (provinces with high concentrations of Tutsi), however by 1971/1972 the number of students in Bururi schools skyrocketed compared to all other provinces (Table 4). This contrasts with other provinces, like Kayanza and Bubanza in the north, which saw a drop in school enrollment.

\textsuperscript{7} Net Enrolment Ratio (NER): Enrolment of the official age group for a given level of education expressed as a percentage of the corresponding population (ibid)
Table 4

School Enrolment Data by Province during the Micombero Presidency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bubanza</td>
<td>8,882</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>3,922</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citiboke</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura</td>
<td>14,077</td>
<td>16,668</td>
<td>13,352</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura</td>
<td>12,172</td>
<td>13,696</td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Rural</td>
<td>12,172</td>
<td>13,696</td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bururi</td>
<td>18,719</td>
<td>23,644</td>
<td>12,325</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makamba</td>
<td>7,958</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitega</td>
<td>13,526</td>
<td>12,473</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karuzi</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyinga</td>
<td>7,747</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>5,592</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirundo</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>4,397</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muramvya</td>
<td>11,385</td>
<td>11,546</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaro</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngozi</td>
<td>9,342</td>
<td>9,259</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayanza</td>
<td>15,027</td>
<td>13,335</td>
<td>10,282</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruyigi</td>
<td>6,312</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cankuzo</td>
<td>8,579</td>
<td>7,696</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutana</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from (UNESCO, 1974);
Note: discrepancies in years are a result of the data provided

There was a very noticeable drop in school enrolment after the 1972 violence and genocide. All provinces suffered losses during the violence and fewer students were enrolled in school in 1973/1974. The drop in enrolment numbers can be attributed both indirectly and directly to the violence: many teachers were killed or became refugees, primary schools were destroyed, and children were killed or lost parents and so became the heads of their households that had to work or were orphaned (Obura, 2008). Bururi (the province where the initial revolts and suppressions took place), Bubanza, Makamba, and Kayanza provinces all experienced a

---

8 Schools were closed down in 1972 as a result of the violence, therefore no data is reported for the 1972/1973 school year
greater proportion of the violence in 1972 than other provinces, which explains the greater drops in enrolment in those provinces (Greenland, 1980). After the violence, the government did little to address these structural discrepancies, if anything inequitable resource distribution was more apparent in the latter half of the Micombero regime.

Another key formal education reform put in place by Micombero as part of the Burundization program was Bashingantahe\textsuperscript{9}, which focused formal education to more “traditional aspects” of Burundian culture, and also incorporated local communities into the organization and programming decisions for schools, or school decentralization. (Greenland, 1980; MEN, 1984; Obura, 2008). The policy had differential impacts in different regions: regions that had a greater proportion of school resources were able to ‘do more’ with those resources, and those who had less access to resources continued to be disadvantaged and could do little to change (Jackson, 2000).


While data from this time do not separate out ethnicity (the ‘White Paper’ makes it hard to get reliable and official demographics for Hutu/Tutsi numbers), there is a significant relationship between school distribution and Tutsi population percentages. For example, Bururi and Muramvya provinces traditionally had higher percentages of Tutsi populations compared to country averages (approx. 25%) and compared to provinces in the north, like Kirundo, which had lower Tutsi populations (approx. 5-10%) (Greenland, 1980). The Tutsi-advantaged provinces received the bulk of the funding for education throughout the Second Republic: for instance,

\textsuperscript{9} Bashingantahe is a traditional ritual and stature unique to Burundi: when a male (in the pre-colonial era this meant exclusively Tutsi male) becomes umushingantahe he is considered to be one step below a tribal elder or chief and a wise person that can help with decision making. (I asked Cadeau, an interview participant, to explain this to me during a series of e-mails after our interview, as I could not find reference to a direct English translation; in Kirundi the prefix *umu-* is singular, and *ba-* is plural)
Bururi received almost 20% of educational funds with only 6.7% of the population (ibid). In general, the regional distribution of Tutsi and Hutu, as well as the overall proportion of each throughout the country have not changed significantly over the past 50 years (Obura, 2008).

The UNESCO 1978 report on formal education in Burundi cautioned that “deep-rooted disparities are concealed by global education indicators” (p. 2) and there was, indeed, a significant difference in urban/rural school access: for example, in 1978 urban school enrolment was 92%, but only 21% in rural areas (UNESCO, 1978). For example, rural areas tended to have higher Hutu populations, whereas urban areas had higher Tutsi populations (Greenland, 1980).


The Third Republic similarly did not accompany increased school access with an equitable increase in number of teachers or other necessary education resources. Furthermore, rural regions had schools located very far away from some children and they could not (or did not) provide lodging for students, and the urban/rural divide in educational resources continued to grow (Jackson, 2000). For example towns, such as Bujumbura-City and Rumonge in Bururi, had an excess of trained teachers, sometimes with three teachers to a class, whereas rural schools, particularly those in Citiboke, Ruyigi, Ngozi and Kirundo (Northern) provinces, had fewer teachers than classrooms, or high student/teacher ratios, in some cases as high as 80 to 100 students per teacher (ibid, and Obura, 2008).
Language of Instruction in Burundian Primary Schools during the Three Republics

The Burundization policies also switched the language of instruction from French to Kirundi (Kirundi is the local language and is spoken universally across the country) in 1973, after the genocide. Classes such as math, science and literature that previously had been taught in French were switched to Kirundi. The stated goal was to make education more locally accessible. Instruction switched to French only in years 5 and 6, with Kirundi continuing only as a language subject, this policy was called Kirundization (MEN, 1984). Table 5 shows the overall curriculum hours of instruction per week for years 1-6 in primary schools during the Micombero Presidency. The reason for the sudden shift to French as the language of instruction was that the national exams for primary school exit and secondary school entrance remained in French (Jackson, 2000). This sudden language switch helps to explain the markedly higher dropout rates in years 5 and 6 compared to years 1-4 in Burundian primary schools during the Micombero presidency, and also subsequently in the Bagaza and Buyoya presidencies where these policies continued (ibid.). The mandate for French instruction, however, was not accompanied with corresponding teacher training, particularly in remote rural areas in the north and east, where teachers often resorted to Kirundi in order to deliver lessons that were supposed to be in French – a practice that continued well into the late 1980s and early 1990s (Ndayifukamiye, 1996).
Table 5

Primary School Formal Curriculum in Burundi, Years 1-6 (1973-1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirundi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étude de Milieu (Economics, History, Geography)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, schooling in the First and Second Republics appeared to focus on developing a more ‘unifying’ and locally relevant curriculum, with policies that served to decentralize schools and make them more accessible to students (in both content – ruralization – and language of instruction). However, the result was to mask real and perceived differences in needs and resource allocation, and ultimately resulted in a two-tiered education system, wherein schools in poorer, rural agriculture-based provinces in the north and east were systematically disadvantaged over those in south and central Burundi. The real effects of the two-tiered system emerged in the perception of the importance of French as a Second Language in the business and government sector.

The national exams for primary school exit and secondary school entrance, the concours nationales (see below), were also exclusively in French, and French-based, private or Church-run schools started to provide a school curriculum more in-line with those national exams and expectations of student success in business and in government. Students who attended French schools (almost exclusively Tutsi, according to interview participants) were advantaged over
those with lower income who could not afford private tutoring or private schools – typically Hutu. The advantage of going to private French schools ensured those students had higher success rates on the national exams and moved on to secondary schools in larger numbers than those in regular public schools. As one participant, Bonheur, whose father was Hutu and mother was Tutsi, described it:

“My mom didn’t want [me to learn in Kirundi], and she decided when they changed the structure to Kirundi, she changed me from that school to another school to where they spoke French all the time.”

This also indicates the importance that Burundians placed on learning French. Bonheur was also fortunate: while his father was Hutu and killed in 1972 and his mother was Tutsi, his family had a decent amount of political influence and were relatively well off, so as an urban ‘Tutsi’ he had greater options than others in rural locations. Most interview participants indicated that they went to French schools from early ages and that their parents encouraged them to speak French.

Parents who had the means to do so, continued to switch their children out of public schools and into church schools or private schools whose language of instruction was French. This further exacerbated the distance between the public, Kirundi-based and the private, French-based schools that was developing in Burundi. Thierry, a male Tutsi, and Michel, a male Hutu, both described their education as French-based, with Kirundi only taught intermittently. While Michel was taught French by his mother at school in northern Kayanza, Thierry went to a private primary school in Bujumbura. In both cases, they expressed the perception that it was important to learn in French, as opposed to Kirundi, in order to be successful in the concours nationales and indicated that they were at an advantaged later in life because they had taken French their whole career in primary school. So access to French instruction was perceived to correlate to an
increase in socio-economic status and greater job opportunities in both business, government, and the military.

The only significant change to the language policy under Buyoya in the Third Republic was that the language of instruction switched from Kirundi to French starting in year 4 (an increase in one year of French instruction) (UNESCO, 1992). As with most other of Buyoya’s policies, the policy was not significantly accompanied by additional teacher training or resources. Thus, it only continued to perpetuate the social, political, and economic exclusion of Hutu and rural farmers and socio-structural inequalities between Hutu and Tutsi that were present throughout the First and Second Republics.

The Concours Nationales
Undoing Burundization Policies and Legitimizing Structural Exclusion

In the First, Second, and Third Republics the final stage of primary education was the national exams, *concours nationales*. These exams were incredibly difficult and competitive, and passing them served as a significant barrier to promotion to secondary school. In principle, the exams existed as a mechanism to test the aptitude of students and select students to attend secondary school based on their results. However, the mandated Burundization primary school curriculum directly contrasted with the material covered in these national exams. That is, while Burundization focused on kirundization, ruralization, and Bashingatahe (that is, mandated curricula was more locally relevant to non-urban Burundian farmers), the national exams focused primarily on ‘cosmopolitan’ subjects: 80% of the exam was French (the non-home, colonial language) and Mathematics, the remaining 20% were subjects collectively called *etude du milieu* (science, social sciences, economics) (Eisemon, Prouty, et. al., 1989). The national exams made these programs in ruralization, kirundization, and Bashingatahe irrelevant except for secondary
promotion. The final two years of formal education (5/6) were rendered irrelevant for the majority of the rural farming population of Burundi, particularly those who did not continue to secondary school.

These exams were not easy, even for the wealthiest of Burundians, but they also served a significant purpose to the government administration. As Julien, a male Tutsi, described them:

“There were the nightmares of the national examinations. These determined the future of all the Burundians, and they were horrible. In French they are the ‘Concours nationale’. The key with these is that they were not a system of assessing the level of understanding or knowledge. But they were about selecting the best of the best.”

This contrasted with several other participants, who indicated that the exams were about excluding Hutu from the system. Julien appears to have adopted the ideology of the government, in that he reinforces the notion that they were selecting ‘the best’ Burundians for secondary school. However, it seems that the government’s definition of the ‘best’ was often code for ‘Tutsi.’ Wealthier Tutsi from Bururi passed the exams, or had the means to pass them, whereas Hutu did not often pass and move forward in schools. Cadeau described the process as follows:

“At the end of primary school, you took examinations and everyone had to take them to finish… about 100,000 kids took them for only about 5,000 spots, maybe fewer, so most people would fail and wouldn’t go to high school, or they would take them two or three times. I failed three times, but my father could afford to pay for me to pass anyways and go on to high school after. So there was corruption there.”

Thus, while the exams appeared to be considered universally difficult, there was also a perceived system of bribes and corruption to ensure that only certain people who could afford to pay were able to move forward. Furthermore, the methods of instruction in Burundian public schools exacerbated the problem, Eraste furthered this notion:

“There was this huge gap between the French [language of instruction] schools and Burundian [language of instruction] ones – a big difference… People were used to memorizing [in Burundian schools], and then the exam was all problem solving. So it was easier to prepare for the exams if you went to French school.”
The exams represented a key structural barrier in the Burundian system and served to legitimize the structural inequalities in the country, by ensuring that some Tutsi were promoted to secondary school (and thus had access to military and government positions), and Hutu who were not successful in the exams were relegated back to the farming fields after primary school. As Fabrice, a male interviewee, who chose not to identify himself as Tutsi or Hutu, explained:

“We didn’t realize the barriers they had at the time in order to get to secondary school or to learn important things that would get them far in life, like math or science or economics. We thought they were choosing this [poverty, rural farm life], when it was just a lot harder for them [to move on to secondary school].”

Fabrice’s description of how Hutu were perceived is telling, he offers insight into the ramifications of the national exams on the consciousness of Burundians. In saying that he thought they “were choosing this”, he implies that in later years, there were not a lot of Hutu in schools and there was a perception that Hutu did not want to go to school. He also acknowledges that, looking back on it, there were significant barriers in place for Hutu that he just didn’t realize at the time.

Civil War (1993-2005): Twelve Years of Destruction and Violence

Members of the all-Tutsi army assassinated President Ndadaye, as well as other leaders of the National Assembly, on October 21, 1993 (Call, 2012), thus ending the Third Republic. His assassination was a catalyst for a protracted civil war, with rival factions and militias fighting largely along ethnic lines. FRODEBU (the Hutu-dominated governing party under Ndadaye) was initially held responsible for the massacres of Tutsi that followed in the immediate aftermath of
the assassination (ibid, and Prunier, 2009). Four principal Hutu militia groups\(^\text{10}\) formed in the early 1990s and these four groups, along with the FRODEBU Hutu-dominated civilian government, the Tutsi dominated army, and Tutsi civil society (and countless smaller militias in all regions of the country divided on ethnic lines) fought throughout the 1900s in a series of ongoing, recurring battles across the country (Prunier, 2009). The first three months of the civil war were the most violent and left an estimated 50,000 to 100,000 dead (Call, 2012), as Obura (2008) explains:

“In Burundi, the year 1993 is referred to as ‘la crise’. The term denotes specific events of 1993, the sudden shock of events during that year, in distinction to the continuing violence and instability over the next twelve years. The expression also signifies that the crisis of 1993 was the immediate cause of unfolding, decade-long events and violence, continuing up to today. The sequels to 1993 are called the ‘period of instability’ or ‘the ongoing conflict’ which was particularly acute until 1996-1997” (p. 91)

That is to say that the year 1993 left a scar on Burundian consciousness, so much so that even decades later, the country is still recovering from that initial shock. After several more years of fighting, the majority (13 of 19) rebel groups and militias signed the Arusha Peace Accords in 2000 (Call, 2012), the rest signed on in 2003 except for FNL. In 2003, a transitional government was sworn in, and a new constitution was ratified. In 2005, the first post-civil war government was elected by the people. When all was said and done, the human toll in Burundi between 1993 and 2005 was inescapable: 300,000 dead and 687,000 refugees in Tanzania, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, or internal refugee camps (Collier & Sambanis, 2005, cited in UNESCO, 2014b, p. 52).

\(^\text{10}\) These groups are: 1) Parti pour la Libération du Peuple Hutu (PALIPEHUTU); 2) Front de Libération Nationale (FROLINA); 3) Conseil Nationale de Défense et Démocratie – Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie (CNDD-FDD), the current governing party under Pierre Nkurunziza; 4) Forces Nationale de la Libération (FNL), signed the Peace Accord in 2008, but as of this writing are still instigating violence in rural Burundi.
Schooling during the Civil War

The initial violence and turmoil in 1993 brought the social, political and economic institutions in the country to a “virtual standstill” (Obura, 2008, p. 93). Similar to other countries emerging from civil war and escalated violence, like Rwanda (E. King, 2011), schools suffered from direct instances of violence. However, unlike in Rwanda where the violent conflict was relatively brief (from April to July 1994) and primary schools opened in September 1994 and in May 1995 secondary schools re-opened (ibid.), the civil war in Burundi was protracted, sporadic and occurred region by region, with multiple militias and groups fighting for dominance and control for over a decade. The ongoing and cyclical nature hampered the reconstruction of educational institutions, which generally took until 2005 to return to pre-1993 levels for most education indicators – such as enrolment rates, and repetition and retention rates (Obura, 2008). I witnessed the effects of the destruction as late as 2010 when I visited the Ministry of Education in Bujumbura, which was shockingly under-resourced and in a desperate state of disrepair, and still had bullet holes in the walls.

School Access During and After the Civil War

The violence included the destruction, loss and looting of schools, and school children and teachers were killed or fled the country (Jackson, 2000). NER of primary schools was 52% in 1991/1992 and fell to 37% in 1994/1995 (Obura, 2008). In provinces (in the north and east) where there was sustained violence and insecurity, the GER was only 9% after the crisis (ibid.). By 1998/1999, almost two thirds of Burundi’s children were out of school because of the insecurity: either as refugees, as child soldiers, as internally displaced persons, or they did not attend school because of other priorities, such as raising younger family members, or out of fear
of violence (Jackson, 2000). While retention rates\textsuperscript{11} through year 6 of primary school were relatively high throughout the 1980s, approx. 80-90\%, they plummeted during this period to 49.5\% by the end of the civil war (UNICEF, 2008). This statistic is somewhat misleading. High repetition rates\textsuperscript{12} in the years leading up to and during the war (Years 1-4 averaged 28\%, Year 5 average 37\% and Year 6 averaged 44\% repetition) meant that age ranges were widely distorted: primary school pupils were often in their teens and a third of the students in year 6 were aged 16-20 (Jackson, 2000).

\textit{The Effect of the Civil War on Educational Resource Distribution}

The civil war exacerbated the educational disparities from pre-war days across every indicator: the urban/rural, regional, socio-economic status, and the gender gaps in school attainment, repetition and completion all grew wider (Jackson, 2000; Obura, 2008). Table 6 below shows the disaggregated data from 2000 – after the Arusha Peace Accords were signed.

\textsuperscript{11} Retention Rates (or School Survival Rate): the percentage of a cohort of pupils enrolled in grade 1 of the primary level of education in a given school year who are expected to reach the last grade of primary school, regardless of repetition (MGDS/UN, 2014)

\textsuperscript{12} Repetition Rate: Proportion of pupils from a cohort enrolled in a given grade at a given school year who study in the same grade in the following school year. (UNESCO/UIS, 2009)
Table 6

*Disaggregated educational data in Burundi for the year 2000 (%)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Richest</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Enrolment Rate</strong></td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Enrollment Rate</strong></td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Repetition Rate</strong></td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Dropout Rate</strong></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survival to Last Primary Grade</strong></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessed: July 20, 2014

The table shows the massive distortions in educational structure, school access and completion rates after the Peace Accords were signed. The shaded boxes represent positive bias. NER and GER favoured male, urban, rich, however rural and female students had lower dropout rates and were more likely to survive to year 6 (and interesting anomaly, and one that requires further study and is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this project). By far the greatest indicator for student success in 2000 was wealth: the richest Burundians has nearly double school enrolment rates, lower drop out and repetition rates. Given the policies enacted by the governments from 1966-1993, this is not shocking. The figures do not separate out ethnicity but Tutsi tended to be from urban areas, whereas Hutu tended to be poorer, rural farmers (Greenland, 1980).

The consequence of this “chronic exclusion” in Burundi (Call, 2012) throughout the Independent Republics manifested as five provinces – Bujumbura City, Bururi, Makamba, Gitega, and Muramvya – comprised about a third of the total population and consistently receiving well over two thirds of educational funding, while the other 11 – Bubanza, Bujumbura Rural, Cankuzo, Citiboke, Karuzi, Kayanza, Kirundo, Muyinga, Ngozi, Rutana, and Ruyigi –
comprised about two-thirds of the population and receiving one-third of the educational resources (Jackson, 2000; see also Ndikumana, 2005). Figure 4, below, shows the state of the formal education sector in Burundi in 2002, just before the transitional government was sworn in. It demonstrates the severe distortions in number of schools compared to population: each province is ranked according to population and number of schools. Bururi is ranked number 10 in population but is ranked 16 in number of schools (that is, it had the highest number of schools), whereas Kirundo had a higher population than Bururi (14) but significantly lower number of schools (8).

*Figure 4. Distribution of Schools and Population in Burundi, 2002 (Obura, 2008, p. 103)*
Post-Civil War (2005-Present): Implications for Formal Education

‘Peace’ (cessation of escalated violence and/or civil war) came to Burundi in 2003, after the majority of militias and government forces signed onto the 2000 Arusha Peace Accords, and in 2005 the Burundians voted for Pierre Nkurunziza as President (a Hutu from the CNDD-FDD party). Unequal resource distribution and access to education was so distorted during the post-Independence Republics that the peace agreement specifically states that “[o]ne of the causes of violence and insecurity in Burundi… is a discriminatory system which did not offer equal access to all Burundian youths from all ethnic groups” (Protocol III, Chapter I, Article 3). Thus, one of the principal tasks of the new government was the reconstruction of the formal educational sector in order to address these inequalities.

School Access

In order to address the structural inequalities in access that plagued the formal education system in Burundi, the new constitution (2005) states the following:

*Article 53:* Every citizen has [a] right to the equal access to instruction, to education and to culture. The State has the duty to organize public education and to favour [its] access. However, the right to establish private schools is guaranteed within the conditions established by the law.

The Arusha Peace Accords (Article 7) additionally states that a goal of the new government should be the “restoration [of] education [that] has been interrupted as a result of the Burundi conflict or of exclusion.” Consequently, current government and international (i.e. primarily World Bank and UNESCO projects, or projects from bilateral aid agencies13) education programs are trying to expand access to schools. The Nkurunziza government in now increasing access to schools in three ways: 1) abolishing school fees, 2) initiating double shifts, and 3)

---

13 Author’s interview with the Canadian Honorary Consul to Burundi
building more schools. President Nkurunziza’s government initiated the construction of more primary schools than all of his predecessor’s combined (Schools for Burundi, 2013). From 2008-2012, GER was at 164% and NER are also higher than ever at 74% (UNICEF, 2014).

The expansion was no doubt significant; however, an insufficient number of trained teachers reduced the quality of education, and the re-introduction of double shifts in schools reduced teaching time per student by 20%. Consequently, repetition rates have remained high at 28% for years 1-4, 37% for year 5, and 44% for year 6 (ibid.) and retention through primary school to year 6 is still low sitting at 50.7% (UNICEF, 2014). That is, the focus on expanding access to or quantity of formal education in primary schools has not necessarily resulted in significant increases in quality of education.

**Resource Distribution**

Article 7 of the Arusha Peace Accords stipulates “equitable regional distribution of school buildings, equipment and textbooks throughout the national territory, in such a way as to benefit girls and boys equally.” Rozette, a female Tutsi who grew up in a suburb just outside Bujumbura and who was in school in the early 2000s, described how everyone in her area went to school.

“I would say in my neighbourhood, everyone went to school, because most of the people from the school I went to, lived in the city. My area is a little bit more civilized and most of the people there knew the importance of school – so pretty much everyone sent their kids to school. I remember pretty much everyone – my neighbours, my friends, the kids I grew up with – they were all in school as well.”

Her statement about school access is telling in that, while she is from an urban middle-class family, she went to school in a region that was traditionally under-resourced (Citiboke). Thus, her perception that most kids went to school reinforces the perception given by secondary
sources (Manistahe, 2014) that there was a concerted effort by the government to encourage school enrolment in areas that had traditionally had lower enrolment rates before the civil war.

**Language of Instruction**

Schools in Burundi have also reverted to French as the principle language of instruction, with Kirundi as a language subject. In 2005/2006 the government also mandated both English and Kiswahili language instruction into the primary school curriculum in order to increase regional competitiveness with Rwanda, Kenya, Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania (Manishatse, 2013), who are significant trading partners in the East African Union and all have English as their cosmopolitan language of business and government. However, as of this writing, English and Kiswahili instruction are not significantly implemented in practice in primary schools, and often teachers do not have the proper training and resources for instruction in those languages (ibid.). This may lead to a similar situation to the latter half of the Republics, in which trained teachers in French were hard to come by in rural schools and thus only a small percentage of students received genuine instruction in French. Rozette was relatively well spoken in English and I asked her about her experiences with learning language in school. She described how the majority of her schooling was in French, with Kirundi as a class of instruction, and that she only started to learn English in secondary school, when she chose a specific language stream to focus her studies.

**National Exams**

Article 7 in the Arusha Accord also states that there “should be transparency and fairness in examinations to overcome social exclusion [of Hutu in schools by government administrators] (which the agreements point to as one of the causes of the outbreak of conflict and violence in
Burundi)” (Dupuy, 2008, p. 159). While the national primary exit exams still exist, they are now called the Certificat D’Études Primaires (CEP) and roughly 50% of pupils pass these exams (Transcript Research, 2012). There is little information on what the current government is doing to combat the corruption that persisted under previous governments in the administration of these exams. Additionally, while Kirundi and French are on the national exam (instead of just French), English and Kiswahili do not, as of this writing, appear in the national exams because they are only taught orally, and thus students do not have the skills to write or read in either language (Manishatse, 2013). This amounts to a significant amount of wastage in funding and resources to ensure teaching in English/Kiswahili occurs without genuine follow-up in later formal education.

In the post-independence years through the Three Republics, Tutsi from Bururi province dominated every aspect of political, social and economic life in Burundi. Call (2012) referred to the situation in Burundi as “chronic exclusion” (p. 150): the Hutu majority and Tutsi from the North and East of the country were largely excluded from social, political, economic and educational institution. Formal education was a tool of the state to promote those groups that were favoured (Tutsi from Bururi and Bujumbura), and marginalize and segregate or exclude those who were not (generally, Hutu) (Greenland, 1980; Jackson, 2000). However, the current government is working to address these structural inequalities through the construction of more schools, in particular in rural regions, and new language policies that may provide equal opportunity for all students to advance to secondary school. I turn now to the cumulative effects of these structural aspects of formal education as a destructive conflict in schools in the socio-structural dimension, and how the government’s steps towards inclusion represent small, but necessary, steps towards building an environment where constructive interethnic conflict can exist in schools.
Discussion: Chronic Socio-Structural Exclusion and (Small) Steps towards Inclusion in Primary Schools

The principal legacy of the colonial formal education policies in Burundi was the creation of an unequal system – favouring sons of Tutsi chiefs and Tutsi from the Muramvya province in central Burundi. The unequal provision of educational resources and inequitable quality of education that persisted throughout the Independent Republics (by favouring Tutsi from south-western Bururi) is considered to be a significant contributing factor to the violence and destructive conflict of the civil war, so much so that even the Burundian Constitution and the Arusha Peace Accords after the civil war specifically mention these educational discrepancies as root causes of the violence that need to be addressed in order to develop sustainable peace in the country (Dupuy, 2008). Current formal education policies provide some room to address the structural inequalities in school resource distribution, access, and language, as mandated by those peace accords and the new constitution. The government is now moving to shift the education system from one that traditionally worked to exclude the majority of the population from jobs in politics, the military, or business (Ndikumana, 2005), towards an inclusive policy that may help to incorporate the interests of both Tutsi and Hutu, through increased schooling.

Destructive Conflict in the Independent Republics: The Socio-Structural Dimension

The three-pronged Burundization policies (i.e. kirundization, ruralization, and bashingatahe) formed the foundations of the Burundian formal education throughout the three Independent Republics (1966-1993). These policies represent an explicit curriculum that promoted a unifying ‘Burundian’ identity. The move to incorporate the local Kirundi as the language of instruction was an attempt to make formal education more appealing to all Burundians (Eisemon, Prouty & Schwille, 1989). The rural-based curriculum was a further
attempt to increase school enrolments by making the explicit curriculum more *locally relevant* to the rural farming communities (Eisemon, et. al., 1993). Furthermore, Bashingatahe was effectively school decentralization, so that *local* school communities could make decisions about *local schooling* (MEN, 1984). These policies represented a plan for “education for self-employment” by the Burundian government (i.e. rural farming) (Eisemon & Schwille, 1991).

However, the official policies were in direct contrast to the practice implemented around the primary exit/the secondary entrance exams (*concours nationales*), in which the *explicit* curriculum covered by the exam promoted a distinctly ‘*cosmopolitan*’ identity’. That is, the exams focused on French language skills (the *metropolitan* language and of its former colonial power, Belgium), and *cosmopolitan* subjects (science, mathematics, economics, and literacy) (Eisemon, et. al, 1993). Furthermore, the exams were standardized across the country, which is to say that exams were *national*. The government’s principal argument for this switch in curricula in years 5 and 6 was that schools needed to prepare those who would continue on to secondary school in the language and business of government (Eisemon, Prouty & Schwille, 1989). Explicit curricula in the last two years of primary school switched to promote “education for secondary school” (Eisemon & Schwille, 1993) rather than the Burundian identity from the first four years of schooling. Thus, the effectiveness of any ‘Burundian’-ness that was promoted through the first four years of primary schools was negated by the national exams.

A further complication lies in the inequitable resource distribution and school access policies that existed throughout the Three Republics (1966-1993). The governments’ funnelling of education resources – in particular building schools and training teachers in French instruction (Ndayifukamiye, 1996) – towards the four provinces in the south (Bururi, Makamba, Muramvya, and Gitega) and the capital city (Bujumbura) through nearly three decades created large
distortions in educational attainment (Jackson, 2000). This inequitable access and distribution ultimately amounted to a *hidden curriculum* that, structurally, all but ensured that wealthier Tutsi from the southern and western provinces would be promoted to secondary school, and thus have access to government and military jobs, as well as greater access to the business sector (compared with access to little beyond rural farming). In contrast, the 11 marginalized provinces in the north and east did not receive the necessary teacher training or resources to ensure success in the national exams. These predominantly Hutu, rural farming communities had little chance at moving beyond primary school and thus limiting the probability that Hutu would acquire positions of power in governance or in the military.

The *lived* curricula experienced by the selected Burundians I interviewed who were in primary school during this time, tells the story of how these policies came to be viewed throughout the republics. Initially, these policies were met with optimism throughout the country: they were considered by many to be emancipatory and allowed for authenticity in educational practices (Greenland, 1974). However, as time moved on, a two-tiered educational system developed across the country, where public schools retained Kirundi as their language of instruction, and private schools were primarily in French. Limited resources in public schools meant that often language of instruction continued in Kirundi in schools, where there was not enough teacher training in French as a Second Language instruction, particularly in the north and west (Ndayifukamiye, 1996). Thus, teachers would provide scripted lessons in French and revert back to Kirundi at the end of the script (ibid.) and, where French instruction did happen, teacher and student French language skills were often limited to the vocabulary and skills examined on the *concours nationale* (Eisemon & Schwille, 1989). For the students that did not pass the national exam and did not continue on in school, two years of French language instruction was of
little use in their daily lives, and often any French language understanding was forgotten immediately after completion of primary school (Eisemon, Prouty & Schwille, 1989). French language skills were therefore only relevant to a small subset of the population: those who went on to secondary school, and by extension careers in government and the military. All of the interview participants in this study continued on to secondary school, and most described how those in French schools were at an advantage to relative to others.

The socio-structural implications of these policies are far-reaching. The combined consequences of the contrast between two official curricula (promoting a national Burundian identity in the first four years and promoting a ‘cosmopolitan’ identity in the last two years) and the hidden curriculum of inequitable resource distribution and school access created large socio-structural distortions and in particular, chronic exclusion of Hutu from social, political, and economic institutions in the Burundian state. Thus, these policies served to legitimize and reinforce existing social norms and structures, that is, they favoured those already in power: Tutsi from Bururi (and, later, also those from Bujumbura).

In 1974, Jeremy Greenland described the potential impact the kirundization and ruralization policies would have on formal education in Burundi and its impact on the exclusion of Hutu from schools, and it is worth quoting him at length here:

“At independence the ruling elite was composed mainly of Tutsi… As a result of the 1972 rebellion Hutu have been physically removed from the education and political system. Should the Hutu seize power by violent means in the near future, they would have few qualified leaders. Since such a coup would lead to a complete massacre of the Tutsi and possibly to overall anarchy, there is tacit support for the present Tutsi regime despite its record and methods. Inevitably, therefore, the [educational reforms, kirundization and ruralization] which could have heralded progress for the whole community will be used as a tool by a repressive minority regime to maintain its own stranglehold on the country. Since guns matter more than textbooks, these valuable and logical reforms lost their educational significance before they left the printing press” (Greenland, 1974, p. 62).
This turned out to be somewhat prophetic: the Tutsi minority government did use formal education reforms to maintain control of the country, and the justification for the repression is found in the inflammatory statements in the 1972 *White Paper* and the 1988 *National Unity Charter*, both of which directly and indirectly accused Hutu of inciting divisionism and promoting hate or violence (LeMarchand, 1995; Turner, 2010). The effect that these policies had on Burundian schools, and school children, in the late 1970s and 1980s was not to create an atmosphere of unity and peace among different ethnicities, nor did they help to address the discriminatory nature of Burundian formal education throughout those times.

Every interview participant in this study described the impact of the *concours nationale* on schools, themselves and their communities as a negative – often evoking words like ‘horror’ or ‘nightmare’ to express their feelings. Even participants from elite Tutsi families described having difficulty with the exams, several described failing them multiple times before a parent eventually bribed education officials to let them pass. Although one denied that this process occurred. Interviewees also talked about the exams and school structure as mechanisms for structural discrimination in schools and for exclusion of Hutu from further formal education. Furthermore, the participants from the 1970s and 1980s described how because of their elite status they were able to go to French schools or have tutors in French, science and economics, which in turn helped them to succeed in the exams.

The inequitable access, distribution and language policies compounded competing socio-structural interests between Hutu and Tutsi in relation to schools. That is, most Tutsi went to primary school and some continued on through secondary and university, whereas Hutu were barred access to schooling beyond basic primary instruction. Meanwhile, the consequence of the Micombero and Bagaza governments’ ‘White Paper’ (1972), by which public discussion about
ethnicity and interethnic violence was limited and censored, was that the real socio-structural inequalities that existed across the country were not addressed. Anyone that claimed one group/ethnicity/region received greater funding or resources over another was charged with inciting divisiveness and, according to the Burundian government, falling into the colonial viewpoint of dividing the Burundian population (LeMarchand, 1995; Uvin, 2008).

Moving Towards Constructive Socio-Structural Interests in Post-Civil War Burundi

The challenge the current government now faces is how to undo these decades of chronic exclusion in a meaningful way without decreasing access and resource allocation to groups that had previously benefited from education policies. That is, if one ethnicity is seen to benefit while the other does not, or to fare worse than before, the government risks evoking the same resentment of perceived social injustices that previously existed within the country, and would “provoke a backlash that could easily re-ignite [violent] conflict” (Jackson, 2000, p. 3-4). This is especially imperative given that the current administration is majority Hutu, and while the current Hutu President (Pierre Nkurunziza) was born in Bujumbura, he grew up in Ngozi (a traditionally marginalized province). This could continue the circuitous ‘culture of conflict’ that has permeated Burundian culture for the 50 years after independence, and would increase the likelihood of further interethnic violence in the country.

Current government initiatives to address the pre-existing social-structural grievances of Hutu in schools include building more schools in rural areas and increasing teacher training across the country. Additionally, the move by the government to switch the language of most curriculum instruction to French (with Kirundi as a language subject) works in concert with the national exams, reducing some students’ access to success in them, and may allow for greater
inclusivity in schools. Namely, the move to exclusive French language of instruction in all subjects, in all classrooms around the country, may help to develop more equitable access to secondary school promotion through the national exams. Furthermore, promoting metropolitan language policies that would help Burundians become more competitive with their regional neighbours and key economic trading partners in an ever globalizing world. However, caution is necessary here: French is still a non-home language and rooted in Burundi’s colonial past. Thus, without proper teacher training on French language instruction there is a possibility that Burundian teachers would revert Kirundi instruction in a similar manner to what occurred in French language instruction in the Independent Republics.

Eliminating school fees also allows for more equitable access to schooling, especially in a relatively poor country like Burundi where even minimal school fees can be a barrier. However, barriers in access to secondary and tertiary schooling still remain, and have the potential to perpetuate some of the socio-structural grievances. Thus, examining strategies to further increase equitable school access such as eliminating secondary school fees, automatic promotion to each grade to increase retention and decrease repetition rates, or providing scholarships to students who cannot afford tuition but have above average qualifications (Obura, 2008) may help the government to ensure equitable access that does not result in a decrease in school attainment for groups that were previously advantaged.
Lessons from Other Countries Emerging from Escalated Violence

Burundi is by no means the only country that has lived through violent interethnic conflict, nor is it the only country that has had formal educational structures that legitimize promotion of one group over another in school and in society. Inequitable school access and resource distribution are, in fact, often present in countries experiencing interethnic violence. For example, Rwanda had a strict ethnic quota system to ensure the continued success and promotion of Hutu in schools during the post-independence Hutu republics, from 1959 to 1994 (E. King, 2014a). In Burundi there was a geographically and socio-economically segregated education system prior to the conflict, rather than segregation strictly along ethnic lines. That is, the barriers set up by the conflicting explicit curricula and the hidden curricula enabled the development of a two-tiered school system, where Tutsi and Hutu were segregated and streamed apart, or more precisely Hutu were streamed out, however the segregation was justified more along geographic and/or socio-economic conditions.

Countries emerging from violence often attempt to develop educational structures that mitigate real (or perceived) inequalities in schools. This is becoming ever more prevalent as more and more countries incorporate formal education mandates into peace agreements (Dupuy, 2008). In some contexts, this includes not only building schools in regions that were marginalized prior to the violence, or developing a quota system to ensure ethnic parity in schools (E. King, 2014a), but also developing separate school systems. The most extreme example of this is in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where post-conflict education reconstruction consisted of developing separate school systems for Bosniaks (Muslims) and Croats (Roman Catholics) with separate curricula that are locally responsive to the needs of each community.
(Tortsi, 2009). However, scholars suggest that desegregation, or rather integration, may reduce socio-structural grievances in situations of interethnic conflict (McGlynn, 2009).

In Burundi it is not reasonable to develop two separate school systems, one for Tutsi and one for Hutu, for three reasons: 1) Economically, Burundi is one of the poorest counties – 180 out of 187 on the Human Development Index (HDI, 2014) – in the world and is already struggling to properly administer one school system, let alone two; 2) Physically as Hutu and Tutsi live in largely integrated communities across the country with only small pockets of communities populated by only one ethnic group; and 3) Socially, an inequitable school system is cited as a direct cause of the violence (Peace Accords, 2003) and implementing a segregated school system would potentially be perceived as perpetuating those inequalities across the county. However, caution should be taken to ensure that the necessary conditions for equal status between both ethnicities in schools occurs, as equal status is necessary to the promotion of peacebuilding in situations with sustained group contact (Tal-Or & Boninger, 2002).

The Burundian government’s program to increase the number of schools could work on an ‘affirmative action’ basis, meaning that schools are built in all regions, and additional schools are built in previously deprived areas. The 2001 peace agreement in Macedonia and the 1997 peace agreement in Bangladesh both call for affirmative action practices and scholarships, to increase access to schooling for previously deprived areas and these have had some success in reducing interethnic tensions (Dupuy, 2008). However, caution must be taken when addressing structural social change in a dramatic way: in Sri Lanka, drastic language policy changes to reverse Tamil dominance in favour of majority Sinhalese generated new inequalities and may have contributed to the Tamil rebellion (E. King, 2014a). However, the Sri Lankan situation is inherently different to the Burundian situation in that Sinhalese and Tamil are very different
cultures (different languages and religions – Buddhist and Hindu, respectively), and live in largely separated communities around the country. The integrated nature of Burundi means that, in general, more children from each group will be in school across the country, regardless of ethnicity and equitable language policies and school access. This also means that a language policy where the language of instruction was French would not necessarily discriminate against one group if there was proper and equitable teacher training such that all public schools had relatively similar attainment regardless of region, ethnic make-up of the school, or socio-economic status of the area.

Thus, these socio-structural changes (equitable official language of instruction curriculum and equitable primary and post-primary school access) have the potential to impact Burundian society in a significant way and redress the perceived structural grievances between Hutu and Tutsi that existed across the country. The most significant implication of the policies would be to increase the number of children in schools. In ensuring that all children are in schools, social-structural grievances about inequitable resource distribution, access, and language of instruction may fade and work towards inclusive socio-structural institutions, and thus address the socio-structural dimension of conflict (Ross, 1993) as Burundi moves towards peacebuilding between Hutu and Tutsi.
Conclusion: The Implications of Socio-Structural Exclusion and Inclusion for Burundian Primary Schools

The chronic exclusion of Hutu in Burundian schools prior to the civil war (1966-1993) represents one of the contributing factors to the escalated violence. The inequitable language policies, resource distribution, and school access proved detrimental to peace in the country: the Burundian national primary exit exams were exclusionary, and a two-tiered and streamed system meant that a select group of Tutsi had access to secondary schools, whereas most Hutu (and many rural Tutsi) did not. This necessarily created a situation in which wealthier, urban Tutsi were successful in schools, and thus achieved positions in government, business and the military, and Hutu were largely excluded from all aspects of Burundian political and economic power, or positions for life beyond rural farming. The civil war represented a period of turmoil and chaos in Burundi, but in tearing down everything that the Tutsi/UPRONA (First to Third Republics) regimes had built, the civil war also represents a turning point in Burundian history. A new Hutu-dominated government and President emerged after the war in 2005 and in many ways, this switch in government control may provide the catalyst for educational reform towards more inclusive education. The current government’s priority to address the socio-structural grievances of Hutu comes as no surprise: given the make-up of the new government, it would want to increase school access and resources in traditionally marginalized regions and to populations that had supported its ascension to power. Also in encouraging the redistribution of resources, the government is working to remove barriers to (fair democratic access to) formal education spaces. The existence of such educational spaces may provide constructive opportunities for peaceful interethnic contact and conflict.

Still, socio-structural interests represent just one dimension of conflict: people’s psychocultural interpretations of conflict, such as interethnic threat levels and/or trust, are
equally important. That is “add education and stir” (simply adding increased access to formal education without changing the content of schooling to involve inclusive learning opportunities and challenges to perceived cross-group threats) would be inadequate at building peace in Burundi, as it is has been Rwanda (E. King, 2014a). Changing the paradigm through which social norms, behaviours, and in-group and cross-group perceptions and identities are viewed is also imperative in building sustainable peace and working to promote constructive interethnic conflict in schools. The following chapter outlines the psychocultural dimensions of conflict present in Burundian schools.
CHAPTER 5

PSYCHOCULTURAL INTERPRETATIONS OF ETHNIC DIFFERENCE AND CONFLICT IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

The official interpretation consequently merges with reality. A general and all-embracing lie begins to predominate; people begin adapting to it and everyone in some part of their lives compromises with the lie or coexists with it. (Havel, 1987)

This thesis project focuses on the formal education system in Burundi. It uncovers the complexities and nuances of the relationships between ethnic difference, conflict and schooling during the three Independent Republics (1966-1993), the civil war (1993-2005) and the post-civil war context (2005-2014). In this chapter, I examine the psychocultural interpretations (shared worldviews that help or trust people to make sense of daily life, such as perceptions of one’s own identities, the identities of ‘others’, and threat levels across identity groups) of the remembered, lived experiences of Burundian interviewees who were in primary schools during these time periods. I identify three types of conflict in schools (destructive conflict, passive approaches to conflict, and constructive conflict) in narratives from ten members of the Burundian community currently living in North America. This chapter argues that participants from the Independent Republics (1966-1993) experienced primarily conflict avoidance through censorship in formal education. The censorship of ethnic identity and interethnic violence by the government did not erase interethnic difference. Rather, ethnic difference was coded in the Independent Republics in public and, consequently in private discussions, where fears and mistrust across groups festered. Additionally, (small) aspects of destructive conflict such as (coded) stereotyping and bullying continued unchecked in schools during the Independent Republics. I argue as well that the current government under Nkurunziza (2005-present) is doing little to formally address interethnic difference and violence in schools – with the notable exception of developing a
However, the participant from this time period still described some aspects of interpersonal conflict management and resolution, small but necessary steps towards peacebuilding.

I begin this chapter with a brief overview of selected official education documents that exist from two of the three time periods: before the civil war (that is, colonial education policy and education policy during the Independent Republics, pre-1993); and after the civil war (2005-2012). I do not include education documents from the civil war period because there were no significant changes to education policy during that time (1993-2005) as a result of the high but uneven insecurity in the country. In relatively ‘safe’ areas untouched by violence schools operated as though nothing was different, but in other parts of the country schools were effectively shut down (Obura, 2008). Education did also occur in refugee camps (primarily in Tanzania, but also in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo) and in several Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps (Turner, 2012). The events of 1993 effectively collapsed the formal education in the parts of the country where there was sustained overt violence, and the prolonged, cyclical nature of this violence hampered reconstruction efforts until after the transitional government was sworn in, in 2003 (Obura, 2008), and even until the current government under President Nkurunziza was elected in 2005. I present these document analyses as context for how ethnic difference and conflict were formally and explicitly addressed in schools in these two periods. The documents provide the lens through which the psychocultural interpretations of conflict may be viewed in order to understand the lived experiences of the interview participants in schools.
Next, I move on to talk about the psychocultural interpretations of ethnic difference and conflict present in schools, as seen by the interview participants. Here, I present each ‘type’ of conflict (destructive, passive and constructive) as a section, drawing on interviewees’ narrated experiences in schools during the three Independent Republics (1966-1993) and one participant’s experiences from after the Peace Accords were signed in 2000. While participants described many examples of low-level destructive conflict in primary schools – that is, bullying or fighting, and stereotyping – the principal theme elucidated from the interviews were instances of conflict avoidance and omission (through censorship). After the genocide in 1972, the Micombero government (as part of its *White Paper* on the causes of the 1972 genocide) declared ethnicity a ‘taboo’ subject in public discourse. Most interview participants who were in primary schools during the First, Second, and Third Republics were shocked that I even asked whether ethnicity was discussed: it wasn’t discussed. They often also proceeded to describe other ways in which ethnicity was discussed, through circuitous means and indirectly through ‘ethnic codes’ of language skills (French vs. Kirundi) and locations during the violence (refugee camps vs. remaining in the country). Finally, the chapter describes certain positive, constructive instances described in schools in the post-civil war era as indicators of the small spaces that currently exist for constructive interethnic conflict in Burundian schools.

What follows therefore presents a picture of Burundian schools across the time periods under study. However, as I described in Chapter 3, the interview participants were primarily urban, Tutsi male from mid-to-upper socioeconomic status, although there was some diversity in the sample (see Table 1, Chapter 3 for participant demographics) particularly among the participants who were in school during the First Republic (early 1970s). While participants often explicitly stated that they were trying to be unbiased in their descriptions or their interpretations,
urban, male Tutsi were the most educationally advantaged (both socio-structurally and psychoculturally) citizens in Burundi during the Independent Republics. While many interviewees made noble attempts to describe what they saw through a critical lens, it is hard to accurately recognize or describe the experiences of a marginalized group from a position of relative privilege. Additionally, while some age-group categories include more than one participant, others did not. As such, what I present here depicts specific situations as described by specific people and is in no way intended to be generalizable across the country or time periods.

**Context: Ethnic Difference and Conflict in Formal Education Content**

**Colonial Approaches to Ethnicity in Schools**

In 1984, the Bagaza government released a report on the state of Burundian education and it contained a scathing indictment of the colonial missionary school system (MEN, 1984). It stated that the purpose of schooling during this time was not to align schooling with national interests, nor was its purpose to develop scientifically or technologically minded Burundians, rather formal education hindered ambition and produced Burundians that were capable only of working for the colonial administration, in line with their values and ideals (ibid.)

Access to formal education during the colonial years was initially limited to the sons of Tutsi chiefs and although the system opened up a little towards the end of the colonial regime, the colonial insistence on categorizing Burundians into different classes filtered through to the education system: students were labelled as *Sons of Chiefs, Hutu, Sons of Soldiers, and Half-Castes* (Gahama, 1999, cited in Obura, 2008). Psychoculturally, this type of categorization of school-aged students sets up in-group/out-group identities from an early age: those who get
schooling and those who do not (E. King, 2014a). As such, the categorization of pupils can act as a (necessary, though not sufficient) psychocultural factor towards developing a culture of conflict (Ross, 1993). Students who are the ‘in-group’ and given access to this privilege of schooling may develop a sense of moral superiority, and also view the marginalized groups as inferior (ibid.). Furthermore, the erosion, preservation and creation of difference (i.e. categorization) is fundamental to conflict (Tajfel, 1981) where in-group favouritism within categories tends to lead to out-group antagonisms (E. King, 2014a)

While schooling itself may not have been a direct cause of the violence in the decade after independence from Belgium and leading up to the genocide (1962-1972), many of the leaders in the First Republic (1966-1976) did go through the Burundian school system under colonial administration and would have been taught of the identity narratives pervasive in the Burundian school system during that time. For example, President Michel Micombero, a Tutsi born the southern province of Bururi, attended primary school in Bururi before going on to graduate from the Royal Military of Belgium in 1962 (the year Burundi obtained independence and became a constitutional monarchy) (LeMarchand, 1995). As such, Micombero was part of the privileged elite who were allowed access to education in Burundi during the Colonial era, and he therefore would have experienced the social signals from colonial school programs.

**School Content during the Independent Republics**

Formal education during the Independent Republics (1966-1993) was no less exclusive. Though there was, admittedly, greater access to schools and school resources as a whole (and especially towards the latter half of the 1980s), access was still almost entirely limited to the Tutsi and UPRONA strongholds, primarily in Bururi and Muramvya. A series of checks ensured
continued exclusion of Hutu from the schooling and also from the formal employment sector (see Chapter 4). Thus, formal education continued to propagate the separate, non-overlapping identity categories of those who were in school and those who were not.

The First Republic can almost be considered as two separate periods with regards to how ethnic difference was discussed: before the genocide (1966-1972) and after the genocide (1972-1976). In the initial years of the First Republic, ethnic identity was a hot-button issue. The interethnic fear and overt violence during the first few years of independence, combined with additional government fear of a Hutu revolt (disseminated primarily from Rwandan Tutsi refugees on the northern border) fuelled interethnic violence and solidified ethnic differences (Prunier, 2009). Consequently, the terms Hutu and Tutsi were freely used throughout the country during the initial years of the First Republic as the most significant identity categories. These ethnic identities came to predominate regional and clan loyalties, so much that the traditional regional and clan conflict between (southern) Tutsi-Hima and (central) Tutsi-Banyaruguru subsided and Hutu/Tutsi identities came to predominate over regional identities (LeMarchand, 1995).14

After the violence, the government released the so-called White Paper on the causes of the 1972 genocide, which forbade using the terms Hutu and Tutsi in public, and also forbade any discussion of the events of 1972. The government actively censored recognition of the Hutu/Tutsi conflict and of ethnic difference from public discourse (LeMarchand, 2008). The

---

14 The consequence of the reification of difference between Hutu and Tutsi group effectively led to the abolishment of Hima/Banyaruguru difference. While politically UPRONA may have still favoured Tutsi-Hima from the south, none of the interview participants self-identified as Tutsi-Hima or Tutsi-Banyaruguru, using only the larger ‘Tutsi’ category. Additionally, most literature surrounding the political and economic causes of the conflict (see: Jackson, 2000; Ndikumana, 2005; Obura, 2008) do not specify Hima or Banyaruguru as key identity markers (in fact, Muramvya was a Banyaruguru-dominated province, and yet it still is classed as an educationally advantaged province). As such, throughout this chapter I do use those labels either. The intention is not to essentialize Tutsi into one group, rather it is to stay true to the self-identification and usage patterns in both the literature and in participant interviews.
ramifications for school policy were significant. As I described in Chapter 4, the government developed the “Burundization” policies of *kirundization*, *ruralization* and *Bashingatahe* for the stated goals of unifying the country (Greenland, 1973). However, school curriculum provided little opportunity to address the root (social, structural and cultural) causes of the violence – a key tenet of peace education (Galtung, 1969; Harris, 2004). Furthermore, fears and negative stereotypes that may have been exacerbated by the genocide in 1972 were left unchallenged in formal institutions. Burundi therefore entered a phase of negative peace (relative absence of overt violence) for the next 15 years: there was very little direct violence throughout the final phase of the First Republic and during the Second Republic, until the start of the Third Republic in 1988.

The First Republic’s *White Paper* was foundational for the educational policy that the government developed in the 1970s and 1980s. The *Burundization* policies continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s, but schools continued towards greater and greater categorization and essentialization, which resulted in the further exclusion of Hutu from public life. I was, unfortunately, not able to find significant formal education policy or curricula relating to educational content during this time period.

The Bagaza (1976-1987) Government’s 1984 (MEN, 1984) education policy document provides some sense of the larger goals of formal education during this era with respect to content. It states that the government “emphasizes civic and ideological training be given to our youth to make them aware of the different realities of our country from an early age” (MEN, 1984, p. 30), and furthers that the responsibility of formal education is the creation of “good citizens” who are “responsible” and “respectful” in “all aspects of their lives” (ibid., p. 41). The document goes on to justify the presence of youth groups in schools, such as the Union de
Jeunesse Revolutionnaire Burundais (an off-shoot of the former JRR). Finally, the document highlights the role of schools: “for youth to grow up filled with patriotic love and committed to the ideal of social justice, with political and ideological training provided in schools” (ibid.). Therefore, the goal of schools was to create a sense of patriotism and justice.

While this document could be seen as an attempt to turn formal education towards a more positive and inclusive environment, in order to encourage students to develop political consciousness and an appreciation for social justice, the political context of these reforms is important. It was written at a time when there were no elections and there was single-party/pseudo-military rule. A minority ethnic group ruled over the majority. As such, moves towards social justice or imbuing students with patriotic love may not have been as genuine as they appear. That is to say: how could there be social justice in schools if the central reasons for requiring social justice (i.e. Hutu/Tutsi enmity and the large-scale violence and genocide in 1972) was disallowed from public discourse, especially in schools? The document’s reference to “political and ideological training” also takes on a different meaning given that the only way into the government and civil service was through the UPRONA party, a single party dominated by one ethnic group, from one region, and composed primarily of (pseudo) ex-military members.

The MEN (1984) document, as well as the White Paper, continued to be government policy through the Second and Third Republic, under Buyoya (1987-1993). The violence at the start of the Third Republic in 1988, during which between 20,000 and 150,000 people (both Hutu and Tutsi) were killed, demonstrated that no effective social justice program had been implemented into schools, if such programs even existed at all.\footnote{Interview participants who were in either primary or secondary school during this time tended to seem perplexed when I asked about the existence of such programs in schools, although that may be a result of the biased sample of mostly male Tutsi from Bujumbura during this time, see Chapter 3, and therefore Ministry Officials may not have seen the need to implement such programs in their schools compared to more marginalized areas.} Buyoya’s government moved
on to implement the *National Unity Charter* of 1988 (which legally abolished ethnic
discrimination and forbade political parties to be associated with any particular ethnicity) after
the violence. The country ratified a new Constitution in 1992 that mandated proportional ethnic
representation in government, which guaranteed both freedom of the press and human rights, and
declared that Burundians had the right to live free from ethnic discrimination, while at the same
time political parties were no longer allowed to be strictly along ethnic lines.

Psychoculturally, in a situation where in-group favoritism and out-group antagonisms
have propagated throughout a society for such an extended period of time, it is likely that inter-
group relationships became perceived as zero-sum: one group’s gain is interpreted as a loss for
the other (Brewer, 1999). These reforms were ‘too-little-too-late’ for Hutu populations who had
experienced more than 30 years of marginalization and structural violence at the behest of the
Tutsi-dominated Burundian government. At the same time, these reforms apparently seemed
‘too-much-too-soon’ to Tutsi populations who had controlled every aspect of political, social,
and economic life in Burundi for those 30 years, and thus may have felt as though their control
and power was being yanked away. Burundi, therefore, may have already been too far down the
path towards escalated inter-group violence to avert the 1993 crisis and civil war.

**Post-Civil War Schooling**

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the Arusha Peace Accords of 2000 specifically cite the
formal education system as a direct cause of the violence (Dupuy, 2008). The document specifies
inequitable education resource distribution between advantaged and marginalized groups (Tutsi
and Hutu) over the course of the Independent Republics as a determining factor of the violence.
However, the narrative portrayed in the Peace Accords with regards to the causes of the
destructive interethnic violence primarily lays the blame on the colonial powers. Chapter I, Article II, Item 2 states:

“In the context of a strategy of “divide and rule”, the colonial administration injected and imposed a caricatured, racist vision of Burundian society, accompanied by prejudices and clichés relating to morphological considerations designed to set the different components of Burundi’s population against one another on the basis of physical characteristics and character traits.”

Item 5 further says that “[the colonial administration] undertook to destroy certain cultural values that until then had constituted a factor for national unity and cohesion.” There is little mention of the role the Independent Republic governments had in increasing and reifying ethnic divisions, stating only that:

1. Since independence, and throughout the different regimes, there have been a number of constant phenomena which have given rise to the conflict that has persisted up to the present time: massive and deliberate killings, widespread violence and exclusion have taken place during this period;
2. Views differ as to the interpretation of these phenomena and their influence on the current political, economic and socio-cultural situation in Burundi, as well as of their impact on the conflict. (Arusha Peace Accords, Chapter II, Article 3)

That is, the Peace Accord acknowledges that there were some problems with interethnic relations during the Independent Republics, but does not lay blame on any specific problems or initiatives developed by the government. Furthermore, the Accords do not mention the violence in 1972, nor do they mention the violence in 1988.16

But how did the Arusha Peace Accord and subsequent Constitution translate to education policy? I was only able to find a small sampling of key documents from the post-civil war time period. The major focus of education during the initial reconstruction years was just that:

16 This is perhaps a result of the fact that one of the principal Tutsi-dominated rebel groups (Parti pour le Redressement National, PARENA) was led by Jean-Baptiste Bagaza (President of the Second Republic), and in 1996 Pierre Buyoya (President of the Third Republic) re-seized power in his second successful coup d’état. So two of the three Presidents of the Independent Republics were signatories to the Accords (Micombero, the first President, died of a heart attack in 1983 in Somalia).
reconstruction. Many school buildings and resources had been destroyed and many trained teachers had been killed or were in refugee camps (Jackson, 2000). The government did not develop new education policy with regards to specific content initiatives – especially not with regards to ethnic difference – in those initial few years, until well after the current government under Nkurunziza was sworn in. Nevertheless, as Obura (2008) points out, the National Unity Charter under Buyoya (however unsuccessful it was in the years leading up to the civil war) did cause the start of the implementation of language on national unity, peace and social justice in textbooks. So, while the textbook language did not stave off a decade long civil war, at least the government did not have to write all new textbooks immediately or to redact and censor textbooks from the pre-war era to remove divisive language, as happened in several countries – such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Rwanda (Weinstein, et. al., 2007) – after their cessations of violence.

I was able to find a fundamental post-war education planning documents, the *National Report on Education Development in Burundi* (MENRS, 2008), developed by the Nkurunziza government. This document describes the action plan and over-arching goals for the Burundian formal education system post-reconstruction, in concert with the Transitional (2003-2005) government’s goals and the goals of the Constitution and the Arusha Peace Accords. The 2008 document specifies that Burundian schools should develop students “that [are] proud of [their] culture and ready to express it to others… and [that are] tolerant and aware of fundamental human rights” (p. 5). Furthermore, the document states that teachers should:

- “Ensure that students have a civic, moral and intellectual mind and a keen awareness of national realities;
- Collaborate with Ministry members and administrators, for the socio-economic advancement of the country and the promotion of national culture, and for respect for human rights and the right to liberty;
• Develop lessons in education on peace, democracy, and on respecting human rights and freedoms in academic life” (p. 5-6).

In 2007, the government also developed a new civics and human rights curriculum: *Curriculum for Civic and Human Education and Peace and Human Rights Education* (MENRS, 2007). This document was surprising in many ways – including that it was the only formal curriculum document I was able to find online. First, it outlines a justification for the document from three levels of government: International Agreements, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Convention for Elimination of Violence against Women (CEDAW); Regional Agreements, such as the African Charter on Individual and Human Rights and the African Charter on the Rights of Children; and Nationally, from the Constitution.

Second, in the introduction section it specifically mentions the violence in the Independent Republics, and the violence in 1993, stating that the:

“[c]onsequences of these acts of violence are such that the morality of individuals and of society, in relation to social cohesion, equality and stability, were disturbed. The most fundamental of all human rights, the right to life, was greatly violated. Values like mutual respect, aid, tolerance, nonviolence and conflict resolution disappeared and were replaced with violence and intolerance at all levels. Secondary schools, ethnic tensions lead students to become killers. It is because of this that schools must now teach students the values of peace, respect for human rights, and democracy” (MENRS, 2007, p. 7).

I quote that section at length because of its very evocative language. This is some of the most direct language that I found in policy documents with regards to the violence and its consequences. It also reflects a significant change in how the government addressed the violent actions of the past in school documents, presumably because the government of Pierre Nkurunziza was fundamentally different than its predecessors: Nkurunziza is a Hutu, born in Bujumbura, but he went to primary school in Ngozi – a relatively poor, rural province in
Northern Burundi, and at the time of this writing (2014) the members of parliament and government ministers were mostly Hutu, with few ties to the old regimes.\textsuperscript{17} As such, the 2014 government may be more amenable than its predecessors to critical examination of former policies and programs in education, as well as of former government actions.

Thirdly, a major theme of the 2007 curriculum document is “\textit{Education for Peace.”} For instance, in primary year 4, the three subthemes in the peace theme are ‘the nature of conflict’, ‘the causes of conflict’, and ‘the prevention of conflicts’. In year 5, the subthemes are ‘the notion of peace’ and ‘peace and development’. In primary year 6, the subthemes address ‘conflict resolution’ and ‘attitudes towards trauma’. All of these themes are difficult topics to address in schools, even in relatively non-violence countries, let alone in a country emerging from violent conflict. Interestingly, this 2007 curriculum document focuses on primary school, with only a single page on secondary education and it specifically states that education for peace and human rights does not continue as a curriculum subject past year 10. Unfortunately, the document provides no further details on pedagogical practices or specific topics or information that should be addressed in each unit or year (the section specific to references of curriculum content is a total of six pages).

That said, the fact that an official curriculum document exists on the subject of civics, peace, and human rights education in Burundi is at least a small step in the right direction. Furthermore, as was the case with the \textit{Charter of National Unity} under Buyoya in 1988, the mere existence of a document that promotes peace in schools does not guarantee its successful implementation in practice. The document covers difficult aspects of the civil war and violence between Hutu and Tutsi. Thus, its successful implementation would require significant teacher

\textsuperscript{17} Bagaza and Buyoya are still in the government as Senators for Life, and Buyoya is active elsewhere throughout Africa, as a representative of the African Union in peacekeeping talks in Chad and the Central African Republic.
training and institutional support in order to increase their confidence in both the subject material and pedagogical practices for successful delivery (Bickmore, 2005; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Richardson, 2005). Unfortunately, my only interview participant from the post-civil war time period was in primary school well before this 2007 curriculum document was written. I therefore have no interview information about the impact and implementation of this curriculum in schools, or if it ever was implemented.

Remembered, Lived Experiences of Schooling in Burundi

How did formal education policy in the Independent Republics and in post-civil war Burundi intersect with the lived experiences of Burundian students during the Independent Republics (1966-1993) and after 2005? The following section organizes (thematically) the experiences with ethnic difference and conflict described by the Burundian interview participants. I start with passive conflict, the most commonly described type of conflict in the interviews. Two key aspects of passive conflict appear to be fairly consistent across the Independent Republics and, to an extent, in the post-civil war era: censorship and ethnic codes as a means of avoiding acknowledgement of the interethnic conflict and its sources. In this part I also include a comparison between public/school life and private/home life, to show that, while ethnic difference and conflict may have been avoided in public, they were ever-present in private life. I then describe instances of destructive conflict described by participants. While there was a pervasive context of passive conflict (in particular censorship) during the Independent Republics, ethnic stereotyping and bias still existed and interviewees also reported instances of direct violence that occurred in schools. Finally, I describe the (very few) instances of constructive conflict that occurred in primary schools that the interviewees mentioned. In general, interview
participants said that early in their school careers, students did not differentiate between ethnicities while playing before or after school, in particular on the football field (a near universal theme for these mostly-male interview participants). Also, the participant who attended school in the post-civil war era described instances of (minor) conflict resolution and cooperation in schools.

**Passive Approaches to Interethnic Conflict**

One of the most prevalent themes throughout the interviews was conflict avoidance and censorship in schools. Interview participants across all age groups, including the participant who attended school in post-civil war Burundi, described how neither ethnicity – Hutu and Tutsi – nor the genocide of 1972 were mentioned in public discourse, and by extensions in their schools. This censorship was the intended consequence of the White Paper released by the Micombero government in 1972: it disallowed reference to Hutu/Tutsi in public discourse, firmly laid most blame for destructive ethnic conflict and ethnic divisions on the former Belgian-colonial government, and promoted a unified ‘Burundian’ national identity (LeMarchand, 1995). The result was that ‘ethnicity’ or ‘ethnic difference’ as topics were erased from all official discourse and texts in formal government institutions, including schools. Teachers and students were no longer allowed to talk about their histories, in particular in relation to the violence in 1972. Successive governments (under Bagaza and Buyoya) continued the censorship and conflict avoidance throughout their tenures. It was only after the 1988 violence that the Buyoya government (the Third Republic) moved to open up the political arena towards a more inclusive environment, and questions of working to promote unity between groups became more central to Burundian policy discourse.
Any steps the Buyoya government took during the end of his term towards national unity and reconciliation were shattered with the advent of the 1993 crisis and civil war that followed. The majority of rebel and militia groups divided along ethnic lines — for example FRODEBU and CNDD-FDD Hutu groups vs. UPRONA, and the Tutsi-dominated government and military forces. Thus, ethnicity once again became the central identifying factor in Burundi and superceded the ‘Burundian’ national identity promoted by the White Paper, largely eclipsing regional and clan alliances.

It was evident from my interviews, where participants often discussed their experiences when they returned to Burundi to visit, that the events of 1993 and the civil war still mark the Burundian consciousness. While the Arusha Peace Accords and the Constitution specify grievances between Hutu and Tutsi and call for ethnic inclusion quotas in formal institutions like the military and Parliament, and (supposedly) call for a free press, there is still a significant amount of self-censorship in Burundi: the Burundian interview participants who had been back to Burundi in recent years, described how ethnicity was still (at the time of this writing) never mentioned or talked about, especially in the countryside or outside the major cities. Data collected for this project suggests that conflict avoidance and censorship (whether imposed by government or community norms) continued to predominate Burundian life during the time of this research.

_Censorship in Burundian Primary Schools_

Several of the interview participants, Cadeau, Eraste, Julien, and Bonheur, started primary school almost immediately after the cessation of violence in 1972, when schools reopened in 1973. Each of them started primary school when they were 5 or 6 and got to university around 1987-1990. This near-20 year time-span in primary and secondary school reflects the
high repetition rates discussed in Chapter 4: each participant indicated that they either took the *concours nationale* more than once or had to repeat grades several times. Three out of four completed university in Burundi. Bonheur went on to university in Kinshasa, Zaïre (now the Democratic Republic of Congo). While interview questions focused on primary schools, all four also described aspects of formal education through the secondary and tertiary education.

Conflict avoidance and censorship were prominent in their daily school lives. When I asked them whether or not ethnicity or the violence of 1972 was ever talked about in schools, they reacted as if it was almost a ridiculous question: of course it wasn’t talked about in schools, it wasn’t talked about anywhere in public. The word most commonly used to describe the situation was “taboo” (every participant, across all age groups and genders, used ‘taboo’ in interviews at least once). Bonheur described the censorship in greater detail, interpreting why he thought this silence occurred:

“In Burundi we have a culture of not involving the kids… So the kids were not aware [of the events in 1972], but you could see some kids disappearing and they suddenly would not be in school anymore… I don’t know, maybe there was a silence code that was part of it. You don’t want to talk about it, you don’t want to tackle those subjects. Just keep quiet. You assume it’s like that but you don’t want to talk about it.

Bonheur is describing several things in this excerpt. First, he describes the Burundian culture that, in theory, kept children sheltered from adult problems. However, he describes that he saw kids disappear and yet no one mentioned why those kids would leave – conflict avoidance through censorship – and that there were assumptions about why students left, but that children at that time did not want to talk about or ask (presumably adults) why this was occurring.

The conflict avoidance and silences continued throughout the Second and Third Republics. Participants who attended primary school during these time periods – Noel, Fabrice, Michel, and Thierry in the Second Republic, and Redempta in the Third Republic – elaborated on the notion
that interethnic conflict was avoided or censored in their schools. Even Michel, a male Hutu who went to school in a province that was educationally marginalized and also experienced significant levels of violence in the civil war (see Chapter 4), wanted to be very clear about the fact that ethnicity was not a topic of discussion in his schools, and neither was the genocide in 1972:

“Oh no, we would never talk about ethnicity – that was never a topic for discussion. It was too sensitive, especially in my area [Kayanza], to talk about. We would all just go in our time in school – play with each other and things like that – but in primary school we couldn’t talk about Hutu and Tutsi – those were taboo term[s]. Maybe in high school it was different.”

Thus, Michel reinforced the notion that ethnic difference was silenced in the Second Republic, although he indicates that high school may have been more open in terms of discussion of ethnic difference.

Redempta, who attended primary school in the years just before the crisis in 1993 and after Buyoya’s Program for National Unity was set up, also said that ethnicity was not discussed in school, and especially not the genocide in 1972. This speaks to the difficulty in implementing programs to change the mind-set of a community experiencing embedded distrust for the other. It also implies that Buyoya’s program was not universally implemented in schools. Noel, however, described the overall atmosphere in Burundi during the Third Republic (when he was in secondary school) as generally positive and he said that billboards and signs about national unity were “everywhere”.

Thus, these experiences in school in the Independent Republics all describe aspects of conflict avoidance through censorship. The continued presence of censorship across the range of interview participants illustrates the pervasiveness of the White Paper and its impact on the Burundian consciousness and society.
Rozette, a female who was in school immediately after the Arusha Peace Accords were signed (post-civil war), depicted similar censorship in schools, and in particular a type of self-censorship in the country. Although she lived in a moderately wealthy neighbourhood in Bujumbura, she went to school in a less-privileged and more ethnically-mixed, rural area outside of Bujumbura. Rozette said that she “never” encountered discussion or dialogue surrounding Hutu/Tutsi ethnicities. Furthermore, she noted that she could recall no Burundian history program in her schools: the only history she learned was European. While she learned about the structure of the government, she never learned about the ethnic quotas or make-up of the current government, or why it was structured the way it is (for instance, she knew there was a Hutu President and two Vice Presidents – one Hutu and one Tutsi – but not the power sharing reasons behind that structure). Even 30 years after the genocide in 1972, apparently such topics were still not discussed in at least some Burundian schools.

This tendency to minimize or avoid conflict and Burundian history or culture is described in detail by Bonheur, whose father was Hutu and killed in the 1972 genocide:

“Unfortunately, we didn’t learn about any of our culture in schools – the food, the music, the dancing. And the reason why is because the majority of the people in Burundi are Hutu – so they had different dances and things compared to Tutsi. The government didn’t want to promote a group that they didn’t support, because the government was Tutsi. So in a cultural or civics class, we talked about the simple things, but historically, but we didn’t go in to details. We had our own style of music, but it wasn’t there as much as it should have been. So that’s unfortunate. If there were no divisions, they could have promoted those things – our food, our costumes, us – in school. But then, how can you promote your own stuff without discriminating against the other people? The better way is to just ignore it. That was the government’s approach at that time.”

Thus, as a result of the censorship and avoidance, an entire generation of students only learned about Burundian culture and history through their parents or through the non-formal education sector (such as churches and other social groups). This represents a missed opportunity
to address Burundian history and culture in schools, and also a missed opportunity to address the more difficult aspects the country’s history, thus allowing the causes of the violence to remain unaddressed in public discourse.

**Ethnic Codes – Knowing but not knowing**

Participants described conflict avoidance in schools in relation to a culture of ‘knowing but not knowing’ one another’s ethnic identity. The participants described how in schools, throughout the 1970s (and continuing on through the 1980s), and largely throughout Burundian public spaces, they perceived a system of ‘ethnic codes’. That is, certain factors helped children and adults (in schools and in the community) to know the ethnicity of another person without directly naming or asking about it. In participants’ schools it seems that a very prominent code was whether a student had a living father. Julien, a male Tutsi, described the ethnic coding as follows:

“People knew others’ ethnicity, sometimes. But it was usually, if they had a parent killed, or a dad killed, then we knew they were Hutu, even if they didn’t say.”

That is, generally speaking male Hutu with any amount of formal education were targets during the 1972 genocide, and as such if your father was killed in the genocide there was a high probably that you were Hutu. Fabrice (who did not choose to directly identify himself as Hutu or Tutsi), started school in 1981, during the Second Republic. He, too, described similar codes for determining ethnicity in his schools:

“But we had dads, and they didn’t have dads. So that’s how we knew. There was no discrimination as such, but they were carrying some weight that we weren’t and that made a difference in school – it made it easier to pass exams and to do well in school for us, we didn’t have those problems.”
Fabrice had started school nine years after the genocide, so it is revealing to have him describe this process of recognizing ethnicity only indirectly, through the consequences of violence, occurring well into the Second Republic. By “carrying some weight that we weren’t,” Fabrice is reinforcing the notion the Hutu generally were those whose parents were killed in the genocide or were victims of violence, rather than Tutsi.

Though this kind of censorship and avoidance of ethnicity labels was not as pronounced in the Third Republic, Redempta described similar experiences. She described ways she and her peers could figure out someone’s ethnic identity without asking, and how this coding played out in schools:

“We wouldn’t necessarily ask, straight out. We would ask in other ways though… ask who your parents were, if you knew so and so, who your uncles and aunts were, until we found a connection that we knew… I guess, with the unity policy [under Buyoya] we were allowed to ask openly, but no one ever did.”

Rozette did provide some evidence of some positive change in this respect, after the Peace Accords were signed. She indicated that, while teachers did not discuss ethnic difference in class, students knew each-other’s ethnicity and said they could ask each other directly if they chose to do so, without repercussions from teachers. However, she did indicate that, in the larger community, it was still difficult to do so, especially in the presence of community elders.

*Public Censorship and Codes vs. Private Discussions*

One of the more striking findings from interviews with regards to the official censorship was that, while people were censored in their public discourse about ethnicity, their private speech (with select family members or very close friends) was a little bit more open. Most participants related some form of private discussions surrounding ethnicity in the home or
amongst close friends. For example, Bonheur, whose father was Hutu and killed in 1972, described how he had learned about ethnicity from home:

“I think, though, that the attitude you had towards ethnicity came from how you were educated at home. So my parents talked about ethnicity and that meant that my attitudes towards it was different than other kids at the time”

Bonheur’s attitude towards ethnicity in the home was different from Cadeau’s experiences. Cadeau’s family was middle-class and both parents were Tutsi – neither were killed during the 1972 violence. However, he did witness killings.

“At home no one would talk about ethnicity but you would be told what was happening in other ways [coding]. We knew that people were killed and injured and mutilated. I saw people get killed in front of my eyes. But they wouldn’t tell you why that happened. I think there was an ethnic consciousness that developed from this.”

The experiences above are mirrored by the participants who started school after the beginning of the Second Republic under Bagaza. Noel, a male Tutsi, described his experience in the early primary schools in the early 1980s, and elaborated on the situation of private versus public discourse in Burundi during the 1980s:

“They didn’t even teach us that [about the 1972 genocide]. It wasn’t in the culture. It didn’t exist! So, what I could hear… is that people would express themselves, it was some ideology, because I was Tutsi, there was some Tutsi ideology around Hutu, you’re gonna hear your neighbour talking about that, you’re gonna hear your uncle talking about that, you’re gonna hear your cousins explaining what happened.”

Noel reinforces the notion that Burundians would learn about ethnicity exclusively from their home life, whereas schools and the public Burundian discourse did not address the violence.

It seems as though little had changed in public schools after the civil war. Rozette added a modern (post-2000) twist to the topic: “We still don’t talk about genocide in 1972 [in school], we know what happened from our family. We learned about it from the internet and those types of things, though.” Furthermore, participants who had been back to Burundi, often claimed that
there was greater freedom of speech at the time of this writing compared to in the 1970s or 1980s. As such, the discussion of ethnicity in the public and private sector should be less hindered. Also, with the advent of the internet, limiting access to the information on 1972 was a harder and harder task to accomplish. However, internet access is limited in Burundi and is ultimately a privilege in the country, rather than easily accessed by everyone, although internet access is ever increasing in Burundi.

The impact of conflict avoidance and censorship on Burundians’ psychocultural interpretations of conflict may be two-fold. First, groups that were stigmatized or victims of violence would not have a chance to address or voice their grievances publicly, and as a consequence were prevented from beginning the healing process. Second, the stigmatization, categorization, and essentialization of ethnic groups was allowed to continue unchecked in both public (through ethnic coding) and private life (E. King, 2014a). Thus, while schooling was a place where multiple groups emerging from violent conflict could come together and constructively engage with each other, schools were relegated to passive institutions. As Freire (1985) said: “washing one’s hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful and not to remain neutral” (p. 122). That is, hegemonic narratives of the conflict and its interpretations were allowed to perpetuate in schools without any challenge, as such formal education became a complicit actor in perpetuating the destructive aspects of the conflict.

**Destructive Interethnic Conflict**

Psychocultural interpretations of destructive conflict in schools can occur through categorization through developing in-group/out-group identities, the essentializing of group identities and through stigmatizing groups in classrooms (E. King, 2014a). These interpretations
of group (in this case, ethnic group) identities tend to reflect and amplify social conditions and realities across the country (ibid.). While essentializing, categorization, and stigmatizing groups can manifest in a wide variety of ways, interviews tended to focus on the development of negative stereotypes and biases others, essentialized Hutu (and Tutsi) identities, and the perpetuation of fears and hate surrounding Hutu actions. These topics (unsurprisingly) were often the most difficult topic for interview participants. The backdrop of conflict avoidance and censorship from 1972-1993 meant that, in general, participants from those time periods might not have deciphered stereotyping or bias specifically related to ethnic identity, based on overt actions by teachers or other students, in particular given that this study focused on primary schools. Additionally, the majority of interview participants self-identified as Tutsi and therefore had experienced primary schooling as part of an advantaged group. As such, while some participants tried to be self-reflexive and critically examine their own actions, it is also likely that they did not notice or experience certain kinds of stereotyping and bias that more marginalized groups (Hutu) would have experienced in schooling, nor would they have necessarily experienced fear to the same degree as Hutu in schooling.

Promoting Hate

After the violence in 1972, the country entered a period of relative negative peace (with relatively little overt violence occurring) until 1988. While there was no overt violence, and while the population was censored in their discussions of ethnic difference and violence, beneath the surface, interview participants seemed to indicate that there was some sort of fear that permeated the country. In general, participants seemed to express that this fear and hatred between groups happened in areas other than where they lived, for example Cadeau described: “there was hatred that was stronger in the rural areas, so it maybe wasn’t the same in those places
compared to Bujumbura.” Eraste furthered that “outside of town, in provinces and the rural areas, it was probably very different. One area may only have one ethnicity. So in those areas, one might learn in schools to hate the other or not interact.” Even Redempta, in school during the late 1980s, externalized Tutsi/Hutu antagonisms:

“No, during school we did not hate Hutu [her school was majority Tutsi, but there were some Hutu], we played with them and things like that in school. There was the National Unity program, too, right? So everyone in the city was trying to get along. But I guess in the countryside it was different. Probably in those areas there was more hatred for different groups.”

The sole participant to suggest that it was not just that Hutu hated Tutsi, but that maybe Hutu were afraid of Tutsi was Bonheur, who mentioned that “[s]tudents of one ethnicity [Hutu] who would fear for their life in school.” Even then, he used prevaricating language to avoid directly stating that Hutu (stating ‘one ethnicity’ instead of using the word ‘Hutu’) were scared in schools. Michel, a male Hutu, did not indicate that there had been a fear of Hutu in his schools, and also did not mention any externalized “they hate us” narrative (as had other participants). This suggests that a different reality may have existed for rural Hutu from marginalized provinces, compared to urban Tutsi from Bujumbura. That is, either the Tutsi I interviewed misinterpreted their own reactions to Hutu discrimination and structural violence, or, perhaps a deeper sense of fear resulted from being Hutu during that time period, may have made Michel reluctant (even years later) to say that he hated Tutsi, or that he was scared to go to school because of the fact that he was Hutu.

The narratives of interviewees that ‘others’ felt hatred and fear indicates two things. First, that there was an indication of the rural/urban divide in Burundi and ethnic codes (using “farmers”, or “rural” or “people in the countryside” instead of “Hutu”). To say that hatred was stronger in rural areas implies that Tutsi participants perceived that Hutu hated Tutsi, more so than Tutsi hated Hutu. It also distances participants from the hatred and violence present in the
country: others hated us, we did not hate them. Participant comments also portrayed what Van Evera called “chauvinistic mythmaking” (Van Evera, 1994, as cited in King, 2014a). Tutsi interview participants, perhaps unconsciously, portrayed small aspects of victimization at the hands of Hutu, rather than the larger injustices that Tutsi perpetrated against Hutu. The sole Hutu participant remained largely silent about overt victimization (as a result of structural violence) or about fears of overt violence in going to school – even though he did indicate that he moved to the rural province of Kayanza because it was not safe for him in Bujumbura (see Chapter 4). This shows that there may have been deeper psychocultural grievances that occurred in the country that were largely silenced.

*Stereotyping in Primary Schools*

When I asked about stereotyping that had occurred in their school experiences, participants tended to seem reluctant to answer the question at first. Interviewees largely started out by explaining that there was no such thing as stereotyping and people didn’t stereotype others, especially in schools. However, as conversations progressed, and specific instances or memories were teased out – such as who had passed the concours national or teacher attitudes – answers started to become more complex and contradictory. For example, Cadeau’s explanation of stereotyping in schools, demonstrates some contradiction of this sort:

“No, there was no stereotyping in terms of what happened in schools, it was really whoever works hard, makes it and passes exams and so on. There maybe were cultural stereotypes… Hutu with big noses and Tutsi, you know, they are historical rulers and the Europeans favoured Tutsi. But there were not individual stereotypes.”

There was often a tendency to fall back on (the dominant, official narrative of) the colonial European stereotypes that were used to classify Hutu and Tutsi by the Belgians as they developed identity cards in the Kingdom of Ruanda-Urundi in the 1920s. These stereotypes were
based on the so-called Hamitic Myth: Tutsi were, supposedly, more closely related to Europeans because they tended to have lighter skin, skinnier nose, and were taller (Melvern, 2004). These stereotypes continued into the post-civil war era, as Rozette described: “Now, I guess we joke about it – if someone likes to eat a lot of food, we laugh at them and call them ‘Hutu’ because there is a stereotype that Tutsi are tall and thin and Hutu are fat.” This speaks to the entrenched nature of ethnic stereotyping across Burundian society, 40 years after the colonizer has left the stereotypes existed in schools.

The extent of the stereotyping, however, did extend beyond simple Tutsi/Hutu dichotomies. In an era where the terms Hutu and Tutsi were censored and therefore a coded set of understandings to imply ethnic identification developed. For example, Eraste (in primary school in the early 1970s) described what occurred in public schools in Bujumbura as follows:

“There is a saying for those from Bujumbura and those grown in the provinces: that we are like two different people or two different nationalities. Jokingly, right, people in town would call people from the provinces foreigners.”

Certainly the differences in urban/rural lifestyles are vast (as someone who grew up in the downtown core of the one of North America’s largest cities, I often feel as though life in rural Ontario would be completely foreign to me), but it is important to remember that urban areas in Burundi contain higher populations of Tutsi, and rural areas were predominantly Hutu (Greenland, 1980). Thus, a statement describing rural communities as “foreigners”, could actually reinforce the notion that Hutu don’t belong in Burundi or are somehow less welcome or valuable people than Tutsi.

In schools, one of the more prominent negative stereotypes I heard in interviews was about Hutu intellectual capacity. In fact, many participants felt as though Hutu did not want to go
to school. For example, Fabrice (in primary school in the early 1980s), described his perception of Hutu in schools as follows:

“Everyone in my area went to school, but there was a perception that Hutu weren’t intellectual… we thought that Hutu did not want to go to education, that it was their choice. I guess there was some form of discrimination or bias. We didn’t realize the barriers they had at the time in order to get to secondary school or to learn important things that would get them far in life, like math or science or economics. We thought they were choosing this, when it was just a lot harder for them.

Thus, in at least some schools, some Tutsi perpetuated the notion that Hutu chose not to go to school and that they did not want to get an education that could help them move forward, and that (in contrast) Tutsi were more amenable to learning and social promotion. Thierry furthered the notion that his peers believed that Hutu didn’t want to go to school: “I guess we kind of thought that Hutu in our community just didn’t want to go to secondary school. We would laugh about it sometimes, because we thought they were lazy and didn’t want a job or things like that.”

So the government (Micombero, Bagaza, and Buyoya) actions that led to structural limitations on Hutu access to formal education (see Chapter 4) reinforced two forms of psychocultural interpretations that stigmatized groups and essentialized group characteristics of Hutu. First, it promoted the destructive essentialization of Hutu as lazy and unwilling to work, thus explaining why Hutu were largely left out of the business, government and military sectors. It also promoted negative stereotypes while promoting the moral superiority of Tutsi over Hutu. That is, the apparently dominant belief among Tutsi (interviewees and their families and peers) was Tutsi were hard workers and good students who wanted to go to school, and that explained why they were the ones who continued on to high school and university – and to get jobs. This stigmatizing and essentialization also served to “white-wash” the faults of the Tutsi minority during the 1972 genocide: Hutu with education beyond primary school levels were largely
rounded up and killed or imprisoned by government and Tutsi militia forces (LeMarchand, 1995). As such, there was a legitimate fear that getting an education for Hutu could result in trouble later on in life (Uvin, 1999).

While aspects of destructive conflict were described by interview participants, the ethnic coding and censorship provided minimal opportunities for overt violence along ethnic lines, in schools, although most participants did describe typical childhood fighting and bullying that would be experienced in most schools around the world. Participants described fairly equitable treatment by teachers and school administrators in primary school, although almost all of them said that later in school life they noticed that the few Hutu in secondary and tertiary institutions were treated differently compared to Tutsi. Nevertheless, there were more subtle forms of destructive conflict, such as fear and/or subtle forms of propagating hatred across ethnic lines, and these, combined with censorship and avoidance, were likely detrimental to interethnic relations.

**Constructive Interethnic Conflict**

There were very few instances of cross-group constructive conflict that participants described – in any generation. However, each participant did describe that there were some positive aspects of primary schooling where members of different groups interacted. In general, participants who went to school during the 1970s periods described the fact that in school there was a general sense of camaraderie between ethnicities in their earlier years of schooling – although this sense of unity, or at least not overt distrust, deteriorated as they moved up the levels of schooling (which may be reflective of ethnic relations deteriorating across the country in the build up to the civil war). Rozette described the post-war interaction between groups in her school in a manner similar to the earlier (older) generations, stating that there wasn’t a difference
perceived by peers between Hutu and Tutsi initially, with children of younger ages playing together, but similarly as children her age got older, differences between groups became more relevant.

Instances of Cooperation and Equitable Interaction between Ethnicities

All of the participants characterized their experiences in school with respect to ethnic difference as almost innocent, as if policies of *Burundization* and national unity seemed, superficially, to have had the intended effect on the children of Burundi. One of the most striking features was how ethnicity barely factored into their education in their early primary school years, in particular they described how everyone played football (soccer) together and teachers did not discriminate against students during the First and Second Republics. Fabrice pointed out just how interesting the dynamic was in schools at that time: “Also, because at the time I went to school, it was interesting. We all tried to play together [members of different groups]. We were not allowed to talk about Hutu, Tutsi and thing like that, so we didn’t and it didn’t factor into who was on the same team when we played football [soccer].”

The one kind of differential treatment of identity groups that most participants did mention was according to gender. Julien was the sole participant who indicated boys and girls were treated in similar ways on the football field, saying that “[g]irls and boys were all mixed – there actually no difference in the numbers between girls and boys in classes and we all played together and knew each other well.” However, most other participants indicated that girls and boys were differentiated in some ways in school. For example Bonheur said that girls wouldn’t play football with boys, although he claimed they were included otherwise. Michel and Thierry both said that girls were treated differently from boys in their schools or had different access or
other limitations on their schooling. Eraste elaborated that this differential treatment was especially prevalent later in schooling with regards to pregnancy:

“There was one thing, though, and it is very interesting. The number one issue for girls later on in school, later in primary school and secondary school, was pregnancy. If a girl got pregnant she was taken away from school and never allowed to come back. Even if she had already given birth, she was removed from school. Which was very interesting and very different from things like that today.”

Unfortunately, pregnancy is often a limiting factor for girls in terms of access to schools, and creates significant boundaries to continuing on through education. He includes late primary school when describing this situation. In Burundi, girls, when they had access to formal education, tended to have higher repetition rates (see Table 5, Chapter 4) and thus were often at child-bearing age by the time they reached later years of primary school.

However, in relation to ethnicity, participants generally said that there was no difference in how Hutu and Tutsi were treated in their elementary schools, either on the football field or off. They tended to describe positive relationships with members of the other group in their early school years, and found that football was a time that Hutu and Tutsi children could all cooperate and play together. Michel described a positive atmosphere: “I guess, later, in like year 6, we would all… play together. And it didn’t matter that I was from a different ethnicity than most of my classmates at that time. We still all got along well and there were no problems on the field. We worked together to win.” Thus, the participants in this study reported that group interactions were positive and cooperative in school and school-linked recreations such as football.

Participants who attended schooling during the Independent Republics (1970s, 1980s) also indicated that teachers rarely treated members of different ethnicities differently in their primary schools. Most, however, did qualify their statements about equitable treatment by teachers by describing that government imposed censorship during that time. For example, Noel
described the situation in his school: “No, I didn’t really see [that] teachers [would] treat somebody different because they were Hutu or Tutsi… even if the teacher could do that, they were only able to do it hiding, not openly, because we as a society couldn’t talk about those things without getting thrown in jail.” Thus Noel, in his memory narrative, recognized that the context surrounding the ways members of Burundian society interacted was shaped by the regulation that (the recognition of) terms Hutu and Tutsi were not allowed in public discourse. His statement also implies that there was some differential treatment of Hutu and Tutsi students, but he did not elaborate on those differences.

Attending school in post-civil war years, Rozette also indicated that students all played together in her school. At the same time, she did indicate that there may have been some more open bias and/or segregation:

“Oh yes, we all played together, no problem. Maybe there were more teams along ethnic lines then before [the civil war]… But people would still all play together [in school]. For example, a football [soccer] team wouldn’t just be one ethnicity. It was more about who was the better player or who your friends were.”

She also described that teachers, in her experience, did not discriminate based on ethnicity, according to her experiences:

“Teachers don’t discriminate against different ethnicities like that today, no. We don’t really talk about ethnicity, but teachers do know their students’ ethnicity because of their background and things like that. In my school, it was mostly Tutsi with only a few Hutu. My teachers were also mostly Tutsi – I don’t know how many Hutu teachers there are in the country, but I would say not a lot. We knew who any Hutu were, but didn’t really talk about that. They also never really said anything bad to us about being Tutsi.”

Her claim that teachers didn’t discriminate based on ethnicity may be a sign that there was still a certain degree of (self-imposed) censorship in school or it may be a small indication that teachers and students alike, in this one school at least, were attempting to move beyond ethnic difference.
Thus, ethnic difference was initially perceived by interview participants to be a non-issue in early years of school across most participant groups: participants remembered cooperative and construction interactions among their peers, regardless of ethnicity. However, as time moved on perceived difference between groups emerged and participants generally indicated that by the time they reached the final years of primary school and early secondary school they knew who was from what ethnicity. How did perceived differences emerge when no-one was allowed to talk about the differences between groups in public institutions? Bekerman (2009) offers the explanation that adult socialization and enculturation may play a role in shaping these narratives of conflict: in private lives adults are key socialization influences on children, and if the adults in a child’s life promote hate and intergroup difference in private, the signal to children is one that develops hate and stereotyping, rather than promoting peace.

Conflict Management or Interpersonal Conflict Intervention

Another positive change towards some small aspects of constructive conflict in schools is conflict management through teacher intervention. Generally, participants in school in the 1970s and 1980s indicated that there was a dearth of teacher intervention when working to resolve student disputes. Again, the participants from the First and Second Republics said that visible destructive conflicts did not occur along ethnic lines, but they may not, as children in school, have been aware of some of the subtle or systemic forms of discrimination. None of the participants in school from any time period under study described directly being involved in bullying, either as victim or perpetrator. However, participants from the First and Second Republic implied that when their peers engaged in bullying, teachers tended to be disconnected from the intervention or resolution the problems. For example, Bonheur described bullying in schools:
“The bullying back home is not the same as here. We, we bully back home, we deal with it. It didn’t affect us that much. Yes, there’s always bullying back home, but we deal with it. We don’t get very traumatized by it. You know? So, for instance, there are always the guys who are the kings and take control and beat up the other guys. There’s always stuff like this. But we are not traumatized like here. We [are] used to be[ing] in contact with each other, and fighting, and [that is] part of how kids grow up, so it’s normal.”

Bonheur was the only participant who described teacher a taking action in the face of bullying or fighting: “In high school, if kids were fighting each other, the teachers would separate them and give disciplinary action to the ones who instigated.” That is, discipline was punitive during his time in his school. Note that Bonheur went to a church school, and his teachers were Belgian priests, so certainly this interview cannot be assumed representative of the overall state of how teachers intervene in fights or bullying in Burundi’s schools.

In the Third Republic, Redempta described how her teachers rarely intervened when students fought: “Teachers… they didn’t get involved in things like that. They let kids fight it out when they wanted. There were no phone calls home or involving the parents with things like that.” First, the overall culture of conflict avoidance and censorship of open talk about conflict or violence may have seeped into other aspects of violence, such that many disputes may have been ignored or avoided. On the other hand, teachers were often under-paid and under resourced (even in the best of schools) in Burundi in the years before the civil war (see Greenland, 1980; Obura, 2008; UNESCO, 1974). In some rural schools, teachers regularly did not even show up to teach, or show up on time, (Obura, 2008), sometimes because they took other work to earn money. Thus, teachers may not have had the resources or means to intervene if students were fighting. A third reason, possibly consistent with the above interview, is cultural, where teachers believe more than the “West” in student autonomy and see fighting as a form of engagement from which students learn – similar to the Japanese pre-school in Tobin, et. al. (1989).
Conversely, Rozette’s post-civil war schooling described some greater teacher intervention in bullying or fighting. Rozette described fighting in her school:

“My primary school was mostly Tutsi but there were some Hutu, and sometimes a fight would break out. Teachers, I think, used to just ignore it, but now teachers – the good ones – bring the students aside and try to solve the problems. I don’t know how ethnicity would be dealt with there… usually the problems aren’t about different ethnicities.”

Thus, teachers in Rozette’s school were taking a more proactive role in facilitating conflict resolution. Also Rozette did not report conflict along ethnic lines. Some research has suggested that when students (and teachers) build skills in conflict resolution, they can apply those skills to more difficult conflicts, such as destructive conflicts over ethnic difference.

Discussion – Psychocultural Interpretations of Conflict and their Implications

The results of the interviews demonstrate the interplay between private and public life. Throughout the majority of the post-Independent Republics there was a significant amount of public censorship of discussions of ethnicity and of the 1972 violence. The result was, unsurprisingly, that in schools there was apparently no overt or explicit discussion of ethnic difference or violence. The perception that ethnicity and the interethnic violence should not be discussed in public still seems to exist to some degree, as of this writing, even though censorship rules have been lifted and the Arusha Peace Accords and Constitution do specifically address issues surrounding the ethnic dimensions of the causes of the Burundian civil war. Several interview participants described significant freedom of the press and argued that they were aware of no limitations on freedom of speech in the country. Yet apparently the avoidance of direct discussions of ethnicity (or interethnic discrimination or prejudice) persists.

Schools played an interesting role in perpetuating stereotypes and bias in the country. While formal education and other government planning documents advocated for unified
*Burundian* identities (through *kirundization*, *ruralization*, and *Bashingatahe* policies), these policies co-existed with a hidden curriculum of conflict avoidance. In avoiding recognition of ethnic difference and conflict in the public domain, fears and stereotypes that existed in the private domain were allowed to simmer and to remain unchallenged in public institutions, such as schools. Through the use of ethnic codes, ethnic identity categories (Hutu/Tutsi) remained intact and implicitly understood throughout the 1970s and 1980: these helped to stigmatize ‘Hutu’ people/identities by perpetuating stereotypes such as Hutu not having dads, or being unable to speak French, or being uninterested in academic work or formal education. Not engaging with ethnic difference in schools, meant a missed opportunity to probe or work with ethnicity, to decrease cross-group tensions.

The majority of interview participants come from Bujumbura – a so-called “cosmopolitan city” (Eraste) – where both Tutsi and Hutu live together and are constantly interacting: Hutu and Tutsi often engage with each other in markets and other communal spaces. Lives in the city are, generally, much more interwoven with people from different groups than lives in the countryside, where whole villages and areas may be populated by only one ethnicity. Participants in this study (mostly from urban backgrounds) generally went to primary school with both Tutsi and Hutu classmates (with a few exceptions, see Chapter 3). And yet, participants described a noticeable tense divide between Hutu and Tutsi, both in school and out (including school demographics, see Chapter 4). They said that despite contact with the ‘other’ group (Hutu) in schools, there was still a sense of fear that persisted within the Burundian community. So, why did the cross-ethnic contact throughout the Independent Republics, in schools and in the larger community, not help to mitigate interethnic tensions and destructive conflict (escalating to the onset of violent civil war in the 1990s)? Why did avoiding the topic of ethnic difference in
society ad curriculum, the omission of interethnic conflict and violence from schools, and the
creation of a superordinate ‘Burundian’ identity not serve to build sustainable peace in the
country?

Proponents of contact theory are quick to point out that contact between groups with a
history of intergroup prejudice and destructive conflict will not magically transform the negative
conflict into positive cross-group interaction, or somehow mitigate the stereotyping and
prejudices that exist between groups (Tal-Or, Boninger and Gleicher, 2002). In fact, as Pettigrew
(1998) argues, certain types of cross-contact may worsen intergroup resentment. Allport’s basic
(1954), contact hypothesis – subsequently substantiated by Tal-Or, Boninger and Gleicher, 2002
– says that four conditions need to exist in order for intergroup contact to mitigate rather than
escalate destructive conflict, by reducing prejudice, stereotyping and fear across groups: 1) the
intergroup interaction should involve cooperation and constructive competition; 2) there has to
be an environment offering social and institutional support for building understanding between
groups; 3) both groups have to have equal status throughout the contact; 4) and contact must be
sustained over long periods of time (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; and Tal-Or, Boninger and
Gleicher, 2002).

In Burundi in the Independent Republics, there was very little, if any, government or
school-institutional support for mitigating cross-group enmity in schools. The official curriculum
promoting the ‘superordinate’ Burundian identities may have been counter-productive, in that it
largely masked (and prevented problem-solving discussion of) real and perceived threats. In
schools, participants described institutional support (through teachers or administrators) to
develop any understanding between ethnicities: there was, officially, no such thing as Hutu and
Tutsi. While the contact was (at least in the city of Bujumbura) sustained over a long period of
time, the two main ethnic groups did not have equal status at all. For example, as described in Chapter 4, in general, Tutsi had more access to schools, in particular they had greater access to schools with French-speaking teachers, among other resources, that would improve their chances of success on the national exams and entry into secondary school. The overall policy and practice to avoid and censor recognition of ethnic difference reduced the opportunities for students from different ethnicities to work with each other in a constructive, open, and cooperative manner. Therefore, none of the conditions set forth by contact theorists existed (except sometimes prolonged contact). Thus, it is likely that the contact may have contributed to negative attitudes and perpetuated stereotypes instead of mitigating those negative perceptions and inequities (discrimination).

From 1966-1993 there was a minority Tutsi-dominated government in Burundi. That government controlled most aspects of social, political, and economic life. In schools, a key socio-structural effect of this domination was to create a very imbalanced and inequitable system (most participants describe their time in primary or secondary schools as having majority Tutsi and very few Hutu present in class, even though Tutsi were the minority in the country). The limited access Hutu had to schools not only structurally limited their access to secure and well-paying employment opportunities (and as a result, reinforced Tutsi control). It also functioned as a hidden (tacit) curriculum, to convey the negative Tutsi stereotype that Hutu did not want to go to school or become educated (often repeated in interviews). Thus, socio-structural limitations helped to perpetuate negative psychocultural interpretations of the ‘other’ in the intergroup conflict, in particular negative stereotypes by Tutsi of Hutu and assumed moral superiority of Tutsi.
Another key element of the hidden curriculum was conflict avoidance. Such suppressed acknowledgement of conflict helps to minimize critiques of government action (or inaction) in schools (Apple, 1979, Bickmore, 1999). Minimizing constructive dialogue in schools may perpetuate stereotypes, especially as students of the marginalized (Hutu) ethnicity were not afforded a chance to challenge those stereotypes without facing accusations of spreading divisive ideology. Bickmore (2007) noted that implicit and explicit curriculum to generate dialogue can generate space for inclusion of multiple perspectives and histories in classrooms, and can address power imbalances and differences. That is, dialogue necessary for constructive discussions regarding conflict and controversial issues in education for peace (Bickmore, 2011). Thus, when discussion of conflict is silenced, these conflictual issues are masked in the explicit curriculum, and this can be detrimental to peacebuilding through education (Bickmore, 1999).

For comparison, in Rwanda, at the time of writing, it was illegal to challenge government-produced narratives regarding the genocide or to challenge teachers who teach these narratives (such as that you or your family’s experience is not the same as what is being taught in schools). Such resistance may constitute a heavily punished crime of ‘revisionism’ and spreading ‘genocide ideology’ and may result in harsh prison sentences (McLean-Hilker, 2011). In Rwandan schools, and in public discourse, Hutu people were relegated to the stereotypical status of ‘killer’ or ‘perpetrator,’ while Tutsi were elevated to the status of ‘survivor’ or ‘victim’ without the opportunity to show that not all Hutu were killers, and not all Tutsi were victims. Narratives described in the Kigali Genocide Memorial or found at other memorial sites and genocide awareness programs throughout the country perpetuated these dichotomous, non-overlapping identities – although, newer exhibitions were starting to acknowledge certain Hutu rescuers at the time of this writing.
Similarly, in Burundi, not all Hutu were victims and/or innocent in the killings, nor were all Tutsi responsible for the violence (in fact the narrative during that time, where it existed in public spheres, laid blame on Hutu insurgents as opposed to on Tutsi government forces, even though the proportion of those who were killed in 1972 were Hutu, in disproportionality higher percentages). However, during the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s, any attempt to re-dress those stereotypes would have meant breaking the ‘taboo’ of ethnic silence.

Finally, this conflict avoidance impedes several strategies necessary for building peace (through) education. That is, avoiding and/or minimizing interethnic conflict in schools did not address the structural causes of tensions (such as unequal access to education and biased national exams) that contributed to large structural inequalities across Burundi – in politics, the military, and in business. While the Burundian school system may or may not have directly contributed to the dehumanizing and mistrustful psychocultural interpretations that led to a culture of conflict, the lack of direct engagement with constructive conflict in schools left a vacuum that was filled by bias in the non-formal and private sector. With no counter-narrative to what children and youth heard at home and amongst their close friends: the collectivisation and essentialization of Hutu and Tutsi binary, non-overlapping identities and repetition of victim/perpetrator narratives that propagated throughout the country continued un-checked and contributed to a culture of fear of the ‘other’ (Hutu or Tutsi) throughout the country.

However, Burundi is, in some small ways, trying to move away from these ethnic categorizations and conflict avoidance, and is working towards (small) infusions of constructive conflict education in schools. The new Civics and Peace Education curriculum (MENRS, 2007) does attempt to address the roots of the violence, and in my interviews, participants who attended school during the post-civil war time period described some teacher-facilitated conflict
resolution in her school. There is some evidence from other post-conflict countries that skills learned through conflict resolution education can be applied to more difficult, immediate conflicts surrounding issues like ethnic difference (Bickmore, 2003; Bickmore, 2008; J. King, 2009). Thus, while there is still a long way to go for Burundi to start incorporating constructive conflict education into schools, the small steps a start towards a larger program.

Schools can reflect and amplify current social conditions, particularly negative and destructive ones, but they can also act as signals (E. King, 2014a) to the larger community regarding conflict resolution (problem-solving) and other constructive conflict between groups. Small examples of constructive conflict were present in the interview description of post-conflict schools. However, if the government were to focus on (increasingly) incorporating aspects of constructive conflict education, like dialogue and discussion of controversial issues (Hess & Avery, 2009) or developing multiple narratives (Funk & Said, 2004) of the civil war and violence in classrooms, then the effect of schools could be significant – the signal to schoolchildren would be to engage with those differences and challenges to identity narratives in a constructive manner, both inside and outside school. Bickmore (2005) cautioned, however, that often a significant barrier to incorporating dialogue, and by extension developing multiple narratives, is teacher confidence. That is, teachers need proper training in order to incorporate preparatory lessons on the content and process of dialogue, as well as institutional support in order to successfully integrate dialogic processes into classrooms for building peace within a school community (Bickmore, 2005; Bekerman & Zembylas, 2011).

Burundian schools are at an advantage in that, in general, many or most communities already include both Hutu and Tutsi people, and schools often contain members of each group. If current government programs to develop equitable school access and resource distribution (see
chapter 4) are combined with programs of conflict resolution and constructive conflict education in schools, then the existing intergroup contact would better meet Allport (1954) and other scholars’ conditions for peacebuilding through sustained cooperation and equal status. The Burundian government could significantly influence large numbers of Burundian school children and communities towards positive peace-building and social change.

Conclusion

Peace and conflict education theorists often argue that formal education programs should address the (structural, relational and personal) roots of violence, teach alternatives to violence, and build acceptance of the fact that conflict is ever present in our daily lives (Barton and McCully, 2012; Bickmore, 2005; Bickmore, 2008; Bickmore, 2011; Bickmore, 2014; Bekerman and Zembylas, 2010; Harris, 2004; Maiese, 2003). The policies of successive Burundian governments from 1972-1993 to avoid and censor public expression and recognition of ethnic conflict in Burundi did not address the root causes of the violence in 1972. Rather, these policies worked to drive ‘ethnicity’ issues underground, such that ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ were alluded to in public indirectly via codes, whereas in private discussions they were still discussed. The Burundian government chose not to seize the opportunity that schools provide to increase positive, cooperative, equal cross-group interactions in the First and Second Republics from 1972-1987. They avoided or denied the existence of the destructive conflict. Schools, therefore, did little to re-dress the socio-structural inequalities, or the differences in psychocultural interpretations of the diverse Burundian population and conflict. These policies, in turn, contributed to a hidden curriculum that indirectly reinforced ethnic stereotypes and promoted fear of one another between ethnic groups. Thus, schools missed the opportunity to address
conflicting psychocultural interpretations of the conflict, through addressing negative stereotypes, biases, essentialized ethnic categories, fears and mistrust. Thus, while schools remained passive, the binary notions of ethnic difference and us/them identity categories were allowed to continue unchecked in public (and private) discourse. Through public silences, real and perceived interethnic problems were ignored, and their causes were not addressed on any large scale.

Buyoya’s Third Republic (1987-1993) did start to open up discussion about ethnic difference, in schools and across the country, and elections occurred in 1993 that gave the country a Hutu President and Hutu-dominated government for the first time since independence. However, these policy changes seemed to be perceived as ‘too little too late’ by Hutu and ‘too much too soon’ by Tutsi. For years, Hutu had been denied fair and equal access to education – thus government, military, and elite business jobs (Jackson, 2000; Ndikumana, 2005) – and the majority of Hutu felt as though it was overdue for them to gain access to those social, political and economic institutions and inclusion in these social landscapes (LeMarchand, 1995). Since for most of the previous two decades, Hutu and Tutsi were afraid to talk about ethnic difference, this contributed to fear and mistrust between the groups. So, when Hutu were suddenly afforded access to those institutions that Tutsi had controlled for so long, Tutsi were, understandably, worried about the consequences of such power being transferred into the hands of a traditionally marginalized group, whom they had learned to fear. The whole-scale transfer of power felt ‘too much, too soon’ for many Tutsi. Schools could have worked to mitigate these fears and mistrust through actively engaging with ethnic difference and creating dialogue amongst individuals to share their experiences. In the end, I argue that avoiding addressing the intergroup conflict served to exacerbate the interethnic conflict and helped to create the conditions that led to the
eruption of interethnic violence again in 1993. Government and education policies served to drive ethnic difference and destructive conflict underground into proxy issues, and led to a culture of perpetual conflict and fear within the Burundian community.

However, certain (small) programs in Burundian schools recently have been developed by the (Hutu-led) Nkurunziza government to address those causes of interethnic violence, and small spaces for conflict resolution are starting to appear in schools. Thus, over time it may be possible to incorporate more and wider dimensions of constructive conflict into schools. Schools are places for both indirect peace education (where the explicit curriculum does not directly address divisive local conflict, but does teach communication skills and non-violence, and human rights in other ways) and direct peace education (where education directly addresses the history and themes of difficult local conflict linked to local identities and concerns) (Bar-Tal and Rosen, 2009). Such development of skills, relationships, and knowledge may facilitate constructive discussions of sensitive topics and histories that may help bridge the socio-structural and psychocultural divides that exist between members of different ethnic groups in Burundi.
CHAPTER 6

APPLYING THE TYPOLOGY AND THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN SOCIO-STRUCTURAL INTERESTS AND PSYCHOCULTURAL INTERPRETATIONS IN INTEGRATED SCHOOLS

The distinction between the past, present, and future is only a stubbornly persistent illusion. (Albert Einstein)

In this qualitative study, I explored the intersection between the official curriculum and the lived curriculum of Burundian primary schools. I examined international comparative research on schools in largely segregated countries emerging from violence (i.e. Northern Ireland and Israel/Palestine) and countries that are relatively free of overt violence but with instances of structural and cultural violence (i.e. Canada, the U.S. and the U.K.) and related them to the Burundian context. The thesis presented a ‘typology of conflict in schools’ (Figure 1, Chapter 2), that combined two dimensions of conflict – psychocultural interpretations and social-structural interests (Ross, 1993) – with three types of approaches to interethnic (and other) conflict in schools – destructive, passive, and constructive (adapted from Davies, 2005). I used this typology as an analytical framework to examine the approaches to ethnic difference and conflict in a largely de-segregated country, Burundi, in two periods: the pre-civil war years from 1966-1993 and the post-civil war years from 2005-2014. Through the analysis of curriculum and planning documents I was able to develop a broad understanding of the official primary school curriculum during the time periods under study. Through semi-structured, open-ended, one-on-one interviews I was able to compare those results to the lived experiences of select Burundian immigrants living in Canada.
In this final chapter, I synthesize the social-structural and the psychocultural dimensions of conflict in the context of formal education in Burundi from 1966 to 2014, in order to show what space there is for promoting constructive conflict education in schools. On this basis, I argue that it is essential to incorporate some aspects of constructive conflict education into schools as a peace imperative. Lastly, I describe the implications of this study for education in integrated societies emerging from escalated violent (armed) conflict, reflect upon the strengths and limitations of the research methodology, and discuss the implications of the research methodology and potential avenues for future research. I conclude by describing the significance of the research.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This study was based on the assumption that schools represent a significant opportunity to shift the paradigm of destructive conflict towards constructive conflict and peaceful interethnic relations (and by extension, schools may act as a signal to the greater society to do the same). The results of this study offer support for this particular idea, by articulating certain dimensions of schooling in Burundi (from 1966-1993) that appeared to exacerbate (or, rarely mitigate) the interethnic conflict between Tutsi and Hutu at different points in Burundi’s post-colonial history.

The socio-structural dimension of schooling (school access, resource distribution, and language policies) served to exclude the majority of Burundians (nearly all majority Hutu and many less privileged minority Tutsi) from secondary schooling in the post-independence republics under Presidents Micombero, Bagaza, and Buyoya from 1966 to 1993 (Jackson, 2000; Obura, 2008). By extension these Burundians were also excluded from government, business,
and military jobs. Those relatively rare students who were able to remain in schools past year 4 were required to learn a new language (French, the former colonial language) and prepare for difficult national exams that covered subjects they had not been taught before in school. Those (predominantly Tutsi) students who had gone to French language schools, or had the means to pay for French tutors, were more likely to pass exams and move on to secondary and even sometimes tertiary schooling. However, those poorer, rural (usually Hutu) students who did not have access to such resources were blocked from entering secondary school. Thus national exams provided a pretext for excluding Hutu from schools beyond year 6, while not directly stating so in ethnic terms. That is, schooling was inherently exclusive and created considerable amount of cross-group inequality. Thus, schools in the Independent Republics were socio-structurally destructive, and they exacerbated interethnic conflict because they caused insecurity, frustration, anger and fear.

The post-civil war government (post-2005) has been working to address these socio-structural grievances of (generally) Hutu people. Through programs that increase school access and equitable resource allocation, the government is effectively moving towards a more equitable school system, what Nancy Fraser (2000) calls redistribution – a pillar of social justice. However, as Jackson (2000) cautioned, it is politically risky if one group or area in Burundi would come to be perceived as gaining educational and structural resources at the expense another. That is, redistributing a small ‘pie’ of limited resources at the expense of the ‘haves’ risks creating the reverse situation, where the ‘haves’ become the ‘have-nots’, and thus perpetuate the culture of conflict (ibid.)

The government under President Nkurunziza (2005-present) has declared that all formal education be in French for all years of schooling (not just the last few years of primary
schooling) and the national exams continue to be in French. This may or may not help to reduce the relatively high drop-out and repetition rates (see Chapter 4) that Burundi has experienced in schooling, and increase the ability for all students to gain access to both public and private sector jobs. While having instruction standardized in one language across the country at least levels the playing field with regards to equitable access to secondary schools (stipulated in both the 2005 Constitution and the 2000 Arusha Peace Accords), French is still a former colonial and non-home language. Questions as to equitable implementation of French language instruction and the quality of instruction across all regions and social groups, as well as access to trained teachers given its relative non-prevalence in rural regions as of this writing, persist. While there will no doubt continue to be inequalities throughout the system (as there are in any country, for example students who have the opportunity and means to pay for schooling or access to private tutors often have a competitive edge), this at least marks a small attempt to address structural distortions that existed in the formal school system in Burundi prior to the civil war.

The psychocultural analysis of ethnic difference and conflict in primary schools showed that, while some (very small) steps have been taken to address the narratives, beliefs, fears and culture of conflict in Burundi, there are still more significant changes that are required to fully move towards constructive interethnic relationship in schools. In this study, I assumed that schools served as a microcosm for Burundian society: they amplified and reflected social norms (E. King, 2014a) during times of both direct violence and negative peace – either through destructively encouraging stereotyping, biases, hate and difference or through passively omitting ethnic difference and conflict from schools altogether. Participants tended to project the more destructive aspects of conflict by implying that their primary schools didn’t have any hatred for Hutu, but that in rural (Hutu) areas that there was more hatred for Tutsi. These statements tended
to reflect binary (we/they or us/them) categories and served to externalize conflict and difference while not critically examining their own biases in the process. They also, in many ways, implied a sense of victimization amongst participants, that Hutu in rural areas promoted fears and hatred but these were not present in urban communities.

Participants in school during the pre-civil war years (1966-1993) and post-civil war (post-2005) elaborated on a stereotype that seemed to permeate Burundian culture: the structural limitations imposed on Hutu as they moved through, and were largely excluded from, higher grades in the school system were not seen as limitations imposed on Hutu. Instead, many Tutsi Burundian interview participants believed that Hutu “chose” an uneducated life. Several interview participants indicated that, at the time they were in school, they simply believed that Hutu did not want to go to school or that they were lazy, whereas they believed that Tutsi wanted to go to school and succeed in life. This is representative of both the development of essentialized, binary identity groups, and also the development of moral superiority of Tutsi relative to Hutu. Participants did, however, reflect on the nature of these stereotypes in their interviews and often pointed out that they did subsequently realize at the time of the interviews how difficult life had been for Hutu during those pre-war years. The participant with more recent schooling in Burundi indicated that there wasn’t as much stereotyping with regards to specifics about Hutu ‘laziness’ per-se, but she did describe the fact that there is still a negative perception in schools of Hutu by Tutsi.

These destructive psychocultural interpretations of the ‘other’ (categorization, essentialization, and stigmatization of Hutu by Tutsi) intersected with the official censorship and conflict avoidance by successive Burundian governments from 1966-1993, to create an untenable situation throughout the country. Where school programs could have represented an opportunity
to mitigate cross-group differences and address the root cause of violence, or to create more inclusive and unifying identities, they instead did nothing. As a consequence of the conflict avoidance and censorship, cross-group fears and stereotypes were allowed to self-perpetuate throughout society and remained unchallenged by formal institutions, if not indirectly exemplified. Thus, an opportunity to address real socio-structural and psychocultural grievances was unfulfilled throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The primary consequence of this categorization, essentialization, and stigmatization, even though it was not ‘officially’ sanctioned, is the massive civil war that was so catastrophic to Burundi in the 1990s. Even though President Pierre Buyoya attempted some structural changes to education and other institutions in the early 1990s, the fear, hate, and stigma had been simmering under the surface for too long.

However grim the outlook in the country appeared to be during the Independent Republics (1966-1993), most interview participants indicated that there was some cooperation between members of different ethnicities, at least in early schooling, especially in play and on the football field. While this may be a consequence of the fact that teams could not be chosen based explicitly on ethnicity (given the existence of the 1972 White Paper), students in school from 1972-1993 demonstrated that they could get along and cooperate in certain aspects of school life is important for the future of the country as it moves towards peacebuilding. Thus, cooperation between groups existed and now continues to do so in schools in the post-conflict era.

The interview participant in school during the post-civil war era (post-2005) also largely indicated that there was at least some form of conflict resolution that takes place in schools today – with teachers stepping in to address certain types of violence or bullying in school. While the
violence or bullying may not necessarily be along ethnic lines, the fact that any facilitated non-violent conflict resolution dialogue is occurring is a step in the right direction.

Communities in Burundi are generally more integrated: generally Hutu and Tutsi lived together in communities, though some rural areas are predominantly Hutu, given the small populations in rural areas and the relative proportions of Hutu/Tutsi in the country. This suggests that, compared to more divided/segregated post-conflict societies, Burundi may be starting at a better position to build peace in the country through institutions like formal education – although Burundi’s relative poverty and limited access to funds for large-scale constructive conflict in education programs may be a significant barrier without international donor aid. That is, across the country and in particular in schools, Burundians from Hutu and Tutsi ethnicities are in near-constant contact with each other. Most areas and communities across the country contain members of both groups, with few exceptions. Contact theory purports that certain kinds of intergroup contact – structured to be cooperative and where both groups have equal status (Tal-Or, Gleicher and Boninger, 2002) and individual experiences and identities are acknowledged (McGlynn, 2009) – can successfully build intergroup bridges and help to mitigate intergroup difference. Thus, in Burundian schools where formerly warring groups are in near constant contact with each other, building cooperative learning activities may help to mitigate cross-group stereotyping and biases. Additional consequences of such learning environments may be to allow for representation within the educational discourse and learning activities of both Hutu and Tutsi, another key tenet of social justice (Fraser, 2000).

Finally, the (relatively) new civics and peace education curriculum (MENRS, 2007) represents a move towards addressing the negative psychocultural interpretations of conflict within Burundi. While the document itself is thin, it marks a paradigmatic shift in how the
Burundian government officially intends to address interethnic violence in the country. This curriculum formally addresses the violence and its root causes, discusses the effects violence had on the country, and looks at peace education as a means to address those problems, tenets for peace education (Bickmore, 2008; Harris, 2004). It serves to begin to recognize the causes and effects of the violence across the country—although much is needed in terms of pedagogical strategies and specifics about material covered. Recognition is another pillar of social justice Fraser (2000): this curriculum consequently represents a positive change in direction for the Burundian government, in that it at least names the groups involved and identifies the dominant role of conflict in Burundian society since independence.

This study contributes to the conflict (in)education literature in two ways. First it reinforces the understanding in existing literature (described in Chapter 2) on the causes and dimensions of conflict, in showing that there was a significant interplay between socio-structural (school access, education resources, and language of instruction) and psychocultural factors (in-group/out-group identities, narratives, fears, stereotypes) in selected Burundian schools. Second, it extended current literature in the field to a relatively small study on a largely de-segregated country, where members of different ethnicities are often in contact with each other in their daily, and in particular in their school, lives. The study showed that while socio-structural interests are being addressed in Burundian schools as a result of the chronic exclusion in place before the civil war (redistribution), the government has yet to implement any significant explicit curricula (as of this writing) to address the psychocultural interpretations of conflict that pervade Burundi, with the exception of one (very thin) document. However, the school experience of one post-civil war participant did describe (small) spaces for interpersonal conflict resolution and conflict management in classrooms, which may represent a first step towards incorporating more
holistic constructive conflict education into schools. The role that schools have in the greater society allows for what is taught – explicitly and implicitly – in schools to permeate into other aspects of daily life.

Schools do not just reflect and amplify social conditions, they act as signals to social actions (E. King, 2014a). Thus, while signals of passive or destructive conflict and violence can be amplified, so can signals of constructive conflict and peaceful interethnic relations. Creating both socio-structural signals of equity across groups (through equitable resource distribution, language policies, school access, and national exams) as well as psychocultural signals about peacebuilding through conflict resolution, de-essentialization of groups, removing stigmas, and moving towards inclusive, rather than exclusive, identities in schools, can help to signal positive changes across the country. Burundi is in a unique position to successfully change destructive attitudes and beliefs through its integrated school system. While Burundi is relatively disadvantaged in that it is one of the poorest countries in the world, which may offset the potential advantages of the integrated nature of the school system, it is also not unheard of for relatively poor counties to lift themselves out of relative poverty and in the process experience periods of sustained peace. For example, while Rwanda still has a long way to go to sustained, positive peace in the country, after the genocide in 1994 it was considered the poorest and most unstable country in the world. In 2014 Rwanda, while still low income, was up to 151 on the Human Development Index (UNDP, 2014) and had not experienced violence on such a sustained and massive scale since 1994.
Creating Spaces for Constructive Conflict in Primary Schools

Throughout the interviews and in the curriculum analysis, two aspects of constructive conflict education were notably absent: critical dialogue and creating multiple perspectives/narratives. These aspects of the typology of conflict are important elements of educational programs that support peacebuilding in school settings (Nagda & Gurin, 2007; Barton & McCully, 2007).

Dialogue is a crucial element in the peacebuilding process. Dialogue is a process that involves both speaking and listening, it brings to light new meanings and understandings of experiences (Davies, 2004). The use of constructive dialogue in classrooms can be a powerful tool that can help to foster empathy across ethnicities, develop connections between individual members of different ethnicities, and develop mutual understanding and respect (Nagda & Gurin, 2007). Thus, dialogue works to address psychocultural interpretations that categorize and essentialize groups, and also can work to subvert stigmas – in particular negative stereotypes – of marginalized groups. Constructive, sustained, and cooperative dialogue and contact (Tal-Or, Boninger, and Gleicher, 2002) may also help groups to move beyond binary identity categories (us/them, we/they, victim/perpetrator) and this can be an important bridge between groups. That is, once a culture of conflict takes hold within a country, steps towards peacebuilding can stall as a result of paralyzing narratives, in particular victim/perpetrator binaries, and finding ways to move beyond those narratives is necessary in order to build a culture of peace (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010). Furthermore, dialogue and discussion in classrooms can create steps towards recognition of marginalized groups in classrooms (Fraser, 2000).

Incorporating multiple narratives into classroom teaching practices and textbooks may also help in building peace in a country emerging from sustained interethnic violence (Bickmore,
A worry with the 2007 Civics and Peace Education curriculum (MENRS, 2007) would be that in its implementation when schools and teachers address the violence of the civil war, they do so by incorporating a single, dominant narrative into textbooks and classrooms. For example, in Rwanda the government (as of this writing) promotes a single narrative of the violence through its informal education centres, like genocide memorials and peacebuilding programs in churches. This narrative provides only one version of the events that occurred in the 1994 genocide, and promotes the notion that the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) was the saviour of the country while the Hutu government and militias were the ones that plunged the country into chaos. Unfortunately, that narrative ignores the experiences of many in the northern province of Ruhengeri who experienced violence at the hands of the RPF. It also ignores the many stories of Hutu or mixed-ethnicity children who lost a parent (or parents) in the genocide and experiences of Hutu that refused to kill. Given the complex nature of the causes of the violence in Burundi, and the role that both government and (Hutu and Tutsi) militias alike played in the violence of the civil war, there is no singular way to tell the story and therefore incorporating those multiple narratives into any teachings and curricula about the conflict may help to ensure that all sides of the conflict are represented in classrooms and would also help to promote cross-group dialogue and alleviate cross-group categorization, essentialization, and stereotyping. However, Ellsworth (1989) cautions that all groups in this situation must be given equal status, with no group feeling marginalized, otherwise any positive effects may backfire and inadvertently perpetuate those feelings of marginalization in classroom settings and beyond.
Strengths, Limitations and Future Research on Ethnic Difference and Conflict in Burundian Schools

I developed this research project to gain an understanding of how ethnic difference and conflict into Burundian schools across two time periods: from 1966-1993 and from 1993-2005. I interviewed ten participants about their experiences in school during those times. The themes I describe and quotes I used demonstrate particular interpretations of events and are based on how the participants themselves experienced them. They are demonstrative and intend to illustrate how each participant perceived conflict and ethnic difference were addressed schools. The experiences cannot be considered representative of the country, nor can they be generalized in any way.

I conducted these open-ended, semi-structured interviews primarily with Tutsi (some participants chose not to self-identify or were mixed, one was Hutu), men (8), and the majority of participants self-identified as coming from middle-to-upper socio-economic backgrounds, they were all from Bujumbura or spent a significant amount of time there. The result is that the sample itself has a notable bias in it: Tutsi male from Bujumbura were the least likely to suffer from government policies of exclusion and inequality, and they were the favoured group throughout the colonial era and post-Independent Republics. The two female participants, as well as the one Hutu, may have come from a place of relatively less privilege than Tutsi males, but their higher socio-economic statuses may have prevented them from experiencing the level of socio-structural discrimination that would have been seen in the rural countryside. The policies generally favoured the group I interviewed, over other groups. Different participants and groups remember different events differently (Roy, 1994) and developing an understanding of how those policies impacted ethnic, social, gender and regional group would increase the reliability and validity of the study, as well as create a better sense of the impacts of schooling on conflict
in Burundi. I did not have the opportunity to interview a representative sample of Burundians in any of the categories (the greatest number of participants were male, urban, Tutsi, but a sample number of 5 is relatively small). Especially missing from the sample were Female, Hutu – and in particular those from rural areas – who were the most marginalized and disadvantaged in the years of chronic exclusion. These discrepancies in experiences raise the question: how did different groups (in particular marginalized ones) experience formal education during these time periods? A representative sample across all ethnicities, genders, and regions would give a better, more holistic picture, of the socio-structural and psychocultural dimensions of conflict, as well as develop a greater understanding of how the typology of conflict in schools can be used to analyze formal education in integrated countries.

All of the participants, as of this writing, live in Canada – most interviewees had been in Canada for well over 15 years – and the role of both time and distance cannot be understated when conducting interviews. Spatial and temporal distance have a tendency to distort memories, as Nora (1989) describes: “history is perpetually suspicious of memory.” This distance raises two questions: How would these narrated experiences compare to those of Burundians who are still living in Burundi? Would members of the ‘urban, Tutsi, male’ category there describe these events and the role that the minority (Tutsi/UPRONA) party played in the violence so critically – as did Cadeau, Bonheur, Noel, and Thierry – if they were still in Burundi? However, the spatial and temporal distance of participants had may have also been an advantage in other ways. It may have allowed for interviews participants the chance to process their experiences with violence and thus allow for more impartial and self-critical answers to questions, which may not have been afforded were participants still in Burundi. They may have be more willing to go into depth
about their experiences or may have been more willing to be self-reflexive about their own ethnic groups’ actions in contributing to the violence (and many were), as well.

A more reliable and persuasive study would include a larger and more representative sample of Burundians who were in school during each time period (from 1966-1993 and post-2005). This representative sample would include greater numbers of female interview participants, as well as both male and female Hutu and representatives from urban and rural settings. Furthermore, a sample that contained greater variation in socio-economic status and provincial variation – participants from advantaged provinces like Bururi and Muramvya, as well as from disadvantaged provinces like Kirundo and Kayanza – would help to elucidate the relationships between formal education and conflict in a more nuanced way. Extensive research could also compare and contrast lived experiences of women and girls in school to their male counterparts in order to flesh out how self-identified gender roles effect experiences of intergroup conflict in schools. Women and girls often experience disproportionately high levels of destructive violence: girls are often forced out of school or faced with higher levels of gender-based and sexual violence (Kirk, 2011). Also, fieldwork in Burundi would enable for further analysis into more current programs in primary schools. In particular, classroom observations and in-depth interviews with current teachers and students could prove foundational for developing and incorporating constructive conflict into Burundian primary schools.

A further limitation of the study involves my access to formal curriculum documents. I was limited to library resources and online searches. While those searches proved fruitful for secondary analyses, these analyses focused primarily on the socio-structural aspects of formal education: resource distribution, school access, and language policies. They rarely address specific curriculum initiatives or school content. While I somewhat anticipated this dearth of
information relating to curricula in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, I was shocked to find it for current curriculum as well. My experiences with finding relevant formal curricula for Rwandan primary and secondary level history, civics, and language curricula were comparatively easy and I expected the same going in to this project on Burundi. However, the Burundian government did not have any curriculum documents online, and thus it was difficult and time consuming to get the (few) documents that I eventually got. The minimal amount of documents I was able to analyze, then, means that the psychocultural content in the official curriculum is still relatively under-represented in this study. Opportunities to go to both Belgium and Burundi in order to gain access to both former (colonial) and current curriculum documents would greatly add to the validity of this study and create a more in-depth analysis of the curriculum documents.

Additional documents that could help to understand the relationships between formal education and conflict in Burundi include school lesson plans, textbooks and teacher training resources and programs. Classroom and field observations of Burundian schools in traditionally advantaged and marginalized provinces may give access to those documents, and would thus provide a more holistic understanding of the formal education process and its implications for peace and conflict in Burundi.

The study did develop and implement a framework through which to analyze formal education in conflict-affected and post-conflict countries (through a synthesis of previous work from Davies, 2005; Fraser, 2000; King, 2014; and Ross, 1993). It reinforced several aspects of these works: socio-structural AND psychocultural dimensions of conflict were at play in the build up to the Burundian civil war (1993-2005) and both socio-structural and psychocultural dimensions seem to have affected violence and peace in the country (Ross, 1993); the
government is working on *redistribution* of educational resources, as well as taking small steps towards *recognition* in schools, through the development of a new Civics and Peace Education Curriculum (MENRS, 2007). Further, conflict was *destructive* in select Burundian schools through stereotyping and promoting hate; it was *passive* through government mandated or self-imposed censorship that did not address the root causes of the interethnic violence; and it was *constructive* in (some) instances, through cooperation and play, and in the post-civil war, through small instances of conflict resolution and management by teachers.

This research therefore lays some foundational work for future research projects. Future research projects could use the conflict typology in schools to examine schooling in Burundi on a variety of analytical levels. Also, this study focused solely on primary school experiences, but the extensive open-ended interviews described the fact that experiences with ethnic difference and conflict changed as participants moved up in schools. Thus, an examination of the roles that secondary or tertiary schooling, or in-depth interviews with participants who started school in one time period, but continued on throughout the different periods would help to elucidate the role that schooling played as participants move up in the school system, especially if those results were compared to Burundians who dropped out of school after or during primary school.

Finally, the research did not address the experiences of the third ethnic group that exists in Burundi (and Rwanda): the Twa. This so-called ‘pygmy’ ethnicity is rarely studied in any critical way, and in many ways it is one of the more marginalized groups in both Rwanda and Burundi. Thus, an examination of how schooling affected Twa, in particular with regards to the creation of socio-structural barriers and psychocultural interpretations, would extend the conflict (in) education literature to one of the most marginalized groups in the region.
Conclusion: Addressing Types of Conflict in Current Burundian Primary Schools – An Imperative for Peacebuilding through Formal Education

Constructive conflict education encourages groups that have experienced sustained and seemingly intractable interethnic violence to engage with each other in classroom contexts. Through engaging with ‘other’ groups in schools, students are provided the opportunity to overcome destructive intergroup conflict – such as categorization, stereotyping, essentialization, hate, bias, fears, and violence – and passive conflict – through omission in formal discourse – towards constructive intergroup conflict in education, such as dialogue, discussion and creating multiple narratives of histories and interethnic conflict. Burundi still has a long way to go in order to get to constructive conflict education in its schools. The sustained nature of its interethnic violence, through social-structural limitations and barriers that legitimized continued Hutu suppression or through direct episodes of violence between Hutu and Tutsi, means that it will take time to overcome the pervasive socio-structural grievances, the psychocultural interpretations of fear, mistrust, and stereotyping, and the culture of conflict that resulted. However, spaces currently exist throughout the existing Burundian frameworks for formal education (even though these spaces are small) that describe curriculum mandates for peace education as well as equitable access to schools and research distribution.

Burundi no doubt has its challenges beyond the scope of other countries that are emerging from sustained violence. It is one of the poorest countries in the world and poverty, unfortunately, is a significant barrier to developing sustainable peace in a country. However, the integrated nature of Burundi does offer some hope. Since schools act as signals to the larger community, signs of constructive interethnic conflict in education in schools could act as a model for cross-group community interactions. Such interactions in schools, however small, may help Burundi to overcome Hutu/Tutsi enmity and build sustainable peace in the country.
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Appendix A1

Informed Consent Form: English
(On OISE/UT Letterhead)

TOPIC: Ethnicity, Difference, Conflict, and Peace in Burundian Schools: A Comparative, Intergenerational Analysis

Dear _______________________.

I would appreciate your participation in a research study primary schooling in Burundi. The purpose of the study is to understand how ethnicity, difference, conflict and peace were addressed in primary schools in Burundi.

You will be asked to participate in ONE (1) 30-45 one-on-one interview at a location you choose. During the interview you will be asked a series of questions about your time in school in Burundi and how you felt ethnicity and difference were talked about in school. If you consent, your interview will be audio-recorded and then transcribed in to written text, which you may read and correct if you wish.

Risks and/or Discomforts: The questions you will be asked are related to your education in Burundi during the time periods from 1993 to 2005, and after 2005. The purpose is to develop an understanding of the education system, however it is understood that these years may be difficult to talk about given the events taking place in Burundi at that time. As such, if at any time you wish to stop the interview or do not want to answer a question, you reserve the right to do so, without consequence.

Benefits: The information gained from this study may help us to understanding the experiences of primary schools students in Burundi with ethnicity and difference and how education can be used as a positive influence in countries emerging from violence.

Confidentiality: Any information you provide will remain completely confidential and anonymous. At all times during and after the study any identifying information will be removed and replaced with a code name, and your identity as a participant will be known only to the researcher. Once the interview is transcribed in to written text, the audio-recording will be destroyed. The information obtained during the study will be used to complete a Master’s of Arts degree from the University of Toronto in Curriculum, Teaching and Learning and Comparative and International Education. All results will be given as aggregated data in order to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

Opportunity to Ask Questions: Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study before or after agreeing to participate. You may call Emily Dunlop at any time, (647) 531-8311 or email emily.dunlop@mail.utoronto.ca. My supervisor is Dr. Kathy Bickmore, at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto: k.bickmore@utoronto.ca (e-mail) and/or (416) 978-0237 (phone).

If you have questions concerning your rights as a participant in the study you may call the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board at: 416-946-3273 or ethics.review@utoronto.ca.
Freedom to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to answer any question, to decide not to participate in the study, or to withdraw from the study at any point in time without any negative consequences. If you choose to participate and then withdraw at a later date, your results can be deleted from the study, if you choose, again with no negative consequences.

Consent: If you consent to participate in the study, you will be interview ONE (1) time for 30 to 45 minutes.

Please sign your consent below if you do agree to participate in the study.

A copy of this consent form will be given to you to keep.

_______________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Participant                  Date

_______________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Investigator                 Date

Investigator:
Emily Dunlop, B.Ed, OCT
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor St. West
Toronto, ON, M5S1V6

Phone: (647) 531-8311
E-mail: emily.dunlop@mail.utoronto.ca

Supervisor:
Kathy Bickmore, Ph.D.
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor St. West
Toronto, ON, M5S1V6

Phone: (416) 978-0237
E-mail: k.bickmore@utoronto.ca
Appendix A2

Informed Consent Form: French
(On OISE/UT Letterhead)

TITRE: Adressant l’origine ethnique, la différence, les conflits and la paix dans les écoles aux burundaises – Un analyse comparative est entre générations.

A qui cela concerner,

Ce qui suit est pour vous inviter à participer à une étude de recherche qui va tenter de comprendre les expériences des immigrants Burundais au cours de leur temps à l'école primaire au Burundi. Les informations suivantes sont fournies pour vous aider à prendre une décision éclairée quant à savoir si ou non vous souhaitez participer. De plus, si vous avez des questions, s'il vous plaît n'hésitez pas à appeler ou e-mail pour demander plus d'informations.


Procédure: Vous serez invité à participer à un tête-à-tête ren tenue pour 30-45 minutes. Au cours de l'entrevue, vous devrez répondre à une série de questions au sujet de votre temps à l'école au Burundi et comment vous sentez l'ethnicité et de la différence ont été abordées dans les écoles. Les entrevues seront enregistrés sur bande magnétique et va prendre lieu à un endroit de votre choix. Les entrevues seront transcrites.

Risques et/ou Malaises: Il n'y a pas de risques prévus ou malaises associés à la recherche.

Avantages: L'information tirée de cette étude peut nous aider à comprendre les expériences des étudiants dans les écoles primaires au Burundi avec l'appartenance ethnique et de la différence. Au même temps, cette étude peut aider à comprendre comment l'éducation peut être utilisée comme une influence positive dans les pays émergents de la violence.

Confidentialité: En tout temps au cours de l'étude des informations d'identification sera retirée et toute information donnée restera confidentielle et anonyme. Votre identité en tant que participant ne sera connue que pour le chercheur. Enregistrements audio seront utilisés à transcrire l'interview. Quand l'entrevue est transcris de l'enregistrement audio sera détruit. Les informations obtenues lors de l'étude sera utilisée pour compléter une Master de Arts (MA) de l'Université de Toronto dans le domaine de l'éducation comparée et de développement international. Tous les résultats qui y sont présentés seront présentés sous forme de données agrégées afin de préserver la confidentialité et l'anonymat.

Rémunération: Il existe des possibilités de tutorat en mathématiques et en sciences, ainsi que des leçons d'anglais parce que le chercheur est un enseignant certifié de l'Ontario dans ces domaines.

Possibilité de Poser des Questions: N'hésitez pas à poser des questions sur l'étude avant d'accepter de participer. Vous pouvez contacter par courriel à emily.dunlop@mail.utoronto.ca. Si vous avez des questions concernant vos droits en tant que participant à l'étude, vous pouvez appeler le Comité d'Éthique de la Recherche à Toronto:
**Liberté de retrait:** Vous êtes libre de décider de ne pas participer à l'étude ou de se retirer de l'étude à tout moment sans affecter votre relation avec le chercheur ou l'Université de Toronto. Si vous choisissez de participer, puis retirer à une date ultérieure, vos résultats ne seront pas inclus dans l'étude. Votre décision n'entraînera pas la perte des avantages convenus avec le chercheur.

**Consentement:** Si vous acceptez de participer à l'étude, vous serez interviewé et observations seront faites lors de l'entrevue.

S'il vous plaît signer votre consentement ci-dessous si vous souhaitez participer volontairement à l'étude, avec la pleine connaissance de l'objet de l'étude et les procédures impliquées. Une copie de ce formulaire de consentement sera donné à vous de garder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature du Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature du Chercheur</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chercheur:**
Emily Dunlop, B.Ed, OCT
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor St. West
Toronto, ON, M5S1V6

Phone: (647) 531-8311
E-mail: emily.dunlop@mail.utoronto.ca

**Superviseur:**
Kathy Bickmore, Ph.D.
University of Toronto
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor St. West
Toronto, ON, M5S1V6
Appendix B1

Interview Protocol for Open-Ended, Semi-Structured Interviews: English

*You have the right to not answer any questions you do not feel comfortable providing and answer to*

**Participant Information:**

Gender: Male Female
Age: __________
Ethnicity: Hutu Tutsi Twa Other Unidentified
Schooling Location: Urban Rural
Highest Ed. Level: Grade: _______ Age: _______
Years in Primary School: _______ to _______

**Interview Information:**

Date: ____________________________ Time: ______________
Place: ____________________________
Interviewer: ________________________

**Introduction:**

Hello, my name is Emily Dunlop and I’m a Master’s level student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto. The purpose of this interview is to determine your experiences with ethnicity, difference, conflict and peace in Burundian primary schools. The interview will last approximately 30 to 45 minutes, although, if you wish to continue after the set time, the extra information would be welcomed. Please be aware that this interview will be recorded and transcribed for analysis.

The purpose of this interview is to learn about and understand your experiences, if at any time you wish to clarify a question or do not understand it, please let me know and I will attempt to clarify as best I can. Furthermore, if you do not wish to answer any questions, I will happily move on. If at any point you wish to stop the interview or decide that you would like to withdraw your participation, the interview will be stopped and your responses will not be used in the final analysis.

I will give you a copy of your own interview to check, after it is transcribed. If you would like to see the final results and analysis, please let me know and I will gladly forward you a copy.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

If you agree to participate, please sign and date the informed consent form before we begin.
Introductory Questions
1. Before we begin, tell me a bit about yourself: What do you do now, when did you come to Canada/US, why?
2. Describe your time in school in Burundi.
   a. Where did you go to primary school?
   b. How many years were you in primary school? When?

Questions about School Structure
3. Did most young people your age go to primary school?
   a. Were there any differences between who got in to school and why?
4. Describe a typical day in your primary school.
5. Tell me about the classroom environment.
   a. Did members of different groups sit together in the classroom, or were they separated? Girls and boys? Any other divisions?
   b. Did members of different groups play together on breaks or after/ before school?
   c. Were you aware of your classmates’ ethnicity? How did you know?

Questions about School Practices and Teaching
6. Please tell me about what you remember learning in primary school language lessons.
   a. What do you remember learning about in history lessons?
7. Were Hutu and Tutsi ethnicities discussed in school? If so, how were they talked about?
8. What do you remember about your teachers?
   a. Did you know the ethnicity of your teachers? If so, what was it?
   b. Can you describe a typical lesson in school?
   c. What were/ are students’ attitudes towards the teachers?
9. What would happen if a student in class questioned or challenged what teachers said?
10. Can you recall a time when different children of different ethnicities were treated differently in the classroom? Describe the incident.
11. Do you feel that education helped intergroup relationships or did it make them worse? Explain.
12. Describe any peacebuilding or national unity programs you experienced in school.
13. Did students and teachers talk about tolerance and respect in class?
14. Can you describe to me what you have learned about the conflict in Burundi, either the civil war or about other problems in the past?

Concluding Questions
15. Is there anything else you would like to add about your time in school in Burundi that you feel is important for me know, besides what we talked about?

Conclusion:
Thank you for participating in this interview. This interview is confidential and any information gathered will be used solely for the purposes mentioned above. The information and content will remain anonymous.
Is it ok to contact you for future interviews and/or clarification questions? ___________

Thank you for your time and for sharing your experience.
Appendix B2

Interview Protocol for Open-Ended, Semi-Structured Interviews: French

* Vous avez le droit de ne pas répondre à toutes les questions que vous ne vous sentez pas à l'aise et répondez à fournir. Aussi, tous votre information restera anonyme et confidentielle. Vous pourriez voir une transcrit de votre entretien si vous voulez. Finalement, vous avez le droit de me contacter a tous temps pour indiquer que vous ne voulez pas que j’utilise vos réponse dans ma these*

Renseignements sur les participants
Sexe: ________ Homme ________ Femme
Age: ________
Ethnique: ________ Hutu ________ Tutsi ________ Twa ________ Other ________ Unidentified
Lieu: ________ Urban ________ Rural ________ City/Region: _______________________
Plus haut niveau de scolarité atteint: ________ Grade: ________ Age: ________
Quelles années vous étiez à l'école? ( primaire et secondaire) ________
Année dans école primaire: ________ to ________
Année dans école secondaire: ________ to ________

Information l'entrevue:
Date: ____________________________ Time: _______________
Place: ____________________________
Interviewer: _______________________

Questions Introductives:
1. Avant de commencer, dites-moi un peu de vous: Que faites-vous maintenant, quand êtes-vous venu au Canada/États-Unis, pourquoi?
2. Décrivez votre temps à l'école au Burundi.
   a. Où êtes-vous allé à l'école primaire?
   b. Combien d'années vous étiez à l'école primaire? Quand?

Questions sur la structure de l'école
3. Est-ce que la plupart des personnes ou enfants de votre âge aller à l'école primaire?
   a. Y at-il les différences entre qui a obtenu pour l'école et pourquoi?
4. Pourquoi est-ce que les personnes de votre age voulez aller a l'école?
5. Décrivez une journée typique dans votre école primaire (est/ou) secondaire?
   a. Comment ont-membres de différents groupes (Hutu / Tutsi, urbain / rural, riches / pauvres, filles / garçons) se réunissent dans la salle de classe, ou ont-ils été séparés?
   b. Membres des différents groupes jouent ensemble sur les pauses ou après/avant l'école?
   c. Étiez-vous au courant de l'origine ethnique de vos camarades de classe? Comment saviez-vous?
6. Qu’est-ce que vous avez faites après l’école?
Questions sur les pratiques et l'enseignement scolaire

7. S'il vous plaît me dire ce que vous vous souvenez de l'apprentissage dans les cours de langue à l'école primaire. Les cours d’histoire?
   a. Et en école secondaire?
8. Ont-ils été les ethnies Hutu et Tutsi ont discuté à l'école? Si oui, comment ont-ils parlé?
9. Qu'est-ce que vous vous souvenez de vos professeurs?
   a. Saviez-vous l'appartenance ethnique de vos professeurs? Si oui, quel était-il?
   b. Pouvez-vous décrire une leçon typique à l’école?
   c. Quel a été / sont les attitudes des élèves à l’égard des enseignants?
10. Qu'est-ce qui se passerait si un étudiant en classe ou contesté ce que les enseignants ont dit?
11. Pouvez-vous décrire un moment où les étudiants seraient en désaccord ou se battre avec d'autres à l'école? Quel était le combat ou un désaccord au sujet et comment il a été manipulées?
13. Pensez-vous que l'éducation a aidé relations intergroupes ou at-il fait les aggraver? Expliquez.
14. Décrire des programmes de paix ou des programmes de l'unité nationale que vous vous souvenez de l'école.
15. Est-ce que les étudiants et les enseignants parlent de tolérance et de respect dans la classe?
16. Pouvez-vous me décrire ce que vous avez appris sur le conflit au Burundi, soit la guerre civile ou d'autres problèmes dans le passé?

Questions finales

17. Est-il autre chose que vous aimeriez ajouter à propos de votre temps à l'école au Burundi que vous jugez important pour moi, en plus de quoi nous avons parlé?

Conclusion:

Merci d'avoir participé à cette entrevue. Cet entretien est confidentiel et les informations recueillies seront utilisées uniquement aux fins mentionnées ci-dessus. L'information contenu resteront anonymes.

Est-ce que je peux communiquer avec vous pour des entretiens futurs et/ou des questions de clarification? __________

Merci pour votre temps et pour partager votre expérience.
Appendix C

Recruitment E-mail for Burundian-Canadian/American Societies

Dear ____________________,

I’m writing to request the assistance of the _____________________________ in a research project that I am currently working on for my Master’ degree at the University of Toronto. My thesis is on the education system in Burundi, specifically how the primary education system addressed ethnicity, difference, conflict and peace. I am planning on investigating the education experiences during the civil war and in the post-civil war periods.

I first became interested in education in Burundi when I travelled there in 2010 and 2011 and was able to visit the Ministry of Education and several primary schools during that time. Now, I’m interested in working in international development and education in order to help local groups in Burundi develop peace and reconciliation initiatives through education.

I would appreciate any advice, suggestions and input to help the project that you may have, as well as help in finding potential participants willing to be interviewed about their time in school in Burundi. This would help to provide personal experience and balance to the project. I’m currently looking to find potential participants to be interviewed about their time in school in Burundi. Interviews will be approximately 30-45 minutes and will remain confidential and anonymous.

This project will help to shine some light on the Burundian experience in education, an often ignored area in the international community, with a goal of helping to develop peace education programs throughout the region. Any help that you or your association could give me would be greatly appreciated

If you are interested, I can send you more information on the project. You can also contact me at (647) 531-8311 if you have any questions. My supervisor is Dr. Kathy Bickmore, k.bickmore@utoronto.ca or (416) 978-0237.

I have attached a flyer with additional information on it as well.

Best Regards, and thank you in advance for any help you can give,

Emily Dunlop