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The notion of peace is a complex and political subject. It is also a deeply emotive topic as the idea of peace evokes our imagination and vision of what it means to attain a moral and social ideal, and is rooted in our myriad understandings of what we perceive peace to be and what we hope it to be for the future. This project presents a review of existing research into the relationship between early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region as it has developed over the past thirteen years, from 1990 onwards. Three overarching questions frame the project: what do we know or do not know about the role of early childhood in peace building? What are the different conceptualisations of early childhood and peace building? and how does the literature inform a future research agenda for the advocacy of early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region? The motivation for the project is to explore pertinent and provocative questions emerging from extant research about the corrosive effects of conflict and adversity on the lives of young children, and the potential for early childhood or early childhood development1 to contribute to the pursuit of sustainable peace in the global society. This report offers an overview of the findings, methodology, research design and conceptual framework that underpins the research.

1.1 Aims and rationale for review

The project is essentially a literature review of the main research dimensions of the field of early childhood and peace building. The study used a participatory methodology in guiding the research inquiry which entails drawing on the collaboration and participation of the commissioners and research-users to guide the review agenda and process. A participatory approach is also underpinned by a social justice and advocacy agenda to inform the research inquiry, with the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing public interest and policy development at a regional and international level. The study aims to identify the knowledge and research gaps in existing scholarship, summarises key findings that emerge from the literature and suggests directions for a future research agenda. The disparate research discussed in the following chapters present examples of the ways the notion of early childhood and peace building is conceived at a particular time; how it is conceptualised and realised in a particular setting and society. An overarching aim of the review is to provide an insight into different approaches to the subject, from different interest groups with differing philosophical, cultural, political and historical viewpoints. As conflicts, disasters, political discords and threats of civil war continue more
than a decade into the twenty-first century, the importance of peace and how it might be achieved remains an ongoing societal agenda for the international community. Children growing up in the midst of adversity in whatever form or context are especially vulnerable. The search for peace, the process of peace building, and with it the relationship between children and peace remains a priority for many countries and governments.

The main rationale for the project is the potential for research to contribute to international advocacy to further advance the regional agenda for early childhood and peace building. A common thread that has emerged from the literature is the importance of communal efforts among stakeholders in the international community to promote the peace building agenda for children and families. As illustrated through the time-line in Figure 1 (appendix p.47), international policy development provides a vital context in informing the scholarship on early childhood and peace building. The role of international government agencies such as the UN, UNICEF and UNESCO are also important in influencing how macro-policies and advocacy have developed within the field. For children, the notion of peace and peace building is enshrined in the 1989 UN Convention of the Rights of the Child, in which article 29 affirms children’s rights to freedom, justice and peace. The principles of the Convention are seminal in underpinning policy developments at an international level to ensure that social justice, equality and security remain at the core of civil society. The Convention frames and informs the project’s research from the inception.

The commissioners of this research are led by the firm belief that there is much to gain by exploring the broad and complex field of early childhood and peace building particularly in the Asia Pacific region. At the heart of the project is the notion that children and childhoods are important in their own right, and the commitment among stakeholders in the region to a common goal in advocating for peace building and societal change for the benefit of children, families and civil society.

1.2 Objectives

The literature review aims to synthesise the available literature in order to produce a better understanding of the research around early childhood and peace building, to harness new possibilities conceptually and empirically, and to chart new avenues for future research developments in the Asia Pacific region. Essentially, based on the findings of the review, the objectives of the research are to:

1. understand the main issues and debates around early childhood and peace building in the region
2. examine the key concepts and definitions of early childhood and peace building as conceptualised in the literature
3. map examples of how the concept of early childhood and peace building is constructed and represented in the literature
4. undertake a gap-analysis of the literature to highlight emerging knowledge gaps in the field
5. suggest potential research areas to inform a future research agenda for early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region

1989 UN Convention of the Rights of the Childhood

The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin. (UNCRC, Article 29)
Following the introduction of the UNCRC in 1989, there has been heightened international focus on the advocacy for children and peace building. In 2001, the UN General Assembly called for an international decade for a culture of peace, recognising the rights of all children to a just and peaceful society. An integral aspect of the UN’s agenda is to advocate for the respect for human rights and equality for everyone in society:

In December 2005, the first Peace building Commission (PBC) was created by the UN to serve as an intergovernmental body, with an official mandate to mobilise and consolidate peace building efforts in conflict societies. The efforts undertaken by the UN and international community to draw political attention to and scale-up global peace building efforts are important in recognising the steps being made in establishing greater solidarity against societal concerns and injustice. However, they are also acknowledgements of the fragile and precarious nature of peace building agendas, where societies face continued threats and challenges to security in their journey to achieving sustainable peace.

The main purpose of this study is to explore the literature around early childhood and peace building, with the aim of informing a future research agenda for the Asia Pacific region. For ease of reference, the following summary highlights the key findings raised in this report:

**Key Finding 1**

Early childhood and peace building offers many linkages with important societal agendas such as education, gender, social cohesion, family engagement, community building, and social justice.

I. The impact of early childhood and peace building programmes goes beyond children and early childhood. It offers added value in promoting social cohesion, parental and familial participation, community building and children’s socialisation.

II. Parental, family and community engagement make up the social fabric of society, and are important support networks that can help to promote peace building and social capital i.e. the values, traditions, community identities, social and cultural networks that influence children’s lives and experiences.

**Key Finding 2**

Early childhood and peace building is a multi-dimensional and applied concept that is conceptualised and practised across different disciplines and sectors.

III. Early childhood and peace building is a vast and complex field which cuts across multiple disciplines such as sociology, cultural psychology, philosophy, education, theology, child health, and political science. The disparate literature reviewed in this study shows both the breadth and depth of scholarship developed by experts in the area, both conceptually and operationally in practice, research and policy documents.

---

**1998 UN Resolution on the culture for peace**

A culture of peace is an integral approach to preventing violence and violent conflicts, and an alternative to the culture of war and violence based on education for peace, the promotion of sustainable economic and social development, respect for human rights, equality between women and men, democratic participation, tolerance, the free flow of information and disarmament (1998:1)
IV. Establishing a multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral perspective is therefore crucial to informing a future research agenda for early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region.

Key Finding 3

Early childhood and peace building can be conceptualised according to three main paradigms: a rights-based approach, participatory approach and pedagogical approach.

V. A rights-based approach underpins the notion that children’s rights to peace and security are part of a wider debate about human rights. These rights are innate to all children irrespective of ethnic and cultural origins, beliefs, gender, geographical location or socioeconomic backgrounds.

VI. A participatory approach to peace building emphasises the importance of empowering children with opportunities and choices to participate in and influence the society in which they live, to mobilise their roles as peace builders and to make a difference to their own and their country’s situation.

VII. A pedagogical approach recognises the important role of educational settings – preschools, primary and secondary schools – as major sites of socialisation which can actively mediate and promote positive behaviour and attitudes of peace among children and young people.

Key Finding 4

Children play an active role in the peace building process and their contributions as ‘agents of peace’ and active participants have to be enabled and acknowledged.

VIII. Children are not merely passive or silent victims of adversity but active participants and collaborators in contributing to conflict resolution and social cohesion. They should be consulted and actively involved in peace building efforts in post-conflict societies.

IX. The notion of leadership and children as future leaders in peace building offers an important dimension for a future research agenda in the region.

Key Finding 5

Building up a body of empirical evidence from research and evaluation of early childhood peace building programmes, within and across-countries from a comparative perspective, could inform an important aspect of a future research agenda for the Asia Pacific region.

X. The role of research and evaluation is crucial in evidencing the impact of peace building efforts and programmes on the lives of children and families. Providing empirical evidence for ‘what works’, ‘how and why it works’ will improve peace building efforts in the long term and offer greater leverage for the future scalability and sustainability of practices on the ground.

In general, there is consensus from reviewing the literature that the early childhood years, from birth to preschool age, is a crucial phase in children’s lives. The immediate environment in which children live are crucial determinants of their overall well-being and can make a positive (or negative) impact on their subsequent growth and development, especially for those who live in conflict or adverse situations. (OECD 2006; UNESCO 2000; The Lancet 2007; 2011). As such, it is important that peace building efforts are as effective as possible in making a difference to the lives of children, especially
those who are most affected by conflict and adversity. The role of research in contributing to the advocacy for children and peace is crucial. The literature included this review are concerned with pertinent questions frequently raised in the existing literature: how can long and lasting peace be sustained for the young and future generations? how can civil society raise collective awareness of the importance of early childhood and peace building? and how can early childhood development help to alleviate the adverse situations for children and families whose lives are dominated by the absence of peace and the presence of conflict?
3.1 Research design and approach

The research design for this project is essentially a critical review of the literature around early childhood and peace building. The project offers a focused, critical examination of the emerging issues and debates, and the role of children in contributing to a peace building agenda. The approach adopted in this study is exploratory and multi-disciplinary. Given the vast and complex nature of the subject area, the study attempts to integrate literature from a wide range of disciplines across different country-contexts such as sociology, cultural psychology, philosophy, education, theology, child health, and political science. The study synthesised a vast body of literature in examining the many concepts, themes and case studies that have emerged around early childhood and peace building. In doing so, the research aimed to establish more nuanced understandings of early childhood and peace building, what it entails and how it is conceived, conceptually and practically through a diverse range of activities and contexts.

3.2 Methodology

The study was informed by a participatory methodology, which is based on the premise that the research process entails the participation of stakeholders and research end-users to inform a social justice and advocacy agenda - in this case, to build a knowledge base of the field in order to inform a future research agenda for early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region. Participatory research is a common methodology increasingly being used in the social science. Supra-national organisations such as UNESCO, The World Bank, and Amnesty International have encouraged the use of participatory research in the campaign for empowering marginalised groups and challenging oppression or inequalities, with a focus on human rights issues (Hickey & Mohan 2008; Peter Uvin 2007). Within the social science discipline, the methodology was developed in part by emerging calls for more socially relevant research agendas and increased user involvement in the development of social policy and research (Wiersma and Jurs 2009; Newby 2010; Creswell 2009; Bourke 2009).

The development of the methodology for the project was guided by communications between the researcher and commissioners, especially pertaining to the policy background and political context that have influenced the research agenda. It was ascertained from the initial kick-off discussions that the findings of the literature review will contribute to the advocacy work around early childhood and peace building, with linkages to the UN Peace Building and Education Advocacy Programme (PBEA), UNICEF’s peace building agenda, the post-2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) goals. This knowledge was immensely helpful in defining the boundaries of the research and methodological approach. It also provided a clear rationale for the project and highlighted the crucial issues to be addressed. In addition, the design of the research and methodology benefitted from the role of the advisor and information specialist in shaping the conceptual framework and research process. These specialist expertise added to the scrutiny of the review, as a form of quality assurance for the project.
Figure 2 below charts the timeline and flow of the overall research design and process, from the initiation of the project to its final stages. The study was essentially designed to ensure that the research process is transparent, systematic and rigorous, and more importantly informed by the endusers to ensure the currency and relevancy of the data.
3.3 User involvement

From the outset of the study, the research was closely guided by the stakeholder and research-user involvement, especially in the designing and conducting of the review. This entailed sustained consultations with various individuals such as the commissioners, representatives of non-government organisations, academics, non-academics and practitioners from the voluntary sector to help inform various aspects of the research including the conceptual framework, key concepts and review protocol. A scoping review was initiated at the start of the project to ensure the relevancy of the data collection. This was achieved through discussions with the commissioners, senior education advisors and peace building team at UNICEF to better understand the key concerns and areas to be addressed. The inaugural launch of a Peace Consortium in New York by UNICEF in September 2013 was used as a platform for the scoping review to further explore stakeholders’ views of the emerging issues and debates around early childhood and peace building. These initial scoping activities were useful in generating interest in the review itself and prompting contacts with people who have a vested interest in the findings of the project. In November 2013, a follow-up consultation meeting with the commissioners and peace building team helped to further consolidate and refine the scope of the review, where the emerging implications of the study for future development was explored. The interim findings were presented at a special symposium on early childhood development and peace building at the ARNEC-UNICEF Regional Conference 2013, where engagement with stakeholders such as education advisors, country policy officers, regional programme coordinators, donor agencies, and practitioners was crucial to informing the emerging findings of the study and its relevancy for specific target countries such as Sri Lanka, Nepal and Myanmar. Stakeholders’ contribution from specific countries in the region was also helpful in linking the researcher to unpublished literature and emerging issues that were relevant to the review. Thus, at various stage of the research process, stakeholders and research users were actively involved and consulted.

Drawing on the issues articulated by the commissioners and various stakeholders, the following research questions were formulated to guide to the study:

1. What literature is available on the association between early childhood and peace building?
2. What literature is available on early childhood and peace building, particularly on fragile states in the East Asia and Asia Pacific region?
3. What key issues and debates characterise research about peace building and early childhood?

3.4 Methods

The research methods entailed a systematic searching and screening of the published literature, and a rigorous data analysis informed by the conceptual framework, policy context, and consultations with the commissioners and stakeholders. A systematic search of online databases was conducted with a standard protocol to capture literature from different databases, countries and disciplines. The review entailed several steps in searching and identifying the relevant literature for review: a database search, data extraction, research analysis and synthesis of the findings. During the review process, a standard screening or coding protocol was applied in the EPPI-Reviewer 4 to screen and code the data. This structured, stepped-process was essential in contributing to the quality and rigour of the review.
Three electronic bibliographies of education and social research were searched - the British Education Index (BEI), ERIC (Education and Resources in Education Index) and the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS). A combination of search terms or descriptors was used to capture the literature that addresses all three key concepts: peace building, early childhood and East Asia. A sensitive search using different combinations of the terms for each concept captured many studies, but only those which were relevant to the review. Inspecting each title and abstract helped to distinguish the studies that were possibly relevant to the review, while those clearly not relevant were excluded. To ensure the validity of the study, this process of inspection was repeated with the remaining full reports. The management of the literature and information was supported by the specialist software, the EPPI-Reviewer 4 tool.

A selection of search terms that were combined by OR and AND were used in the review: Peace building; Peace AND Early childhood d; Peace building AND Children; Peace, Early childhood And Family; Peace, Early childhood AND Community; Conflict Resolution and Early childhood; Peace building AND East Asia; Peace AND [country]. In this final search category, five target countries identified by the commissioners and noted in policy documents as ‘fragile-states’ were included in the review - Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Timor-Leste, Myanmar and Nepal. The five countries were identified through discussions with the commissioners as target countries for the early childhood and peace building agenda. All the countries have a history of civil wars and conflict, with two countries – Bangladesh and Timor-Leste identified by the UN as among the top 15 (out of 173) high-risk countries for natural hazards, according to the 2011 World Risk Report.

A combination of two different research software applications was used to undertake the review – Zotero/ProQuest and the EPPI-Reviewer 4. Both software were used simultaneously during the review process to cross-check the multiple data sources and search categories. Zotero or Proquest is used to aid the database search from the IOE lib guides databases, and the EPPI-Reviewer 4 was used as the primary software for managing, storing and screening the data. The EPPI-Reviewer 4 is an online research software application used for various types of literature reviews including systematic and narrative reviews. Developed in 2010 by The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) at the Social Science Research Unit at the Institute of Education, the EPPI Reviewer-4 is an internationally recognised software application used extensively in the social sciences for all types of literature reviews. The results of the search uncovered potentially relevant studies, which were merged and stored in the EPPI-Reviewer tool. Following the removal of duplicated studies, the list of items of literature were screened, firstly on title and abstract, and then secondly on full article report. Further details of the search are provided in appendix 1 in the database search diary.

**Identifying the relevant literature: inclusion and exclusion criteria**

A wide range of literature from 1990 onwards to 2012 was considered in the review. The rationale for restricting the time frame was two-fold. Firstly, the introduction of the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child in 1989 was a watershed moment for the early childhood and international sector, and it was considered likely that the literature published from this period onwards was reflective of current policy developments and therefore more relevant to the aims of the study. Secondly, the time period was informed by increased interest
in the advocacy and scaling up of early childhood and peace building initiatives as suggested by an initial scoping review of the field.

The database search captured a diverse set of literature or items from a range of publication types and documents including books, conference papers and proceedings, anthologies, journal articles, encyclopaedias, reference works and government reports. All the items identified in the review were screened first and foremost by their title and abstract, and then secondly by the full article report. During the screening of the items, the inclusion criteria applied were those items published in the English language, from 1990 onwards, and including items covering the age group 0-12 years, and items relating to a range of education levels - early childhood education (0-7 years), preschool education (0-4), nursery school education (2-5) and infant school education (5-7). Items that meet the above inclusion criteria and relating to the five target countries - Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Timor-Leste, Myanmar and Nepal were also included. The exclusion criteria included those items that did not pertain to the target 0-12 age group, all items before 1990, and those items on an entirely unrelated topic.

3.5 Search findings and review flow

Using the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the literature was systematically screened and coded. Figure 2 below depicts the search results and the flow of included and excluded items. A total of 1,126 items were retrieved from the search. Out of the 1,126 items obtained, 152 items were identified as duplicates where they were marked with a score of 1 and considered an ‘exact match 100%’. After removing the duplicated studies, a final list of 974 items remained. All 974 items were screened and coded, from which 196 items were included based on title and abstracts. A final 122 items were screened and coded on full report, and the full texts of the final items were retrieved for review.
3.6 Data analysis

For the data analysis, a thematic approach was used to analyse the final list of included literature, with the items coded under 3 emerging themes: conceptual, intervention and advocacy. Further discussions of the retrieved data and research findings are elaborated in chapter five and six on the findings. The data analysis was undertaken in an ongoing, iterative cyclical process, informed by the conceptual framework, research questions, and emerging literature. During the data analysis, the review identified several conceptualisations of early childhood and peace building, and these were assessed and synthesized in relation to the review questions and conceptual framework. Three broad categories were used to guide the final data analysis: topic relevance of the literature and how it relates to the research focus and questions, methodological quality of the items especially in regards to research papers, and the type of literature and documents and its function in the field. The data analysis generally adopted a narrative approach by summarizing the key themes and results, and examined the weight of evidence against each theme and how it relates to a future research agenda. The analysis was conducted with the overall aim of synthesising the extant literature around early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region.
4.1 Conceptual model

The aim of this conceptual framework is to accommodate the many complex and overlapping factors that influence early childhood and peace building. This is largely informed by:

- the research questions;
- the review of the research literature;
- the knowledge bases that underpin the concepts of early childhood and peace building; and
- the key descriptors that define the concepts of early childhood and peace building.

A recurring theme emerging from the literature is the surrounding sociocultural, familial and societal environments that influence young children’s worlds and lives. Researchers argue that it is almost impossible to discuss children and peace building in isolation from the home, family, community and wider environment in which children develop and grow (Sagi-Schwartz A. 2012 ‘Children of War and Peace: A Human Development Perspective’; Yale University & ACEV Partnership (2012) ‘Ecology of Peace: Formative Childhoods and Peace Building. A Brief Note.’ New Haven, CT and Istanbul, Turkey: Yale-ACEV Partnership). The Russian-American theorist and psychologist Bronfenbrenner (1995) highlights the powerful influence of the environment on children’s development and overall well-being. He uses the term ‘ecology’ to refer to a layered system of settings and institutions that both influence and are influenced by the child, maintaining that the child’s family, school, community and government must all be taken into account in a comprehensive, holistic perspective of children’s development. Building on Bronfenbrenner’s paradigm, existing research propose that there are different environmental systems or layers which children interact with directly and indirectly, and the synergy of all these different levels and factors affect children’s overall development and engagement with peace building at a local, national and international level.

The figure that follows provides a visual image of the conceptual framework of early childhood and peace building that has been used to guide the review. The framework proposes an ecological paradigm in which the child is positioned at the centre of the system, within a series of layers or concentric circles, illustrating the complex web of inter-relating and overlapping environments and factors that affect the child’s life experiences and worlds. The model is composed of five intertwined systems, each depicting a distinct domain and level in the child’s world.

Reinforcing the importance of children and childhood at the centre of the framework, the innermost circle is the child, whose development and experiences are influenced directly or indirectly by a whole range of domains including the family, community and society. These are represented schematically by the three different consecutive layers or circles surrounding the child. The layer in closest proximity and contact with the child is the family, which includes the child’s parents, care-givers, extended family members and others whom the child is in direct interaction with. The following layers comprise of the community and civil society such as the child’s neighbourhood, social networks, and relationships with various ethnic and religious groups. The outer-most layer describes the macro system, the larger cultural, political,
historical, and socio-economic conditions that influence the holistic environment in which the child is embedded. These conditions represent the interplay of various sociocultural values, norms, beliefs and philosophies that have consequential effects on the child and his or her environment. The child in the innermost circle stands in the crosscurrent of these cultural, political and socio-economic conditions as they interact and evolve over time, contributing to and shaping the entire ecological environment in which the child, family, community and society co-exist and inter-relate.

In addition, to further understand the notion of early childhood and peace building, it is also useful to structure two dichotomous terms – fragility and peace – as opposing concepts on a continuum. As depicted in the conceptual framework, the arrows at the bottom-end of the diagram depict the challenging and fragile conditions that arise as a result of various adversity such as conflicts and natural disasters, economic deprivation, social inequalities or social injustices. These conflicts and adversity can be perceived as natural disasters or acts of human frailty that invariably affect the lives of children and families. These adversities threaten the stability of peace and have a negative impact on the child’s entire eco-system.

4.2 Fragility

The arrows at the bottom-end of the diagram point towards a state of fragility. The concept of early childhood and peace building is underpinned by various philosophical and sociological constructs, not least the notion of ‘fragility’. Beyond a humanitarian imperative to address global issues of inequality and social justice, the concept of fragility is central to the research around peace building. Researchers within the field have noted that the key to understanding sustainable peace lies in understanding fragility, and there are important insights to be gained from considering fragility as the breakdown of peace (Klein et al 2008). Addressing fragility is at the heart of peace building, and is a deeply political issue centred on the social relationship between the individual, state and society. A report by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) identified 47 states that are classified as ‘home to an increasingly concentrated proportion of the world’s poor’ and countries which are more susceptible to political and socio-economic instabilities. It is estimated that by 2015, half of the world’s people surviving on less than USD1.25 a day will be found in fragile states. The countries described as ‘fragile states’ are plagued by conflict and adversity in a diversity of situations. The report shows that fragility encompasses multiple dimensions and is manifest in different ways – political, security, justice, economic, social and environmental. Significantly, the report also indicates that rapid shifts in demography and geopolitical factors today has precipitated a profound change in our understanding of fragility - where most countries in fragile situations a decade ago were considered low-income and developing countries, today nearly half of all fragile states are classified as middle-income countries, indicating that pockets of fragility can also exist in seemingly stable countries. Almost a third of the fragile states identified by the OECD are in the East Asia and Asia Pacific region, with a significant proportion of children and families living at risk in vulnerable situations as a result of poverty, conflict, natural disaster, corruption or other adversity.

Current global state of fragility

By 2015, half of the world’s people living on less than USD 1.25 a day will be in fragile states. ... Fragile states are also off-track to meet the rest of the [Millennium Development Goals] MDGs by 2015. (OECD 2013 Fragile states 2013: Resource flows and trends in a shifting world)
The literature shows that there is also no international consensus on what constitutes fragility, all states are fragile in some respects and countries move in and out of fragility. However, the literature on fragility is central to the notion of peace building as a way of identifying specific priority countries in the region. The Department for International Development (DIFD) in the UK defines ‘fragile states’ as those countries whose governments cannot or will not deliver what citizens need to live decent, secure lives (DFID, 2005). One common way to estimate the level of fragility is based on the World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessments (CPIA) which is a diagnostic tool measuring the extent to which a country’s policy and institutional framework supports sustainable growth and poverty reduction. The CPIA consists of 16 criteria grouped in four clusters: Economic Management, Structural Policies, Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity, and Public Sector Management and Institutions, and countries are measured against each of the criteria and rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high). A country’s composite score make up the overall CPIA and is used as an indicator to determine macro-policies such as the level of financial aid that the World Bank lends and grants to developing countries. The World Bank (2007) defines ‘fragile states’ as the term ‘generally used to refer to countries that are facing particularly severe development challenges such as weak governance, limited administrative capacity, violence, or the legacy of conflict.’ It estimates that currently some 1.5 billion of the world’s poorest people live in countries where conflict and fragility have trapped them in a cycle of poverty and violence (World Bank 2013 http://www.worldbank.org/ida/ida_abcs_fragile_conflict_affected_states.html).

Within this international context, this project presents a scoping review of the main research dimensions of the literature around early childhood and peace building, with a focus on the East Asia and Asia Pacific region. In reviewing the literature, particular ‘fragile’ conflict-ridden states within the region are purposefully identified and screened – Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Timor-Leste, Myanmar and Nepal, where notions of ‘peace’ and ‘peace building’ are highly politicised and emotionally charged issue. All five countries share a history of civil wars, occupation and conflict, with two countries – Bangladesh and Timor-Leste identified by the UN as among the top 15 high-risk countries (out of 173) for natural hazards, according to the 2011 World Risk Report.

### Defining ‘Fragility’

The key to understanding sustainable peace lies in understanding fragility. The OECD definition of ‘A fragile state: a country that has weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society. Fragile states are also more vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters. More resilient states exhibit the capacity and legitimacy of governing a population and its territory. They can manage and adapt to changing social needs and expectations, shifts in elite and other political agreements, and growing institutional complexity. Fragility and resilience should be seen as shifting points along a spectrum.’ (OECD, 2012a)

### 4.3 Sustainable peace

The arrows at the top-end of the diagram indicate a movement towards an aspirational, sustainable ideal - that of peace building and the pursuit of conflict resolution and social justice. Existing research shows that as the child begins to make the transition from conflict to peace, the bedrocks of the ecological system – family, community and civil society, can often help to mitigate against displacements and other challenges of adversity and move towards the direction of peace, in the hope that the distance between adversity/conflict and peace will seem less insurmountable. A review of the research literature suggests that
this process of transition (from adversity to peace building) can be realised in various ways, reflecting the shifting dynamics between the child and elements of the eco-system which can be transformed positively through the role of peace building at a local and ‘grass-roots’ level. For instance, early childhood and peace building can be conceptualised through the theoretical or conceptual models of what peace building entails (Merav 2001; Klein, Goerrtz and Diehl 2008). Peace building can also be achieved through intervention programmes focusing on the family, early childhood settings, and the community, and importantly, through collective political advocacy for addressing conflict-resolution. Taken as a whole, the concentric circles and arrows depicted in the conceptual model illustrate the key factors and conditions that transact across the different levels of the system, leading to differential outcomes for the child. The concept of ‘early childhood and peace building’, as embodied by the framework, can therefore be defined as those conditions and processes that enable and enhance the transition from a state of fragility and adversity to the realisation of and contribution to sustainable peace.

Trying to understand the complexities of early childhood and peace building in this way is immensely useful in helping us to understand at once the diverse elements that can potentially impede or benefit the holistic care and education of children in their lives and worlds; that is, the complete socio-cultural ecological system that promotes and supports children’s overall well being. An ecological perspective can also help our understanding of the world as an interconnected system, in the way the economy, history, politics, culture and the environment interact to form a tangled system of tensions and conflict. In addition, such an approach brings together existing research about conflict and reconciliation, and provides a deeper understanding of the resilience and capacity of children and families living under extreme conditions in different conflict or adverse situations. In sum, early childhood and peace building is an ecological process, influenced by the multiple and multi-level factors and environments that promote the engagement of peace building at a national and international level. Promoting peace through early childhood therefore entails a holistic and multi-dimensional approach, shaped by a myriad of multifaceted interfaces between the child and his or her eco-system and environmental influences.
One of the aims of this project is to examine the different approaches to and definitions of early childhood and peace building as conceptualised in the literature. To this end, the first step in understanding the relationship between early childhood and peace building is to recognise the complexity of the terms and their related concepts. The project takes on a comparative task through the inclusion of a range of literature which conceptualises the notion of early childhood and peace building in different geopolitical and cultural regions. It recognises that the basic concepts of peace, peace building, and early childhood are not fixed but socially constructed and continually evolving. This is especially the case as the established body of scholarship reviewed in this study illustrates the wide range of definitions and terminologies that have emerged over time, in different contexts and amidst changing societal norms and values. To this extent, a focus in the project is not to locate a universal understanding of early childhood and peace building. It would be too simplistic and narrow to do so. Rather a focus of the project is to examine the different ways in which the concept of early childhood and peace building is interpreted and conceptualised, and how this informs a future research agenda.

5.1 Defining early childhood

A challenge in defining the term early childhood is that it varies considerably according to the context in which it is used. These variations stem from the many political, ideological, cultural and historical factors that influence the way we construct our ideas of children and childhood. The concept of early childhood is used in a number of designations by different organisations. For example, the OECD (2006; 2013) uses the term early childhood education and care (ECEC) to encompass all forms of care and education services for children from birth to compulsory schooling age. UNESCO tends to refer to early childhood as early childhood care and education (ECCE), while the World Bank (2013) adopts the term early child development (ECD). The UN and UNICEF use the terminology ‘early childhood development’ and ‘early childhood’ interchangeably to describe the all-encompassing holistic continuum of education and care for children and the overall environment in which they live including children from birth to preschool age, maternal health, child health and child protection especially those affected by natural disasters, pandemics, armed conflict or other adversities (UN 2003; UNICEF 2009). Such a conceptualisation is also supported by other international organisations such as UNESCO (2007) which argues that the concept of early childhood, at its core, encompasses the wellbeing and holistic development of children’s capacities and competencies. Thus, while this report adopts the more conventional UN and UNICEF’s usage of the term early childhood or early childhood development, it does so with the acknowledgement that different descriptors and concepts may be used by other organisations and networks to describe a similar concept.

### OECD definition of early childhood education and care

Early childhood education and care (ECEC) encompasses all forms of ECE and ECC services under an integrated system, which provides integrated pedagogical settings covering age zero or one to compulsory schooling age, regardless of setting, funding, opening hours, or programme content.  

(OECD 2001, 2006 and 2012a)
5.2 Defining peace building

The former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali introduced the term ‘peace building’ in his seminal report to the UN Security Council in January 1992 (UN, 1992). Reviewing the changing global contexts and ideological challenges that have given rise to conflict and fragile situations in various nation-states, he asserts that social peace and international security continue to be challenged by threats of discrimination and exclusion. He emphasises the need for a clear and practical mandate, that of peacebuilding, as a way of maintain global stability. ‘Peace building’, Boutros-Ghali proposes, is ‘the comprehensive efforts to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people.’ This may take the form, for example, of cross-country cooperative projects that is mutually beneficial to all societies involved in contributing to socio-economic development and stability and which is fundamental to the onset of peace. In essence, the concept of peace building, as defined by Boutros-Ghali, is ‘the construction of a new environment [that] should be viewed as the counterpart of preventive diplomacy, which seeks to avoid the breakdown of peaceful conditions.’ (UN, 1992)

Implicit in the concept of peace building is the notion of peace. The UN defines peace not just as the absence of conflict, but an evolving, dynamic process of dialogue and conflict resolution. A broad understanding of peace is deeply rooted in the notions of social justice, inclusion, conflict-resolution and resilience - concepts that together promote the idea of nurturing positive attitudes, and maintaining civil and respectful relationships among individuals in communities and societies.

Early understandings of ‘peace’ describe the term within a framework of ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ peace, where negative peace is defined simply as the absence of war and conflict, and positive peace as the building of positive, civil relationships amidst the complex interactions among individuals, community and society (Hicks 1998; Boulding 1991; Moola 2006). Johnson and Johnson (2005) describe the idea of peace and peace building as an active process, a way of building and maintaining cooperative systems... and creating long-term harmonious relationships based on mutual respect and social justice.’ Clark (2001) defines peace in a dichotomous dimension with ‘imposed peace’ at one end and ‘consensual peace’ at the other (Clark 2001). Imposed peace is defined as having derived from imposition and domination by particular high-powered groups (e.g. the military), which suppresses the conflict but does not actually resolve the underlying adverse issues. In contrast, consensual peace
is based on a mutual agreement between individuals and parties that not only ends the conflict but establishes new relationships built on harmonious interactions, mutual respect and social justice values. Peace can also generally be conceived as encompassing a set of values and practices such as social harmony, cooperation, tolerance and mutual respect (Bey and Turner 1996).

While there is substantial debates in the literature around the notion of ‘peace’ and ‘peace building’, researchers have also argued that the terms present conceptual and practical difficulties for policy makers and scholars as the concept of ‘peace’ is arguably elusive and problematic. Researchers map out the complexities by contending that the notion of ‘peace’ and ‘peace building’ reflect culturally different approaches from individual, personal and cultural experiences in particular contexts. A prevailing argument is that all definitions of peace and peace building are value-laden which reflect personal and local understandings, and which contain within them a particular world view or understanding of how the world should work (Smith and Carson, 1998; Gervais 2004).

As debates continue to take place about precise definitions of peace and peace building, a general consensus is that there is no universal definition. The complexity of the concepts is widely recognised and this is reflected in the different approaches synthesised in this report. Given the diversity of definitions used, the report recognises that no terminology can offer a definitive description of the concept of early childhood or peace building, but it is anticipated that further knowledge can be gained from exploring the different ways in which the terms are conceptualised on their own and in relation to each other, and how these might inform a future research agenda.

### 5.3 Defining early childhood and peace building

The literature review shows an emerging body of scholarship around the area of early childhood and peace building in a variety of fields from diverse cultural and ideological perspectives. From a conceptual point of view, the idea of early childhood and peace building can be categorised into three broad paradigms or approaches:
5.3.1 A Rights-based Approach

The review shows that a rights-based approach to early childhood and peace building informs much of the literature in the field. This approach is underpinned by the notion that children’s rights to a peaceful society are part of a much wider debate about human rights. A key principle of a rights-based approach is that of universality, where human rights are considered innate to all people including children and families, irrespective of ethnic and cultural origins, beliefs, gender, geographic location or socioeconomic backgrounds. This approach is derived from the principles of two international conventions: The UN Charter Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations 1989; 2003; 2007). Both documents recognise the fundamental rights accorded to all human beings to peace and social justice in all phases and sectors of life, especially those who are most marginalised and vulnerable. The UN defines human rights as ‘those rights which are inherent in our nature and without which we cannot live as human beings’ (UN 2003:3). UNICEF contends that all human rights are interdependent, that ‘no single right should be prioritised over another’ and that all rights are inherent to the human dignity of every person (UNICEF, 2005).

Under a rights-based paradigm, the advocacy for early childhood and peace building emphasises a holistic perspective of children and their rights. For children, this means ensuring that the rights of the ‘whole child’ are taken into account including their physical, emotional, spiritual and psychological development, and broad-based concepts such as early childhood or early childhood development should entail a commitment to a holistic and integrated continuum of care to support the fulfilment of children’s rights. Adopting a rights-based approach is significant in broadening the peace building agenda to include a commitment to children, which takes into account their holistic and diverse needs, and from a wide range of fragile contexts such as in emergencies, pandemics, armed conflict or natural disasters (UNICEF, 2005).

Yet, while recognising that a rights-based approach dominates much of the literature, it is also important to underscore a cautionary dimension to such an approach as raised by some of the literature. There has been recent recognition of the need to critically examine the notion of ‘rights’, its application and what the term means at a country-specific local level (Watson 2008; Bush and Salterelli 2000). Watson (2008) suggests that while peace building strategies are often justified in terms of the promotion of human rights and democratic values, the attainment of sustainable peace can nonetheless fail because notions of rights do not adequately relate to the wide diversity of children, their diverse contexts and living experiences which often differ in different societies. Watson cautions against the language of rights being rooted in an institutional rather than a “human perspective” and the need to take into account children’s voices and agency in the application of a rights-based approach to peace and peace building.
5.3.2 A Participatory Approach

Closely related and implicit in a rights-based approach to early childhood education and peace building is the notion of participation. Central to this approach is the premise that building peace for children, for their health, social and economic well-being must be ‘everyone’s concern’ (Bey and Turner 1996: 101), and that peace building as a programme of activity is more effective when individuals and communities are active participants in exercising their own rights in the development, implementation and evaluation of peace building efforts. This paradigm views children and families as ‘holders of rights’ rather than ‘objects of charity’, and the peace building process as a shared forum and space in which children and the community can contribute and engender conflict-resolution in building a peaceful civil society (UNICEF, 2005). Children’s rights to participation is also enshrined in the UN’s declaration of the international decade for a culture of peace which places children and young adults at the centre of the Convention, acknowledging their innate rights to participate fully in the development of their society. The concept of early childhood and peace building in a participatory approach is perceived as an empowering process of building capacity and awareness among children and families to contribute and work towards achieving long term peace. Partnerships between children-family-community-society are perceived as fundamental to the peace building process. There is established literature that calls for a participatory approach in peace building which empowers children with choices that enhances their capacities to influence policy development and decision making to make a difference to their own and their society’s situation in the immediate and long term (Watson 2004; Evans 2008). The research argues for the central role of children in creating long term sustainable peace through influencing decisions that affect all areas of their lives and their participation in the community and society. An overarching principle that underpins a participatory approach is to bring about the meaningful participation of children and families in the peace building agenda, to include children’s voices and engagement in promoting peaceful social relations and cultural practices at all levels of society.

5.3.3 A Pedagogical Approach

A pedagogical approach to early childhood and peace building recognises the role of education and the pedagogy of teaching and learning for the benefit of children and future generations in contributing to a more sustainable, just and peaceful society. There is established past and present literature in the field that is concerned with peace building as an ‘educative process’, as a way of nurturing and cultivating critical aspects of social behaviours and moral development through education. This is perceived as particularly pertinent in educational settings and institutions that are centrally concerned with the care and education of young children (Gervais 2004; Kirkwood-Tucker 2004; Harris 2000; Smith and Carson 1998; Bey and Turner 1996). A crucial aspect of a pedagogical approach is the building of formal and informal learning communities to support children in understanding the importance of maintaining peaceful relations and working creatively with
diversity and difference within their learning environment.

A pedagogical approach encompasses all aspects of education and pedagogy, including curriculum development and delivery, teacher education, children and teacher interactions, across all levels. The literature review illustrates the wide range of educational programmes developed over the years by educators and educational professionals such as global education, peace education, citizenship and sustainable education (Bey and Turner 1996; Burns and Aspeslagh 1996; Salomon and Cairns 2010). A substantive content in all these educational programmes is the subject of peace, and the inclusion of related concepts of care, compassion, positive peer socialisation and conflict resolution to nurture and attain the social ideals which promote peace.

The overall goal of a pedagogical approach to early childhood and peace building is to empower educators and children in creating respectful relations with each other. It recognises the important role of educational settings – preschools, primary and secondary schools – as major sites of socialisation in children and young people’s lives, which can significantly promote (or in some cases threaten) peacebuilding efforts. As Bey and Turner (1996) contend, schools should be ‘place[s] of peace’, safe havens for children, and powerful forces in promoting positive, peaceful attitudes among children, family, school and community. The role of educators to this extent, is to help children understand their rights and responsibilities, and to create an educational curriculum and pedagogy that will help build the critical foundation of positive attitudes, knowledge and behaviour that contribute to peace.

A pedagogical approach

As educators and concerned citizens, we must insist that our students learn conflict resolution, social problem-solving, and peace-making skills. We also must teach them to behave in socially acceptable ways, to question and challenge injustices, to establish personal and academic goals, to understand their own rights and responsibilities, and to assume their future roles as the peacemakers of our society.’

Bey and Turner (1996)
The findings from this review highlight the emergence of three central themes which illustrate the association between early childhood and peace building, offering us a deeper understanding of what the concepts entail. The themes - conceptual, intervention and advocacy - could be described in terms of peace building as a concept, interventions for peace building, and advocacy for peace building; central tenets which serve to bridge the gap between conflict and peace; and which serve as the medium through which the child, individuals and community groups are empowered in their participation in the peace building process. Conceptually, the themes could also be described as the tools, knowledge and/or processes that have the potential to contribute to the attainment of sustainable peace as illustrated in the conceptual framework in chapter four.

6.1 Theme 1 Conceptual - Peace building as a concept

First, the notion of ‘peace building’ as a concept is widely explored in the literature. Social science researchers such as Merav (2001) and Klein et. al (2008) define peace building as a human aspiration in ‘relational terms’, in the way individuals co-exist, relate with each other and build mutually respectful relationships. In this context, fundamental to the concept of peace building is the recognition of human rights as ‘a tool to promote relationships both within and between societies’. At the crux of the conceptual literature is the emphasis on human relationships and the inter-dependence among individuals and communities that govern the peace building process. The literature in this category suggests that it is in the context of human relationships and development that individuals, family and community are able to ‘work for the realisation of justice and equality for all people through active civil participation and community building’ Merav (2001). This conceptual perspective resonates with the human ecological approach to peace building described earlier and which governs the wider literature.

Historically, early literature in the field tend to conceptualise peace building in terms of a wider social justice agenda, as a form of social transformation and reconstruction. Bertram (1995), Boutris-Ghali (1992), and Kotze and Du Toit (1995) for instance note the role of peace building as an active agenda for political activity and ‘social change’ that is pertinent across all identity groups in order to encourage the development of a healthy civil society. The latter literature to emerge in the twenty-first century witnessed a reconceptualising movement of the ‘peace’ paradigm in attempts by researchers to provide a more rigorous and systematic definition of the term. Researchers in the field caution against the oversimplification of the concept of ‘peace’ as more than just the absence of war or conflict. As Klein, Goerrtz and Diehl (2008) argues, ‘If we want to explain why some people are “wealthy”, it is not useful to define them as being “not poor”’. Similarly, to oversimplify the definition of ‘peace’ as the absence of conflict or war is misleading and wholly inadequate. Instead, they propose the use of a five-level scale of indicators to define and measure peace as outlined by various scholarly literature internationally. In their study on ‘The Peace Scale’, the authors present a conceptual framework that empirically codes different levels of peace using a range of ‘peace scale indicators’ denoting different dimensions of peaceful relations on a continuum from
negative peace at the extreme lower end of the scale (where peace is maintained by threats, deterrence and marked by unresolved conflict issues despite the absence of war), to positive peace at the opposite end of the scale signifying a state of reconciliation and conflict resolution over an extended period of time. The availability of a peace scale marks a paradigm shift in the conceptual understanding of peace building in the field, with important implications for future research on how we conceptualise early childhood and peace building.

The earlier chapters have outlined the established scholarship around the concepts of peace and peace building. Attaching ‘early childhood’ to the term ‘peace building’ is to add another crucial dimension to the concept of peace by placing children at centre-stage, not only as a motivation for maintaining a sustainable, civil and peaceful society, but as participants in the peace building process themselves. Bringing together the concepts of ‘early childhood’ and ‘peace building’ emphasises the central role of early childhood education and care in formulations of peace, and children’s active role in creating peace and in ensuring its stability.

We now have clear, established evidence from the literature supporting the important association between early childhood and peace building, with children as a central concern both as casualties in various conflict situations as well as active agents in the peace building process (Gervais 2004; Vestal A. and Jones N. 2004; Merav M. 2001; Yale University & ACEV Partnership 2012). Existing research contends that children are particularly vulnerable to fragility and adversity, with potential long-term effects on their early years and later development, especially as the global picture of early childhood and peace building remains intense and complex (Vestal and Jones 2004; Watson 2008). As Watson (2008) states, ‘In the aftermath of war, children are the group most likely to suffer the long-term consequences of, among other things, inadequate health care and insufficient access to education.’ Children, especially those living in developing countries suffer disproportionately from the effects of conflict and adversity. Young children are particularly vulnerable in emergency situations, and peacebuilding that promotes inclusive communities and supports care-givers can significantly benefit their development (ARNEC, 2011b).

The author Kleinfield (2009) goes one step further by perceiving the association between early childhood and peace building in terms of the child as an embodiment of peace, as described in the notion ‘The Child as a Zone of Peace’. The child is constructed as a ‘nonpolitical’ being with the ability to depoliticise a conflict environment and the rights to live in a conflict-free humanitarian zone. The authors of the peace building literature identified in this review represent a wide variety of ideological perspectives which provide compelling evidence of the ways in which children are central to the concept of peace building. The available literature on early childhood and peace building is still emerging and different researchers have tended to apply diverse concepts, approaches and theories to the term. The complexity of the concept also becomes apparent when there are different geopolitical expectations and approaches regarding the achievement of sustainable peace.

6.2 Theme 2 Intervention – Interventions for peace building

Second, the notion of ‘early childhood and peace building’ is encapsulated in some of the literature as a means of mediating conflict or adverse situations through intervention strategies in a range of contexts. Within this theme, ‘interventions for peace building’ is largely conceived in relation to three domains - community outreach programmes; curriculum and pedagogy; and children’s socialisation.
6.2.1 Curriculum and pedagogy

The literature in the area of curriculum and pedagogy refer extensively to peace building as constituting a pedagogy of early childhood education, for the purpose of promoting children’s learning about positive relationships and empowering teachers or educators in building a more just and peace world. The literature in this domain focus on classroom practices and the curriculum such as peace education, global education, education for sustainable development, multicultural education citizenship education, teacher training, children’s learning, and other peace building educational programmes that are implemented in preschool or school settings.

Maria Montessori, a pioneer in the field of early childhood care and education who opened the first ‘House of Childhood’ in Rome in 1907, emphasised the importance of children’s learning environments and strongly advocated for the education of peace and character building in shaping the early experiences of young children. Montessori’s philosophy of early childhood was partly influenced by her anti-fascist views in response to the politics of the time, during the period of world war two in Italy. Her philosophy of creating an educational environment that enables children to foster a spirit of peace, independence, and learning through exploration are distinct traits of the Montessori curriculum approach known internationally today (Montessori, 1962; 1964).

A pedagogical approach to early childhood and peacebuilding recognises that schools and educational settings play a powerful role in society, where they can actively promote (or in some cases, destabilise) peacebuilding efforts. Thompson (1993) emphasises the importance of education for peace, having developed a series of classroom resources and activities to help early childhood and elementary educators integrate multicultural and inclusive practices in the curriculum and during their work with children. Staub (2002) uses the phrase ‘caring schools’ to describe the role of schools in helping children to become responsible citizens who are concerned about other people’s welfare and being able to relate to others in their own lives in peaceful ways. Kirkwood-Tucker (2004) describes the importance of global education in advancing educators’ knowledge and skills in managing conflict and peace building, and the handbook Education for Peace Curriculum Manual (2007) offers a practical guide with suggested lesson plans for educators working at various education levels in creating a culture of peace in school communities, and supporting children to develop peace-based conflict resolution skills.

There is some literature which raises caution that schools and educational settings can also be sites of tension, with episodes of violence, intimidation and antisocial behaviour. In alleviating these adversarial situations, the role of schools is therefore all the more important, as a socializing medium in infusing peaceful and respectful behaviour throughout all aspects of children’s educational experience, to equip children with the strategies they need to build social cohesion, tolerance and mutual respect.

The literature on the pedagogy and curriculum of peace building maintain the theory that children perceive themselves and others as ‘social and cultural beings’ in a sociocultural context, and educators can support children in recognising the diversity in their countries and the world to maintain peaceful relations. In an early publication in the book Making School a Place of Peace (1996), Bey and Turner (1996) highlight the importance of planning for peace across the curriculum and incorporating the teaching ‘social peace’ as an integral part of children’s learning. This includes teaching activities that cultivate positive interpersonal relationships, social skills, and effective communication and interactions among children of diverse groups. Extending the idea of curriculum and pedagogy as a conduit for peace, they emphasise the role
of the ‘hidden curriculum’ in promoting peaceful behaviour and attitudes among children through peer socialisation, child-teacher interaction, recreation and other informal unintentional aspects of the learning environment that is aside from the more formal written and planned curriculum.

**Peace Education**

‘Peace education is the process of teaching people about the threats of violence and strategies for peace.’

Salomon and Cairns (2010)

In their work around children and peace building in Sierra Leone, where virtually all citizens particularly children were subject to civil war, Kamara and Neal (2005) propose the setting up of a Peace Club within schools, to offer training and support for children, teachers, manager and administrators in managing peer mediation and conflict resolution. There is also some literature which alludes to the importance of leadership through the roles of school principals and preschool managers in creating a conducive educational environment within educational settings which supports children’s understanding of peace and maintaining peaceful relations with their peers (Miller and Mucci 1999; Sagi-Schwartz 2012; Miklian et. al. 2011; Hertz-Lazarowitz and Eden 2002). The crux of the literature that explores the theme of curriculum and pedagogy argue that as schools and early years settings become more diverse with children from various ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic groups, there is a sense of urgency to review the role of education and the learning environment to support the agenda of peace building and children’s role as peace builders. This, the authors generally contend, will reduce the social and cultural gaps that exist within schools, communities and societies that often exacerbate fragility.

### 6.2.2 Community outreach programmes

There are also a number of research literature that explore the development of a strong family and community as an intervention through which to advance the peace building agenda for children (Vestal and Jones 2004; Yale University and ACEV Partnership 2012). The literature asserts the potential for communities to intervene, mediate and negotiate the needs of its people, governments and other diverse communities, for instance through the use of practical toolkits, examples of practice, community groups and intervention programmes aimed at helping children, families and communities realise their roles in the peace building process. The book *From Conflict to Peace Building: The power of early childhood initiatives* (2007) offers examples of stories of the impact of conflict on the lives of children and families living in adversity across the world, and the ensuing intervention and outreach programmes undertaken to rebuild communities and civil society. O’Kane, Feinstein and Giertsen (2013) cite the example of ‘child clubs’ which have been established in Nepal since the 1980s as a form of outreach programme coordinated by the government, international non-government agencies, and the local community to facilitate children’s engagement in the peace building agenda. The clubs are established within schools and the community in urban as well as rural areas to provide a space for children to share their views and participate in activities around peace building and other social issues pertaining to their welfare. Based on the principle of “children as zones of peace”, the clubs are crucial in establishing partnerships with children, their families and community, and as a way of facilitating their engagement in the peace building process. Although not residing in the field of early childhood, researchers such as Gamble and Weil (1997), Longland (1994) and Heenan (1997) propose the role of ‘community development’ as an intervention and a way of promoting peace building, especially through a collective community participation in the economic, social and political development of a country.
6.2.3 Children’s Socialisation

In a related body of literature, there is established research which explores the association between peace building and the management of children’s peer relationships, conflict resolution and socialisation, as a way of promoting peaceful relations among children in the peace building process. The literature around children’s socialisation are concerned with providing a pragmatic approach to peace building by supporting children to coexist with and negotiate differences in their everyday interactions with other individuals (Vestal and Jones 2004; Coles 1997). In a study on peace building in preschool, Vestal and Jones (2004) explore teaching strategies in helping preschool children to resolve conflicts and to learn and use conflict resolution strategies. Similarly, Coles (1997) assert, prosocial skills need to be taught to the very youngest child in order to build the foundations for peaceful relations, and a critical challenge of educators and communities must be to develop emotional and social competency in children.

6.3 Theme 3 Advocacy - Advocacy for peace building

Thirdly, a developing body of literature relates to the ‘advocacy for peacebuilding’, especially in the wider context of campaigning for social justice and human rights. The literature in this area is focused on the lobbying of transformative change and advocating for a better future and well-being for children, families, and future generations. In an advocacy paper focusing on ‘kindred peace’ and children’s rights, Watson (2008) makes the case that peace building strategies are often justified in terms of the promotion of ‘human rights’ and ‘human security’, and that children’s rights are central to the promotion of human rights in any post-conflict environment. Watson goes on to argue that even though children are significant to the sustainability of peace, they are often ‘little discussed in peace-building policies, seldom asked to participate in peace building projects’, and easily conceptualised as victims and lacking agency. The paper advocates for the role of children as critical to the development of sustainable peace and children’s rights in being consulted and actively involved in the peace building and decision-making process. This is particularly pertinent in contrasting sociocultural contexts where childhood and children’s experiences do not constitute the “Western” ideal as in reality, children even at the age of twelve or younger may be charged with significant roles in their local contexts such as homemakers, landowners, breadwinners, peace brokers and heads of their households. Given the crucial role that children play in society, Watson argues that children themselves should take an active role and be consulted regarding ‘the nature of the peace and of their requirements in it’. The essay is important for its strong advocacy for a “kindering” of peace, to galvanise humanity in action and placing children as central to the debates regarding the nature of peace.

There is also literature in this category which advocates for the importance of early childhood and peace building in building ‘social capital’ for children and the wider civil society (Tongeren, Brenk, Hellema and Verhoeven 2005; Barnes, 2005). The idea of social capital – the societal values, traditions, community identities, and social cultural networks that enable the coordination and cooperation among people and communities are perceived as fundamental to the peace building process. The literature argues that by strengthening these local systems, resources and networks, children can build on their social capital and strengthen their capacity to manage conflict and adverse situations peacefully to promote national reconciliation, especially within post-conflict societies.

Much of the literature in this category consists of regional and international reports and opinion pieces advocating peace building as a basic universal human right for children, families and civil society. A UNICEF report ‘Children and Truth Commissions’ (2010) advocates
the rights of children and young people in contributing to sustainable peace through their families, schools and communities. The report emphasises the need to engage with children and incorporate their perspectives into peace and nation-building efforts. Another commissioned report ‘Consolidating the peace’ (2007) by three NGOs - ActionAid, CAFOD and CARE International, was published to coincide with the UN Peace building Commission’s first annual report to the General Assembly in June 2007 as a means of galvanising advocacy for peace building strategies, with a particular focus on Sierra Leone and Burundi. Contributing also to the advocacy for early childhood and peace building, the World Bank’s ‘Global Monitoring Report’ (2007) advocates for the scaling up of international aid for the world’s poorest, most fragile countries identified by the UN and the World Bank. Similarly, other literature reporting on a peace declaration, cross-country peace agreement or bilateral treaty (e.g. the bilateral treaty on peace and friendship in India, 1950) strongly advocate for the advancement of civil participation in building strong communities, and the promotion of social justice, equality and other positive dispositions in forming the foundations of peace building.

The categorisation of the literature according to the three themes: conceptual, intervention and advocacy, helps to build a more coherent picture of the existing research landscape around early childhood and peace building. A central argument prevalent across the literature is that early childhood or early childhood development can contribute significantly to the advocacy for a peaceful, just and sustainable future for civil society, conceptually and operationally in practice through policy structures, intervention strategies, and advocacy. In general, the research undertaken during this review shows a strong tradition of scholarship around early childhood and peace building. However, while acknowledging that the study is not exhaustive, the review does show that the balance of literature around early childhood, children and peace building in the East Asia and Asia pacific region is significantly narrow, with those focused on the five target countries (Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Timor-Leste, Myanmar and Nepal) even more limited. Following the findings of the review, the discussion in the next chapter ‘A future research agenda’ highlights potential areas for further research where more indepth exploration of the key themes will encourage further scholarship in the region.
Throughout this review and analysis, it is apparent that the notion of early childhood and peace building draws together a wide spectrum of knowledge stemming from a variety of fields. Building on some of the issues identified during the review, the following themes have been derived from an ongoing iterative process of analysis and synthesis of the conceptual framework, research questions and findings. It is envisaged that the themes will offer interesting and promising leads for a future research agenda. They also represent a consolidation of some of the ideas that have emerged from the literature and the views articulated by researchers and authors in the field.

**Theme 1**

**Conceptualising early childhood and peace building**

Continue to explore and refine existing concepts and knowledge of early childhood, peace and peace building, and their implications for policy development.

Authors such as Klein et. al (2008), Klein, Goertz and Diehl (2008), Merav (2001), Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) view the conceptualisation of peace as a social and political process that evolves over time as society changes, and therefore the need for continued research in formulating the guiding concepts and conceptual frameworks that inform the field, within and across societies. They suggest that further efforts should be focused on synthesising different conceptual ideas and operational definitions of peace and peace building. As Klein et. al (2008) asserts, future research should entail a continued refining of existing theoretical approaches of ‘peace’ and ‘peace building’ and their implications for policy development. The extant research shows a strong tradition of early childhood and peace scholarship that has contributed significantly to new knowledge in the field. It is important that such scholarship is sustained to reflect the multi-disciplinary ideological, social and cultural perspectives of early childhood and peace building that continues to inform ongoing scholarship in the field. A key dimension in a future research agenda is to therefore contribute to the continuing exploration and interrogation of key concepts and paradigms in the field.

Referring to the growing knowledge base of early childhood and peace building, Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) states:

> [T]here is a need for intercultural dialogue not only in the process of formulating guiding concepts and frameworks, but in the conceptualisation of the tasks, including educational frameworks.

**Theme 2**

**The role of leadership in promoting early childhood and peace building**

2.1 **Researching effective political leadership and ‘peace personalities’**

A potential area for future research is to build on some of the existing literature which suggests that the role of leadership is an influencing factor in the promotion of early childhood and peace
building (Miller and Mucci 1999; Sagi-Schwartz 2012; Miklian et. al. 2011; Hertz-Lazarowitz and Eden 2002). In the article ‘Children of war and peace: A human development perspective’, Sagi-Schwartz (2012) suggests that human attitudes and personalities can greatly influence a person’s ability and willingness to build peaceful and reconciliation activities. From a human development point of view, ‘peace personality’ traits are particularly important in shaping the attitudes and mind-set of political leaders in facilitating the peace building process, and enabling leaders to be open and ready to resolving conflicts. Sagi-Schwartz (2012) cites examples of how charismatic political leaders who are more balanced, flexible and open to the perspectives of others can become ‘powerful agents of social change’ in moving along the peace building agenda. He suggests further research is needed to explore the psychological behaviour and capacities of these leaders in resolving conflict and reconciliation, as well as the interplay between the contextual and personality factors that characterise effective political leadership in promoting peace building strategies. In this way, early childhood and peace building advocates are able to capitalise on better understanding the states of mind, behaviours and character traits of leading political figures whose attitudes have changed over the years towards conflict resolution. Miller and Mucci (1999) suggest the area of moral leadership and leaders’ perceptions of their role in strengthening the identity and connections within and between communities as a potential area of research, in particular the role of local leaders in brokering positive relationships between international organisations and the local community to maintain successful peace building at grassroots level. Similarly, Miklian et. al. (2011) suggest that effective leadership is important in the implementation of peace building strategies particularly in post-conflict developing countries. The notion of leadership, and in particular political leadership, is therefore a key dimension for a future research agenda.

2.2 Researching the role of children as future leaders

The notion of children as future leaders in peace building offers an important dimension to a future research agenda. Ujvari (2005) contends that critical to the nation’s peace building process is the role of children as the future generation in maintaining the country’s peace and prosperity, and therefore the importance of engaging them in leading and actively participating in rebuilding their own lives and that of the nation. Danesh (2010) views the training of present and future generations of children to become leaders and peace makers as a critical long-term task. Further research in this area will offer a better understanding of the potential role of children as leaders in initiating and maintaining social cohesion.

2.3 School leadership in creating a peaceful and safe learning environment

A key theme highlighted during the review is that of pedagogy and the learning environment offered in schools and preschools are primary sites of socialisation for children. Further research in the area of effective school leadership can contribute positively to the promotion of peace building and resilience among children.
Theme 3
Gender in early childhood and peace building

Research into the links between gender, early childhood and peace building

The issue of gender offers interesting linkages between early childhood and peace building which could richly inform a future research agenda. There is some literature to support the impact of conflict on children’s experiences, and on gender roles and identities (UNICEF 2010; Reardon 1996). UNICEF (2010) reports that age and gender-specific data can contribute to a better understanding of the impact of conflict on different groups of children. However, such data need to be supported with qualitative research and analysis from personalised and participant perspectives. Further research in the area will therefore offer added-value to the field.

Reardon (1996) highlights the importance of peace education in helping children explore gender roles in the socialisation of both boys and girls. She argues that while peace educators have advocated education for cultural diversity and the development of positive attitudes toward cultural differences, limited attention is paid to how peace education takes into account gender differences between men and women in developing positive dispositions. Schnabel and Tabyshalieva (2013) suggest the importance of taking into account a gender dimension and differences in constructions of masculinity and femininity in all stages of peace building activities including programme design and implementation.

Girls and boys, young women and men experience the post-conflict moment quite differently. Such differences need to be taken into account when protecting them and creating opportunities for contributions to the peace building effort (Schnabel and Tabyshalieva 2013).

The authors Bush and Salterelli (2000) have noted emerging links between early childhood and peace building, with issues of gender and leadership. Their research shows gradual shifts in gender roles in a few societies where girls and women have been known to assume leadership positions in peace movements. These changes in societal expectations with regards to gender roles offer potential contributions to inform a future research agenda in the region.

From Somalia and Sri Lanka to Peru and Palestine, for example, women and girls are breaking from restrictive societal expectations to assume leadership roles in peace movements, NGOs and politics. Bush K.D. and Salterelli D. (2000)

Theme 4
Researching the role of parents and families in peace and peace building

Further explore the role of parents and families in educating children about peace

Future research around the role of parents and families will help to build up the empirical evidence to support the role of parents and families in helping children develop peaceful values and disposition, and the potential impact on social transformation and the peace building...
agenda in the Asia Pacific region. There is some research to support the key roles that parents and families play in ensuring children’s overall development and well being, and this could inform further research about their specific roles in educating their children about peace in the home and family environment. (Deng, 2012; Muttha 2012). In a study on the peace education program Mulyavardhan in a cluster of rural primary schools in the Maharashtra state of India for instance, Muttha (2012) investigated parents’ perceptions of children’s behaviour and the impact of the programme on the home and family environment. The parents in the study reported a marked difference in their children’s interpersonal and conflict resolution skills, and the application of these skills in their daily living within the family and community. While the study is useful in evaluating the impact of the particular intervention programme, there is also potential for further research around the parents and families’ own influence over the children’s behaviour.

Little is known regarding how parents educate children about the issues of peace and war.’ (Deng 2012)

**Theme 5**

Children’s voices and participation in peace building

Research into children’s voices and participation in peace building

Further research into methods of engaging children in participation in peace building, including collection of best and worst practices, is required.

Popovski (2013)

A significant dimension to a future research agenda is to contribute to the growing knowledge base on the inclusion of children’s voices and participation in peace building. Existing empirical research suggests the importance of engaging with children’s roles and voices as active participants in the peace building process. Popovsky (2013) argues that children are not merely passive recipients in the peace building process, and that serious attention must be paid to their voices, opinions and participation in all issues relating to their welfare and the development of the society in which they live. The UNICEF report ‘Children and Truth Commissions’ (2010) advocates the need to deepen our knowledge and understanding of the opportunities and challenges in including children’s voices and perspectives in building a peaceful and just society. Sagi-Schwartz (2012) argues for further research in exploring the criteria and indicators that define children’s participation and role in peace building efforts. Based on a rights approach, Schnabel and Tabyshalieva (2013) stress the support of children’s participation in all levels of planning and policy-making in the constitution process, and the capacity of children’s contributions to peace building as a way of building social relationships in families and communities. They advocate in particular for further policy research to advance knowledge in the field on child and youth-centred peace building strategies. In general, the literature recognise that children’s perspectives and priorities for peace building may be different from adults, and encourages further research to address pertinent questions around the ways in which children’s voices can be included and how their participation can be promoted.

An exploration of how to learn from experiences with peaceful youth, enhance children’s agency, build up young people’s capabilities and increase their opportunities for contributing to peace building efforts is needed.

Schnabel and Tabyshalieva (2013)
An additional area for future research is also the exploration of the relationship between children and media, to investigate the ways in which technology can be a practical and powerful medium of raising the voice of children as potential agents of social change and transformation (O’Kane, Feinstein and Giertsen 2013; Leman 2002). Recognising the increasing use of social media such as facebook, mobile phone connections and other online applications among children and youth, O’Kane, Feinstein and Giertsen (2013) suggest social media as a potential entry point to engage with children in dialogue forums and knowledge exchange on peace building. It is an area of research which merits further examination in engaging children and young people with other civil society groups and enabling their contribution to peace initiatives. Leman (2002) proposes the following research question when engaging with children’s participation in peace building - ‘What role can the audiovisual media and new technology play in multicultural and peace education programs?’ Further research in the area of children’s voices and participation, including through the use of media and technology, will encourage an inclusive approach to peace building in facilitating children’s role to influence the development and implementation of government policies, plans and practices that affect their welfare and security in society.

**Theme 6**

Local and regional country-specific research in the Asia Pacific region

*Engage local and regional research on early childhood and peace building*

The literature review shows a general dearth of literature on early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region, especially literature which focuses on children and peace building in the five target countries identified in the review - Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Timor-Leste, Myanmar and Nepal. Schnabel and Tabyshalieva (2013) contend that there could be more focus on empirical research in post-conflict developing countries to address the knowledge gaps and improve international and national policy development in regards to peace building advocacy and activities.

\[M\]ore comprehensive data on child and youth populations in post-conflict societies will help eliminate knowledge gaps and improve processes of international and national decision and policy making as well as programme design and implementation. Schnabel and Tabyshalieva (2013)

**Theme 7**

Research and impact evaluation

*Develop impact assessments and practice-oriented research of early childhood and peace building interventions and programmes*

The findings highlight a crucial need to develop further research and evaluation which focuses on aspects of peace building practice and intervention programmes, such as the quality of practice, pedagogical methods, and the impact on children, families and communities. This is especially the case as research and evaluation have the potential to inform more sustainable policies and practices around peace building initiatives. Commenting on the peace building activities in Sri Lanka and the issue of engaging with Sri Lankan diverse diasporic communities, Zunzer (2005) argues that a key challenge is to determine the impact of peace building initiatives at all levels of society, at a political and community level.
A report by ActionAid international on ‘Consolidating the peace?’ (2007) suggests that greater attention is needed on the monitoring and impact assessment of early childhood and peace building programmes. This will increase the accountability and validity of the programmes and their contribution to genuine, sustainable peace in the long term. The report recommends that peace building programmes and initiatives involving children and families should be embedded in a process of monitoring and evaluation rather than perceived an end-product or output on its own. In doing so, the report suggests that the time frames for such evaluative research should be set beyond a one or two-period to assess the sustained impact of early childhood and peace building engagement in the long term.

Another challenge is to determine how the impact of often rather broadly designed advocacy, development or dialogue initiatives can be more focused, so as to have a more direct impact on the level of macropolitical peace process. .. Still, the question remains as to whether and for how long such mono-ethnic capacity building should be pursued given the often inverse power structures throughout the world wide diaspora and the need for improving communication between representatives of the different ethnic groups for achieving sustainable peace.’

Zunzer (2005)

Peacebuilding is an activity that is ultimately defined by its impact.

The expectations of the international community for peace-keeping and peace building efforts for children and families in the coming years will continue to challenge the political will and capacity of advocacy efforts in the Asia Pacific region. In making the case for a future research agenda, it is therefore important that practical steps are taken to sustain the momentum and engage the attention of policy makers and key stakeholders. The following is a list of suggestions for further development which have been largely informed by the literature and findings of the study, as well as dialogues with stakeholders during the review:

1. **Regional research task force**
   A potential area for development is the bringing together of expert stakeholders across the region to advise on, explore and propose strategic research priorities for the region, taking into account the relevancy for the local and national contexts in specific countries. The establishment of a regional task force focused on research can play a strong role in contributing to advocacy for the field of early childhood and peace building. It can also help to build collegiality across stakeholders in the region to enhance the empirical evidence based of the field.

2. **Strategic peace building framework for the Asia Pacific region**
   As part of the work of the regional research task force, a possible area of development could be to develop a strategic peace building framework to build political consensus and promote coherence among local, regional and international policies in advancing the research and advocacy for early childhood and peace building in the region. Within this strategic framework, a regional agenda for peace and an evolving concept for early childhood and peace building could be agreed and developed. It is envisaged that the framework will be developed through regional cross-country partnerships and participation to encourage ownership and implementation of the framework.

3. **Target priority countries and cross-country comparative research**
   Research has shown there is much knowledge to be gained from undertaking comparative research across countries. Given the general dearth of research in the region, a potential area of development is to identify priority countries and target specific areas for country-specific and cross-country comparative projects that will enhance the empirical knowledge of peace building practices and their impact on children and families. Comparative research can also help to enhance knowledge exchange and access to further data and information within the region.

4. **Early childhood and peace building forum**
   The establishment of an early childhood and peace building forum, either face-to-face or virtually, can promote continued dialogue for exchanging views and strengthening networks among stakeholders in contributing to the early childhood and peace building agenda. The forum can enable exchanges and stimulate ideas on how key networks and organisations can steer future directions in the field at both a national and international level.
This literature review was compiled within a defined scope and timescale. As such, it does not aim to provide a comprehensive guide to the research area but rather to map some of the key relevant concepts and literature, in order to uncover areas for future research inquiry and development. The project sought to address, rather ambitiously, the three research questions regarding the relationship between early childhood and peace building in the Asia Pacific region. Admittedly, there were several constraints when conducting the research. A challenge that surfaced early on in the project was the wide range of terminology used across the different types of literature, where often a different terminology is used in a variety of context to mean the same thing. For example, descriptors used to denote the concept of peace and early childhood such as conflict-resolution, resilience and community building turned out to be more ambiguous than expected and was especially challenging during the selection process and when evaluating the literature. The challenge was compounded by the wide range of literature which emerged across different fields and disciplines, reflecting the complexity of the subject area. Methodologically, this meant that there were implications for the review process if the wording was changed during the database search or search terms were used in a slightly different way. Although a systematic review protocol was used and consistency maintained in the descriptors included in the database search (see database search diary in appendix p.48), the overlaps and diversity of terminology used meant the search would not be exhaustive or definitive.

A major obstacle to the review is the disparate and wide-ranging literature base which made it difficult to capture a full spread of the relevant research. For example, it was difficult to track down the “grey literature” and less widely known publications in the field as they were either inaccessible or published in a native language other than English. A technical limitation meant that only literature published in the English language was reviewed. As such, it is possible that potentially relevant studies may not have been included and valuable information may be missed. When reviewing the search items themselves, and in selecting the research for inclusion in the review, some of the studies reviewed also presented challenges with regards to the research design and methodology. As typical of most literature reviews, a handful of literature, while interesting and valuable in their own right, had to be omitted because of obvious methodological or conceptual limitations.

The challenges, as highlighted above, inevitably pose limitations to the research. From a logistical perspective, the defined timescale and scope of the project meant that the study was undertaken as a “rapid” review over approximately twelve weeks rather than over a more extended time as one would expect of a full systematic review. The study had to be undertaken within the allocated resource and capacity of the project. For this reason, the research was limited to the three primary electronic databases considered highly relevant to the subject area - the British Education Index (BEI), ERIC (Education and Resources in Education Index) and the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS). It is envisaged that a more indepth and comprehensive database search and analysis could have taken place if the project was
conducted by a larger professional systematic review team but the challenges in regards to the conceptual difficulties and the searching of data as raised above may well remain.

Given the limitations described above, the project does not purport to offer a definitive assessment of the literature and research in the field but rather to map out some of the main dimensions of the literature around early childhood and peace building. Ultimately, its aim is to offer a broad-based gap-analysis of the literature with a view to discovering new areas of inquiry and to inform a strategic agenda for future research in the Asia Pacific region.
Advocacy for early childhood and peace building is an ongoing and long term process. Working on this study, I am reminded of the collection of images produced by the late photo journalist Robert Capa, published in the book *Children of War, Children of Peace* (1991). The pictures capture the emotions of war through the images of children and force us to ponder on the impact of conflict, not just physically but emotionally and psychologically on children and families. Poignantly, the photographs also depict images of children playing and smiling, reminding us of the resilience of the human spirit, amidst great adversity.

A common understanding articulated in the literature reviewed in this study is a united commitment to contributing to a peaceful society and providing compelling evidence of the ways in which children are central to the concept of peace. Research brings about new knowledge and new understandings about children, children’s lives and their role in peace building. This in turn enhances the richness and effectiveness of policy and advocacy. The findings of this research suggest a need for rigorous, high-quality research to advance the early childhood and peace building agenda for the Asia Pacific region, and to build a strong knowledge-base for further peace building efforts. The future research agenda for the region is important, not least because research evidence and findings can hopefully lead to new policy development, new innovative practices, and stronger impact on the lives of children and families.


‘Consolidating the peace?’ (2007), ActionAid, CAFOD and CARE international http://www.actionaid.org/sites/files/actionaid/consolidating_the_peace__views_from_sierra_leone_and_burundi_on_the_united_nations_peacebuilding_commission.pdf


DFID (2005) ‘Why we need to work more Effectively in Fragile States’.


FIGURE 1

KEY INTERNATIONAL POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>‘An Agenda for Peace’ - Report of the Secretary-General to the UN General Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2000 | Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)  
UNESCO The Dakar Framework for Action.  
Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations (also known as the Brahimi Report) |
| 2001 | UN General Assembly International Decade for a Culture of Peace |
| 2002 | UN Special Assembly Special Session on Children ‘Building a world fit for children’ |
| 2005 | UN Peacebuilding Commission – Intergovernmental advisory body |
| 2006 | OECD Starting Strong II. Early Childhood Education and Care |
| 2007 | UNESCO Strong Foundations. Education for All  
| 2010 | UNESCO Reaching the Marginalised  
UNESCO Early Childhood Care and Education Regional Report. Asia and the Pacific. |
| 2011 | UNICEF Building Peace in Early Childhood  
A ‘New Deal’ for fragile states, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) |
| 2012 | UNICEF-UNESCO Asia Pacific End of Decade Notes on Education for All |
| 2013 | UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) Report  
OECD Fragile States: 2013  
Launch of Global consortium on ECD and Peace building |
EARLY CHILDHOOD AND PEACE BUILDING IN SOUTH EAST ASIA AND THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION
DATABASE SEARCH DIARY

KEY DESCRIPTORS:
Peace building; Peace AND Early childhood; Peace building AND Children; Peace And Early childhood And Family; Peace AND Early childhood AND Community; Conflict Resolution and Early childhood; Peace building AND East Asia; Peace AND [country]

PUBLICATION TYPES:
Books; Conference papers and Proceedings; Dissertations and Theses; Encyclopedias and Reference works; Government and Official Publications; Other sources; Reports.

DOCUMENT TYPES:

LANGUAGE:
English

AGE GROUP:
All children (0-12 years), Young children (0-8), Infants (0-2), Pre-school children (2-4/5), Adolescents (13-17)

EDUCATION LEVEL:
Early childhood education (0-7 years), Preschool education (0-4), Nursery school education (2-5), Infant school education (5-7)

SORT BY:
Relevance, NOT by Publication date; All abstracts downloaded, tagged and read where available

DATABASES [3]:
British Education Index (1975 - current), ERIC (1966 - current), International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) (1951 - current)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search No.</th>
<th>Date searched</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>29-9-13</td>
<td>Peace building</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NON-EC Sub-tags – Peace and Adolescent; Peace and Young People; Croatia; Patriotism and Citizenship in South Africa; Pastoral Care; Humanism; peace Education in Rwanda; Sport Education for Peace; Perceptions of Arab and Jewish Adolescents on Peace and violent events Clear evidence and advocacy for peace education but nothing on EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>29.9.13</td>
<td>Peace AND EC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>29.9.13</td>
<td>Peace AND Family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1.10.13</td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1.10.13</td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>29.9.13</td>
<td>Peace building AND Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>29.9.13</td>
<td>Peace building AND East Asia/Asia Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>AND Asia Pacific – also 0 results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Children AND Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Children AND Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace building AND Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace AND Nepal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Bangladesh AND Early Childhood/AND Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/ Peace Building and Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Timor Leste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Timor Leste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution AND Early childhood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>But ONLY 3 are relevant – the other 4 articles relate to peer conflict among young children and behavioural management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search No.</td>
<td>Date searched</td>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace building</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace AND EC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace AND Family</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Family</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace building AND Children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace building AND East Asia/Asia Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>6.10.2013</td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Children AND Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND Early childhood AND Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Peace building AND Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Nepal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Peace Building AND Bangladesh AND Early Childhood/AND Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No results for either combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/ Peace Building and Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Timor Leste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Timor Leste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution AND Early childhood</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search No.</td>
<td>Date searched</td>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>Results extremely diverse – including adult education, human security, military, genocide, international peace development, political conflict situations. Topics are generic, none with a clear focus on EC. Need to filter results. Primary search descriptor does not allow to select 'education level' (Preschool education), unlike BEI or ERIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND EC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND EC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tried twice, no results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building and Children</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Family</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Early childhood AND Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND East Asia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND Asia Pacific</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Myanmar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tried peace/peace building twice, no results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Children AND Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND Sri Lanka</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mostly generic items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND Nepal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Nepal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item is duplicate, was available under ‘Peace and Nepal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building AND Bangladesh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Peace building AND Bangladesh AND Children/ Early Childhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tried twice, different combinations. No results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and Bangladesh</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>But majority are non-EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search No.</td>
<td>Date searched</td>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace AND Children AND Timor Leste</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution AND Early Childhood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution AND Children</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Items from BEI, ERIC and IBSS (Before Managing Duplication): **1,126**

Items marked with score of 1 (exact match 100%): **151 items (108 groups)**

Total Included Items from BEI, ERIC and IBSS (After Managing Duplication): **975**
CODES

SCREEN ON TITLE AND ABSTRACT
- Exclude on target EC age group (exclude items that do not pertain to children 0-8 years)
- Exclude on country (exclude items that are not based on East Asia and the Asia Pacific region)
- Exclude on date 1990 (exclude all items before 1990)
- Exclude on topic (the item is on an entirely unrelated topic)
- Include based on title and abstract

SCREEN ON FULL ARTICLE REPORT
- Exclude on target EC age group (exclude items that do not pertain to children 0-8 years)
- Exclude on topic (the item is on an entirely unrelated topic)
- Include based on full article report
- Exclude on country

CONCEPTUAL
- Peace Theories and Paradigms

INTERVENTION
- Programme Implementation (Literature relating to peace building at a programme level e.g. early intervention initiatives, toolkits, recommended practices etc.)
- Curriculum and Pedagogy (Literature relating to peacebuilding and early years classroom practices, teaching and learning; teacher training; children’s learning)
- Children’s Socialisation (Items relating to children’s socialisation and peer conflict-resolution issues as a way of promoting peace and peaceful relationships. Also relating to children’s socialisation within the family, community and society.)

ADVOCACY
- Children’s voices and participation (Literature focusing on children’s voices and participation as a form of advocacy for peace building)
- Research (Items provide evidence of empirical research on peace building and EC)

NOTES ON CODES

1. Exclude on target age groups: Young people and conflict; Women in peace politics; Social emotional well-being in Chilean students; college; Universities and peace corps; Youth intervention and peace; Adolescent; Youth violence

2. Exclude on topics: Human rights issues; Women in conflict situations; Military and defence in conflict situations; Adult education and peace values; Abdominal pain and conflict resolution in children; Children mediation in parental separation; Family mediation; Sibling conflict-resolution; Bullying; Domestic violence and peace; Parental conflict; Parental-adolescent conflict resolution; Global war and peace; Co-parenting divorcing couples and keeping peace; Refugee education and peace; Economics and conflict transformation.

3. Exclude on country: War and peace in Afghanistan and Iraq; Africa and literacy; Rwanda genocide; Poverty alleviation and peace promotion in sub-saharan Africa.

4. Conceptual: Conflict resolution; Peace and social justice; Concepts of war and peace;

5. Curriculum and Pedagogy: Planning for peace in the curriculum; Family-community-school partnerships to promote peace; Storytelling and community building
15. Boardman Susan K; Horowitz Sandra V; Deutsch Morton, Rubin Jeffrey Z; Fisher Ronald J; Kressel Kenneth, Frontera Edward A; Forlenza Samuel, Butler Frances, Fish Linda, Rediiner Irwin, Zhang Quanwu, Johnson David W; Johnson Roger T; Donnellon Anne, Kolb Deborah M; Rouhana Nadim N; Kelman Herbert C; Kimmel Paul R; (1994) Constructive conflict management: an answer to critical social problems?. Journal of social issues. 50(1): 1-211.
105. Slater, Marsha; Allsman, Ava; Savage, Ron; Havens, Lani; Blohm, Judee; Raftery, Kate (2002) Roles of the Volunteer in Development. 
104. Singer, Elly; Hoogdalem, Anne-Greth van; Haan, Dorian de; Bekkema, Nienke (2012) Day care experiences and the development of 
91. Murtagh, Teresa; O’Sullivan, Jean (1998) The Quiet Peacemakers. A Tribute to Teachers. UNESCO, Global Action Programme on Education for All, 7 Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France; Tel: (33-1) 45 68 21 27; Fax: (33-1) 45 68 56 24; E-mail: t.murtagh@unesco.org; Web site: http://www.education.unesco.org. 
77. Levin, Diane E; (1994) Teaching Young Children in Violent Times: Building a Peaceable Classroom. A Preschool-Grade 3 Violence Prevention and Conflict Resolution Guide. Sales Manager, Educators for Social Responsibility, 23 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138 (paperback--ISBN-0-86571-316-2, $16.95; 10% discount to ESR members, add 10% of total for shipping and handling in U.S. and Canada ($2.50 minimum); add 20% of total outside U.S. and Canada ($4.50 minimum) discount on quantity orders of 5-49 copies is 10%; 50 plus copies is 15%; New Society Publishers, 4527 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19143 (hardback-ISBN-0-86571-315-4, $44.95). 
74. Levin, Diane E; (1994) Teaching Young Children in Violent Times: Building a Peaceable Classroom. A Preschool-Grade 3 Violence Prevention and Conflict Resolution Guide. Sales Manager, Educators for Social Responsibility, 23 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138 (paperback--ISBN-0-86571-316-2, $16.95; 10% discount to ESR members, add 10% of total for shipping and handling in U.S. and Canada ($2.50 minimum); add 20% of total outside U.S. and Canada ($4.50 minimum) discount on quantity orders of 5-49 copies is 10%; 50 plus copies is 15%; New Society Publishers, 4527 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19143 (hardback-ISBN-0-86571-315-4, $44.95). 


112. Thompson Debra S; (1993) The Integration of Young Children’s Literature with Multicultural, Nonsexist, and Global Education Goals and Themes..


