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# Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2NL</td>
<td>Sinhala and Tamil as Second National Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/L</td>
<td>Advanced Level Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEG</td>
<td>Citizenship Education and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Critical Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSE</td>
<td>Disaster Safety Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCY</td>
<td>Education for Disadvantaged Children and Youth in Post-conflict and Poverty Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Education for Social Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit/German Agency for Technical Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL</td>
<td>Government of Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCE</td>
<td>Life Competencies and Civic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLRC</td>
<td>Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTE</td>
<td>Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECORD</td>
<td>North East Community Restoration and Development Extension Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>National Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/L</td>
<td>Ordinary Level Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Psycho-Social Care/Guidance and Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVE</td>
<td>Peace and Value education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPE</td>
<td>The National Policy on Social Cohesion and Peace Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>School Development Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Sri Lankan Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Strategic Relational Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHRC</td>
<td>United Nations Human Rights Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preface: Field diary excerpt

“My research in Jaffna has come to its abrupt, premature and final end. Following discussion with my fieldwork adviser, it has been concluded that to continue would not be worth the risk. Since a year ago, the Sri Lankan military have substantially increased their ‘occupation’ of the Tamil North; they are everywhere, and rule through their visible might of urban military camps and observation posts on city streets, and by fear of the invisible force, plain-clothed military informants and the white vans which have forcibly taken thousands of Sri Lanka’s ‘disappeared’ people. Research is becoming too difficult now. There are constraints and restrictions upon research in this situation, and the family I am staying with have become concerned for my safety. As one respondent cried, “the government are ruthless, you must be very brave to discuss these issues”. Those confidants advising me added, “The military don’t want you to do anything, at all. They need no excuse to deport you; it means you can’t return here”. But I want to return here in the future. Many people have died during this conflict, including close family members of confidants - they know the reality of these dangers.

The secondary schools I have been visiting have also been subject to close military surveillance during my time in Jaffna. Recently, an International Non-Governmental Organisation has been involved with a local school, sponsoring one of their pupils who has been orphaned. It turns out that the student’s parents were civilians killed by government forces in the final stages of the war in 2009. This information is being used as evidence within the March 2013 United Nations Human Rights Council resolution which is highly critical of Sri Lanka’s human rights record. Military and government officials, not too different from one another, have come to the school demanding why this information is being used against them, and have consequently stepped up their monitoring of the school. In light of this, the school principal stated my interpreter and I should not return. There have also been posters around town referring to protests by students fasting in the Indian state of Tamil Nadu in solidarity for Tamil rights in Sri Lanka. My visit to Sri Lanka has coincided with animosity and rioting between Muslims and Sinhalese in the south too. Furthermore, government-controlled media are escalating xenophobic rhetoric and behaviour, with attacks upon minorities and blame on interference from Western foreigners becoming a populist political strategy to appeal to Sinhalese nationalism which is sweeping the south. These series of events have been constraining upon my individual research process.

Perhaps in part due to my lack of research visa and official permission from the Ministry of Education, the secondary schools in one way or another have all expressed that they are uncomfortable with our continued presence and that we have overstayed our welcome. During my final visit to the Islamic school, we politely asked the school
‘Librarian’ to leave the classroom for a short time, explaining that the student questionnaire had to be conducted without the presence of teachers, to ensure confidentiality. Apparently he complained to the principal and it has been decided our presence can no longer be tolerated. The principal has heard I have been talking to other people in the Muslim community, and there is much gossiping about my presence there, with people increasingly wary and suspicious of my being there. Situations can turn for the worse here very quickly in a volatile and unstable environment. The military are looking for any reason to make an example of someone, including foreigners, or foreign researchers, and I would have a serious problem should I be questioned by the military. People are scared, self-censorship is widespread, with everybody feeling they have to ask for permission for everything, even for things they don’t have to ask permission for.

The barber living across the street from my residence has been keeping a close eye on what we are doing, asking questions about our movements, activities and the purpose of my visit to Jaffna. This has been increasingly unsettling and troubling my interpreter with suspicions the neighbour is a government informant, resulting in his reluctance to come to the house. He explained his reasoning, "You will be leaving the country in two weeks, while I live here and have to take my safety into consideration. I have lived here for 35 years - we know who is with the government and who is not". It would be irresponsible to put the safety of my interpreter, the friendship we have formed over these last few months, and my own personal safety at continued risk. I have accomplished an enormous amount in the last two and a half months, which has far exceeded my expectations; although, only due to the goodwill and courage of those oppressed people in Jaffna, prepared to discuss their experiences living in this situation with no escape, and no basic freedoms. I too fear, but for those who I have left behind.”

'Time to wrap up research field diary reflection’ March 15th 2013, Jaffna, Sri Lanka.
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1: Research challenges in a culture of fear, conflict and militarization

This opening field diary excerpt is intended to articulate substantial research challenges and my personal experience whilst undertaking research in the post-war context of continued conflict and militarisation in Jaffna, Northern Sri Lanka (Appendix 1). Moreover, this piece of journalistic prose recognizes the role of the respondents, who live in the city of Jaffna and whose lives are defined by displacement, military repression and ethno-religious segregation and violence. The 26-year civil war is now officially over, yet conflict still remains and shows no signs of abating, thereby perpetuating deep ethnic, religious and linguistic divisions. Since the war began in 1983, people in the north of Sri Lanka have had their voices suppressed and silenced (Brun, 2013). This makes it particularly challenging for researchers in conflict or post-conflict environments to understand peoples’ silences in a culture of fear whereby disappearances continue and free speech and democratic rights are not realised. In order to conduct fieldwork, I had to overcome deep suspicion from within the researched Muslim and Tamil communities; as well as a hostility towards foreign aid workers, journalists and researchers from the government and military. Despite these difficulties outlined, research was conducted by acquiring the ‘right local knowledge, contacts and access through local partners and a flexible approach adapting research methodologies’ (Goodhand, 2000, 12), but most importantly, through building trust between ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’. It is imperative to make these restrictions of the research apparent to the reader to gain a greater understanding of this community-based research in war-affected Jaffna. There will be further reflection on these practical, methodological and ethical challenges throughout this thesis. Considering the above, this complete version of the thesis will only be shared with my academic supervisor and second reader. Due the sensitivity of this research, a synthesised version of this thesis will be subsequently made available online.

1.2: Aims and justification

This thesis provides an ethnographic study of predominantly two ethnic groups: Northern Sri Lankan Tamils and Northern Sri Lankan Muslims, of which both communities have been disproportionately affected by war and displacement. This fieldwork investigates the potential of education for peace and ethno-religious reconciliation in three urban secondary schools in Muslim and Tamil communities of Jaffna through a number of themes: from structural inequalities of society and secondary school education; to official peace education policy and how it manifests at the micro level, considering its relevance and implications to the local community, and to the agency of individuals and communities re-defining ethno-religious reconciliation.
between Jaffna Tamils and Muslims. Moreover, this paper pursues a multi-disciplinary approach by considering the social and political context of education, and a methodology which acknowledges the inter-connected relationship between the school, community and society.

It is important to reflect on the research process, and the progression of research ideas and priorities. Throughout this process, research design was under constant adaptation through the fieldwork, reflection, analysis and writing process (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, 4). During my research process I began to modify research priorities and gravitated towards Jaffna’s Muslim community and school. Upon first setting out to conduct this research, I initially intended to investigate the implications of peace education upon the Tamil people; however upon arrival in Jaffna I was alerted to the predicament of the Muslim community, a minority which has been largely forgotten and excluded, termed by one respondent as the ‘silence of the Muslims’ (P15). Through conflict, information is manipulated, which promotes and suppresses voices. Furthermore, research is an innately political process by which decisions are made as to which voices are heard (Goodhand, 2000, 12). In recognition of this, I made the decision to listen to the suppressed voices of the Muslim community as I believe it is most important to provide a ‘voice’ to those people who are marginalized and discriminated. Consequently, I commenced researching the Muslim school in comparison with two neighbouring Tamil schools, and the potential of peace education to facilitate ethnic reconciliation between these groups.

Through consultation with Muslim community representatives, it was made clear that research is much needed in identifying the needs of this poverty-stricken community, but specifically the requirements of deprived and under-funded schools. In general, post-war research in the north of Sri Lanka has been limited. Although research has been conducted on Muslim Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs) in the Puttalam district (Brun, 2009; McGilvray & Raheem, 2007), academic literature regarding the Muslim community in Jaffna is rare (Thiranagama, 2008; 2011). I have come across no academic literature specifically regarding the role, position and relationship of Muslims in post-war ethnic reconciliation and peace education.

Conducted less than 4 years since the bloody culmination of the civil war, this field research was carried out between the 26th January and 8th April 2013, and coincided with rising animosity and sectarian rioting towards Muslims in the south of the country. Additionally, tensions remained high regarding growing calls for an investigation into war crimes by the United Nations (UN), into claims of war-time and post-war human rights abuses by the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). Academically, this paper is highly influenced by former studies of peace education in Sri Lanka (Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Davies, 2011; Hoeks, 2012) and seeks to build upon their work which specifically focuses on the agency of teachers. More broadly, this research positions itself within the growing field of ‘education and conflict’
of which there has been much literature discussing this contentious relationship (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Smith, 2005; Novelli & Smith, 2011).

Having discussed my research experience in Jaffna and the aim and justification of this research, I will now discuss the relationship between conflict and education, which is gaining increased prominence in international development and education discourse. This is followed by the historical and socio-political context of Sri Lanka, discussing ethnic war, displacement and post-war repression of minorities. Next, the Sri Lankan education system is discussed, particularly within secondary school education, and how it has historically been viewed as a source of conflict. Subsequently, I elaborate upon peace education, and its context within Sri Lankan secondary school education. Finally, the research questions and structure of this thesis are outlined.

1.3: Introduction to education and conflict

Education and conflict is an emerging field of study which has been receiving increased global attention from the media, within academia and from practitioners and policymakers (Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008, 473). Education and conflict as an area of specialization is ‘a field in its infancy’ (Tomlinson & Benefield, 2005, 9); yet within a changing global context it is becoming a worldwide concern for the 21st century (Smith, 2005, 373). Sri Lanka is one of many low income countries stricken by intra-state warfare, which has increased throughout the second half of the 20th century (Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008). The formal education system has a significant role to play in peace-building and ensuring equal educational opportunities for those children who are disproportionately affected by armed conflicts. Over 40% of out-of-school children live in conflict-affected and post-conflict countries (EFA Global Monitoring Report, 2011). The Education For All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report (2011) refers to this as a ‘hidden crisis’, which is having severe impacts on the youth of war-torn countries and is one of the greatest development challenges facing the international community. Undoubtedly, education is imperative for development, highlighted by its central role in the Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s) and subsequent EFA targets. As the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) states: ‘Education is one of the building blocks of human development. It is not just a basic right, but a foundation for progress in other areas, including health, nutrition and the development of institutions and democracy’ (UNDP, 2005, 159). The contention that education can contribute to conflict will be elaborated upon in Chapter 2 when discussing Bush and Saltarelli’s (2000) theory of the ‘two faces of education’.
1.4: The (post)-conflict context of Sri Lanka

Demographically, Sri Lanka, known as the ‘Teardrop Isl¢, is ethnically diverse containing four major groups: firstly, the Sinhalese comprise 74.9% of the population, residing mostly in the south; secondly, Sri Lankan Tamil people account for 11.2% inhabiting the north of the island; thirdly, Indian Tamils of Sri Lanka, known as Hill Country Tamils, Up-Country Tamils account for 4.2%; and lastly, Sri Lankan Moors, commonly referred to as Muslims, account for 9.2% (Department of Census and Statistics Sri Lanka, 2012). The country is religiously heterogeneous, with the Sinhalese predominantly Buddhist, and Tamil predominantly Hindu, although Christianity is represented within both Sinhalese and Tamil ethnic groups. Sri Lanka endured ethnic conflict and civil war between the years of 1983 and 2009, which has had a major impact upon the social and economic development of the country. Despite this, it has a relatively high Human Development Index ranking of 0.715 against the global average of 0.694 (UNDP, 2013). Although economic growth have been increasing to 4.5% per annum, Sri Lanka remains a relatively poor and unequal country, where income inequality remains high with a Gini coefficient of 0.4 (World Bank, 2012). Furthermore, poverty distribution is highly uneven, whereby 23% of the population are living below the poverty line (Davies, 2011). It is a country characterized by endemic unequal political, economic and educational opportunities between its linguistic, religious and ethnic groups, which has only been exacerbated by the ravages of decades of war (Lopes Cardozo, 2008, 19).

The civil war has often been portrayed as a power struggle of competing ethno-nationalisms between the central Sinhalese government and the LTTE – better known as the Tamil Tigers - a separatist rebel insurgency with the objective of securing independence for a Tamil homeland in the Northern and Eastern parts of the country (Lopes Cardozo & Hoeks, 2012). The civil war came to a brutal conclusion in May 2009 when government forces crushed the LTTE’s battle for independence, amid large civilian casualties, and claims of indiscriminate shelling and executions. Approximately 100,000 people were killed during the conflict, including up to 40,000 people in the final five months alone, in which government forces are accused of perpetrating war crimes for which the GoSL has faced international condemnation (BBC, 2012). An investigation by the UN claimed the GoSL’s rejection of these claims through its Lessons Learned and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) report, continues to cast significant uncertainty and distrust between state and citizen throughout post-war Sri Lanka.

According to Perera (1997, 44), the structural causes of ethnic conflict have been developing since the 1920s with the formation of political-ethnic groups run by high caste elites, and the existence of social stratification which would become historically ingrained in the culture of Sri Lankan society. Following independence from British rule in 1948, Orjuela (2003, 198) states that a combination of exclusionary government policies set in motion the attempted ethnicisation of Sri Lanka into a Sinhalese nation-state. The 1956 ‘Sinhala Only Act,’ whereby English was replaced as the official language, began to
initiate grievances of injustice among the Tamil-speaking population. Ethnic division between Sinhalese and Tamil communities was further reinforced through regional quotas imposed upon university Tamil admission, acting as a catalyst for ethnic rioting and civil war (McLean Hilker & Fraser, 2009).

The war in Sri Lanka resulted in the displacement of over one million people, including 75,000-80,000 Muslims evicted from the island’s north by the LTTE in 1990; of which approximately 65,000 Northern Muslim IDPs continue to live in refugee camps in the district of Puttalam, north of Colombo (Thiranagama, 2008). Nearly half of all Sri Lankan Tamils were displaced during the course of the civil war, and in 2009 there were an estimated 200,000 people in refugee camps, of which 65,000 were children (GIZ, 2009). The International Displacement Monitoring Centre estimated that the lives of over 300,000 children had been affected in Sri Lanka (IDMC, 2008:8 in Davies, 2011). The displacement of the Jaffna Muslims is a focus of Chapter 3.

1.5: A brief history of (secondary school) education in Sri Lanka

Education has been a priority of the GoSL since independence in 1948 (Perera, 2004, 1), yet it has been highly politicized and a source of much conflict between Sinhalese and Tamil ethnic groups. Since the 1990s, the administration of secondary school education has become increasingly decentralized to nine provincial education offices and the 95 education zones (Lopes Cardozo & Hoeks, 2013). Education in Sri Lanka has historically been tuition-free up to university, although this is being increasingly eroded as part of neoliberal marketisation of education driven by domestic pressures to increase competitiveness within the economy and from global financial forces demanding increased privatization of public services (Kadirgamar, 2013). In spite of a lack of funding to state education, which accounts for only 2% of Sri Lanka’s GDP (World Bank, 2013); the country has relatively high education rates for a South Asian developing country, for example primary school enrolment rate has increased to 99% (UNICEF, 2012). This high enrolment rate is a highly positive development; nevertheless masks problems regarding educational quality and attainment which has been less successful in Northern and Eastern areas, due to associated problems of war (Lopes Cardozo, 2008, 20).

There have been many challenges confronting the Sri Lankan education system which has been widely regarded as failing in terms of providing equal opportunities. The segregated secondary school education system reflects an ethnically divided society which was established during British colonialism, and has since deepened ethnic division, especially following independence from colonial rule in 1948 (Davies, 2011). The secondary school system is divided into ‘language’ streams, that is, the ‘mother tongue’ of Sinhala or Tamil, but there are also religiously segregated schools, such as Muslim-only schools, with mainly Tamil medium (Perera, 2004 in Davies, 2011).
Colenso (2005) identified an unequal distribution on educational resources, rigidity of the curriculum, and segregation of the schools’ structure as problematic to delivering good quality education, with Northern areas principally the scene of educational deprivation. Lopes Cardozo (2008, 4) suggests that this ethnic segregation and divide through schooling and the promotion of linguistic nationalism has exacerbated misrecognition and unequal opportunities for Sri Lanka’s multi-ethnic, multi-lingual and multi-religious population; thus the need for an inclusive form of education addressing these immediate concerns in a post-war context.

Despite these inequalities, Jaffna has historically been viewed as a national centre of education since the 19th century and the location of many renowned education institutions which has long been a source of pride for the Tamil people (P7). During the war, education in Jaffna entered irreversible decline as numerous academics were persecuted by the LTTE, assassinating those they perceived as a threat to authority. The decimation of Tamil education in Jaffna can be epitomised through the burning of the Jaffna Public library in 1981 and the major repository of Tamil literature containing over 100,000 Tamil manuscripts and documents (see title page) (Knuth, 2006). This act of ethnic vandalism was perpetrated by uniformed police and Sinhalese gang members during a violent pogrom, and is viewed by many Tamils as a symbol of ‘physical and imaginative violence’ against Tamil identity and culture (Knuth, 2006, 84). In light of the above, this justifies the need for education to be included within peace-building.

1.6: What is peace education in Sri Lanka?

Peace education has undertaken a number of different forms and constant evolution since its conception; peace education itself however is not a new concept and has been a feature of the education landscape in post-conflict countries for the previous four decades (Page, 2004, 4). Peace education programmes differ considerably in terms of ideology, objectives, focus, curricula, contents and practices and are extremely localised in their form and structure (Bar-Tal, 2002: 28). Lopes Cardozo (2008, 4) explains there are a proliferation of programmes which would come under the umbrella term of ‘peace education’, such as peace-building education, education for conflict resolution, global education, education for liberation, life skills education and finally citizenship education. Meanwhile Davies (2013) states that post-war education systems commonly incorporate democratic citizenship and importantly, a social justice approach.

Sri Lanka itself has had a peace education programme in operation since 1991 to primarily address ethnic conflict and facilitate reconciliation between Tamil and Sinhalese groups. Bilingual teaching and learning was introduced in the 1997 general education reforms, which specified pupils should learn both Sinhala and Tamil languages. Within this reform a new emphasis was placed upon teacher training to educate in terms of human and gender rights and values and democracy (Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Davies
To facilitate this process, a Ministry for National Languages and Social Integration has been created, thought to be the first of its kind in the world (Davies, 2011). Additionally, a Social Cohesion and Peace Education Unit, was established within the MoE, although until 2008, the formulation of a comprehensive framework for the implementation of peace education had not taken place (Lopes Cardozo, 2008).

A major breakthrough came in 2008 with the formulation of the Social Cohesion and Peace Education (SCPE) MoE peace education umbrella programme (MoE, 2008), which is largely seen as a positive advancement for peace education in Sri Lanka (Davies, 2011; Hoeks, 2012). The policy was intended to instill the virtues of peace, equality and respect among its participants, the students, and create the desired model Sri Lankan citizen (as shown in Appendix 2). This specific strategy concentrating upon peace education prioritised seven key strategic areas: curriculum, teacher education, second national language, integrated schools, co-curricular activities, whole school environment; and research (Hoeks, 2012). The integration of peace education into every subject within the school curriculum is central, ensuring that peace education is all-encompassing and thorough, rather than to be taught through only one subject; although the policy document does make explicit reference to civic education which contains modules on multiculturalism, democracy and human values. Furthermore there is reference to increasing inter-cultural understanding and tolerance through inter-ethnic and inter-religious integrated schooling (Hoeks, 2011).

There are four actors central to the implementation of SCPE in Sri Lanka, as identified by Lopes Cardozo (2008, 7): Firstly, peace educators, including school principals and teachers; secondly, non-state actors, including civil society, religious groups, and community-based organizations (CBOs); thirdly, policy-makers which includes the MoE and its national and local officers; and finally, international donors, in the form of International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs), and bilateral aid agencies such as GIZ, the most prominent international presence involved in peace education in Sri Lanka, implementing such programmes as Education for Social Cohesion (ESC) – the structure of which will be discussed in Chapter 3. Having concluded with a discussion on peace education in Sri Lanka it is now appropriate to introduce the research question and sub-questions for this thesis.
1.7: Research question and sub-questions

This thesis aims to answer the following research question:

*How can we understand the extent to which secondary school education can contribute to ethno-religious reconciliation between the Muslim and neighbouring Tamil communities in post-war Jaffna, Sri Lanka?*

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Chapter 1 provides the reader with a contextual background to (post)-conflict Sri Lanka, its education and peace education policy, and introduces the key research questions. Following on from this, Chapter 2 describes the theoretical and methodological foundations of this thesis, which inform the central research question and research sub-questions. The data chapters aim to answer to following research sub-questions:

Chapter 3: *By applying Fraser’s ‘social justice’ framework of recognition, representation and redistribution, how can we analyse the extent to which structural inequalities of society are replicated through education? And is this perceived by key actors (teachers and students) to reinforce ethno-religious conflict?*

Chapter 4: *How is official peace education experienced and understood by key actors (teachers and students)? Does peace education address the needs of the community at different scales (supra-community; inter-community; and intra-community)?*

Chapter 5: *What agency is available to those inside education (teachers, students), and outside (community) to employ ‘unofficial’ peace education and ethno-religious reconciliation between Muslim and Tamil groups? And what are the perceived challenges faced in resistance to this agency-for-reconciliation and empowerment of communities?*

Finally, Chapter 6 summarises the research findings and provides conclusions and recommendations for policy and further research.
Chapter 2: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations

Part 1: Theoretical Framework

This chapter critically examines a number of theories which are the foundation for this thesis, with a focus upon post-war education for peace and ethnic reconciliation between polarized and segregated communities. The first section introduces the concept of ethnicity and its relationship with identity formation and despite my focus upon ethnicity, the role of religion, culture and language are equally as important. The second section examines the over-arching theory of the ‘two faces of education’ and the potential of education as an instrument for war and peace. Bush and Saltarelli’s (2000) theory is adapted to include certain issues which I believe to be important for this research; predominantly the development of a critical consciousness, religious tolerance and understanding and the concept of integrated schooling. Additionally, this section aims to introduce the conceptualization of multi-scalar peace education. The third section, with reference to Fraser (1995; 2005), investigates the agency of individuals and community-based groups in promoting social justice and change within education; with the intention of increasing empowerment and participation of minority groups and culture. This framework is conceptualized within the context of top-down government policy perceived to exacerbate exclusion and inequality by local Tamil and Muslim actors. The final section envisages the role of education within peace-building and ethnic reconciliation as imperative, and discusses the need for a broadening of educational discourse into social, cultural, historical and most importantly political spheres through Dale’s (1999; 2000; 2005) multi-dimensional theory of the ‘politics of education’.

2.1: Ethnicity (Religion, Culture, and Language) and Identity Formation

In developing countries, ethnicity has long been adopted as a prime unifying element to mobilise politically (Horowitz, 1985). The concept of ethnicity and the identity which is attached to this notion is central to the argumentation of this thesis, and is an appropriate point of departure to begin the theoretical foundations. Ethnicity, when discussed broadly can be interpreted to include religion, culture and language and is a crucial aspect of identity, concepts which define Sri Lankan society and its myriad of identities including Sinhalese, Tamil, and Muslim. According to Eriksen (2002, 5), ethnicity refers to ‘aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others as culturally distinctive’, inciting visualisations of difference and exclusion between ‘us’ and ‘them’. The concept of ethnicity received increasing attention from the 1970s onwards, notably from Glazer and Moynihan (1975) arguing that ‘ethnicity had become the fundamental basis of social stratification in contemporary society’ (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000, 1).
In *Identity and Violence*, Sen (2006) discusses identity in connection with civilisation, religion and culture in the context of history, globalisation and individual freedom. The core argument proposes that human-beings possess a hybrid of identities, yet through freedom of choice, or lack of, a singular identity is commonly attributed to individuals, whole groups or communities (consisting mostly of ethnicity or religion). Sen (2006, 44) states that violence emerges from issues which are deeply embedded in identity and has spawned and reinforced many ethnic violent conflicts around the world such as in Sri Lanka, through crude classifications which provide the conditions for uncomplicated bigotry. Muslim identity is such that is frequently misconstrued and perceived in terms of narrow Islamic views and not in terms of tolerance and diversity (Sen, 2006, 67).

Furthermore, the central role of religion in the identity formation of Sri Lankan Muslims is the subject of much misunderstanding with ethnic Tamils, as acknowledged within academic literature (Mohan, 1987; Mahroof, 1995; McGilvray & Raheem, 2007). Although Northern Muslims converted to the Tamil language as mother tongue to create a mono-linguistic Northern Province, they are keen to retain a distinct ethno-religious identity and show a separateness from Tamils (Mohan, 1987). The decision of Muslims to identify themselves religiously, rather than to align themselves ethnically, continues to be a source of conflict with Tamil and Sinhalese ethnic groups. As this paper refers to the concept of ‘ethno-religious’ identity, it is also essential to recognise a plethora of complex ethno-religious identities and the pervasion of the four major religious power structures of Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity and Islam within a multi-religious Sri Lanka.

Further to the discussion of ethnic and religious identity within education, the importance of culture and language and the power it can exert over smaller and marginalised groups should be not be ignored (Davies, 2004). Language has historically been a form of domination and is itself a form of power which can be demonstrated by the ruling classes. Watson (2007, 256) discusses the highly-contested relationship between language, education and ethnicity, stating that ‘language policy can be used to bring about a sense of national identity and ethnic harmony, or it can easily be used to maintain one particular ethnic group in power, thereby exacerbating ethnic conflict’.

Ethnic, religious and cultural identity is a concept integral to the current debates on education, in exercising tolerance and understanding, or indoctrination of ethnic hegemony. Through multicultural education as advocated by Banks (1993) and Sleeter (1996), the accommodation of such a diversity of race, ethnicity and social-class is a central objective in achieving educational equality in a multi-cultural society, yet as recognised by this thesis, the implementation of such faces a series of substantial challenges.

Education itself has a central role in identity formation. Positive and negative ethnic attitudes are formed at an early age, influenced by schooling and external socio-cultural factors outside the walls of the classroom (Padilla, Ruiz & Brand, 1974 in Bush & Saltarelli, 2000, 3), yet it is important to recognize this is a process of choice. The
socialization of a child through education during their formative years is undoubtedly crucial in developing ethnic and religious tolerance and understanding, individual capacities for peace, and prejudicial attitudes, however to what extent is still not agreed (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000, 3).

2.2: Education: A weapon of war or an instrument for peace?

There is increasing recognition within academic literature that the relationship between education and violent conflict is highly complex and that education systems can be both ‘victim’ and ‘perpetrator’ of war and conflict (Novelli & Lopes-Cardozo, 2008, 478). This section explores the claim that education can create conflict between people and communities of difference, and contrastingly, how education can alter the social rules of ethnic interaction and can contribute to greater understanding and tolerance. Education has a powerful influence over identities, both through its content and structure, and can be designed to integrate or segregate peoples and societies. The assertion that education can be used to control is a contentious one; as is the accusation education can be used to oppress and reinforce ethnic marginalization. With this in mind, it is crucial to investigate the contribution of schools and education to society in an environment of conflict.

Through the influential UNICEF report The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict, Bush and Saltarelli (2000) challenge a widely-held assumption that education in post-conflict environments is inevitably utilised as a force for the good of society in terms of peace-building. Through their notion of ‘two faces of education’, these scholars discuss the potential of education to aggravate and exacerbate pre-existing social and ethnic tensions between groups. This theory is fundamental to this thesis, a theory which contains a ‘positive face,’ and a ‘negative face’. The contribution of schools towards violence and conflict within society is recognised by a number of academics and studies in the field of education and conflict (Smith & Vaux, 2003; Tawil & Harley, 2004; Davies, 2005; Smith, 2005; Salmi, 2006; Lopes Cardozo, 2008), and it is on this ‘negative face’ which I will firstly focus.

The ‘negative face’ of education theorizes the potential of education to reinforce ethnic conflict represented through seven sources of conflict, as summarized in table 1. Bush & Saltarelli (2000) suggest how structurally, education can be used as a weapon against minorities to suppress language, traditions and religious practices, and as a tool of segregation used to maintain inequality between groups within society. Segregated religious schooling is claimed to instill prejudice, intolerance and discrimination, and as Sen (2006, 117) asserts, religious faith schools ‘can have the effect of reducing the role of reasoning which the children may have the opportunity to cultivate and use’. Education can inculcate the young with attitudes of ethnic superiority, through descriptions of ethnic hegemony and selective history. In contested societies, the content of the teaching curriculum, learning resources and textbooks can become sources of conflict, regarding
who should be involved in deciding what is included and excluded from teaching materials, and whether separate linguistic communities should share the same teaching materials. For example, Davies (2005, 22) emphasizes that history textbooks in Sri Lanka during the 1970s and 1980s positioned the Tamils as the historical enemy of the Sinhalese. When in denial of the historical facts, this form of history education is a dangerous precedent in generating and exacerbating ethnic hatred and unhealthy competition, rather than alleviating ethnic tensions and conflict.

*Table 1: The Two Faces of Education (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education as a weapon of war – The ‘negative face’ of education exacerbating ethnic conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The uneven distribution of education, the exclusion of less privileged social groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education as a weapon in cultural repression, and the ‘ethnocide’ of the cultural identity of minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of education as a weapon of war through the destruction of schools and education infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulating history teaching for political purposes, and to reinforce hegemonic power relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manipulation of textbooks to reinforce ethnic supremacy of ruling classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education as a means of devaluing self-worth and hating others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated education to ensure inequality, lowered esteem and stereotyping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education as a instrument of peace – The ‘positive face’ of education alleviating ethnic conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political will to prevent ethnic conflict through provision of equal opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing and sustaining an ethnically tolerant climate through de-segregation of schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The de-segregation of the mind, through greater integration and participation between communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic tolerance and multi-lingual teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating inclusive and democratic citizenship through the recognition of diversity of ethnicity, religion and creed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The de-politicisation and disarming of history to allow for the reflective discovery of own cultural history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Peace programmes promoting democratic principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational practice as an explicit response to state oppression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contrastingly, there are numerous positive developments within education which can contribute to a 'positive face' summarized in Table 1. Education promoting critical thinking, free speech, mutual respect and equal rights can make a valuable difference to positive conflict (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000, 12). In order to achieve this, Davies (2005, 32) states that education must deal with two factors: firstly, challenge exclusionary nationalist subjectivities through an open dialogue and recognition on the politics of identity and difference; and secondly, hold the state to account, through the respect for the rights, responsibilities and duties of civic engagement. In this sense, secondary schools have a fundamental role to play in advocating the development of a 'critical consciousness' - an in-depth understanding of the world with exposure to political ideas and an understanding of the oppressive conditions in which people live so they can ultimately be challenged (Freire, 1996). The freedom for schoolchildren to explore their own possibilities and opportunities to choose and think for themselves is pertinent to Bush and Saltarelli's (2000, 16-17) 'desegregation of the mind', overcoming historical conceptions of ethnic separation and division which had become normalized in the minds of students. Furthermore, through Giroux's (1992) 'border pedagogy' children are encouraged to re-territorialise their own ethnic borders to include those they once perceived as different. Through the implementation of ethnically-integrated schools and inter-ethnic participation days, it has been claimed the GoSL has made concerted attempts to realise de-segregation, nevertheless this has not been widespread (Davies, 2011).

Following conversation on the political context and policy, this section of the theoretical framework will be concluded by discussing further on the overall capacity of the school to facilitate an 'education for peace', not only through curriculum and pedagogy. An important component of the 'positive face' is 'educational practice as an explicit response to state oppression' which regards the agency of individuals, schools and communities to overcome state oppression. It must be underlined that schools 'in different settings have been forces for progressive change as well as for the maintenance of an unjust status quo' (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000, 21). Bush and Saltarelli (2000, 21) cite examples of South African faith and church schools admitting black pupils in direct opposition to the South African government's policy of apartheid, and in Sri Lanka where the formal mechanisms of the state became Sinhalese ethnicised, thereby marginalised the northern Tamils and this neglect allowed for the creation of space for religious and community groups to enter the educational sphere. Nevertheless, for this form of resistance to proceed, there must be the space which has been vacated by the state for local agents to act independently, which is limited in centralized education systems such as in Sri Lanka. Governmental neglect can create opportunities within which alternatives to violence can be developed, promoting ideals of education which are inclusive, tolerant, democratic and just.
2.3: Agency of community and individuals (for social justice education)

The underlying problems and drivers of conflict in the Sri Lankan civil war remain in place, in a society in which the exclusion and marginalization of minorities continues (Lopes Cardozo, 2008). As theorized by Galtung (1969), a transition from negative peace towards positive peace needs not only the absence of direct violence, but a peace which requires the underlying structural inequalities within society to be addressed, introducing the principles of social justice to prevent a return to conflict. Social justice is a key concept, yet the conceptualization of social justice within the framework of educational debates is perceived to be under-explored (Gerwitz, 1998; North, 2006). The definition of social justice within education is also said to be problematic, as the concept is one which is shifting and fluid, although fundamentally pursues the removal or elimination of social injustices (Clark, 2006).

Fraser (1995; 2005) has contributed greatly to the contested concept of social justice; theory which is central to the definition of social justice within this research and the post-war context. Through a framework of recognition in the socio-cultural sphere, representation in the political sphere and redistribution in the economic sphere as depicted in table 2, Fraser (1995; 2005) explores the obstacles and barriers to attaining social justice and how to overcome these, to establish an inclusive society, eradicated of exclusionary practices on the basis of ethnicity, gender, race or sexuality. Her line of argumentation broadly asserts that identity-based groupings are the pre-eminent form of injustice, subordination and inequality within society and that 'cultural domination supplants exploitation as the fundamental injustice' (Fraser, 1995, 68). Fraser's approach is a useful analytical tool to investigate the inequalities within and between Tamil and Muslim schools in this study and will provide a framework to Chapter 3 and further reference throughout the data chapters.

**Table 2: Framework of redistribution, recognition and representation in the economic, socio-cultural and political spheres (Fraser 1995; 2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The first dimension of recognition relates to ideas of cultural diversity, the respect for human rights and social equality, and the prevention of the assimilation of a minority to a dominant social, ethnic, social or political group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The second dimension of representation within the political sphere, intended to advocate the important of addressing unequal power relations within multi-level governance, and ensuring that social, ethnic, political groups are equally represented at these levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The third dimension of redistribution refers to a fair and equal distribution of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individuals such as teachers, community activists and students can play a significant role in resisting top-down ‘peace’ policy for the pursuit of alternative strategies, discreetly and implicitly, whereby they seek to integrate a social justice perspective in education based on the values of equality, fairness and respect for diversity. Davies (2006 in Lopes Cardozo, 2011) discusses that teachers can actively pursue pedagogies of tolerance overcoming discrimination and narrow polarized identities. Moreover, teachers have the opportunity to teach students to adopt a ‘hybrid identity’ to understand one’s own and others differences of culture, language, ethnicity and religion.

The potential for education to re-address social injustice through local agency is substantial and is expressed through academic literature (North, 2006; Tilky & Barrett, 2010); however it is now important to consider collective agency and participation of the community at the micro-level. Davies (2013, 212) refers to a process of ‘interruptive democracy’ by which people can empower themselves to ‘intervene in practices which continue injustice’ at the micro-level. This includes not only increased participation in education, but also the ‘disposition to challenge, to find spaces for dissent, resilience and action’ (Davies, 2009, 24 in Lopes Cardozo, 2011). To further expand upon the operation of this bottom-up form of community action for social justice, an appropriate example is through a study of educational and indigenous justice in Africa, whereby Aikman (2011) examines the methods through which some of the Continent’s most marginalised, disadvantaged and discriminated groups are re-defining education by pursuing bottom-up strategies intended to promote the recognition of rights and social justice. Aikman’s study is relevant for this thesis as it demonstrates an example of community agency to re-define and re-claim education for local people and their culture. The debate regarding the internal battle within education between government and individuals, groups and communities over the inclusion of social justice within education, leads to the discussion of the wider role of education reconciliation between ethnic groups and the influence of the political debate on education policy formulation and implementation.

2.4: Education’s (new) role within the political realm

There is much agreement between academics that war and conflict ‘are generally caused by exclusion, related to issues such as political, cultural and economic inequalities, lack of trust in government, mistrust and suspicion between different ethnic and religious groups, and lack of avenues for peaceful interaction’ (Novelli & Lopes-Cardozo, 2008, 479); yet these external influences upon education have generally not been examined within educational discourse. The role of education within the wider debates of ethnic reconciliation and peace-building is an important discussion point to introduce this final theoretical section. Post-war rebuilding is not only about the reconstruction of decimated schools and teaching facilities, but also the repairing of human relations and the modernisation of inclusive education systems for those
previously discriminated through ethnicity and religion. The concept of ethnic reconciliation through education is not new, having been a feature for post-war rebuilding in Europe post-1945; however as a specific component of post-war peacebuilding it has become more prominent in recent years (Smith, 2005, 385). Education is becoming increasingly pivotal within debates regarding post-war and ethnic reconciliation, and is interconnected to debates within the economic, social, cultural and in particular, political spheres (Buckland, 2004).

**The ‘Politics of Education’ and the context of education and conflict**

In undertaking this research, I developed a meta-theoretical epistemological approach incorporating Dale’s theory of the ‘Politics of Education’, a broad critique of mainstream educational research (Dale, 2005, 139-141). This approach envisages education and society as intrinsically linked, stating how education systems are embedded and inherent within local, regional, national and global processes of politics, history, culture and economy. Therefore, education cannot be separated from these phenomena. Dale (1999; 2000; 2005) advocates there must be an acknowledgement of historical processes and tensions, colonialism, ethnic conflict, socio-economic conditions and local power relations, when researching in an educational context. Through a multi-scalar, historical and interdisciplinary approach, Dale’s theory seeks to uncover the submerged realities and underlying discourse of the ‘Politics of Education’. By drawing upon this broader critique of education research developed by Dale, I was able to address questions which move beyond the education sector, broadened the framing of research problems towards societal inequalities and conflict.

This thesis is especially inspired by ‘three levels of education questions’ proposed by Dale (2006, 190). Firstly, ‘who is taught by whom, where and when, under what circumstances and with what results?’ Secondly, ‘how, by whom and at what scale are these issues problematised, determined, coordinated, governed, administered and managed?’ Thirdly, ‘in whose interest are these practices and policies carried out; what is the scope of education and what are its relations to actors/scales?’ (Lopes-Cardozo, 2011, 18). Using Dale’s framework, I specifically examined the secondary school educational systems in Jaffna within a wider multi-level context of identity, ethnicity and conflict. This approach was particularly insightful in investigating the evolving relationship between community, society and education.

An essential component of the theory which cannot be overstated is the importance of removing oneself from ethnocentrism, in this case, one who holds western literature as its knowledge base, and to avoid assumptions that the western model of development is the definitive and only model of development (Lopes-Cardozo, 2011, 14). Instead, this theory requires the utilisation of alternative sources of power, such as place-bound constructs and local forms of knowledge, meanings and culture. Therefore, this paper
engages with Sri Lankan literature regarding ethnic conflict, for example through Kadirgamar (2013; 2014) and Thiranagama (2007; 2008; 2011) however literature on peace education predominantly emanates from academic institutions of the Global North.

Within this research paradigm of the ‘Politics of Education’, a methodological approach developed by Novelli and Smith (2011) is one research framework I find particularly useful to draw upon, as it is a framework which similarly focuses specifically on an understanding of the relationship between the education system and the post-war environment, and the core issues of conflict. This form of analysis accurately captures the potential of education upon peace-building processes, and pays significant attention to religious, social, ethnic, class and geographical dynamics and their relationship in enabling or undermining peace-building activities (Novelli & Smith, 2011, 8). The approach draws upon a multi-level political economy and conflict analytical framework, which recognises that there is a need to analyse structures, institutions and agents in direct relation to the education system, identifying unequal power relations and the evolution of conflict over time. Through this form of analysis, there is an understanding that educational projects may fail not due to technical deficiencies, but also because of a range of wider political, economic and social factors.

'Multi-scalar analysis of peace and conflict'

As discussed by Dale (1999; 2000; 2005) and Novelli and Smith (2011) we should acknowledge the globalised and multi-scalar world in which we live, and incorporate these power relations, structures and mechanisms into a multi-scalar analysis. Therefore, such an analysis of conflict and peace through these different levels is a concept central to this thesis. Additionally, other scholars have acknowledged the need to examine peace education at a multitude of levels (Bush & Salterelli, 2000; Smith, 2005; Salmi, 2006); however notably by Lopes Cardozo (2008) who emphasises a model from the intra-personal to the international, demonstrating the way in which peace education can be ‘included in a multilevel process of peace-building’. Moreover, Smith (2005, 386) alludes to this fundamental point that reconciliation may be necessary at many levels: between individuals, between groups in conflict and between peoples or nations at war. By expanding upon academic literature, this leads to the conceptualisation of a ‘multi-scalar’ peace for the purposes of this thesis and for the analysis of peace education from the national to the local in Sri Lanka. This multi-scalar classification essentially refers to how peace education relates to a series of different levels: Supra-community, Inter-community and Intra-community which are illustrated in the figure 1 below and which forms the basis for Chapter 4.
Through this approach of employing multi-level analysis, I specifically explored the field of education for ethnic reconciliation in the post-conflict area of Jaffna, while recognizing education ‘as a sector embedded within a complex and highly unequal system of local, national, regional and global actors, institutions and practices’ (Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008, 24). In light of this theoretical framework consisting of the relationship between education and conflict through ethnic identity, the ‘two faces of education’, community-based and individual agency for social justice, and the ‘politicisation of education’, the process between theory and research practice is discussed below regarding the methodological foundations of this thesis.

**Part 2: Methodological Foundations**

This section regarding the methodological foundations of this thesis will firstly discuss my ontological and epistemological stance, exploring Critical Realism and the Strategic Relational Approach which provides a foundation for this paper. Secondly, I will discuss the research location in Jaffna. Thirdly, the research methods, including qualitative and quantitative techniques and the subsequent analysis of data collection are considered.
Fourthly, the complexities and reflection upon language and the use of an interpreter are examined and finally, the consideration of ethical practices in research is examined.

2.5: Critical Realism and the Strategic Relational Approach

The meta-theoretical approach which I most closely adopted for this research is a position informed by firstly, Critical Realism (CR) (Fairclough, 2005), and secondly, the Strategic Relational Approach (SRA) (Jessop, 2005; Hay, 2002) which has previously been introduced. Firstly, the theory of CR promotes the concept that multiple interpretations of reality are possible, which includes a version of reality that exists independently of our observation of it (Fairclough, 2005, 922). Ontologically, CR distinguishes between three domains of reality of the actual, real and empirical: firstly, the ‘actual’ is defined by visible and invisible events and processes; secondly, the ‘real’ consisting of structures and causal forces of events we experience; and lastly, the ‘empirical’ of the observations and measurements of visible experiences of the actual and real (Lopes Cardozo, 2011, 24). Taking this distinction into consideration, it is crucial to understand actors’ interpretations of their subjective realities and how they perceive their own role and position within these mechanisms, structures and power relations. In terms of practicalities, the meta-theoretical approach of CR allowed for the development of a greater understanding of my respondents’ realities, and the assessment of the transformations education has brought to communities within Jaffna following the end of the civil war. This involved the identification of agency through, and of, students, teachers and community members, all of which possess their individual opinion and perceptions on this subject.

I further developed my meta-theoretical epistemological approach by employing the framework of SRA (Jessop, 2005; Hay, 2002), which works in conjunction with CR. The SRA develops an epistemology to explore the complexities of structure and agency and seeks to offer “solutions” to the conventional analysis of the structure-agency debate, and move beyond earlier theories of structure and agency (Jessop, 2005). Jessop’s SRA is a possible bridge which can transcend the artificial dualism of agency and structure, contending the co-production, co-evolution, and mutual construction and constitution of structure and agency (Jessop, 2005, 48). A major advantage of SRA is a concern with, and emphasis upon spatio-temporality of structures, agents, and agency (Jessop, 2005, 51), and its assertion that structures emerge in specific locations at specific times dependent upon social relations and context. SRA is a valuable tool for the political analysis of this study, and can reveal the covert, hidden and submerged structures, discourses, mechanisms, ideas and agency which support or resist ethno-religious reconciliation through education in Jaffna. The uncovering of these forces of power, control and wealth proved to be integral to the strength and depth of the analysis of this study, examining inter and intra-community power structures and relationships between the state and subject. SRA views agents as ‘strategic political actors’ which
possess agency and space for manouevre, however crucially have the capacity to “operate strategically within the confines of structure but can also change these same structures” (Jessop, 2005).

The strategies that political actors may choose to employ, based on their ideas, perceptions and beliefs, can lead to changes in structure and context-shaping, thus having tangible effects. Furthermore, strategic agents form their own strategically selective strategies, and can implement their own strategies whilst under duress and in situations of crisis, to which Fairclough refers (2005, 931 in Lopes Cardozo, 2011, 43). This is relative as strategic agents within this study perceive themselves to be under coercion due to militarization and authoritarian in Jaffna, which is an essential contention of Chapter 5. SRA supports this study in examining the structural challenges which individuals such as principals, teachers, students or religious or community-based organisations encounter in their role as agents of change within their local contexts and challenging environments, for example in resisting national top-down education policy and advocating local and grassroots forms of discrete political agency. Active subjects have the 'choice to develop their own strategies' (Lopes Cardozo, 2011, 39) and zones of resistance and struggle within the context and structure of organised religion, ethnic identity, state and military control and repression. By utilising these epistemologies of Jessop (2005) and Hay (2002), it is possible to apply a political analysis through SRA and analyse the politics of education and conflict.

2.6: Research location

Research was conducted in three urban secondary schools less than a square mile apart from one another in Jaffna. The schools in this study were given alias letters of A, B, and C in order to protect identification, and the reasons for this are expanded below. The Muslim community was the first location in which research was conducted, and was the site of secondary School A. Two nearby ethnically Tamil communities were the locations for the second (School B) and third (School C) schools. The second school researched, School B, was a Roman Catholic secondary school situated in a coastal fishing Tamil-Catholic community, which was located in the immediate vicinity of the Muslim area. School C was the third secondary school researched, and was situated in a Tamil community which is predominantly religiously Hindu located adjacent to the Muslim quarter. Additionally, interviews were conducted in participants houses, schools and offices.
2.7: Research Methods

Due to the ethnographic nature of my research, a mixed-methods approach of data collection was the most suitable, as it allowed me to triangulate my results, ensuring increased reliability and a greater understanding of the in-depth processes within a specific educational and community setting (see Appendix 3 for fieldwork research activities). This took the forms of qualitative techniques such as interviews, focus groups, participant observations and quantitative techniques, such as student questionnaires as expanded below.

Qualitative data collection

Semi-structured interviews were the most appropriate and primary method of attaining in-depth and reliable information. In total, I conducted 30 semi-structured interviews, which on average were one hour and a half in duration, of which 15 were conducted with either practitioners of education, such as principals, teachers, and NGO staff, and subjects of education, such as secondary school students themselves. There were a total of 40 respondents from these semi-structured interviews, of which other participants included community activists, religious leaders, parents and academics. The semi-structured interviewing technique allowed for freedom and flexibility to explore issues within the interview, which Russell (2002, 209) refers to as a “free-wheeling quality”. These types of interviews are advantageous in allowing the interviewer control in steering the conversation in whichever direction is desired; meanwhile recognising the path taken by the respondent and allowing time to react and change course of conversation based on their response (Bryman, 2008). An interview guide was developed with open-ended and specific questions based on themes per respondent group, which evolved throughout the research process.

Jaffna society is rigidly hierarchical in structure, which required substantial time and networks to negotiate access to desired research areas. I frequently employed the snowballing technique, which was highly instrumental for contacting and securing respondents. School principals were undoubtedly a source of local power, therefore the granting of permission from these figures was crucial to the success of this study. Gatekeepers were also in the form of religious leaders, community activists and participants within informal community networks, and through the consultation of these different stakeholders, dependability and reliability of data was increased (O’Leary, 2004). A negative consequence of snowballing is that the interviewees were more likely to know one another than if they had been selected at random, which can create a bias sample. However, this is considered uncontrollable, as the research was within such a small area that it is likely that most respondents would have been acquainted, with many interviewees already being aware of my research before first speaking with them, due to word of mouth and community gossip. Therefore, this research encompassed a form of non-probability purposeful sampling, as not everyone
within the entire population of Jaffna was included in my research and I explicitly decided the relevant actors to include in my research in order to answer the research question and increase variety (Bryman, 2004).

Interviewees put forward a diversity of views across age, gender, ethnicity and religion. As anticipated, some respondents avoided answering certain questions directly, perhaps due to the political sensitivity and taboo of discussing war-related issues. In fact, it was relatively challenging to focus the interviewee to the issue of education. Within time, it became increasingly apparent that the majority acknowledge education for peace and the political situation as an intrinsic relationship. Responses to questions also tended to be descriptive rather than critical, which required persistent and incisive questioning to obtain in-depth and insightful information rather than the customary standard and superficial answers.

The majority of interviews were conducted with an individual, although on occasion other people would be present in the room listening intently to the conversation, which proved to be unavoidable. It was commonplace for teachers to want to participate in the discussion uninvited and take control of the interview, often as they were considered to be the most respected and senior person present. In most situations the researcher will not be 'able to choose who else is present at the interview, and inevitably the presence of a parent, child or co-worker will alter the interpersonal dynamics of the interview,’ (Cloke et al., 2004, 157). Therefore, focus groups were an appropriate and tactful method which allowed for greater organisation and structure in a group environment. Both focus groups took place on separate occasions, with firstly teachers, and secondly students, in a school classroom. During focus groups I actively encouraged interaction and debate among participants, which produced some insightful findings I believe, would not have surfaced through interviews, as they allow for respondents to overcome any reluctance they may have, (Kitzinger and Barbour, 1999), for example a group of Muslim female students were noticeably more comfortable in a group environment. The focus group discussions, as with interviews began very cautiously, however soon became animated and heated discussion. Questioning followed a similar line to interviews and lasted for a similar duration. Focus groups were also successful by gaining access to groups which perceive themselves as marginalised and feel intimidated in an interview situation, in this case ethno-religious minorities (Barbour, 2007, 21).

‘Participant observation is accepted almost universally as the central and defining method of research in cultural anthropology’ enhancing the quality of data collected (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011, 2). Through conducting participant observation, I was able to gather valuable information on the day-to-day realities of life in Jaffna under a heavy military presence. As a researcher, I undertook the role of an observer-as-participant (Bryman, 2008, 410) where I predominantly fulfilled the role of interviewer, however I was not necessarily explicit in my role as researcher, but rather as a student and tourist.
due to the current tense situation in the north of Sri Lanka and my lack of official research visa, which is further expanded upon later in this chapter. A significant period of time was spent in the company and engaging with local people, immersing myself in the everyday rhythms and routines; whilst simultaneously sitting back, observing and recording events using a field notebook. I attended a number of school, community and religious events in Jaffna such as: Sri Lankan Independence Day Event hosted by a Muslim CBO; meetings on Tamil-Muslim relations, discrimination and resettlement in Jaffna; inter-cultural sports days; Hindu religious festival with the participation of local schools; and a cross-cultural music festival. Additionally, I observed classes in a selection of schools, which included examining classroom practices, course content and interactions between student, teacher, and their relationship within community and society.

Quantitative data collection

Quantitative questionnaires were used for data collection as questionnaire research is particularly useful for eliciting people’s attitudes and opinions about social and political issues and provides a rich amount of quantifiable information within the time frame available (Clifford et al, 2010, 77). The questionnaire (Appendix 4) provided basic information such as ethnicity, religion and Sinhalese language proficiency, as well as in-depth data regarding perceptions of history teaching, Muslim-Tamil relations, and the contradictions within peace education.

The quantitative questionnaire was conducted throughout the 3 secondary schools with schoolchildren born between 1994 and 1997, predominantly studying at Advanced Level (A/L) and Ordinary Level (O/L). In total, 34 questionnaires were distributed and completed by the students: 14 at School A, 8 at School B, and 12 at School C. This variation between schools can be accounted by differing class sizes and difficulties in acquiring students to participate. Each questionnaire comprised 25 questions, carefully formatted to obtain the most amount of significant data possible in a limited time-frame. Following Oppenheim’s (1992) guide to questionnaire design, the questions comprised a mixture of closed, more-structured questions such as semantic scale and ranking questions, to open, less-structured questions. They focused on key research themes and were constructed receiving advice from my interpreter and local fieldwork adviser on cultural differences and students unfamiliarity with this process.

To avoid any written evidence and a paper trail of this research which could be discovered by military and government officials, I decided to conduct the questionnaire with small groups of students whereby my interpreter would read out each question in Tamil to be answered by the students. Once each question was delivered verbally, each student would individually record their answer on a blank piece of paper provided. Before and after distribution, the questionnaires were required to be translated from Tamil to English and vice-versa by my interpreter. The formulation of questions was an
extremely delicate process considering that terms such as “LTTE” and “SLA” cannot be spoken of within a school environment.

**Data Analysis**

My data analysis is based primarily upon in-depth research notes from interviews and a smaller number of interview transcriptions. At the beginning of each interview I asked permission from the respondent to use a voice recorder; however it soon became apparent that the majority of interviewees were uncomfortable with this, as anticipated. Hence, I relied upon taking detailed notes during the interview and focus groups. During evenings whilst conducting fieldwork, I typed-up my collected field notes which provided time for reflection to identify gaps in my knowledge and to formulate further research questions to be investigated in the remaining time ahead. The analysis of documentary sources, life stories and photographs were another, albeit less extensive, part of my research. This involved the examination of GIZ and MoE policy documents, sourced during interviews and online websites. Specifically, policy documents referring to peace education in Sri Lanka such as SCPE were of importance to this research. This regular review of my research enabled me to use open and axial-coding to explore and develop initial themes, codes and sub-codes which I ultimately analysed and categorised upon return to the University of Amsterdam. Analysis of the written data collected has been qualitatively analysed through the data analysis software, Atlas Ti. Additionally, the quantitative student questionnaire has been analysed using the statistical program, Microsoft Excel, to produce tables (*Appendix 5*).

**2.8: Language**

Through formative discussions with my research adviser and scouting of the research area, it became apparent that a well-respected interpreter was required for participants were given the choice whether to express themselves in Tamil and/or English, to allow them to feel more comfortable. I secured a Tamil interpreter who was highly proficient in English and very knowledgeable on education and community politics. He was well-connected as a former secondary school principal in Jaffna having lived in Jaffna for at least 35 years, and assisted greatly in arranging interviewees and negotiating with principals for access to local secondary schools. Additionally, he advised me on the wording of questions and the sensitivity of certain topics during interviews. The payment provided was agreed upon at 2,000 Sri Lankan rupees (LKR) for a full day.

The relationship between researcher and interpreter is of fundamental importance to the success of the research project, especially in challenging research conditions, and is founded upon trust. There were certain inter-ethnic social and power relations which became apparent during research. Firstly, my interpreter was Tamil-Catholic, which became problematic whilst conducting research within the Muslim community, acting
as a moderator and altering the dynamic of the interview. Accusations were made that my interpreter and I were being intrusive, escalating a deep suspicion regarding motives for this research, particularly due to the interpreter's ethnicity, which I suspect prevented some respondents from expressing themselves freely. Secondly, whilst interviewing students there was a substantial age-gap between translator and interviewee, which required time to establish trust. Nonetheless, my initial fears that young participants restrain in their responses to outsiders generally did not materialize, and they were uninhibited in their feedback.

The use of an interpreter essentially removes the direct interaction between the interviewer and the subject in some measure, however accurate the translation. Due to language difficulties I was limited in not fully being able to appreciate the inter-subjective dynamics of thought, speech, tone and understanding (Crang & Cook, 2007, 91). In light of this, and as it is the interpreter who has most interaction and engagement with the interviewee, I considered it important to make a concerted effort to connect with respondents directly within a 3-way conversation. Interviews involving interpretation took considerably longer, limiting the volume of information which could be revealed. Barley (1983) deliberates that rather than building one's own interpretation of the interviewee's information, interviewers are 'left to build an interpretation from a gatekeeper's translation of what interviewees reveal of themselves and the social position of that gatekeeper impacts on the information gathered'. This raises a number of important issues in ensuring the interpreter is independent from the community under study, impartial and objective in their interpretations, and leads appropriately to consider the ethical practicalities within this research.

2.9: Ethical Practice in Research

In essence, ethics concerns 'building mutually beneficial relationships with people you meet in the field and about acting in a sensitive, and respectful manner,' and holding a moral belief that research should 'do good' in the world (Scheyvens et al., 2003, 139). It is a combination of these factors which make ethics so central to research and so it is important to reflect firstly upon ethical considerations and secondly research challenges and limitations.

Particularly in challenging research contexts such as post-war Jaffna, it is imperative to consider the positionality of the researcher and power relations between the researcher and researched. Crang and Cook (2007, 25) discuss how perceptions and pre-conceptions of the researcher by the subject can enhance our understanding of the world, specific to our cultural background. It is essential to recognize my position as a white, European, Western, male and middle class researcher with a religious education of a secular outlook, informing my worldview and prejudices, perceptions, attitudes and
assumptions I may hold. Moreover, my role as a social scientist is not value free and without bias (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).

At the beginning of each meeting, I would ensure the respondent understood my position as an independent researcher for a small and private study, unconnected to any NGOs or IOs (International Organisation). I was regularly introduced to people within the Muslim community by a well-known female Muslim activist in the area, who due to my presence was suspected of earning income by assisting in my research, emphasising the need to be aware of how attitudes and perceptions can be dependent upon who you are associated with within the community and the initial contacts that you make. In this case, it was necessary to reassure and to gain the community's trust that I had no ulterior motives. The position of the researcher, in this instance, suspended between different ethnic groups, has a significant impact on the nature of the information gathered. As aforementioned, there is a need to be wary not to entangle myself in complex power relations during research in conflict and post-conflict areas (Brun, 2013, 130).

Sensitive information within research was censored to provide anonymity, and in order to protect and not cause respondents any harm that may occur given the unstable circumstances in Sri Lanka. The main actors were divided into three groups: teachers (T) and students (S), those delivering and implementing experiencing peace education; and those outside school education, community and religious leaders (P) and all cases, individual actors were allocated a number. As aforementioned, the three secondary schools researched were classified into School A, School B, and School C. Furthermore, it is critical to acknowledge the ethics of working with schoolchildren as they hold a degree of vulnerability when discussing sensitive issues, such as their experience of violence and war (Briggs & Coleman, 2007, 107).

Trust is fundamental in the relationship between interviewer, interpreter and interviewee, and to ensure that information provided will remain confidential. Both researcher and interpreter should hold discretion with members of the community during research to avoid causing any offence; this included the way in which questions were presented and the constant need to be flexible, to ensure they were not unethical, aggressive, underhand or discomforting (Cloke, 2004: 164). Constant awareness has been given not to misrepresent the views of respondents, and to the negative consequences regarding data collection and potential damages the study may pose to relations within communities, further reinforcing the recognition of interaction, positionality, reflectivity and interpretation of the researcher and their research (Hoggart et al, 2002, 223).

There were a number of difficulties encountered whilst conducting this research, which originated from firstly, a lack of research visa and secondly, the heavy military presence in Jaffna. The justification for not applying for a research visa was through advice
provided by academic advisers, in that this gave an advantage of having flexibility conducting research in secondary schools without unwanted government attention and monitoring. The schools which I regularly attended had little involvement from the MoE, allowing for freedom with regards with whom I questioned and content of questioning. Conversely, I was restricted in that I was unable to contact the MoE directly regarding my research and consequently with whom I could contact, which created a bias sample as I was unable to interview Sinhalese and education officials above the level of school principal. Additionally, I found difficulty in reconciling my position as an explicit researcher and simply as an interested tourist due to my lack of research visa. Furthermore, I had considered broadening the scope of this study to include private schools, however there were substantial difficulties in gaining access to these schools and lack of contacts within them.

As already established, my research was abruptly cut short due to suspicion from the military and government informants which provoked a second challenge. As a result my interpreter had to conduct a final questionnaire in a school solely on my behalf, due to the dangers which I faced had I continued. A degree of caution and vigilance was maintained throughout fieldwork as it was unknown whether respondents were indeed LTTE members or sympathisers, or government or military informants. Therefore, it was crucial to be careful and aware of whom I was talking with and to recognise the political sensitivity of many respondents’ background, history and connections in a deeply suspicious and fearful society. Furthermore, there were certain logistical problems in arranging interviews which was a time-consuming process, such as the tendency for interviewees to be either late or not show up at the designated time and place. Due to military presence, school interviews were rarely arranged in advance to avoid contact if at all possible with the Sri Lankan Army (SLA).
Chapter 3: Structural inequalities of society and education

By applying Fraser’s ‘social justice’ framework of recognition, representation and redistribution, how can we analyse the extent to which structural inequalities of society are replicated through education? And is this perceived by key actors (teachers and students) to reinforce ethno-religious conflict?

This chapter seeks to investigate the structural drivers of ethno-religious inequality and its manifestation within the education sector, specifically within and between the three secondary schools included in this study; in agreement with the methodology of Novelli and Smith (2011) incorporating an analysis of external factors in education, in order to understand the inter-relationship between the education system and the post-war environment. The relationship between inequality within the secondary school system and conflict is contested, yet the cross-cutting narratives of segregation, exclusion and discrimination which pervades education in Jaffna is unequivocal. This chapter will apply Fraser’s (1995; 2005) framework of recognition, representation and redistribution, in the economic, socio-cultural and political spheres, however most importantly focusing on secondary school education. Fraser (1995, 70) acknowledges ‘culture and political economy are imbricated’, as are the demands for redistribution and recognition; nevertheless it is important to distinguish between these separately in this analysis. In light of this distinction, the first section will look at inequalities in recognition between ethno-religious groups, specifically the complex relationship between the Muslim minority and Tamil majority in Jaffna, based on a lack of understanding of one another’s culture, historical grievances and exclusion founded in the relationship with LTTE and subsequent displacement. This theme of social and cultural recognition will then be explored within the religiously segregated secondary school structure and whether minority groups are assimilated or accommodated within these schools. The second section will examine inequalities in representation between ethno-religious groups in the political sphere, and in secondary school education; more specifically political representation of the Muslim community, and political tensions within the Islamic school – School A. The final section of this chapter will examine (material) inequalities in redistribution of ethno-religious groups, by firstly discussing the issue of resettlement and housing for the Muslim community, and the continuation of this theme in secondary education whereby there has been an unequal distribution of resources. This section will culminate by introducing the structural distribution of peace education, through resources, implementation and training.
3.1: Recognition

‘Recognition’ as defined by Fraser (1995, 74) is centred on notions of group identity, differentiation and cultural domination. Hereby, this section regarding recognition between Muslim and Tamil groups will begin by introducing a central source of conflict between these opposing groups, which is the Muslim displacement from Jaffna. In order to begin to understand the Muslim community in Jaffna, I engaged with a highly influential gatekeeper, a Muslim activist and community leader (P1), who is central to this story. My introduction to the Muslim community coincided with my attendance of Sri Lankan Independence Day ‘celebrations’, for which Muslims but not Tamils commemorate to signify their return to their ‘home’ of Jaffna and the end of decades of ethnic civil war. She (P1) first of all explained the distressful wounds caused by the forced eviction of the Muslim people and their subsequent exodus from Jaffna. The Muslim people were expelled from the city by the LTTE on the 30th October 1990; an immensely historic date on which the Muslim community is defined to this day. Muslim displacement is often judged to have been a form of ethnic cleansing completing a Tamil homogenisation of the north of Sri Lanka (Thiranagama, 2007). The respondent explained: “I was 13 years old when my family and I had to leave our homes. We were given only 2 hours notice and we could only leave with the clothes on our backs and a maximum of 200 rupees in our pockets. We had to leave immediately….otherwise we would have faced certain death at the hands of the LTTE. Our lives in Jaffna stopped that day”. Prior to the events of late 1990, Muslims and Tamils in Jaffna were said to be largely integrated (T9), yet the LTTE were highly successful in portraying Tamil nationalism as anti-Muslim, thus turning a large proportion of Tamils against the Muslim population living in the Jaffna peninsula at the height of the war (P7). Upon eviction, the Muslim community were rounded up at School A, which consequently has a special poignancy and historical importance for the Muslim community. As one of at least 10,000 expelled Jaffna Muslims, P1 and her family relocated to Puttalam, where they lived in IDP camps for at least the next 12 years. This story is representative of the experiences of many Muslims forced to flee their homes which still has ramifications for their lives and their relationship with Tamils in Jaffna today.

Upon the return of the Muslims to Jaffna, the majority in 2009, they were immediately confronted with a series of problems regarding their historically antagonistic relationship with Tamils. In fact, only 600 Muslim families have returned in a permanent capacity since the end of the war (T13) due to a series of problems regarding housing, political representation and educational facilities which will be discussed in due course, all of which are grounded in this relationship of mistrust, jealousy and hatred. Displacement continues to adversely affect the relationship between Muslims and Tamils and is to many Muslims the fundamental cause for the ever-increasing geographic, political and social segregation and the perpetuation of inter-ethnic tension and communal violence which exists between the two communities. Though the displacement was initiated by the LTTE, ordinary Tamils are
to this day blamed for the predicament of the Jaffna Muslims (P1). The Muslim Principal of School A commented on this relationship of mistrust: “Tamils relationship with Muslims is one of bitterness, forged in the past... the seal of hatred [between Tamil and Muslim] is still here. The war is over, yet the conflict still remains” (T9). Equally, Tamils are said to show similar levels of animosity towards Muslims. A substantial proportion of Tamil respondents refuse to trust the Muslim people as during the war they betrayed Tamils by informing the SLA about the LTTE, often portraying the Muslim community as insular, secretive and backward.

Not only has war and displacement caused a significant amount of trauma to those involved, the impact extends to the next generation of young Muslims where it continues to influence all aspects of their lives. The quote below (Text Box 1) illustrates the inter-generational prejudice and entrenchment of ethno-religious identity through stories of displacement. I heard many similar anecdotes of the harrowing stories of Muslim eviction, repeated by schoolchildren, maintaining a cycle of ethno-religious prejudice and hatred from one generation to the next. This plays a vital role in identity formation, as discussed by Sen (2006) that identities are formed by membership and association with a single social group.

Text Box 1: A student’s account of the Muslim eviction as described to them by their parents.

“Our parents have told us many times about displacement. They walked through the night away from Jaffna to avoid being seen by the LTTE. My mother was heavily pregnant with my brother at the time; now he cannot walk or hear because of her trauma. Mother was put on a bicycle which travelled all the way to the town of Anuradhapura – a distance of 200km; while everyone else had to walk for 15 days to Vavuniya. My uncle was killed by the LTTE, a shell fell in his house and also killed his son, who was a baby asleep in his cot. There is much bitterness there that my family suffered. Yet I feel mixed feelings about it...fear, anxiety, resentment of Tamils to this day. This didn’t happen just to Muslims, also to the Tamil community. The LTTE also killed many innocent Tamil people. They too have suffered greatly”. (S37)

The existence of a long-standing animosity in the immediate area between the Muslim and surrounding Tamil communities, is said to have a detrimental influence upon school children and the manner in which they identify themselves ethnically and religiously, with 8 of 14 teachers interviewed (T2, T3, T5, T7, T8, T9, T10, T12) agreeing with this. Meanwhile, 13 out of 18 Muslim students stated they feel discriminated against specifically by Tamils, with one student (S20) adding that she suffered from “verbal abuse on the streets” from Tamil people. Nevertheless, evidence discovered through this research suggests there are generational differences in attitudes and prejudice between the younger generation of school leaving age and middle-aged adults. Muslim girls interviewed at School A (S39, S40, S41) explicitly asserted that they view Tamils
and Muslims living in this area to be “one community”, rather than the segregation claimed by older respondents. In fact, all 34 students’ surveyed stated that they had friends of other religions, which indicates a closer relationship between young Tamils and Muslims than expected, in spite of the strict religious segregation of secondary schools which will now be explored.

**Recognition in secondary education**

This geographical segregation of ethno-religious communities is reflected in secondary school education in the research area. The structural segregation of Hindus, Catholics and Muslims is rigidly enforced in schooling, but it is the segregation between Muslims and ethnic Tamils and the discrimination and prejudice shown from one community to the other which is most profound and on which I will primarily focus.

Education in post-conflict situations, but specifically segregated school structures, has the potential to reinforce wider social and political structures of society, such as religious or ethnic tensions and perceived inequalities between competing groups (Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Davies, 2013). The relationship between secondary school religious segregation and further conflict is highly contested between the teachers of the three secondary schools. Almost half of teachers (T3, T7, T8, T9, T13, T14) explicitly defended the current segregational structures between local secondary schools and suggested this segregation should be maintained. A Muslim teacher (T14) justified the current arrangements as they are seen to preserve Islamic culture and safeguard the existence of Islamic schools, which as a minority religion in Sri Lanka are already perceived to be under threat; which is a common argument often repeated by Muslim respondents.

In contrast, fewer teachers - only 4 out of 14 (T2, T5, T6, T12) - asserted that segregated schooling for religious purposes is a serious and dangerous issue which can create further conflict and exacerbate polarisation of people who identify themselves differently. Two of these teachers (T6, T12) emphasised the importance of religious integration to create a tolerant and inclusive school culture, and to de-alienate pre-conceptions of one another before developing entrenched ethno-religious identities (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000, 17), with one teacher adding that “integrated education can overcome physical segregation” (T12). Meanwhile, schoolchildren, representing the younger generation of respondents were broadly against the current secondary school structure enforcing religious segregation, with 27 out of 34 explicitly stating their opposition to this, with a number of students suggesting that a lack of inter-religious schooling leads to communities moving further apart thus deepening rifts between them. This crucial issue of inter-ethnic engagement and participation will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.2 when examining inter-group reconciliation through official peace education.
The most significant secondary school to this research is the only Islamic school in Jaffna today, School A. The school is located in the heart of the Muslim community and considered as a focal point and social forum, in conjunction with the Mosque; although the school is generally considered to be more inclusive allowing for the participation of women and does not discriminate on the grounds of gender. Nevertheless, the school does exclude schoolchildren on the basis of ethno-religious identity. School A has a total of 450 students, 98.4% of which are Muslim (see table 3 below). Although shortly after re-settlement there seemed to be an initial integration of the Tamil and Muslim communities and greater cross-community cooperation between them, the number of Tamil children at School A has since decreased to its current and lowest ever number of 7, accounting for a mere 1.6% of the student population. A former student (P23) claimed that Tamil students at School A have ultimately resorted to leaving the school as their religious customs and practices were not accommodated.

School B is a Catholic school which is ethnically segregated, only admitting Tamil students. Student enrolment at School B stands currently at 659 students, 84.7% Catholic and 15.3% Hindu. The school is becoming increasingly segregated with only Tamil teachers present, yet before 1990 there were 10 Muslim teachers out of 30 (T1). Interestingly, the MoE is claimed to actively discourage the school from admitting Muslim students, despite the schools location being only 50 metres from the Muslim residential area. The Principal (T7) asserts the school rejects Muslim students for their own well-being, to protect and preserve their own culture, and strict religious customs; "they have their own facilities" he added. As a result, there are currently no Muslim students at School B as the school pursues an independent policy of Muslim exclusion and limited engagement with the Muslim community.

Located in a poor and predominantly Tamil-Hindu area of Jaffna, School C was originally created as a Hindu school though is officially recognised as non-denominational. It is the only school in this study which can be described as a “school of inclusion” (T13). The founder of this school was a Hindu Priest, yet the school was created for the purpose of all religions in response to the foundation of the nearby, exclusively Hindu elite national school. The school does not discriminate on the bases of ethnicity, religion or caste, which is seen as a source of pride within the community and unlike the neighbouring private Hindu national school which places restrictions upon admittance for children of other religions (T5). Of the 37 teachers at School C, all are of Tamil ethnicity. Meanwhile, the student population of 471 is predominantly Hindu (83.1%), Tamil-Catholics account for 12.7%, and finally the 20 Muslim schoolchildren comprise 4.2% of the student population. Before Muslim displacement in 1990 the Tamil-Hindu and Muslim communities enjoyed greater integration, with more Muslim schoolchildren attending School C. A Muslim student (S38) attending School C claimed that the school does very well to accommodate Muslims, such as allowing students to leave class at 12pm on Fridays the attend the Mosque, which in School B is viewed by a minority of teachers as a problematic allowance and could evoke conflicts between students of
differing religions (T1). Although the students believed they do not suffer from discrimination as such due to their age, and status in society as children, they did suggest they endure covert racism such as in attention given by teachers in class and comments regarding Islamic dress.

Table 3: Characteristics of secondary schools in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious majority of school</strong></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Catholicism</td>
<td>Hinduism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic majority of school</strong></td>
<td>Sri Lankan Moor</td>
<td>Sri Lankan Tamil</td>
<td>Sri Lankan Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School District</strong></td>
<td>Jaffna Educational Zone</td>
<td>Jaffna Educational Zone</td>
<td>Jaffna Educational Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Northern Provincial Council</td>
<td>Northern Provincial Council</td>
<td>Northern Provincial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>1AB</td>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>1AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Of teachers</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethno-religious division of teachers (%)</strong></td>
<td>13 (51.2%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
<td>35 (95.4%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
<td>28 (75.7%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (8.3%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
<td>6 (14.6%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
<td>9 (24.3%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (37.5%) Muslim</td>
<td>0 (0%) Muslim</td>
<td>0 (0%) Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Of pupils</strong></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethno-religious division of pupils (%)</strong></td>
<td>7 (1.6%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
<td>101 (15.3%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
<td>391 (83.1%) Tamil-Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
<td>558 (84.7%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
<td>60 (12.7%) Tamil-Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443 (98.4%) Muslim</td>
<td>0 (0%) Muslim</td>
<td>20 (4.2%) Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil: Teacher Ratio</strong></td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades</strong></td>
<td>1 to 11 (up to G.C.E. O/L examinations)</td>
<td>1 to 11 (up to G.C.E. O/L examinations)</td>
<td>6 to 13 (up to G.C.E.A/L examinations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age range</strong></td>
<td>5 to 16</td>
<td>5 to 16</td>
<td>10 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language medium</strong></td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointment of Sinhalese teacher</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2: Representation

Fraser’s dimension of representation within the political sphere advocates the importance of addressing unequal power relations at a multitude of levels of social, ethnic and political groups and to ensure these groups are equally represented. This section looks specifically at local political representation for the Muslim community and the representation of ethno-religious groups and internal politics within secondary schools.

From my research the local political landscape at the municipal and provincial level is one of corruption, demagoguery and nepotism, driven by entrenched ethno-religious identity politics. To many respondents this is seemingly thwarting the social development of the Muslim community and to a lesser extent the poorer Tamil areas (P21, P22). Members of both the Tamil and Muslim communities perceive there to be a clear disconnection between ‘political Jaffna’ and ‘civilian Jaffna’; there is an absence of trust between these levels, vertically from the people to political elite. However, according to the majority of Muslim respondents, the Tamil political elite in Jaffna fail to represent and address the fundamental, basic needs of the Muslim minority in Jaffna, resulting in claims that Jaffna Muslim’s are a “forgotten community” (P14).

Furthermore, the absence of educated leaders who can speak on behalf of the Muslim people is a substantial challenge in terms of gaining political representation for the community. Additionally, most of the Muslim community are illiterate, which exacerbates problems in terms of political representation and meeting the community's needs in administrative matters like completing official government forms for housing applications. There is often the assumption that highly educated people are more likely to question and overcome the problems of ethnic prejudice and discrimination, however highly educated elites often instigate ethno-religious conflict and legitimise this through state apparatus (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000, 12). Furthermore, the divided internal politics of the Muslim community (moderate vs. radical Islamic fundamentalism) compounds the requirement to speak with a united voice and to undertake a long-term and dedicated effort to craft an equal place and challenge the entrenched Sinhalese and Tamil politics of Muslim exclusion (McGilvray & Raheem, 2007, 6).

The political elite are routinely said to instigate ethnic division; one Tamil-Catholic religious leader stated “it is politicians and not the ordinary people who tear the Muslim and Tamil communities apart” (P26), indicative of the views of both Muslim and Tamil respondents. Since the war years, many people within the Jaffna Muslim and Tamil neighbourhoods have become discontent and despondent with the failures of the justice system, and the close connections between war crimes and public officials implicated in these. The political elite are considered to be above the law and are said to instil fear
and mistrust which pervades throughout Jaffna society; in particular an infamous politician widely known for their beliefs as anti-LTTE and anti-Muslim (P1). This is deemed by many as a continuation of the war years, of which many public figures have yet to face justice, relating to wider debate regarding the claims of the past in creating a future. To summarise, this raises unanswered questions regarding the role of those individuals - perpetrators of ethnic conflict - in the rebuilding, reconciliation and rehabilitation of post-war society. These factors have serious implications for the political representation of the Muslim community and their struggle for resettlement, jobs, and importantly education facilities and funding for the School A in the area. This battle for political representation is having implications upon representation and control over School A, as will now be discussed.

**Representation in secondary education**

Social relations between Tamil and Muslim teachers at School A are said to have been under strain for some time, and are part of a wider power struggle for control within the school. The religious background of teachers working at School A is mixed. Of the 24 teachers, there are 15 Tamil and 9 Muslim teachers. However, the aforementioned problems between Tamil and Muslim have spilled over into the school, resulting in a rift between Muslim and Tamil teachers and a division in the internal politics of the school based on ethno-religious fault-lines. This has begun to negatively affect the working relationship between colleagues within the school, with both sides enduring counter-claims of unprofessionalism, absenteeism, and being work-shy (T2). Moreover, there have been instances whereby Tamil teachers have disciplined Muslim students by corporal punishment, which has been opportunistically manipulated into an issue of identity and utilised to stir up racial conflict between teachers (T10).

The education question posed by Dale (1999; 2000; 2005) regarding ‘educational politics’ and ‘politics of education’, are relevant in revealing the internal political decisions made within schools. A Muslim teacher (T14) claimed that decision-making power within School A is held solely by Muslim teachers and intriguingly Muslim community elders from the local Mosque. Tamil teachers are excluded from decision-making within the school, because the school is perceived to be a religiously homogenous institution, which is claimed as Muslim territory for the sole purpose of the Muslim community. This is politically significant as the school which was once lost to LTTE control, has now been re-claimed exclusively as the possession of Muslims. In this case, Tamil teachers are increasingly maligned which to Fraser (1995, 71) is deemed as a form of cultural injustice. It is claimed that Tamil-Muslim segregation is advocated by the local Mosque, the central institutional powerbase in the community which exerts considerable power over school activities (T14), and is itself involved in a power struggle with the MoE regarding absolute control of the school. Religious segregation of teachers and pupils is reinforced through the political interference of the Mosque in the school, which even to Muslim teachers (T13, T14) is perceived to be detrimental to the...
hopes of ethno-religious reconciliation through education. The above examples reiterate the structural dynamics and power relations within the Muslim community and between school teachers, MoE and the Mosque, elucidating a narrative of exclusion and segregation.

3.3: (Re)-distribution

This section examines the third dimension of redistribution, defined by Fraser (1995, 70) as ‘injustice which is rooted in the political-economic structure of society’. Jaffna itself is recovering and rebuilding from the ruins of a city ravaged by war, while specifically the destruction of the Muslim built environment, its primary schools and particularly its only existing secondary school, is continuing to plague education in the area; acting as a deterrent for many Muslims who choose not to return due to poor living conditions, considered worse than IDP settlements. Housing in the Muslim community has been decimated and land-mined heavily, with many returnees living under canvas and without adequate sanitation and running water. This has led many observers to call for a concerted effort implemented by the national government in Colombo, as it is such a notable case of prolonged displacement for over 20 years (P7). Government or NGO assistance targeted for the resettlement of displaced Muslims has essentially been non-existent. The November 2011 report by the government-sponsored LLRC acknowledged this by noting, “the treatment given to the Muslim community of the Northern Province has led them to believe that they are at the bottom of the list of priorities of the government, INGOs [international NGOs] and NGOs and the donor community”. Despite the recognition of this issue, the housing requirements of the Muslim community have been continually ignored at the national and provincial level leading many activists to look elsewhere for support, such as the High Commission of India, to put pressure on local government to assist the Muslim community in their process of resettlement (P1). Furthermore, there have been claims that Tamils actively obstruct Muslim re-settlement through intimidation and the boycotting of Muslim businesses. Additionally there have been allegations of land disputes with neighbouring Tamil-Catholic and Tamil-Hindu communities, regarding property which was vacated upon Muslim eviction in 1990. This has only compounded the sense of being “unwelcome in a place once called home” and injustice among recent Muslim returnees (T9).

(Re)distribution of secondary education

There are interesting parallels between redistribution, more accurately the absence of redistribution of resources for housing in the Muslim community, and for education in the Muslim community, more specifically secondary school education. Fraser (1995, 68) specifically identifies inequality in educational attainment, with access and quality as a source of socio-economic injustice between groups. However a number of scholars
(Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Stewart, 2010) expand upon this assertion that structural educational inequalities can be used as a tool to maintain segregation and contribute to conflict between groups.

There are a series of interrelated structural problems which have affected schoolchildren at School A, which is widely considered to have a poorer standard of education and facilities than the surrounding Tamil schools. According to the majority of Muslim respondents, deprivation of school infrastructure in the Muslim area in comparison with neighbouring Tamil schools is contributing to perceived ethno-religious inequalities. Teaching facilities are in urgent need of repair, with teaching taking place in buildings without ceilings and walls decimated by artillery bombardment and house-to-house gun fighting during the war. The Islamic secondary school was one of a number of properties commandeered and occupied by the LTTE during the war, along with the destruction of other Muslim schools in the area which have not since been reopened (T4). Upon re-opening of the school in 2002 there has been limited help from the MoE which is illustrated in the quote shown in text box 2.

Text box 2: School Principal describes the struggle to re-open the school, following the return of a minority of Muslims to Jaffna in 2002.

“Only 30 to 40 Muslim families returned at the beginning, and most of the children went to surrounding schools as the facilities at our school had been destroyed – there were no desks, windows were missing, there was nothing. At the request of parents, I volunteered to take over as Principal with help from two Tamil teachers, provided by the MoE – there was no-one else. The school re-opened with Grade 1-5, supporting 42 students, of which 26 were Tamil students. School enrolment increased to 180 pupils in 2006, when again the school had to close as the war re-started in 2006; the A9 Kandy-Jaffna road was closed so people left Jaffna by boat. Then the school reopened again in 2009. It could only re-open twice based on the goodwill and volunteers from the community, Muslim and Tamil alike. Since then there has been no extra assistance provided by the MoE and the NGOs have come and gone. Why has this school been left behind?” (T9)

This quote accurately demonstrates the poor state of the school and the limited funding it receives from the MoE to renovate school buildings, and the lack of facilities and equipment which School B and C possess, such as a library, science equipment, and computers. In light of this, all of the teachers interviewed at School A (T2, T3, T4, T8, T9, T13, T14) explicitly asserted that due to the associated problems and greater needs of the school in comparison with surrounding schools, there is desperate need of additional and specialist assistance; with one teacher claiming “the school has not returned to normal functioning following Muslim re-settlement” (T6). However, none of the teachers stated that the school is under-funded based on the current formula,
which allocates funding based on the number of students which attend the school (T6). Moreover, School A has the highest teacher student ratio of 1:18, although this figure remains below the national average (World Bank, 2014).

The convergence of conflict and poverty has led to the existence of many disadvantaged schoolchildren, who are illiterate and have been absent from school for long periods. Although both Tamil and Muslim populations were forced to leave Jaffna at one time or another, Tamils in 1995 and Muslims in 1990, the Muslim community has been displaced for significantly longer, with many children at School A losing one or two years of schooling. A group of Muslim girls I interviewed suggested displacement and constantly moving from one school to another before their return to Jaffna was unsettling, and as a result has had long-standing implications on their personal development and studies – often failing and having to repeat exams (S39, S40, S41). Furthermore, the poverty-stricken nature of many Muslim families forces young schoolchildren into work on family businesses from an early age, thus neglecting their education (P5). For example, Muslim boys are ordered to work as sales assistants on roadside stalls, collect old iron, and look after cattle for meat, when they should be attending school (T13). The accusation that poor, illiterate and uneducated parents are disinterested and do not understand the merits of education is not uncommon. It is widely acknowledged by Tamils and Muslims in this study, that the educational levels of Muslim students at School A are drastically below the level of neighbouring students at School B and School C; the declining of School A’s educational level is further compounded as before displacement School A was once well-respected which educated future university professors, doctors, and politicians (T8).

School C is the only school in this study to have the facilities to teach A/L, resulting in a flow of Muslim students from School A at age 16 for those who wish to continue with their studies; which has both positive and negative outcomes. According to the Principal of School C (T6) this “system makes this school attractive and an alternative for poor underachieving students”, as it allows “failed O/L students, those that would have dropped out of school otherwise, are deserving of second chance, despite negative repercussions for the schools’ reputation”. It has become family tradition for Muslim students to come to School C for A/L following O/L at School A, building up links between the Hindu and Muslim community and contributing to desegregation between Muslim and Tamil schoolchildren. Despite the development of community relations between Muslims and Tamil-Hindus, the unequal distribution of teaching facilities has caused an imbalance and friction between local secondary schools, and is seen as draining other schools resources. Muslim students of School A feel unfairness that their school is under-resourced when in comparison with neighbouring schools such as School C which teach A/L. To address this inequality they suggest School A “should introduce A/L and improve facilities as the school is currently disadvantaged without a science laboratory or even decent library” (P1). Some teachers (T1, T3) explicitly assert that inequality between schools in different areas is deepening divisions between young
Muslims and Tamils; particularly the absence of A/L at School A and the perceived lower quality of teaching and funding for facilities.

*(Re)*-distribution of peace education

As peace education forms the basis for Chapter 4, it is worthwhile to introduce the structural issues of the MoE’s official SCPE policy in secondary schools. As discussed in Chapter 1, GIZ is the main supporter of official peace education in secondary schools in Sri Lanka. These post-war education programmes implemented by GIZ fall mainly under the ESC programme, the most recent form of peace education implemented beginning its third phase in 2012 (OECD, 2010), on which I will predominantly focus. ESC ‘provides children and youth with skills and competencies for a peaceful and responsible coexistence’ (GIZ, 2011, 1) and has five components with extensive activities: Peace and Value Education (PVE); Sinhala and Tamil as Second National Languages (2NL); Education for Disadvantaged Children and Youth in Post-conflict and Poverty Areas (EDCY); Psycho-Social Care/Guidance and Counselling (PSC); Disaster Safety Education (DSE) (GIZ, 2011; Davies, 2011) (see Appendix 6 for description of these components). The understanding and perception of such will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter. ESC operates at three levels: Firstly at the macro level, it advises the Sri Lankan MoE on training policy, curriculum development, and teacher training; secondly, at the meso-level, working with the provincial ministries of education, the 17 teacher training colleges in the country, and the 92 local centres providing in-service training for teachers; and thirdly at the micro level in individual schools on which level this thesis concentrates (Davies 2011; GIZ, 2014).

There is some discrepancy regarding which secondary schools in this study receive peace education training, funding and resources. Interestingly, in contrast with the previous findings of this chapter, School A receives greater official assistance from the MoE and GIZ for SCPE/ESC than School B and School C. As one of the few Islamic schools in the North Province, School A receives greater attention in terms of peace education and has been selected for increased support from GIZ as one of 200 pilot schools in disadvantaged areas, as the peace programme implemented by GIZ requires Muslim involvement and representation. This is considered a positive development by those within the Muslim community, in spite of the great strides which have yet to be taken (P17, P18). Meanwhile, implementation of peace education at School B and C is claimed to be “minimal”. The Principal of School C (T6) stated, “all we received was a little booklet, which nobody paid attention to”. In specific reference to the peace education policy, the principal added: “that’s only in writing...there has been no training, no interest, nothing from the MoE”.

Specifically, in terms of peace education teacher training, the number of teachers who have received or been present at formal peace education training (including counseling training), attending at least one seminar is very low, with only 4 out of 14 teachers (T4,
T7, T10, T13) stating that they had attended such a seminar (two of which attend school A). However, Lopes Cardozo and Hoeks (2013) state that peace education is not included in pre-service and in-service teacher training, meaning that teachers do not have the skills to teach peace education in a classroom setting; instead peace education is increasingly being delivered through extra-curricular activities. Despite this lack of training in peace education, teachers are expected to possess the appropriate skills to implement peace education and incorporate it into all aspects of the school curriculum (T5). One of those teachers who has attended such a training seminar (T10) explained that SCPE "was talked about at staff meetings....we received letters about it from the MoE but eventually nothing has happened...we haven't received permission and instruction from the MoE as of yet ". This evidence raises serious questions regarding the implementation of SCPE and the role of the central actors, MoE, GIZ, and secondary school principals and teachers, and whether in this case the school can contribute to creating a culture of peace.
Chapter 4: Multi-scalar peace

How is official peace education experienced and understood by key actors (teachers and students)? Does peace education address the needs of the community at different scales (supra-community; inter-community; and intra-community)?

Following the SRA (Hay, 2002) Chapter 4 explores the dialectical relationship and inter-linkages between context of peace education, and agents, in this case teachers and students. To elucidate further, this chapter examines official peace education curricula within secondary schools and its relationship with local actors at the micro-level; by investigating how peace education is perceived, experienced and affects local conditions and communities. By adopting the notion of ‘multi-scalar peace’ (conceptualised in Chapter 2) this chapter is organised into three levels in which post-war reconciliation can occur, and explores whether peace education meets the needs of the researched communities on these levels, and the wider consequences of peace education. Firstly, the ‘Supra-community’ level examines national issues of history, language policy, and free speech in the context of increasing militarisation and ethnicisation of education. Secondly, the ‘Inter-community’ level explores post-war ethno-religious reconciliation between Tamils and Muslims, changing perceptions and attitudes facilitating greater understanding, integration and inclusion between groups. Thirdly, the ‘Intra-community’ level is concerned with post-war reconciliation within groups, on an individual and inter-personal basis, specifically psychological wellbeing.

4.1: Supra-community

The first level of ‘multi-scalar’ peace education developed in the theoretical framework examines peace and conflict at the supra-community level, and the relationship between society and the state, which has been discussed by a number of authors (Perera, 1997; 2004; Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Balasooriya et al. 2004; Lopes Cardozo, 2008). This section will focus on the key areas of: firstly, the manipulation of the history curriculum reflecting a trend towards the mobilisation of Sinhala Buddhist nationalism, excluding Tamil and Muslim histories; and secondly, the politics of language through a policy of teaching Sinhala and Tamil in all secondary schools in Sri Lanka. As having discussed the structure of SCPE of the MoE, and ESC of GIZ in the previous chapter, there will be reference to these policies throughout.

The contention made by Bush and Saltarelli (2000, 12) that “the distortion of history takes place intentionally and unintentionally both through acts of commission as well as
"omission" is an appropriate point of departure when discussing the highly contentious history curriculum in Sri Lanka, which exercises the negative face of education (as introduced in Chapter 2). At all secondary schools in this study, History is taught between grade 6 to 11, with no teaching at A/L. Additionally, the teaching of History is included within the subjects of Life Competencies and Civic Education (LCCE) and Citizenship Education and Governance (CEG), commonly referred to as 'Civics' (Hoeks, 2012) which will be referred to in greater detail below. The history curriculum currently focuses on Portuguese, Dutch and British rule during Colonialism, the independence of Sri Lanka in 1948, and post-independence period until 1985, with an emphasis upon business, trade and development (T10). There are no discrepancies between secondary schools within this study, as all follow the national curriculum defined by the MoE, which is subject to much controversy from teachers and students.

Four teachers (T3, T10, T11, T13) were highly critical of the history curriculum as “biased and selective of past events” (T3) and the way in which it does not accurately represent Tamil and Muslim minority culture, with many strongly contending this as an act of purposeful discrimination. Some teachers commented the History text is heavily structured in favour of the Sinhalese ethnic group and adherence to Buddhism. Teaching centres on Buddhist texts, for example on the Mahavamsa, an important text in Theravada Buddhism that covers the early history of religion in Sri Lanka, which according to one teacher has "no relevance or benefit for Tamil and Muslim students" (T13).

In reference to this perceived manipulation of the history curriculum, a Muslim teacher (T13) stated poignantly: "the factual account of history will be deleted and forgotten by all, and then it is too late as our culture will have been lost" resulting in the "indoctrination of the younger generation". This viewpoint is indicative of many Muslim and Tamil teachers who generally agree there is an absence of recognition for minorities within history textbooks, and particularly the Sri Lankan Moor Islamic population, portraying the Muslims as "outsiders" and "those who do not belong in Sri Lanka" (T10). In this context, a drastic reduction of Tamil and Muslim history by the MoE is perceived as threatening through which it will assimilate and subsume minorities, in line with academic writings by Davies (2011), Hoeks (2012) and Lopes Cardozo (2008).

As in many post-colonial societies, the education curriculum mainly ignores local culture as a means to assimilate and integrate within a broader, or narrow national identity (Bush and Salarelli, 2000, 6) which could be viewed as a cultural hegemony. In light of this, there is very much a sentiment from Tamil and Muslim teachers that education is seen as another instrument of the government to control, and to pacify Tamil and Muslim populations, and to subdue or nullify feelings of individuality which do not prescribe to Sinhalese Buddhism; text box 3 aptly expresses a Tamil teacher’s opinion on the politicization of history education. A senior teacher claimed that the
current President of Sri Lanka, “Mahinda Rajapaksa is attempting to depict himself as a Sinhalese King” further contributing to the notion that education is inherently political and manipulated for political purposes. They claim this in conjunction with a significant reduction in the teaching of the histories of minority groups is highly dangerous, yet not unsurprising of an “authoritarian...xenophobic...and dirty government” (T10). A teacher at School B (T1) believes that this is “making Tamil children feel they don’t belong to Sri Lanka as outsiders to Buddhist Sinhalese”, which is detrimental to the mental well-being of those belonging to non-conformist minority groups.

Text Box 3: Tamil history teacher interview excerpt discussing the politicisation of history education

"Education is made in politics; education is political. As the government controls education, the curriculum will be moulded to the views and wishes of the ruling party; which is to be expected from a corrupt government. ‘Peace education policy’ is incorporated in textbooks, through which they force Buddhist culture through education, creating a new history of Sri Lanka. When I was a child, there was teaching of the Tamil Kings and the Sinhalese Kings, Jaffna culture and history is not, but should be taught. It should be maintained, I used to be proud, yet now these things are hidden. Now there is only Sinhalese Buddhism, contrived as the rightful heirs and fathers to Sri Lanka. The government want to make the young and impressionable believe everything they teach - my son or these children, they are not taught the facts, which is scary for the future of this country and these communities”. (T11)

The views of students themselves on this matter are varied and moderate in comparison. Less than half (16 out of 34) of students explicitly asserted they thought that history teaching is biased. Meanwhile almost a third (10 out of 34) explicitly stated that history teaching materials are unbiased. Although acknowledging that Muslims are one of the smallest ethno-religious groups in Sri Lanka, there is certainly an underlying conviction among young Muslims that they should learn each culture – Muslim, Tamil and Sinhalese - in equal measure and not at the expense of the erosion of their own culture in a history curriculum which should promote inclusion and diversity. Tamil and Muslim students generally agreed that the teaching of an equal representation of Sinhalese history is positive.

As previously mentioned, civic education is now taught through the new subjects of LCCE and CEG, which was once an aspect of the broader Social Sciences curriculum. Civics is supposedly a subject in which the great issues of the day can be debated, yet in reality teachers and students cannot discuss certain matters with the freedom the subject implies. Discussion of ethnic conflict is unmentionable and implicitly forbidden within the walls of the classroom, despite the omnipresence of its historical implications and consequences which pervade everyday life. Based on my analysis, civic education is afflicted by ahistoricism, and absurdly, there is not a single direct reference to the 1983-
2009 civil war throughout the curriculum. Instead LCCE concentrates on presidents, elections, and constitution of Sri Lanka, and teachings on democratic participation and citizenship of the Sri Lankan nation (T10). Teachers generally agreed on the purpose of civics to be critical, interactive, and to facilitate debate in the classroom, nevertheless they also found agreement that civics essentially does not achieve these objectives: "Whatever is favoured by the Sinhalese public is included, yet anything that is against Sinhalese society is left out" exclaimed a Muslim teacher (T13). This suggests a minority of teachers believe the curriculum to be a form of Sinhalese populism. Civics is considered by some teachers to be superficial and hypocritical as "there is a lot of talk of peace...but nothing will change in this general attitude of silence" (T13). The forms of agency of resistance which individual teachers and students employ in the classroom to challenge this will be examined in Chapter 5.

Language has historically been considered a source of conflict, having the power to marginalise and discriminate against those unable to participate in the discourse of the ruling classes (Watson, 2007), and is undoubtedly a national issue in Sri Lanka. Repercussions of the 1956 Sinhala-only language act are still being experienced, and the continuing politicisation of language in the education system and society of 21st century Sri Lanka, is claimed to be a causal factor of ethnic violence. The GoSL’s trilingual policy recognizes Sinhala and Tamil as official national languages, whilst English remains as a link language (Department of Official Languages, 2014). The flagship policy of the second national language (2NL) promoting 'Sinhala and Tamil as second national languages' since 2010 is a central component of ESC programme (Davies, 2011). 2NL is introduced in grades 1-11, although there are significant challenges regarding implementation, compounding a sense that secondary schools and students are being neglected.

The implementation of 2NL is almost non-existent, with schools lacking Sinhala-speaking teachers as well as crucial training and resources, as similar to the findings of Davies (2011, 18); observably, secondary schools in Jaffna commonly have more resources available for them to teach English than Sinhala. Not one of the three Tamil-medium secondary schools within this study appointed a permanent teacher specifically to teach the Sinhalese language. Meanwhile of the 14 teachers interviewed, only 3 could speak Sinhala fluently (T9, T11, T13), of which two were Muslim (T9, T13) having learnt Sinhala whilst displaced from Jaffna. Meanwhile, a group of Muslim students (S39, S40, S41) considered displacement a positive means of learning Sinhala. However, only 6 out of 18 Muslim students can speak Sinhala, of which two are fluent, and four can only speak ‘some’. This compares with a mere 3 out of 16 Tamil students capable of speaking ‘some’ Sinhala.

In general, Tamil-speaking teachers want to teach Sinhala and Tamil-speaking students want to learn Sinhala. All the teachers interviewed explicitly stated they believed in the principle of teaching Sinhala, with only one teacher (T8) voicing concerns that Sinhala is
a threat to the identity of Northern Tamil language and culture. The most widely quoted explanation for the desire to teach Sinhala is that it will improve understanding and reconciliation between disparate communities, as exemplified by the Tamil Principal of School B “learning of the language allows people to connect personally, so misinterpretations and misunderstandings may fade away” (T7). Students were eager for higher quality Sinhala teaching whilst acknowledging its importance in Sri Lanka, with one student at School C explaining, “we live in a Sinhalese country; Sinhala is essential. It is our country’s most important language” (S1).

Intriguingly, there are substantial linguistic challenges to be faced in Tamil-speaking Jaffna without Sinhala language skills, as Sinhala is required to participate in Sri Lankan civic life (T5). This language barrier in society, but specifically the limited basic teaching of Sinhala is exacerbating ethnic inequality and preventing many young Tamil and Muslim students from realising their potential and participating in society; “Without Sinhala language skills, students cannot locally benefit from communication with the army, police and government officials, or when they go outside the Tamil north” (T5). Mono-lingual Tamil-speaking students have become increasingly disgruntled they are unable to communicate effectively with Sinhalese, with many older students in secondary education demanding they are taught Sinhala as basic as their right to an education. In light of these demands, Sinhala teaching has begun to emerge from an unusual source. As aforementioned, military involvement in school life is generally unwelcome, yet I heard accounts of school visits from army personnel speaking with school pupils in Tamil, and briefly teaching children the Sinhala alphabet at School C (S4, S10). As the opportunity to listen to Sinhala is limited outside school (Davies, 2011, 18), this could perhaps be seen as a positive development, in spite of what is viewed as the continuation of the militarisation of secondary school education in Sri Lanka.

There exists a perception that Tamil-speaking people, including Northern Tamils and Muslims, feel as though they are subjugated by the national-level and persistently marginalised through language policy. Perera (2007) concludes that through evidence presented before the LLRC Tamil-speaking people were unable to work and do transactions in their own language due to negligence of administrative and judiciary systems, in spite of a tri-lingual national policy. To overcome the problem of inequality and maltreatment, the Principal of School A (T9) advocates for a language exchange programme to allow teachers to gain experience and appreciate the equal place and standing of all religions and ethnicities. This is echoed by two GIZ staff of Tamil ethnicity (P17, P18), who suggested that for peace education to succeed this must be implemented not only in Northern areas populated by Tamils and Muslims, but in the other 80% of the population in Sinhalese areas which were affected by decades of conflict. They admit that discrimination is imminent in peace education, whereby predominantly the Tamil ethnic group are being made to feel guilty and said to be at fault for the war, reinforcing a sense of unfairness among young Tamils and those of other ethnic and religious minorities.
4.2: Inter-community

The second element of ‘multi-scalar’ peace education examines peace and conflict at the inter-community level, specifically investigating its potential for ethno-religious reconciliation between groups, as recognised by a number of scholars (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Page, 2004; Davies, 2011). As aforementioned in Chapter 3, the relationship between a united Tamil group of Catholics and Hindus, and the Muslim population is plagued by animosity and resentment, motivated by long-standing inequalities between these areas in development, housing, poverty and importantly for this research, education. This section will focus on the ‘Peace and Value Education’ (PVE) component within the overarching ESC programme (Davies, 2011) and will investigate the values, ethics and morals instilled in schoolchildren to create a more peaceful society. It will identify the needs of these communities and schools for inter-religious reconciliation at the micro-level and whether ESC is perceived as successful in addressing this. This section will investigate the various components of ethno-religious reconciliation through official channels; from inter-group cultural and religious events, aimed at changing prejudicial perceptions and attitudes; to the teaching of religion within the curriculum and at the three secondary schools within this study.

The PVE component of ESC is incorporated into numerous subjects in the secondary school curriculum (Davies, 2011). The importance of inculcating the right values in students is fundamental to those within the educational sphere and the hope that “through the children parents can be re-educated....having been part of violent society for the last 30 years” (T14). A GIZ chief officer (P17) tasked with implementing peace education throughout Jaffna explained the significance of religious teaching as the awareness and understanding of other religions is central in the development of these values. A campaign for cultural and religious tolerance has been launched in 2012, which is based on ethics of mutual respect. A banner with the phrase ‘Respect Others’ is displayed prominently within all secondary schools in the Northern Province, including the schools in this study, and is a crucial message of this campaign.

In addition to the ‘Respect Others’ banner campaign, one of the most crucial, and perhaps surprising aspects of teacher training seminars on creating a ‘culture of peace’ within schools is an emphasis on ‘positivity’ (P17). Teachers are expected to maintain a positive state of mind and impart this philosophy to their students to develop a positive attitude of oneself and towards others (see Appendix 7 for an example of teaching material at peace education teaching seminar). T6 is one of many teachers deeply critical of this initiative, describing it as superficial and shallow which can be viewed as merely a point of departure and not as a substitute for more rigorous and in-depth teaching. This is primarily because this does not address societal and educational inequalities which the majority of educators ascertain as the routes causes of ethnic conflict, but
instead asserts a one-size-fits-all approach of individual happiness and positivity to a plethora of underlying complex factors. Two GIZ staff interviewed (P17, P18) openly mocked this initiative, and were disparaging of the idea that displaying banners with 'Respect Others' would have any sort of impact. Furthermore, remarks were made which insinuated that a large number of MoE officials do not take peace education seriously, and specifically efforts for cross-community religious reconciliation. Instead they claim peace education is seen as a pretence and not a genuine attempt to establish a culture of tolerance and mutual understanding through secondary school education. They continued, apathy starts at the top of government and disseminates to those individuals tasked with implementing peace education; allegations which are an extremely damaging and a damming indictment of peace education in Sri Lanka. Similarly, there are parallels here with the findings of Hoeks (2012) discovering that key respondents doubt the authenticity and legitimacy of peace education.

ESC strongly advocates the integration and accommodation of minorities, yet as established in Chapter 3 each school seems to pursue its own individual policy that contradicts and undermines national peace education policy. Although through intercultural exchange, education can assist the process of cross-community interaction by increasing 'participation days' through which Muslim schoolchildren socialise with Tamil-Hindu and Tamil-Catholic schoolchildren (P1). GIZ implements sporadic inter-ethnic meetings between schoolchildren of different religions throughout the Northern Province, which include drama, dance and reading competitions, for example the readings of Islamic and Tamil literature which is broadly welcomed by students.

As previously discussed in Chapter 3, School A is the only school to be included within the GIZ implemented peace education programme for inter-ethnic participation. These events allow a space for students to de-alienate those who identify themselves differently in society and to discover the many commonalities among them. Through these means, students can learn to show consideration and deference to others in society, and gain a greater understanding of the other, if not absorbed through society or the home (P1). This is demonstrated through observing religious ceremonies such as funerals, which in some cases are not permitted by the Sri Lankan state; for example the prevention of Tamils commemorating war dead. In my opinion, this is one of many inherent contradictions of government facilitated post-war reconciliation, whereby a campaign of respect pursued through education is not replicated through society.

A Tamil student of School C (S12) claimed that inter-ethnic meetings are increasingly rare and infrequent, and that she has never attended an inter-ethnic participation event with Sinhalese students. This is supported by other students of School C who criticise the MoE for failing to establish a common venue for open debate; yet it is claimed to occur more frequently in the south through forums between Muslim, Tamil and Sinhalese students. It is worth noting that when students were questioned on whether they believe inter-ethnic and inter-religious meetings can change negative attitudes and
stereotypes of people from other religions, 100% answered yes, further reinforcing the
desires of integration within the Jaffna student community. Through these findings it
can be concluded that despite the recognised prejudice of their parents’ generation, as
identified in Chapter 3, schoolchildren themselves acknowledge that through
socialisation with other ethno-religious groups prejudice can eventually be overcome.
Through this form of inter-ethnic interaction schoolchildren can increasingly develop
what Davies refers to as ‘hybrid identities’ (Davies, 2011).

There are 3 periods of religious teaching at school per week which teaches only about
the religion of the school. The lack of religious awareness and knowledge instilled in
schoolchildren through peace education, leads many within education to assert there is
a need for a comparative religion subject, approaching each religion as equal. P1
explained the central role of religious education should be the teaching of religious
tolerance and understanding through an overview of every religion, whereby all
students will have knowledge of: the Bible, sacred texts to Judaism and Christianity; the
Vedas, oldest scriptures of Hinduism; Tripitaka, the various canons of scriptures of
Buddhism; and the Quran, the central religious text of Islam.

For what ESC lacks in teaching of other religions and peoples, it attempts to make up for
through inter-cultural forums and events celebrating religious festivals such as
Muharram (The Islamic New Year), and Mawlid al-Nabi (Prophet Muhammad’s
Birthday) (T2) (see text box 4).

**Text Box 4 : Example of religious festivals held between secondary schools**

"The northern provincial director and the government pursue a policy of exchange
between schools, celebrating each other’s culture in which we gladly participate. Muslim
students wear Tamil traditional dress to foster respect at a festival of religion
which occurs annually in the month of May. This festival promotes understanding
between religions, such as a festival to commemorate the Birthday of Mohammed, in
which Christian and Hindu children are involved. These festivals revolve around
schools, for example a Christian festival in Hindu school, Hindu festival in Muslim
school, and Muslim festival in Christian school."(T2)

Furthermore, a GIZ peace education officer (P17) explained student exchange whereby
Tamil schools go to Sinhalese schools and vice versa for 2 to 3 days, spending time in
each other’s houses and keep in contact, yet due to a lack of implementation in practice
the occasions in which this occurs are extremely rare. Davies (2011) refers to number
of student exchanges although these have decreased since 2006. During my visit to
Jaffna, I witnessed a number of Sinhalese school trips to iconic and important sites of
Tamil culture such as the Jaffna Public Library, and Nallur Kandaswamy Temple, yet
heard of no examples whereby Sinhalese students would visit the secondary schools in
this study, or any other in Jaffna. Opportunities for inter-religious events within and
between schools are limited through official peace education channels, however there have been events organized through the community which will be discussed in the final data chapter.

4.3: Intra-community and individual

The final element of ‘multi-scalar’ peace education examines peace and conflict at the intra-community and individual level. Internal conflict has afflicted Muslim, Tamil-Catholic and Tamil-Hindu communities, defined by complex social problems of poverty, displacement and religious discrimination; and other sources of conflict not necessarily consequential of war - caste, Islamic extremism and gender discrimination. The existing problem of youth conflict, ignited by psycho-social trauma of experiencing war is continuing to curse communities and is a substantial challenge which cannot be ignored. This section investigates and scrutinizes the micro-level challenges faced on an inter-personal and individual level, and to what extent and scope peace education has addressed these needs, primarily within my central focus of the Muslim community. An important, although often repudiated component of peace education addresses the psychological wellbeing of children affected by war. Former studies have rightly highlighted the need for greater focus on the psychological well-being of students in the aftermath of ethnic conflict (Page, 2004; Hoeks, 2012, Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Davies 2013); furthermore there is a need to examine how peace education can alleviate the external contributory factors of poverty and displacement, which firstly, ‘Psycho-Social Care/Guidance Counselling’ (PSC) and secondly, ‘Education for Disadvantaged Children and Youth in Post-conflict and Poverty Areas’ components of ESC attempt to address (GIZ, 2011).

Government authorities have been accused of neglecting the psycho-social needs of young people after the war (Hellmann-Rajanayagam, 2010) however this need is gradually being met through a GIZ implemented counselling programme, extra assistance for teachers, and creating a supportive environment for vulnerable students (Davies, 2011). For selected secondary schools, resources have been provided by GIZ and UNICEF such as the appointment of specialist teachers and increased counselling for secondary school students targeting those who have been subjected to abuse, violence and displacement. Throughout Jaffna, 160 war-affected schoolchildren have been selected for counselling sponsored by GIZ (P17). These claims are disputed by teachers, the number of students receiving counselling and teachers receiving counselling training in the researched schools has been minimal, yet all schools in this study are said to require psycho-social counselling. A Hindu teacher and trained counsellor at School A (T4) explained that the school in fact obtained more funding for counsellor training and student welfare during the war, but today these programmes have been abandoned, as elucidated in the text box below. In response to this lack of required assistance, there have been efforts for ‘unofficial’ peace education whereby
CBOs have come to the school to offer counselling to students, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

**Text Box 5**

“From 2002-2004 the UNHCR and Danish Refugee Council would come to the school…conducting teacher training on counselling, and also providing meals for the schoolchildren. The help soon stopped…they were asked to leave by the government in 2009. Children need counselling help now because they don’t have a stable family situation and live in poor housing…some have special needs, psychological illness and many have witnessed murder.” (T4)

One of the primary objectives of the PSC component of ESC is to change the culture of a violent society which has infiltrated the home and the classroom (P17). Through classroom teaching PSC aims to put out a strong message that physical abuse against children by parents and teachers is not excusable and should be condoned. A Hindu MoE official (P12) explained that violence in schools persistently occurs, such as punishment through teachers beating students with a cane, in spite of government notices explaining the need for this to stop. A GIZ officer (P18) emphasised the objective of PSC to tackle domestic abuse. An increased incidence of domestic abuse ‘becoming the norm’ is one of many consequences of war, conflict, and displacement (Davies, 2013, 101). A teacher (T13) confided that “some children are in desperate need counseling…as they have been abused by their parents, siblings, neighbours”.

An influential community leader in the Muslim area believes that “cultural values are broken in the post-war period, as no-one has the experience of living in a peaceful society”; however stating that “through proper teaching and guidance this can be changed, slowly over time” (P9). Muslim and Tamil communities suffer from anti-social behaviour and violence, which many believe to be a post-conflict consequence of years of ethno-religious hatred and animosity between rival groups. Based on my analysis, this intra-community youth violence experienced and perpetrated by children is not a reflection of schools themselves, but a reflection of a violent and conflict-ridden society. In fact, there is evidence that children who have grown up with violence are more likely to reenact violence as adolescents or young adults and consider violence to be an ‘acceptable means of solving problems’ (McLean Hilker & Fraser (2009). Nevertheless, there is an overriding sense among teachers and community members that peace education in schools must do more to “reduce violence within our communities” (T9).

After the war, the youth became very “boisterous”, “angry”, and “confused” often engaging in fist-fights prompted by alcohol and drug abuse, which are afflicting these communities (P6); comparable to the findings provided by Hoeks (2012). Confrontations between students commonly provoke personal disputes such as over a relationship between a boy and girl of different caste, for example in the hierarchical caste-based Catholic community; or Muslim and Tamil youths fighting with each other.
and between themselves (P8). It should be noted that youth violence does not frequently occur on ethno-religious lines of identity, framed as Tamil versus Muslim, unlike conflict which occurs between those of the older generation. Based on findings presented in Chapter 3, it could be suggested a greater integration of Tamil and Muslim schoolchildren’s friend groups has led to less rigidly structured ethno-religious identities and subsequent conflict between them.

Many adult respondents felt sadness and regret that young people engaging in this form of behaviour have not received psycho-social support, nor have they received extra classes teaching interpersonal skills about forming relationships and defusing conflict (P6, P31, T9). In the few GIZ implemented conflict resolution classes which are held in schools, there is an emphasis upon developing peace at an individual level concentrating on inter-personal relationships, behavioural change, and the ‘predisposition to fight’ - which Bush and Saltarelli (2000, 28) refer to a ‘demilitarisation of the mind’. “Peace should start with the individual” stated a teacher at School A (T2), while another stated, “if there is to be peace throughout the country, it begins through the individual and the family” (T13). Interestingly, T14 was one of a few teachers who claimed that conflict resolution is “not specifically taught, but morally it is passed onto students”.

Social disruption, family dispersal, and the death or disappearance of family members have drastically affected the young lives of schoolchildren at each of the three secondary schools, but Muslim families are said to be particularly dysfunctional and ‘broken’, and perpetrate gender discrimination against women, whereby school girls are confined to the house outside school hours (P1). Education is perceived to be the exception to society’s norms of gender exclusion and discrimination, as the school provides equal opportunities for girls; however education can only help to such an extent for the social emancipation of women, pointed out by Muslim female teachers (T13, T14). This is of relevance as Gender equity is a central objective of GIZ ESC programme (Davies, 2011, 36). Through the ‘Education for Disadvantaged Children and Youth in Post-conflict and Poverty Areas’ component of ESC, assistance is targeted towards schools and schoolchildren providing greater resources needed to tackle the results of conflict and displacement, subsequent low education and poverty of Muslim community spoken of in Chapter 3. There are immeasurable intractable factors external to education which are detrimental to a child’s personal development and learning in school, such as family poverty, displacement and forced migration.

Importantly, the school itself must be a safe, stable and inclusive environment in which all schoolchildren feel secure (UNICEF, 2006). The close presence of the Sri Lankan military is often said to be unsettling to students of Tamil and Muslim ethnicity, and subsequently disadvantageous and counter-productive to the intended outcomes of peace education in these secondary schools; moreover militarization observably stifles local agency for reconciliation which will be discussed further in Chapter 5. In response
to question 25 of the student survey, ‘does the current military presence in Jaffna make you fearful and negatively affect your studies?’, a resounding 25 out of 34 of students said yes, with a number of respondents adding they felt threatened and that their presence has been frightening. Intriguingly, School B had the lowest number of students who agreed (3 out of 8), in a former LTTE-supporting area which is claimed to have the most frequent day-to-day interference from the military. Nevertheless, according to students, they also felt protected at school, and perceived it to be a place of refuge and a sanctuary. “Within the walls of the school there is no discrimination...it is a safe place to escape family stress and worries where we are treated as equals...outside is a different story with harsh realities,” explained a student (S34). Although Sri Lanka is now in post-conflict ‘negative peace’, as has been established in Chapter 1, in no way does this reduce the importance of providing a safe place for children to learn and preserving the sanctity of the school, as well as providing food, safe water, and other services integral to the well-being and development of a child.
Chapter 5: Community and Individual Agency

What agency is available to those inside education (teachers, students), and outside (community) to employ ‘unofficial’ peace education and ethno-religious reconciliation between Muslim and Tamil groups? And what are the perceived challenges faced in resistance to this agency-for-reconciliation and empowerment of communities?

This final data chapter examines the agency of individuals and community groups in pursuing strategies for cross-community participation for ethno-religious reconciliation between Muslim and Tamil groups. Furthermore, this chapter explores the submerged activism of local ‘social agents’ for social justice and change, and ‘unofficial’ or bottom-up forms of peace education. These activities are undertaken by actors within secondary school education, and those from out-with education, in direct response to the perceived failings of officialised or formal peace education discovered in Chapter 4, and in spite of the compression of democratic space through militarisation. This chapter will begin by discussing firstly, the agency of teachers; secondly, the agency of students; and finally the agency of external agents to education.

5.1: The agency of teachers

The agency of teachers in teaching peace education in Sri Lanka has been the focus of previous research projects (Vongalis-Macrow, 2007; Lopes Cardozo, 2008), in particular a comprehensive study by Hoeks (2012) on the agency of secondary school teachers for peace; however the agency of teachers to cause unintended and further conflict is worth equal consideration. It is important to discuss the role of teachers as they ‘are the core of peace education programmes as they are the key implementing agents’ (Lopes Cardozo & Hoeks, 2013, 12). Referring to the SRA, teachers are viewed as ‘strategic political actors’ (Jessop, 2005). The pedagogy that teachers employ is dependent upon a number of contextual factors, from their ideology and political views, to teacher training, and to education policies and governance (Hoeks, 2012).

Three teachers (T9, T11, T13) explicitly asserted that they actively pursued a personal strategy to deviate from the curriculum with which they disagreed, and instead teach with input from their own beliefs, culture and history; thus exerting teacher autonomy, as defined by Vongalis-Macrow (2007, 434) as the ‘capacity held by teachers to pursue their own interests and make effective their demands’. Those teachers who decide to debate these issues, which otherwise would not be spoken of, depart from the standard teacher-student authoritarian model into a pedagogy which is interactive promoting free speech in the classroom, and thereby challenge the barriers of identity and
prejudice between Muslims and Tamils in Jaffna, and beyond to the relationship with the Sinhalese. This form of teacher agency follows an educational objective advocated by Davies (2005, 32) to challenge exclusionary nationalist subjectivities and pre-conceived notions of identity and difference through an open dialogue. Teachers of this persuasion believe that to ignore the “problem of indoctrination” is more damaging long-term to the sustainability of peace than to allow the truth be told in a balanced and objective manner, “the next generation of young people must not succumb to propaganda” asserted T1. Meanwhile, another teacher (T11) stated: “The danger of not teaching the truth is perhaps greater than the danger of teaching the truth”, promoting to an active teacher agency to explore issues which teachers perceive to be manipulated, such as an ethnic bias towards the Sinhalese.

A bottom-up approach of agency is regularly favoured by Muslim and Tamil teachers in the three secondary schools yet the schools in which they operate are in no way independent, and despite the serious risks and consequences of undertaking these forms of activities. In reaction to questionable government intentions regarding post-war reconciliation and the perceived failings of the curriculum to inculcate the correct values in their students, School B have begun to introduce and distribute a series of books to students (see text box 6) not of the formal curriculum and not certified by MoE (T11). Although these texts are not included in the national curriculum, teachers decide to teach this due to their own personal convictions and desire to place emphasis upon their own culture; as the Principal of School B allows teachers a certain degree of autonomy. Previous studies have acknowledged the role of teachers in resisting change or allowing an alternative form of peace education to emerge (Lopes Cardozo, 2009; Davies, 2011: Hoeks, 2011). T13 explained her personal struggle regarding split loyalties between reconciling her "professional duty as a teacher" to teach the prescribed national history curriculum which she describes as "incorrect", and educating according to her conscience what she believes is right, "if important things are not in the official text, that is my duty to include them". This justification for introducing alternative teaching materials is reinforced through a desire to instill the ideal of equality and tolerance between religions, creeds and races in their students—an important theme which is present throughout these selected texts. It has been established that teachers deem this quality to be absent from a top-down national peace curriculum which is having a detrimental impact upon students, and ultimately society.
Disagreements between teachers persist regarding the discussion of the 1983-2009 civil war with children in class, including discussion on the LTTE, human rights abuses, forced evictions and military ‘occupation’ of the Northern province; a conversation officially forbidden from schools (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). The studies of Hoeks (2012) and Davies (2011) both concluded that teachers are unlikely to discuss war in the classroom reflecting a ‘strategy of neglect’ (Lopes Cardozo and Hoeks, 2013, 11). In this study a minority of teachers actively pursued a pedagogy of interaction and the valuing of shared experiences, stimulating classroom debate questioning the state’s narrative of war crimes, human rights abuses and discrimination of minorities. For instance, a Tamil teacher at School B (T1) considered it to be a teacher’s “responsibility to tell the truth, not the distorted truth by government”, and to challenge pre-existing power relations and government-control through education. Another teacher (T11) explained that during a regular 20-minute period towards the end of the class allocated for senior student discussion, the class is encouraged to debate current issues in the media. For example, “We discussed an article from an Indian magazine which stated in the final days of the war in Mullaitivu, a mother, father, and children were naked and shot. We discussed in class whether our army could have done it...whether they could have murdered these innocent people”. Unofficially, students can discuss topics in this part of class which are otherwise off-limits and not allowed under any circumstances and they are encouraged to ask questions and be critical of the GoSL. As political views cannot be expressed freely, the Principal of School B (T7) has resorted to an alternative strategy for free speech, installing a suggestion box in which students anonymously can post their opinions and ideas on how to approach unresolved issues which are troubling them. In this situation these decisions made by teachers are inherently political, adapting to a changing environment (Vongalis-Macrow, 2007). Moreover, these agents form their own strategically selective strategies, and can implement their own strategies whilst under duress and in situations of crisis such as increasing militarization of education and wider society (Fairclough, 2005, 931 in Lopes Cardozo, 2011, 43).

Contrastingly, there are many teachers who hold the opposing viewpoint and are against such discussion with students, as they view this agency as destructive and a

---

**Text Box 6: Selected non-curriculum texts at School B**

The first book, written in Tamil, is entitled 'The Art of Joyful Living' by a recently retired 'Mother superior nun', regarding the potential of religious reconciliation through making other religions integral to one’s way of living, and its central concept suggesting Sri Lanka is a family of a diversity of religions, creeds and colours. The second of these books in question, taught in -Grade 8 and 9, is a book entitled 'Enlighten students and inculcating the right values in them', a text for those affected by the war and deep-rooted prejudices. Finally, a third book introduced, seemingly untitled, teaches the history of the Tamil people, and their relationship with races such as Veddas, an indigenous people of Sri Lanka, the Sinhalese and the Muslims. (T1, T11)
possible means to cause unintended and further conflict. This is in line with Hay (2002), whereby teachers’ strategies are influenced by the wider context; in this case teachers are wary of militarisation and seek to comply with official peace education policy. For instance, the Principal of School C (T6) insists that a teacher’s role should not be to incite hatred in young people, adding that teachers must be aware of the sensitivities and risks associated with these types of discussions, explaining “the danger is that when they [students] start reading, they may rebel against the government”. In the context of continued discrimination of minorities it is considered to be crucial not to engage in dialogue with students regarding such emotive issues, which may be perceived as extremist, for example, the restrictions that “Tamils are not allowed near the President should certainly not be discussed with children” (T1). Although some teachers would like to discuss the war and its socio-political consequences, to reiterate there is a great fear which runs throughout the teaching profession. One teacher (T12) explained the dangers of deviating from the subscribed curriculum, “It’s impossible to discuss the war. Only politicians can talk freely. If we talk about conflict we may be suspected as Tamil nationalists and branded as Tigers [LTTE]”.

5.2: The agency of students

Through the agency of teachers, students are developing a greater awareness of the socio-political structures which surround them. The agency of both students and educators pursuing an educational path relevant to their locale is at the front-line of the battle between bottom-up and top-down forms of peace education. Students have become increasingly facilitated and encouraged by teachers and other individuals outside education to to explore their own possibilities and opportunities to choose, and to think independently and critically. This is pertinent to Bush and Saltarelli’s (2000, 16-17) 'desegregation of the mind', overcoming historical conceptions of ethnic separation and challenge received truths about group relationships, in this case the context of the 1983-2009 civil war and Muslim displacement. There has been less academic literature concerning the agency of students, yet in line with the SRA of Hay (2002) students similarly are viewed as strategic agents questioning and challenging what is taught within the curriculum and what they experience in society.

In response to the survey question on whether students think they should have the opportunity to openly debate issues of war and human rights abuses in school, and learn from the lessons of this, the resounding majority were in agreement. This finding is supported by accounts of students who ask their teacher penetrating questions about the conflict, and proactively seek out answers to their past. Whilst talking about the conflict in school, a Muslim student (S38) suggested: “We should discuss the important question of who instigated the war, though Tamils are not really interested in this….the teachers only talk about ‘unity’ and say ‘good thoughts should be developed’…nobody wants to answer the difficult questions.” This quote is representative of many students
frustrations regarding the perceived failure of education to allow open discussion on a war which has affected all their lives, yet they must remain silent as though it never occurred. Another Muslim student poignantly outlined the urgent need to question accepted ‘truths’ and ‘facts’: “It is important not to forget, to learn not to repeat it and make the same mistakes as our parents generation. To prevent this from happening again, it begins with the schools...the children must not be poisoned. Yet, we are not prepared...not prepared to stop this from happening again” (S40).

Contrary to other schools in this study, the majority of students at School A explained that they are not permitted to participate in the debate of post-war issues in their school, and even insinuated they did not consider themselves entitled to discuss such politically sensitive topics as they were exclusively reserved for “well-educated grown-ups of society” (S40). Despite this, and to many adults surprise, students believe they are being fed contrived misrepresentations of history reinforcing marginalization of minority groups; with one student exclaiming, “they [the GoSL] aim to suppress our freedoms when we are young so we don’t rise up again. Reconciliation means democratic rights for everyone. Not only the Sinhalese” (S31). Subsequently some students have demanded to their teachers that they be taught the ‘truth’ about the past conflict and the unspoken narratives of war.

The principals and teachers of School A, B and C have ‘opened up’ education to external influence and actors of local community members, religious leaders, and intellectuals, thereby strengthening the relationship between community and school, to the unknowing MoE and military. Through extra-curricular Tamil student unions and student debating clubs, a space for debate has been established where students actively set the agenda and argue for and against motions ideally on militarization of the north, devolution for Tamil areas, and repression of minorities, although not always due to the fear to discuss such things. These groups are claimed to take inspiration from the historically significant Jaffna Youth Congress (JYC) (see Text Box 7).
The independence of such groups is of utmost importance as debating between schools through official channels “tends to avoid those particular topics of inequality, conflict, and war” (T5). The vast majority of students (28 out of 34) participate in extra-curricular student forums and debates, however the number of students participating in autonomous clubs able to express more freedom regarding content is difficult to ascertain. School A has the smallest participation numbers (9 out of 14).

A Tamil student who hopes to attend university next year is worried of increasing militarisation of Sri Lanka and its infiltration into secondary and higher education. Through her Tamil youth group, she opposes “the encroachment of the military state on civilian life, and all forms of military training for all university participants”, which is claimed to “instil discipline” in the Tamil, Muslim, and Sinhalese students (P23). These debating societies, independent of secondary school influence, are seen by many students and teachers as places for critical thinking and as a bastion for the defense of free speech which is increasingly eroded by restrictive freedoms through militarization of society and education itself.

The agency of individual students in attempting to redefine the contested relationship between the Muslim and Tamil communities is noteworthy. For example, a Muslim pupil (S38) studying at School C for A/L is conducting a project regarding Muslim displacement, investigating the justification for such an eviction and the subsequent trauma experienced by Muslims. The student stated his desire to conduct this research project “in order to learn from this, and to stop this from happening again”, and so he

---

**Text Box 7: The case of the Jaffna Youth Congress (JYC)**

The JYC was founded in 1924 and was a pioneer of the youth leagues of Sri Lanka; debating societies consisting of young people and intellectuals. Inspired by the Indian struggle for independence led by Mahatma Gandhi, the JYC began as study group for students and teachers at Jaffna College to debate issues of the day, but quickly evolved into a political entity committed to national unity in the guise of non-sectarian Ceylonese nationalism, independence from British colonial rule, and the eradication of hierarchical caste inequalities. The secular JYC played a major role in securing universal franchise in 1931 (Perinbanayagam, 2012). A revised edition of ‘Handy Perinbanayagam: A Memorial Volume and the Jaffna Youth Congress’, edited by Santasilan Kadirgamar, has recently been re-released in a post-war era which many democracy activists would argue requires such an forum for debate which is becoming increasingly oppressed. In recognition of this condensed democratic space in Sri Lanka, Kadirgamar draws a parallel with this by-gone era and calls for the need, or hope, of a modern-day JYC debating issues of inclusive nationalism, linguistic segregation, the discrimination of minorities, and religious tolerance and extremism, with which the youth can engage and continue the JYC’s tradition democratic participation, right to protest, and radicalism.
can inform young people of his age not aware of these issues. Like many young Muslims, he learnt about displacement from his parents, but recognizes their views can be subjective and carry prejudicial attitudes; yet he seeks to challenge these inherited assumptions of the Tamil-Muslim relationship. He claimed “the purpose of this project is not to name, nor hurt anyone, but to help future generations learn about the facts of displacement, as we all should have a clearer idea of what happened”. This example is representative of many young people and their aspirations to change their communities for the common good. Interestingly, the student has been discouraged by his Tamil teachers, with one stating that he is “wasting his time”. Predominantly, Muslim teachers and students express an inner desire to address issues of the recent past, and reexamine the social and historical context of education in Jaffna and their position in relation to it. From this data, it could be concluded that students seem to employ more active agency than teachers, perhaps teachers as ‘strategic actors’ (Hay, 2002) are more strategically aware, or are restricted by social and political structures in which they have become institutionalised by the norms of society, not to question authority which they are governed by. Based on this assumption, students are more likely to choose to challenge the status quo as they have not yet been moulded and ultimately impeded by their surrounding environment.

5.3: The impact of external interventions on agency for reconciliation

The dialectical relationship between school and community is a theme constant throughout this thesis. This section will closely examine this changing and dynamic relationship with regards to concerted and collaborative efforts made by both parties for ethno-religious reconciliation between the Tamil and Muslim communities of Jaffna. In an atmosphere of fear, involvement of community actors who utilise the secondary school apparatus as a platform for cross-community dialogue and assistance must remain covert and ‘unofficial’. This is perceived by the majority of teachers, community activists and religious leaders to be necessary in response to the failures of peace education for meaningful and genuine ethno-religious reconciliation, established in Chapter 4.

In the post-war context of Sri Lanka, the perpetuation of ethnic inequalities and conflict has debatably sparked local groups into action and increased involvement within the education system, having attempted to secure social justice through their own agency and increasing local ‘ownership’ of education. However, there is a reluctance and fear to engage in such activities because of recent cases whereby innocent Tamils and Muslims from these communities have ‘disappeared’ having engaged in activism for Muslim-Tamil reconciliation; more accurately they have been forcibly taken by snatch squads operating from notorious white vans (Channel 4, 2013). Recollections of vigilance and intimidation by the SLA are not uncommon, with one parent (P29) claiming “they [SLA] can arrest you for anything”. Observably, where the threat of disappearance once
originated from the LTTE, it is now taken over by military intent on the pacification rather than protection of the people. P8 made an interesting observation about individual activism and involvement in the community, by suggesting that many within the community are not interested in assuming leadership responsibilities. They do not fear the responsibility, but fear recognition in the public realm and attention from military informants or "old enemies" who may not take a liking to their current activities, acting as a strong deterrent to participate in cross-community reconciliation. Based on these circumstances it seems that agency for ethno-religious reconciliation which is `underground' is the only viable alternative in this environment of silence.

The School Development Society (SDS) is perceived as the sole official instrument of interaction between community and school. The SDS organisation consists of students' parents of a particular school, and is an opportunity for parents to become involved in the politics and extra-funding for the school. Throughout the three secondary schools, this form of local participation is not encouraged by Government and MoE officials, which could be viewed as preventing and stifling local agency, initiative and a sense of local ownership of education. SDS at School A which consists of predominantly Muslim parents, has very little involvement in the school, as explained by a parent and member (P30). The organization is not wealthy and can only gather materials such as stationary and furniture for the school, and is increasingly sidelined by the Mosque. Contrastingly, in light of the perceived failures of the PSC component of ESC, as discussed in Chapter 4.3, a teacher (T14) expressed that the SDS at School A has funded a recent seminar on "how conflict can be solved, and the misuse of children rights", and counseling for individual students, ran in conjunction with the 'old boys association' and local CBOs. Despite these claims of assistance for School A from within the Muslim community, individual and community involvement in the Islamic school is more likely to be from ethnic Tamils living out-with the Muslim community boundary, rather than Jaffna's Muslim enclave itself. This is in spite of the dissuading exclusionist and segregational policy adopted by many senior Muslim community and religious leaders. There are also a number of Muslim individuals working out-with the education sector, assisting the school in terms of campaigning for better quality education and fundraising for extra-classes for students (P1).

The Tamil people who help in the school in efforts for greater Tamil-Muslim relations are generally of a professional, well-educated, middle class demographic, and are recent returnees to Jaffna following the end of the war. In line with Freire (1970), these educated agents are more likely to strategically take it upon themselves to transform the social structures which currently oppress them, and expand the democratic space for community-cooperation and empowerment. One such individual is the current Vice-Principal at School A, a Tamil-Hindu, who has taught there since 2003, helping the Muslim community and battling teacher and funding shortages (T2); while another respondent (P5) has recently become a community coordinator, organising free after-school classes in School A for Muslim schoolchildren. The agency of Tamil individuals is
not a flood but a trickle of altruism in the hope of building a better society of cooperation and collaboration between Muslims and Tamils, and certainly does not represent a large-scale community-driven project.

To Bush and Saltarelli (2000, 27) this form of education for peace-building would be a bottom-up rather than top-down process driven by war-torn communities themselves, founded on their experiences. Following the culmination of war in May 2009, community assistance in secondary school education has began to establish itself in the Catholic area, as community leaders of caste-based organizations confirm (P22): “In early 2010, our community centre began to host study nights, allowing schoolchildren who didn’t have electricity, lights, desks and anywhere to study at home to study at the community centre. Students from any school are welcome, not only this area, but also Muslim schoolchildren are welcome to study here.” Similarly to other events, donations from former students who are now business people in Jaffna, Colombo and international Tamil Diaspora, has helped to assist cooperation between the Muslim and Catholic community providing extra tutoring for poorer students. Furthermore, due to the poverty and lack of facilities within the Muslim community, Muslim schoolchildren have been welcomed into the homes of Tamils where study groups have been arranged for students from School A and School B. Positively, these groups are said to be empowering Muslim girls, allowing them to escape the confinements of their homes which they are usually not allowed to leave unless during school hours (T13). The existence of Tamil-Muslim extra-curricular study groups, organized by parents, and community leaders reflects the notion of ‘border pedagogy’, theorized by Giroux (1992), which suggests opportunities for students to study together from different and opposing identities can facilitate inclusion and a re-territorialisation of their ethno-religious identities, and consequent reconciliation between formerly opposing groups.

It is necessary to differentiate this form of agency with the official events organised for official peace education. Of the ethno-religious events organised by community members, inter-cultural sports days are an opportunity for students to meet with one another, in a competitive environment and create a ‘momenta of togetherness’ between ethno-religiously opposed students, and the formation of inclusive identities based on common interests Schulenkorf, (2010). Football teams travels south to play against Sinhalese schools, which is significant as it is currently the only opportunity for Tamil children from this school to visit a Sinhalese area. Likewise language competitions facilitate inter-religious participation, for example Sinhala language competitions between Tamil-speaking Hindus, Catholics, and Muslims recently organised by Muslim parents in Killinochi and Jaffna (S5).

External community-based organisations have initiated efforts to improve relations between communities; particularly inter-religious and inter-cultural events structured to develop religious tolerance and understanding between Muslim, Hindu and Catholic schoolchildren. Multi-religious events which focus on religious learning are organized
between collaborative efforts by school principals and community representatives with
the blessing of Catholic and Hindu religious leaders; however there is greater resistance
to these events from Islamic religious leaders (T13). School A is a common venue as it is
seen as a focal point of the Muslim community. Through this form of inter-religious
participation it was compelling to observe the dichotomy between segregation in
secondary schooling, and contrastingly integration in after-school classes, which are
seemingly popular with students as they are not compulsory (S5). Many students
believe peace education should be implemented through another avenue of informal
extra-curricular education, in which communities can play a larger part in construction
of curricula and alternative learning spaces. These events are not only opportunities for
students, but allow members of each community to interact and engage with one
another’s culture as parents of pupils, prominent community representatives, and
religious leaders are invited (T13). This convergence of disparate civil society, the
vehicle of secondary school education, and the unifying cause of Tamil-Muslim
reconciliation is having lasting success of facilitating shared understanding and
tolerance of one another’s culture.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

How can we understand the extent to which secondary school education can contribute to ethno-religious reconciliation between the Muslim and neighbouring Tamil communities in post-war Jaffna, Sri Lanka?

The final chapter of this thesis answers the main research question above, by drawing upon and connecting together information elicited through the three research sub-questions and corresponding data chapters. The first section of this conclusion will conclude the findings of the data chapters. Chapter 3 discussed how structural inequalities in society, are replicated in secondary school education and are perceived to be perpetuating ethno-religious conflict. Chapter 4 examined peace education through multi-scalar analysis, concluding that it is perceived by respondents not to be meeting the needs of communities. Chapter 5 discovered community and individual agency in response to failings of state peace education, is predominantly for Tamil-Muslim reconciliation. The second part of this conclusion will reflect on the theoretical framework and what my study has brought to the field. The final section of this chapter will provide recommendations for peace education policy and future research.

6.1: Research conclusions

Chapter 3 sets out to answer the following research sub-question: By applying Fraser's ‘social justice’ framework of recognition, representation and redistribution, how can we analyse the extent to which structural inequalities of society are replicated through education? And is this perceived by key actors (teachers and students) to reinforce ethno-religious conflict? Chapter 3 has drawn upon the social justice framework provided by Fraser (1996, 2005, 2009) and focused on the structural inequalities of Sri Lankan society; which are perceived to be perpetuating conflict between ethno-religious groups. This chapter discovered that these structural inequalities are reflected within secondary school education and between the researched schools in the three distinct ethno-religious communities.

The first dimension of Fraser’s framework to be explored was recognition. Historical grievances regarding war-time events, such as Muslim displacement, are continuing to plague the relationship between Tamils and Muslims; perpetuating discrimination, exclusion, and segregation, and the entrenchment of singular ethno-religious identities. The geographic, social and political segregation between Tamils and Muslims is
seemingly replicated within the strict religious segregation between secondary schools; identified as a ‘negative face of education’ (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000) exacerbating conflict between groups. The absence of recognition of one another’s culture between Muslims and Tamils continues to be a source of conflict, observably within the secondary schools, whereby minority groups are not accommodated at Schools A and B. School C is seemingly the exception to this rule and is widely viewed as a ‘school of inclusion’. Analysis of the interconnected second dimension of representation discovered there to be identity-based conflict regarding an absence of political representation, impeding Muslim efforts for resettlement. Schools have also been the venue for struggles for political power, specifically within School A where religious-based conflict exists between Muslims (the Mosque, Muslim teachers) and Tamils (MoE and Tamil teachers).

Through analysis of the third dimension of redistribution, educational inequality and uneven distribution of resources between schools are perceived to be contributing to conflict between students. Specifically, Muslim students feel a sense of injustice and unfairness that educational facilities at School A are perceived to be worse than neighbouring Tamil schools; particularly the lack of A/L at School A. However, the link between local educational inequalities and further inter-group conflict is debateable as research discovered there is a greater integration between Muslims and Tamils between young people, than adults. This section also examined the structure of peace education (SCPE and ESC) and its implementation in the three secondary schools which is perceived to be imbalanced. School A receives additional ESC from GIZ than School B and School C; it is widely believed that is because it increases Muslim involvement in the Northern Province in this programme. Based on my analysis, peace education is the only component of secondary school education which can be said to be appropriately redistributed towards marginalized groups such as the Muslim community. However conflict-affected vulnerable schoolchildren at neighbouring Tamil schools are excluded and implementation in all three schools remains weak. Nevertheless the (lack of) implementation of peace education, plagued by shortages in training, funding, resources for schools to create ‘culture of peace’, is generally not perceived by key actors to be having an observable influence on further conflict between Muslim and Tamil groups.

Chapter 4 aimed to answer the following research sub-questions: How is official peace education experienced and understood by key actors (teachers and students)? Does peace education address the needs of the community at different scales (supra-community; inter-community; and intra-community)? Through a multi-scalar analysis this chapter investigated peace education at a series of levels and across the curriculum, as there is currently no specialist peace education subject.

Firstly, peace education at the ‘Supra-community’ level, where both ethnographic groups (Tamil and Muslim) are seemingly subjugated to the same national forces of Sinhalese bias and xenophobia, claimed to originate from the GoSL, has been at the centre of most criticism of education and social inequalities of Sri Lanka. Both Tamil
and Muslim teachers were united in their criticism of a “biased” history curriculum which is seen as portraying a Sinhalese Buddhism domination and cultural hegemony; through a process to re-territorialize the minds of young people to firmly establish Sri Lanka as the nation of the Sinhalese. Thus the history curriculum is viewed by teachers and students as a continuation of attacks upon Islamic and Tamil minorities, through the marginalisation and attempted erosion of culture and assimilation within Sinhalese-defined national identity. Nevertheless, the teaching of Sinhala in Tamil-speaking schools is generally considered as a positive tool for peace and reconciliation by teachers and students, yet there is a lack of implementation of 2NL in the three schools, due to inadequate Sinhala language skills, lack of teacher training and no appointment of Sinhala language teachers. In contradiction with a peace policy designed to be representative of the plethora of religions, ethnicities and culture, there is a resolute Sinhalese control over history education; a domination reflected throughout Sri Lankan society.

Secondly, at the ‘Inter-community’ level, there is a general consensus among education practitioners that SCPE does not address unresolved religious identity-driven conflict. A central contention of this thesis is that peace education must give more leaning towards conflict between different religious groups and re-address religious misunderstandings and intolerance, which is identified in this thesis as a central source of conflict between Tamil and Muslim groups. Although a policy advocating inter-ethnic participation is welcomed, this contrasts with the retention of ethno-religious segregation between communities and schools. The teaching of values, ethics and morals is crucial to attaining religious tolerance and understanding between these rival ethno-religious groups. An absence of trust and knowledge of one another’s religion and culture is the key problem identified by teachers, students and community members that is perceived to reinforce the divide between them.

Although all aspects of peace education require actions at the individual level, analysis of the ‘Intra-community’ level illustrated the psychological and social stresses of schoolchildren blighted by the past in a post-conflict and post-displacement society. Furthermore, the intimidating presence of the SLA is said to be negatively affecting students by creating atmosphere of mistrust and fear. Without the involvement of GIZ, extra assistance through the MoE for the most vulnerable conflict-affected students is minimal; even though it is apparent through this research that GIZ peace education and counselling does not engage at the scale required for schoolchildren’s psychological needs, nor provide the insurance of a safe place for a child to learn. Basic needs - material and psychological - must firstly be addressed for peace education to have a chance of success. There are many perceived problems of the younger community by the older generation, yet the mental health of those who have witnessed traumatic events and lived through war seems to have been largely forgotten. In light of the findings outlined above, critical questions have been raised regarding the implementation of peace education which is perceived to suffer from apathy and ‘lack of
interest’ from the MoE, and ultimately the GoSL. It is claimed by teachers and students that peace education does not meet needs of local Tamil and Muslim communities, and there exists a chasm between a peace policy which is equitable, inclusive and democratic, and in practice where minorities are excluded and marginalised.

Chapter 5 aimed to answer the following research questions: What agency is available to those inside education (teachers, students), and outside (community) to employ ‘unofficial’ peace education and ethno-religious reconciliation between Muslim and Tamil groups? And what are the perceived challenges faced in resistance to this agency-for-reconciliation and empowerment of communities?

Leading on from the findings of Chapter 4, the perceived failings of official peace education in terms of not addressing the needs of the communities, and non-existent implementation is initiating alternative forms of peace education. This chapter began by investigating the agency of teachers through the SRA (Hay, 2002) which views teachers as ‘strategic political actors’ employing strategies for change for greater ethno-religious reconciliation within the confines of educational structures. There are a minority of teachers in all three secondary schools actively resisting official peace education policy and instead employing their own form of ‘unofficial’ peace education, which they believe to be politically and culturally-balanced through the introduction of individual teachers’ alternative teaching methods and materials, although questioning issues usually silenced within the curriculum, for example the discussion of human rights abuses perpetrated by the SLA and LTTE. The agency of students exerted for free speech, critical thinking and engaging in political debate through student projects and unions is an interesting development, considering the younger generation remain deeply affected by war, and are keen to question selective narratives of the past and prevent the neglect and marginalisation of minority Muslim and Tamil culture and history.

Not only has agency originated from those within education – principals, teachers, and students – but also from external actors – individuals and CBOs from both Muslim and Tamil communities who have began to take it upon themselves to reDEFINE the role of education in the community for ethno-religious reconciliation. In response to the perceived failings of an ethnically-oriented Sinhalese-Tamil curriculum, inter-religious reconciliation through cross-community engagement, collaboration and participation is identified as a priority area by both Muslim and Tamil communities to improve relations between them. Undoubtedly, the main issue of conflict for this study is of Muslim and Tamil misunderstanding, mistrust and animosity, which is claimed official peace education does not address. Individual and community agency in education is bottom-up, inclusive and participatory attempting to facilitate cross-community dialogue; however its influence is limited due to restrictions imposed through militarisation of social and educational spaces, thus the narrowing of democratic space and the suppression of a discourse of reconciliation. Militarisation is increasingly
stifling agency for reconciliation, as the journey towards authoritarianism nears. There are still disappearances, abductions and threats to those who dare to dissent so therefore agency for ethno-religious reconciliation remains covert and shrouded by a politics of fear and recriminations from the SLA. Such activism is even more remarkable in view of the considerable risks. In spite of these challenges, there are numerous examples of individual agents attempting to improve Tamil-Muslim relations through the common goal and vehicle of education; yet the impact of such activism will remain limited until this form of democratic citizenship is endorsed and encouraged by the GoSL.

6.2: Theoretical Reflection

In this section, I would like to return to the theoretical framework which has been applied throughout the data chapters and reflect on what this study has brought to the academic debate. First of all, this thesis has built upon the ethnographic research on peace education in Sri Lanka by Davies (2011) Lopes Cardozo (2008) and Hoeks (2012); however research on the implementation, perceptions and experience of peace education in the Tamil North has been limited and it is hoped this paper will fill a gap in the literature. I have aptly utilised Bush and Saltarelli’s (2000) influential theory of the ‘two faces of education’ to demonstrate that official education is perceived to be the embodiment of the negative face of education through enforced segregation, manipulation and ethnic bias of the curriculum, and repression of critical thinking and debate; Simultaneously, the agency of individuals (teachers and students) and external actors (community members and organisations) can be viewed as a concerted effort to implement the positive face of education through the desegregation of ethno-religious groups, and the teaching of democratic principles and one’s own culture.

This paper has pursued a methodology broadening the debate towards political, cultural and social contexts, departing from a narrow educational analysis, in line with Novelli and Smith (2011). Furthermore Dale’s (2006:190) ‘three levels of education questions’ has been a source of inspiration and guidance for the analysis of peace education, examining the relationship between the ‘politics of education’ and ‘educational politics’. This approach has elucidated the findings that there is a substantial disconnection between peace education policy, a policy which is designed to incorporate social justice, and the implementation of official peace education in practice. Education is often perceived to be in direct contradiction with this policy. These findings resemble the work presented by Lopes Cardozo and Hoeks (2013). Following the holistic approach offered by Dale (1999; 2000; 2005) and Novelli and Smith (2011) to engage with the political, cultural and social spheres, peace education is viewed by key Muslim and Tamil actors to be highly politicised, and criticised that it is too narrowly focused on the ethnic problem at the national-level. Yet through analysis of the ‘politics of education’ is became clear that religious identity rather than ethnic
identity is a major source of conflict within education, and so peace education must shift from a paradigm of ethnic reconciliation to one of religious reconciliation.

Further drawing upon Dale (1999; 2000; 2005), Lopes Cardozo (2008) and Smith (2005), the conceptualisation of multi-scalar approach whereby conflict and responses to conflict are examined at a series of levels proved to be a successful form of analysis illuminating a series of findings showing that SCPE in practice neglects a series of levels, in summary, the neglect Tamil-Muslim ethno-religious reconciliation and psychological needs at the individual level. Through my holistic approach, I have demonstrated through a more defined concept that peace and conflict is multi-scalar and multi-dimensional, and the education system is dependent upon political, social and historical factors.

The social justice framework provided by Fraser (2005; 2009) was extremely useful for the analysis of Muslim and Tamil groups highlighting inequalities and injustices in recognition, representation and redistribution in secondary school education and more broadly in society. Through this alternative approach based on a theory of social justice it became apparent as to what was absent to secure inclusive and democratic post-war reconciliation. Importantly, Fraser’s social justice framework informed the approach for individual and collective agency through education. Through reference to the SRA (Hay, 2002) and the emphasis upon the inter-relationship between structure and agency, this thesis specifically contributes to the body of work regarding the agency of teachers (Vongalis-Macrow, 2007; Lopes Cardozo 2008; Hoeks, 2012) viewing them as strategic political actors within the strategically selective context of the Sri Lankan state and educational structures. However this research goes further to shine a new light upon the agency of students in education facilitated by teachers and external actors, and importantly the agency of external actors taking it upon themselves as agents of change. To be clear, my contribution to this debate is that a social justice based agency-for-reconciliation has emerged through teachers and students within formal education, and from external actors’ such as community members and CBOs. This form of agency demonstrates that activism occurs when even the most basic of democratic rights are assaulted and suppressed.

6.3: Recommendations for peace education policy

SCPE and ESC in Sri Lanka are generally viewed positively at the policy level, incorporating a strong social justice element which has received international plaudits. Nevertheless as discussed there are numerous problems regarding implementation. Peace education also suffers from a lack of monitoring and evaluation which could be used to provide valuable feedback from teachers to MoE and GIZ. GIZ, the central actor in the implementation of peace education – observably requires greater support from
the MoE and the GoSL in order to implement peace education and to expand the policy country-wide which is desired by respondents.

The enthusiasm from schoolchildren for more inter-ethnic and inter-religious events was striking, through both unofficial and official channels, as was their criticism of segregated schooling. In light of this I would advocate for peace education to increase the regularity of these events and to ensure that all four religious communities of Sri Lanka are represented. Moreover, a minority of teachers advocated teacher exchange between Sinhalese-medium schools and Tamil-medium schools. In its current form, peace education is incorporated within a range of subjects in the curriculum, however in light of findings suggesting many teachers do not know how to integrate peace education into teaching, I would advocate the introduction of a individual, specific subject on peace education.

In response to participants’ perceptions that they are being increasingly marginalised within education, I would advocate the national school curriculum would benefit from an emphasis upon the local, which is more relevant to the day-to-day realities experienced by schoolchildren. Greater local involvement in peace education policy through a consultation process would allow for greater participation and flexibility in implementation and contribute to a sense of empowerment. Although education is to an extent devolved provincially, this would require greater school autonomy. It must be noted though there are substantial dangers here of fragmenting secondary schools still further and exacerbating the problems of segregation and difference.

I argue that peace education should pay greater attention to firstly, the views of students, whose views are often ironically sidelined as they are the subject of peace education and the agents for creating a more peaceful society; and secondly the opinions and suggestions of teachers as they the main agents of implementing peace education.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that peace education cannot succeed unilaterally, without political consensus for structural reform; a conclusion similarly drawn by a number of scholars (Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Davies, 2011; Lopes Cardozo and Hoeks, 2013). Peace education can assist in the creation of a less violent society of tolerance and acceptance of others, however it cannot alter the fundamental structural inequalities and stratifications at the macro-level and micro-level of Sri Lankan society. Peace-building must include education, which has an integral role to play in post-war reconciliation for a pluralistic, equitable and socially just Sri Lanka.
6.4: Recommendations for future research

There are significant possibilities for future research of minority groups in Sri Lanka, although the difficulties of researching in the militarised Northern Province has been made clear throughout this thesis. Undoubtedly, research would benefit from greater embeddedness in the community for a longer duration of time as it is a slow process to remove prejudice within young people and subsequently society; in sum, educational research must be long-term. Moreover, findings could be extended from state to private secondary schools, in addition to incorporating primary schools and formative years education within this research on education.

There remains a desperate need for attention to be drawn to the Muslim community in Jaffna and their struggle for recognition, representation and a redistribution of social development. Ethnographic research on the plight of the Northern Muslims is under-researched and received little to no coverage in the debate of peace education and post-war reconciliation in Sri Lanka, by policymakers and practitioners. Within academia, discussion has been limited to Thiranagama (2007; 2008), McGilvray and Raheem (2007), and Brun (2009) focusing on those who are still displaced. Further research could be used to contribute to draw attention to this ‘forgotten minority’ and contribute to policy making which recognises the role of minorities in post-war reconstruction and reconciliation.

Moreover, this research has problematised the wider role of Muslims within post-war reconciliation and rebuilding in Sri Lanka, although primarily within the educational sphere. Research on the role of the Muslim minority within peace-building at a multitude of scales from the local to the national would provide insightful findings. There is need for further research into a preponderance of religious conflict and the reasons for such conflict between the four main religious groups in Sri Lanka.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Map of Sri Lanka

Map displaying location of Jaffna, Northern Sri Lanka

Source: Google Maps, 2014 Available at: https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@9.7089304,80.0071487,11z
Appendix 2: National Policy on Social Cohesion and Peace

The desired citizen who is a product of ESCP is therefore one who:
1. Can live in a multicultural society, respects diversity, does not compete based on differences, values or tolerates other cultures, trusts others, treats others as human beings; is not racist; can analyse the causes of intercultural disharmony objectively
2. Is democratic in decision-making, can work in a team without conflict, seeks to understand the ideas of others, can share resources, has an open mind, thinks critically, can act assertively
3. Respects and ensures others’ rights
4. Communicates well, and in each others’ language, is an active listener
5. Can solve problems and face challenges, particularly challenges of the multicultural society
6. Can transform conflict, and can think positively
7. Has discovered inner peace, has a peaceful and sustainable lifestyle, can understand his/her own capacity and scope of work
8. Is politically enlightened
9. Is not corrupt or does not accept bribes; serves others without expectations, has civic virtues, is willing to sacrifice
10. Has a global vision and is a global citizen; has the courage to participate in the development of the world; is environmentally friendly
11. Does no harm to anybody in thoughts or deeds; respects others’ feelings, is empathetic
12. Can protect Sri Lankan traditions, culture and values
13. Obey the laws; also has qualities beyond the rules and regulations

## Appendix 3: Table of fieldwork research activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of research activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Language Medium</th>
<th>Research Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04/02/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Sri Lankan Independence Day event held by Muslim community - (P1), Former Deputy Mayor of Jaffna (P2), leader of Muslim civil society organisation (P3)</td>
<td>Tamil &amp; English</td>
<td>Muslim Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05/02/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>University of Peradeniya academic (P4), University of Jaffna academic (P5)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>06/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Former school principal (P6)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Independent academic (P7)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>06/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview (second)</td>
<td>Muslim community activist (P1)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>08/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview (third)</td>
<td>Muslim community activist (P1)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Tamil-Catholic Priest (P8)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Vice Principal of School B (T1)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>08/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Muslim community leader (P9)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Shop visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>09/02/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>President of Muslim Federation (P10), Secretary of Muslim Federation (P11)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11/02/2013</td>
<td>Joint Interview</td>
<td>Tamil-Hindu MoE official (P12), Muslim pre-school teacher (P13)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Muslim pre-school building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11/02/2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>Vice principal of School A (T2), Teacher of School A (T3), Teacher/counsellor of School A (T4)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Vice Principal of School C (T5)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Principal of School C (T6)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13/02/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Meeting on Tamil-Muslim relations in Jaffna, Muslim discrimination and resettlement (P14, P15, P16, P1, P5, P7)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>House visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15/02/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>GIZ education officer (P17), English teacher for GIZ (P18)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>GIZ Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Principal of School B (T7)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>UNHCR official (P19), UNDP official (P20)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Restaurant visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview (second)</td>
<td>Principal of School C (T6)</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20/02/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>School B inter-religious sports day</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/02/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>Tamil-Catholic community leaders (P21, P22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Retired Tamil-Catholic teacher at School A (T8), former student of School C (P23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Principal of School A (T9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Teacher at School B (T10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>President of School C SDS (P24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hindu Priest for School C (P25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Jaffna Music Festival (cross-cultural event, Sri Lanka civil society, USAID funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Teacher of School A (T13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Teacher of School A (T14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Catholic Bishop of Jaffna (P26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Jaffna Public Library visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Tamil-Hindu religious community festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview questionnaire</td>
<td>8 Students at School B (S27, S28, S29, S30, S31, S32, S33, S34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Teacher of School B (T11), Teacher of School B (T12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Trip to neighbouring resettled rural Tamil community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>3 Muslim parents (P27, P28, P29), 1 student of School C (S35), and 1 student of School A (S36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
<td>Joint interview</td>
<td>1 Muslim parent (P30), 1 student of School C (S37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1 student of School A (S38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview questionnaire</td>
<td>14 Muslim students at School A (S13, S14, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19, S20, S21, S22, S23, S24, S25, S26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/03/2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>3 Muslim students at School A (S39, S40, S41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Former secondary school principal (P31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview questionnaire</td>
<td>12 students at School C (S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, S12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Student Questionnaire Design

My name is Ross Duncan, I’m 24 years old and I am a student from Scotland. I am studying at the University of Amsterdam. I am carrying out research in Jaffna in the Muslim and Tamil communities, and schools of Ozmaniya, Vaitheeswara, and Navanthurai, on how education can bring peace between Singhalese, Muslim and Tamil peoples. I would very much like you to be part of my research. This study is confidential and anonymous so please feel free to express your opinions openly and share any experiences you feel may be relevant. Thank you very much! Nandri!

Please complete the following questions: NB: n/a = not applicable

1. What School do you attend? ...........................................................................................................................................................................

2. Gender:
   Male  ○   Female ○   Prefer not to disclose ○

3. Year of birth ..........................................................................................................................................................................................

4. What grade are you studying? ...........................................................................................................................................................................

5. How many years have you studied at this school? ..........................................................................................................................................................

6. Were you and your family displaced during the war? Yes ○ No ○ Prefer not to disclose ○

7. If yes, where and for how long?
   ...........................................................................................................................................................................................................

8. What is your religion?
   1 = Hindu ○
   2 = Muslim ○
   3 = Catholic ○
   4 = Other ○ Please specify which: ........................................................................................................................................................................
   5 = Prefer not to disclose ○

9. What is/are your parent(s) occupation? ..............................................................................................................................................................

10. Can you speak Singhalese fluently?
    Yes ○ No ○ Prefer not to disclose ○

11. If yes, where did you learn (for example, through your parents or school)?........................................................................................................
Social interaction with other religions and ethnicities
11. a. Would you consider Muslim or Tamil people to be your friends?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to disclose ☐

b. How often do you meet with other students as friends from other religions than your own?
1 = Never ☐
2 = Less than once a month ☐
3 = Once a month ☐
4 = Several times a month ☐
5 = Once a week ☐
6 = Several times a week ☐
7 = Everyday ☐
8 = Prefer not to disclose ☐

Inter-ethnic
12. Do you believe inter-ethnic and/or inter-religious meetings can change negative stereotypes and attitudes of people from other religions?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to disclose ☐

13. Have you ever attended an inter-ethnic meeting between religious groups through school?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to disclose ☐

b. If yes, what do you believe were the positives and negatives of this?.................................

Curriculum
14. Do you think the teaching of history is biased towards Singhalese culture by excluding Tamil/Muslim culture and history?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know/Prefer not to disclose ☐

15. Should history teaching include discussion on how to prevent conflict from happening again?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know/Prefer not to disclose ☐

Perceptions
16. Do you feel you are an equal citizen of a Sri Lankan nation? [relating to education for citizenship and nation-building]
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know/Prefer not to disclose ☐

b. What do you believe the role of education is in promoting this?.................................
**Segregation**
17. Do you think you should go to school with children from only your religion?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

**Free Speech**
18. Do you think you should have the opportunity to openly debate issues of the conflict, human rights, and displacement, in school, and learn from the lessons of this?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

19. Do you participate in extra-curricular student forums, student unions, Tamil unions, debates etc?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

**Education for peace**
20. Do you believe the teaching of equality and positivity within school is contradictory to the inequality between ethnicities outside the walls of the school?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

**Community and society**
21. Do you feel discriminated as part of the Tamil or Muslim ethnic group?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

   b. If yes, in what way?.............................................................................................................

22. Are there any problems between the Tamil and Muslim communities, if yes, what are they and why do they occur?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

   b. If yes, why do you think they occur?...............................................................................................

23. Is there mistrust and suspicion between the Tamil and Muslim communities?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○

   b. If yes, why does this exist?.......................................................................................................

24. What shared values and common bonds do you have with Muslims/Tamils/Christians?
   ..............................................................................................................................

25. Does the military presence in Jaffna make you fearful and affects your studies?
   - Yes  ○
   - No  ○
   - Don't know/Prefer not to disclose  ○
END OF QUESTIONNAIRE
### Appendix 5: Example of tabulated student responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Grade of study</th>
<th>Years of study at this school</th>
<th>Displacement of student and family during war</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Ability to speak Sinhala fluently and do you believe it is important to speak Sinhala and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Yes, because it's important and helps with work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Yes, it helps with business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Yes, because it helps with business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Focus Areas

**Peace and Value Education (PVE)**
Students learn about the concepts, skills, positive attitudes and practices that promote mutual understanding, empathy, tolerance and peaceful co-existence in class and in extra-curricular activities. The curricula and textbooks promote these values and special programmes bring students and student teachers from all three communities together to jointly experience the power of sharing, exchanging and understanding across cultures. A national policy on education for social cohesion and peace provides schools with the concept and ideas for implementation.

**Language Education (2NL)**
The power of language can bridge ethnic differences; it is beneficial that every Sri Lankan speaks a national language other than their own to be able to communicate with all Sri Lankans. By strengthening Sinhala and Tamil as national languages and English as a link language from an early stage in a child’s life, the language gap and misunderstandings can be overcome. The project supports the creation of a cadre of competent educators and a learning environment that is conducive for teaching and learning a second national language.

**Disaster Safety Education (DSE)**
The December 2004 Tsunami highlighted the need to educate teachers and school children on managing and coping with natural disasters. Many areas of Sri Lanka face the threat of landslides, floods, cyclones and drought but little has been done to incorporate an understanding of these natural disasters into education. The project provides guidance to teachers and school children on how to prevent, mitigate, and cope with natural disasters. They gain an understanding of how to minimise damage and save lives in emergencies. Practical exercises including evacuation, fire safety and first aid are integrated into the learning process.

**Psycho-Social Care (PSC)**
Thousands of children were directly and indirectly affected by the 2004 Tsunami, emphasising the need for psycho-social care for social children experiencing distress. This programme was born out of the need to empower educators and counsellors with the right knowledge, skills and tools to provide guidance and counselling to children and youth affected by natural disaster, conflict and other personal and social distress. The right psycho-social support enables students to achieve better learning performance and better wellbeing.

**Education for Disadvantaged Children and Youth in Post-Conflict and Poverty Areas (EDCY)**
Conflict and poverty have led to the existence of many disadvantages school children who have been absent from class for long periods, have low motivation to learn, live in remote areas or live in a home environment that impedes their education. These children often form the bulk of school dropouts, exam failures and repeaters. Education for disadvantages children and youth addresses the special needs of these children and youth by introducing creative methods that inspire them and make them eager to learn at school level. For out of the school youth and children alternative education in the form of Open Schools and pre-vocational skills enables them to avail of to further education as well as vocational education.
Appendix 7: Scanned Copy of ‘Be Positive’

BE POSITIVE

Be positive
Think positive...... think positive........think positive......
Positive.......positive......positively
Positive.......positive......positively
Be positive....... do positive........... 2
Make good + happy thoughts in our minds........... 2
Learn together – we change together ...............2
Make good + happy thoughts in our minds........... 2
Make good ......make good.......make good......make good...
Be positive............Think positive..........................

I respect others always

I listen what other people say
I visualize only a favorable one
I image only a positive situation
My positive thought is mighty power....... 1
Be positive............Think positive..........................

I dedicate for good citizen

I replace negative thoughts with positive thoughts
I never give a place to enter evil thoughts
I will fill my mind with confidence and joy
I will fill my heart with light and hope.......1
Be positive............Think positive..........................

Source: GIZ, 2013