

II. Analytical Framework

April 03 (Revision 4)

This is an adapted version of the analytical framework, collectively developed by case study coordinators/ team leaders at the first technical meeting (Geneva Aug 02), in light of further collective discussions Geneva April 03 and subsequent consultations.

| 1. Background to conflict | |
|--|---|
| 1.1 Nature of social composition (changes over time) | Nature of group identity (language; religion; “ethnicity”). What is equivalent of "social cohesion" in local language(s)? Nature of social divisions How is group identity articulated with social / political divisions. Issues of “cultural defensiveness” and inflexibility. |
| 1.2 Nature of conflict | Type of conflict: Internal armed conflict / disturbances; political violence; sectarian violence; “ethnic conflict”; civil strife – “identity-based conflicts” in which very existence of communities is perceived to be under threat. Difficulties in naming the conflict. Scale and intensity of violence. Duration of violence / Recency |
| 1.3 Nature of peace | Nature of political agreement. Nature of external involvement. How is the role or education reform / curriculum change articulated in peace agreements (if at all?). |
| 2. Characteristics of present day education system (with historical background as relevant) | |
| 2.1 Management system | Degree of centralisation/decentralisation; Level of democratisation of policy structure Fragmentation? : Potential difficulties in identifying locus of decision-making authority. “Real” decision-making power |
| 2.2 School system | Structure of school system (segregated; assimilated; integrated, other...?) School types: Public / private /community / other? Share of overall enrolment in each school type? |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2.3 Institutional setting for curriculum development | <p>What is/are the department(s) that translate policy decisions and develop curricula materials ? (institutional mechanisms, institutional structures) What is the relative degree of authority/autonomy of this/these department(s) with regard to central education authorities?</p> |
| 2.4 Educational/curricular traditions and implications for reform | <p><u>Traditions:</u> What is being built on? What are national pedagogical traditions? What are the curriculum traditions? What has been done in the past? Characteristics of the examination system Pedagogical style</p> <p><u>Implications:</u> How do these traditions impact on possibilities for effective curriculum changes/innovations? To what extent do educational traditions influence present policy decisions? What are the implications for teacher training?</p> |
| 3. Economic context of reform (internal and external) | |
| 3.1 Resource assessment | <p>How does economic context determine possibilities for consultation (languages; translation; evaluative research; surveys; national workshops/debates...)? How do resource assessments with a view towards implementation (textbook development, teacher training...) impact on the scope of policy change?</p> |
| 3.2 Nature of donor involvement | <p>Degree of dependency (if any) on external funding, expertise, and/or initiatives for implementation of curriculum change. What impact (if any) does this have on curriculum policy choices (rationales and direction of change, as well as modalities for consultation)?</p> |

| 4. Assessment of schooling as a factor of conflict | |
|---|---|
| 4.1 Rationales for curriculum change (why change?) | <p><i>Change is introduced on the basis of a recognized weakness in the relevance of existing curricula in reflecting the ways in which society has changed as a result of conflict and/or in promoting the types of social changes perceived as being necessary in order to ensure transition out of armed conflict and political violence and the consolidation of peace.</i></p> <p>What assessment (evaluative research; surveys; national workshops/debates) of the relevance of curricula have informed the need for change? What has been identified as having potentially contributed to the conflict in the first place? How has this been identified and by whom? What is the level of political will to undertake change?</p> |
| 5. Reconceptualizing curriculum: changing curriculum paradigms as a result of conflict | |
| 5.1 Changes in curricular paradigms | <p>Has the conflict provoked a shift in curriculum paradigms? If so, how has the curriculum paradigm shifted from the “pre-conflict” period to the present? How has the curriculum model or approach changed? What philosophical premises are these decisions based on? How is curriculum conceptualised and by whom? What is curriculum policy reform thought/assumed to be capable of in terms of its contribution to peace-building, stability, reconciliation, social cohesion etc ? Does hope (future orientation) play a role?: Is the curriculum reform asking the present to confront the future, the past, both?</p> |
| 5.2 Direction of curriculum change (change what?) | <p>What needs to change as a result of the paradigm shift?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In what ways are aims and fundamental principles of education reformulated? - Does this reformulation move towards reinforcing a common national identity (through assimilation) or towards the recognition of multiplicities in reconciliation/reconstruction? |

| 6. Policy dialogue, consensus building, and resistance: challenges posed by sensitive learning areas | |
|---|--|
| 6.1 Modalities of consultation and participation in policy reform* | <p>Who is consulted in the process of reviewing and changing curriculum policy (stakeholders)? What is the nature of their participation? Whose voices are heard, and how are they expressed? Whose voices are not heard? What is the process of consultation? How does it emerge after prolonged period of conflict? What are the motives and levels/degrees of influence of stakeholders? The quality of their input? The genuineness of the consultation? Who is undertaking to consult?</p> |
| 6.2 Identifying difficult issues with regard to sensitive learning areas | <p>Are there any contentious/sensitive/difficult issues to resolve? (particularly in areas of learning such as languages, social studies, civics, religious studies, history, etc. that touch upon collective memory, identity, sense of citizenship?) Which ones? What are the different viewpoints / conflicts of interest among stakeholders with regard to the learning areas listed below?</p> <p><i>Culture and Languages</i> Status of official national language(s) Language(s) of instruction “National” literature</p> <p><i>Civics / citizenship</i> Thematic, multi-disciplined approach or discrete subject? Degrees of flexibility. Questions of contradictions between content and methodology.</p> <p><i>History</i> Rewriting of official history. Does the curricular reform perpetuate tradition/status quo or introduce a critical historiography? (necessary preconditions for the latter? Recency of conflict, etc.) Is the reform questioning a founding myth of a national identity (as opposed to a more ‘recent’ history)?</p> <p><i>Religion</i> Religious instruction versus culture of religions</p> |

* Please note that this is not a rigid placement for this sub-heading. Some of these questions should be brought in as they occur naturally in other sections of the framework.

| | |
|---|---|
| 6.3 Consensus building: Dealing with difficult issues | <p>How are conflicting views dealt with? How is consensus reached? How does consensus building come about or change throughout the distinct phases of policy dialogue, policy formulation, and policy-making? (Risk of polarisation? Might it be counterproductive to discuss certain issues at certain times?). What are the processes of negotiation and of consensus building adopted in drafting and approving curriculum frameworks and subject curricula What strategies are (or have been) employed to deal with these difficult issues?</p> |
| 6.4 Curriculum balance | <p>How is learning content reorganised and restructured? What decisions are involved? How is a new curriculum balance defined? How is the issue of overcrowded curriculum approached? Infusion and cross-curricular models vs. separate subjects. In an effort to create space for additional content, what is reduced (removed, left out, rejected)? How does this impact explicit policies about teaching methods?</p> |
| 7. Research, Monitoring & Evaluation | |
| 7.1 Pilot programmes | <p>Role of pilot programmes and way in which these may (re-)inform curriculum policy decisions (scale of pilot programs; who is involved?; Is evaluation taking place?)</p> |
| 7.2 Monitoring Policy and Practice: Identifying indicators of change (if applicable) | <p>Has any evaluation been undertaken on recent curriculum change? If so, what type, with what results, and with what implications for (re)informing policy and implementation? Research carried out to identify gaps, obstacles, limitations, etc. Role of evaluative research in identifying degree of receptivity/resistance in the implementation of curriculum changes. What is the nature of the resistance that may be encountered?</p> |
| 7.3 Perspectives of youth | <p>How do youth/students perceive reform? How do they see education in relation to conflict?</p> |