Training for Conflict Transformation – An Overview of Approaches

Beatrix Austin

1. Introduction 208
   2.1 Agencies 209
   2.2 Design, Content and Methods 212
3. Lessons for Good Practice and Challenges 216
4. Perspectives 222
5. Resources 224
   5.1 Tools and Methods – Workbooks and Manuals 224
   5.2 Institutions and Internet Resources 228
6. References 232
1. Introduction

The past two decades have seen a marked increase in conflict prevention and peacebuilding activity on all levels, involving, among others, local activists, international civil society organisations and diplomats. Training in conflict resolution or management skills has become an important part of such conflict prevention and peacebuilding activity (Kriesberg 2009, 26/27), as a growing number of people who are interested or involved in conflict transformation are looking for opportunities to expand and refine their skills. They are faced with a variety of offers – and there is still little guidance for choosing from the wide and diverse array of organisers and formats. The mainstreaming of conflict resolution into other fields (development, environment, etc.) has only further diversified the field (Zelizer/Rubinstein 2009, 1). No unified methodology and approach has thus far emerged; and despite some calls for standardisation or harmonisation (ITS 2008; Arajärvi 2007), a great number of different formats continues to be tailored to the great variety of audiences and practitioner-learners.

This chapter introduces different training approaches and agencies and provides an extensive resource section as a first step in organising this wide variety. It does so by taking a step back and surveying the field through the eyes of a prospective “trainee”.

Trainees usually come from one of three groups (the boundaries admittedly blur):

1. People who engage in constructive, nonviolent conflict transformation, and who come from or work in regions where conflict is, or has been, fought out violently. When considering training opportunities, this group of (local or international) “activists” generally looks for capacity-building that will prove useful in achieving a tangible transformation of violent conflict.

2. People who aim to become trainers (or multipliers of another kind) for conflict transformation themselves (either working locally or internationally). This group of “potential trainers” usually looks for both content-based and educational skills-training and “training on/for the job”.

3. People who – in a more indirect, yet connected sense – work in the environment of violent conflict. They include staff of national and international agencies, donors, decision-makers, etc. This broad and heterogeneous group of “interested third parties” often takes to conflict transformation training in order to become more informed about, or sensitised to, conflict transformation work. Their expectations centre on conflict analysis and basic skills, which may or may not be implemented in their day-to-day jobs.

---

1 I would like to thank my colleagues at the Berghof organisations and beyond who have patiently helped me to shape this chapter with their expertise and comments.

2 The emphasis in the following is on conflict transformation training, rather than on training for human rights, humanitarian aid or development cooperation in which conflict transformation may be one module among many. A further qualification is necessary: this chapter is mostly concerned with training adults in training settings other than universities, although some reference is made to academic programmes. Those interested in peace education in primary and secondary schools and the wider field of peace education can find more information in Schell-Faucon 2001; Jones 2005; GTZ 2008; Bar-Tal/Rosen 2009 and the Annotated Bibliography of Peace Education and Conflict Resolution in Schools prepared by GPPAC (2007, available at www.gppac.net).
While all these trainee groups are bound to have somewhat different expectations and needs, there are questions that arise for all of them: who is offering training for which audience? Which designs, contents and methods of training are commonly applied? Are there criteria that can help assess training for conflict transformation? What challenges remain, and what recommendations can be made for improving training offers? These are the organising questions of the following sections.

Section 2 reviews different training agencies and takes a closer look at training design, contents and methods. Section 3 presents lessons and challenges. Section 4 focuses on the most important next steps in improving training for conflict transformation. Section 5, finally, provides an extensive resource section on tools, methods, organisations and programmes.


Training has an important role in the conflict transformation repertoire for several reasons: it can, first, sensitize participants to conflict causes and dynamics in the environment in which they work; and, second, strengthen their skills for dealing with conflict and their sensitivity to (intended and unintended) consequences of specific activities. Training local activists, training other trainers and training third parties can, in addition, contribute to (a) supporting and strengthening people who work for a shift towards social change and constructive conflict transformation, (b) building networks of support and empowerment among such people who otherwise may work in isolation from each other, and (c) spreading sensitivity and skills to more strategically placed people, contributing to creating what is metaphorically referred to as critical mass or critical yeast (Lederach 2005; see also Louis Kriesberg in this volume).

A great number and variety of trainers and organisations offer training in the area of peacebuilding and conflict transformation. The following highlights typical examples and points to useful “marketplaces”.

2.1 Agencies

Training for Activists

In general, it is possible to distinguish professional training institutes – which specialise in delivering tailor-made training courses – and organisations in which training forms but one piece of their strategy (see also Arajärvi 2007). Examples of the former – professionalised training

---

3 All agencies and organisations referred to are listed – along with their websites – in the resource section of this chapter (see 5.2 Institutions and Internet Resources). Although care has been taken to include material of non-western provenience, the overview is, due to my own educational and professional background, more deeply informed about concepts and resources used in Europe and North America. All organisations stand as examples for their categories; the lists are by no means comprehensive.
providers, who often have an analysis and strategic consulting component – are the US-based NGO CDR Associates, the internationally operating Coverdale Institute, Johan Galtung’s Transcend based at different sites throughout Europe and the US (most notably the Peace Action Training and Research Institute of Romania, PATRIR), Responding to Conflict in the UK or Partners for Democratic Change (with a focus on South Eastern Europe). Examples of the latter – conflict resolution organisations, which also provide training courses when circumstances call for it – are the US-based NGO Search for Common Ground, the UK’s Conciliation Resources and International Alert and the South African Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR).

There are, moreover, freelance trainers with different specialisations. Many trainers (so-called scholar-practitioners) are affiliated with academic centres, such as Harvard Law School and the Program on Negotiation (PON), the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) at George Mason University in the US, the Dutch Clingendael Institute for International Affairs, the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Bradford University’s Centre for Conflict Resolution in the UK and others.

A very useful resource for exploring this large field is the directory of conflict resolution organisations published by the European Centre for Conflict Prevention, which was updated in 2005.4 National platforms and umbrella organisations also provide good initial access to training resources and courses: among them are the Association for Conflict Resolution in the USA, the University of Colorado’s Conflict Resolution Consortium and its resource websites, the German Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung, the Swiss Peace Foundation, the European Initiative for Peacebuilding, or INCORE and INTRAC in the UK.

Training for Trainers

“Training for trainers” workshops are also offered by many organisations or individual trainers. Most organisations that offer basic training courses have added these advanced workshops to their repertoire (see above). Analysis and lessons learned are available in particular for the work of Responding to Conflict (RTC) who have, over the years, trained a large number of peace practitioners from all around the world (Fisher et al. 2000; see also ACTION for Conflict Transformation 2003); the Centre for Nonviolent Action’s training for trainers programme in the Balkan region (evaluated in Wils/Zupan 2004; see also Nenad Vukosavljevic in this volume); and the South African Centre for Conflict Resolution’s training for trainers programme in Burundi (Arnold 2001).

Third-Party Training

Over the last five to ten years, training for so-called “peace personnel” has received increased attention (Truger 2001, 2007; Schweizer 2009). Nowadays, four main types of agency – into which individual trainers and institutes are often integrated on a contractual basis – offer training for international staff:

4 The directory can be found at www.gppac.net, via “directories”, or ordered on CD ROM. It allows searches by keyword, e.g. “training”, and by country/region.
Section II: Enhancing Capacities and Practices

Training for Conflict Transformation – An Overview of Approaches

1. Seconding organisations and recruiting agencies (at national level), e.g. the Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre (CIPTC); the German Center for International Peacekeeping Operations (ZIF) and the Swedish Folke Bernadotte Academy; or the Civilian Peace Service in Germany (ZFD), which coordinates peace training and prepares staff for secondment mainly in the context of grass-roots NGO work through its Academy for Conflict Transformation (Akademie für Konflikttransformation);

2. International organisations – like the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the United Nations (UN) and its agencies, and, albeit still to a lesser extent, the European Union (EU);

3. Development agencies like the German GIZ (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit), Britain’s DFID (Department for International Development) or Swiss DEZA (Direktion für Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit), as well as humanitarian agencies like Care, Oxfam, the International Committee of the Red Cross, etc. who are in the process of mainstreaming conflict management into their programmes;

4. Training/research centres, e.g. the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR), the Swiss Center for Peacebuilding (KOFF), the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Centre in Ghana or the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), specifically through its Academy for International Conflict Management and Peacebuilding.

Academic Institutes and Professional Schools

For some, conflict management nowadays has become a career choice. Academic and professional programmes in peace and conflict studies have grown considerably in numbers over the last decades (Zelizer/Johnston 2005). Substantive information about programmes can be found at various sources, and there is no shortcut to thorough, personal research. The recently established Peace and Collaborative Development Network can serve as a useful starting point since it provides frequently updated guides to key programmes in the field. Eileen Babbitt (1997, 383-385, for the US context), Oliver Ramsbotham et al. (2005, chapter 2), as well as the research team around Brian Polkinghorn (for example Polkinghorn et al. 2008) also provide a good first orientation. Information clearing houses such as the Conflict Resolution Network Australia, the Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT) in the USA or the Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung in Germany offer information about programmes and prerequisites, as do the websites of the various schools (see section 5.2.4 for a small selection).

For those who have a stronger interest in the practical rather than the academic side of conflict transformation or who discover the field later in their careers, programmes by non-academic organisations may present an alternative. Among those offering such programmes are Responding to Conflict (UK), especially through the Applied Conflict Transformation Studies (ACTS) Programme, or Transcend (Europe and USA). When looking for certified training

---

5 The field of practice that is associated with peace and conflict studies is plagued by a certain confusion of terms. For the purposes of this chapter, “conflict management” and “conflict resolution” will be used as the overarching, general category, while “conflict transformation” refers to a specific long-term attempt to shift the processes and underlying structures in dealing with differences towards nonviolence.

6 For a self-reflective evaluation of its first two years, see ACTS 2008.
programmes in specialised areas, e.g. mediation, the best source of information are umbrella organisations, such as the Bundesverband Mediation for Germany or the US-based Association for Conflict Resolution. Also of interest are distance-learning opportunities which make use of modern advances in technology (Ward/Lekson 2007, 378).

2.2 Design, Content and Methods

The design, content and methods applied in training processes are an important indicator of what a prospective trainee can expect to learn. Workshop design encompasses timing, the selection of participants and trainers, and the choice and arrangement of the location. In terms of content, it will be most important to look at the mix of topics covered. Teaching methods and materials encompass elements such as reading, discussion, simulation and role-play. Evaluation, finally, can be an indicator that the training workshop/seminar is taught with an intention to learn and improve. Each of these choices influences what trainees will be able to transfer to their personal work environment.7

Workshop Design

Participants – Participants can come from a variety of backgrounds. They can be homogenous groups in terms of organisational or national affiliation. They also can comprise representatives of different parties to a conflict. There is no common recipe, except that most trainers prefer small groups, so that intensive interaction is possible, and mixed groups (in terms of experience, nationality or seniority), so that learning is not only an exchange between a trainer and his/her “pupils” but also between trainees/participants. Such learning and exchange is often cited as a particularly powerful and lasting experience in participant feedback (Anderson/Olson 2003, 79; Babbitt 1997, 369/370; Fischer 2001, 59).

Trainers – Trainers for conflict transformation should possess several characteristics: one of the most frequently mentioned is the need to be a conflict-tested personality with their own international field experience. The idea behind this is that unless trainers “have been there” themselves, they lack credibility and authenticity. Beyond this, different groups and individuals will have different needs and preferences. Since it is impossible for any one trainer to be everything to everyone, trainers often work in teams (Sprenger 2005; Francis 2002a; Babbitt 1997; Fisher 1997b). Carefully composed teams (from different ethnopolitical groups, female-male, local-external, etc.) have the further advantage that they can model a central value of conflict transformation: respectful and creative cooperation across differences (Strimling 2002, 271). In regions that have witnessed ethnopolitical conflict and violence, for example, it seems particularly powerful to employ trainer teams that span the ethnopolitical divide: a participant from former

Yugoslavia states, “[t]o have one person from another country in the region in a training [course] is very good. To have a ‘Serbian’ in the team, who is different than people expected, helps a lot to show that people are different, and that nationality does not matter” (Wils/Zupan 2004, 18).

**Timing** – Conflict transformation training can last from one or two days (workshops on specific methods, e.g. negotiation) to several weeks; from one-off events to sequenced programmes with multiple modules. Five-day to ten-day training workshops seem to be most frequently used. What format to choose depends on a trainee’s qualification, resources and experience, a needs assessment and the purposes of the training course. On a micro-level, breaks and free time are extremely important for the flow of energy and concentration during a workshop and should be generously built into a good curriculum. Especially when training is held for mixed groups from different sides to a conflict, these moments usually provide an invaluable space for personal encounter.

**Location** – The choice of where to attend a training workshop can send clear messages about ownership, inclusiveness and empowerment. Johan Svensson (2001) thus advises training organisers not to “shy away from the difficult spots”. At the same time, it can make as much sense for trainees from areas where violent conflict dominates daily life to look at things from a distance or learn from comparative experience, and gather outside the conflict region. More remote locations offer the advantage of allowing for more focused group-work, whereas urban locations may be easier to reach and more exciting with important effects on the overall energy of a group. A second set of choices relates to the immediate physical surroundings of the training venue: seating arrangements, sources of light and air, variety of presentation modes, break rooms, food and drink, accessories (pictures, flowers or the like) – they all influence the level of energy and concentration of participants and trainers. While only some of these can be assessed ahead of time, it is worth asking organisers for their planned set-up before deciding where to attend training.

**Choice of Contents**

Introductions and goal-setting, focused thematic sessions, daily feedback and final closure form cornerstones of each workshop. Since conflict transformation explicitly aims to address root causes of violent conflict, conflict analysis has a prominent role in almost all training programmes (see also Arajärvi 2007). Basic/introductory workshops usually cover the whole set of potential conflict transformation activities. These activities can be grouped along different structuring principles: one such set of principles are the four steps of analysis, strategy, action and learning (Fisher et al. 2000). Another set are the conflict phases of latent conflict, open conflict, settlement and conflict prevention together with the related skill-sets of awareness raising, group formation and communication; preparation for and implementation of dialogue, negotiation, mediation or reconciliation; and monitoring, reconstruction, community (re-)building (Francis 2002a and b). Advanced workshops can focus on a great variety of different specialisations (Truger 2007). Capacity-building for the internationalised world of conflict resolution can usefully be complemented by modules on advocacy, media-relations, fundraising and proposal writing (Wils/Zupan 2004; Arajärvi 2007).
Methodology and Materials

Two methodological ideal-types can be distinguished: the elicitive and the prescriptive approach (Lederach 1997; Fisher 1997a; Francis 2002b; Sprenger 2005; Fetherstone/Kelly 2007). Pre-
scriptive methods assume the trainer to hold expert knowledge, which can be transferred through
lectures and examples (i.e. “the best way to do it”). Elicitive methods, on the other hand, assume
that both trainers and participants hold relevant knowledge and share responsibility for the
learning process. The role of an elicitive trainer is to facilitate a joint process of finding the most
appropriate response to address a given conflict system. Most trainers and workshops these days
apply a mix of elicitive and prescriptive elements (e.g. short lectures alternate with case studies or
applied joint analysis), acknowledging the variety of needs and environments with which they
work. There is, however, an emphasis on using a participatory, peer-orientated, elicitive approach
to its fullest, since it is seen to further the conflict transformation field’s core values of ownership
and collaborative relationships (for example Freire 1972; Lederach 1997). Also, there is strong
evidence that “participants will not apply methods and strategies that they have not learnt in
practice […] ‘training’ needs to encompass exercise and practice, ideally in relation to the
participants’ context and reality” (Sprenger 2005, 4) – a goal that, in the realm of conflict reso-
lution and transformation, elicitive methods are more likely to achieve than prescriptive ones.

In this context, a number of general insights have emerged on how to ensure transfer in
experiential learning. Basic requirements include “a structured experience, reflection on that
experience, and a subsequent experience in which behaviour may be altered based on the prior
experience and reflection” (Susskind/Corburn 1999, 16). Learning from analogy – in particular
using case studies and simulation – is limited if the context of learning and context of use differ
greatly (Gillespie et al. 1999). Comparison, recognition of similarities (which would trigger the
newly learned response), and transfer are thus more likely if the difference between teaching
material and real-life context decreases and if practice opportunities increase – characteristics
of training workshops that can be assessed by a trainee ahead of time. Increasingly, attention is
called to additional conditions that will turn education “about” peace into education “for”
peace, among them the encouragement of critical thinking and valuing of grass-roots experience
next to theoretical models (Fetherstone/Kelly 2007; Schmelzle/Fischer 2009). Occasionally,
criticism can be heard regarding the insufficient interlinkage of academic and practical
knowledge, with concern about training courses running ‘on autopilot’ for years without taking
into account new research, or theoretical developments being effectively isolated from practice
(Meerts 2009; Botes 2004; Meijer/Matveeva 2006). Good training programmes will be marked
by an openness to engage with both sets of knowledge.

8 The issue of transferring concepts from seminar contexts to real-life situations, and the challenge of ensuring
transfer from individual learning and change to social learning and change, are among the most pressing issues in
training for conflict transformation (see below and Sprenger 2005). Betts Fetherstone and Rhys Kelly succinctly point
to the lingering worry experienced by many trainers and teachers when they write: “it was increasingly troubling
that we were graduating students from our program who would only be reflective practitioners by accident or prior
experience” (Fetherstone/Kelly 2007, 265).
Among the numerous training manuals that have been published (see section 5.1), materials for the non-English speaking world are increasingly being made available. Fewer collections of visual or audio materials or other creative methods (like storytelling, for example) are available internationally, although the recently established Peace Media Clearinghouse sponsored by the United States Institute of Peace aims to close this gap.

There is still a shortage of original or thoroughly adapted (i.e. not merely translated) materials for different regional and cultural settings. In a concrete training, the joint selection of cases and examples – or their flexible adjustment – is essential, as sloppy work will always backfire. Mohammed Abu-Nimer (1998, 115) recounts such a case, where Middle Eastern participants could not relate to a US-based conflict scenario:

“On at least one occasion, participants shared their experience about a North American training team that only changed the names of the parties involved in the conflict. For example, Hasan would not play baseball, Mustafa and Ahmad would not be drunk in a university in Gaza or Jordan, and they would not date different women casually and have conflict around that issue be mediated!”

Ways of Evaluating Learning and Training “Impact”
Assessing the usefulness of the training often forms the final activity that organisers, trainers and trainees engage in together. Ideally it helps all partners to discover useful next steps and adjustments to their ways of teaching and learning. There are several formats in use:

Regular feedback is a basic way of staying responsive to trainees’ needs (i.e. getting a sense of how things are going, comparing intentions and impact). Some trainers hold daily feedback rounds, asking what has worked well and what could be improved. Most trainers include feedback rounds and questionnaires at the end of a training event (Arajärvi 2007).

Evaluation, defined most generally, judges the success of an activity in terms of goal achievement, efficiency and impact (looking at both intended and unintended consequences). These issues have been of growing concern in the field of conflict transformation (Rothman 1997; Anderson/Olson 2003; Church/Shouldice 2002, 2003; Church/Rogers 2006; Ashton 2007; Movie 2007; see also Cheyanne Scharbatke-Church in this volume). Both internal evaluation (by the organising team/organisation) and external evaluation (by an independent evaluator or evaluation team) are being practised. All forms of evaluation rely on interviews with, or written feedback by, trainees who have participated in training events and implemented training concepts. Occasionally, people in the wider environment of these trainees are also asked about their perceptions. In addition, longitudinal research can and should shed light on the longer-term impact that training has had in participants’ lives and environments.

Supervision and individual tutoring and coaching – the systematic and open reflection by a team or individual guided by a qualified coach or counsellor – are tools of learning and evaluation that are slowly spreading in the field. They create opportunity, space and qualified company to reflect on what is going on in a conflict context, how multipliers try to affect it and how the conflict and the methods chosen to address it affect them (trainees, trainers, support staff, donors, etc.) in turn. This form of reflection offers crucial insights into how the things learned in training settings
translate practically and also emotionally into real-life contexts: “self-awareness is a vital skill for practitioners in this field” (ACTS 2008, 1). If tight budgets do not allow for professional tutors, coaches or supervisors to be brought into a programme, creative and inexpensive alternatives can be used, like networks of peers or Internet-based forms of exchange.

Special Needs of Training for Trainers Programmes

As Arnold (2001) observes, “there is no shortcut to becoming a good trainer”. Training for trainers programmes thus take significant time. Several phases of training and practice can be spread over one or two years to allow for sufficiently deep learning and supervised practice. On-site training phases can last anywhere from 5 days to 10 weeks. The length and depth of single components are usually tailored to the needs, qualifications and practical constraints (resources, availability) of participants.

In training for trainers, opportunities for supervised practice are highly important, including safe spaces for experimenting with what has been learned, feedback and coaching in order to develop experience, gain security and grow in authenticity as a trainer. Alternating joint training and phases of ‘homework’ back in the trainee’s individual professional context ensures that issues of transfer, re-entry, practice and reflection can be addressed.

While these ideals have become more important as conflict management training has been professionalised over the years, it should not be forgotten that in many situations where violent conflict actually is waged, trainers (and other multipliers of the conflict transformation message) take up the challenge of spreading skills of dealing with conflict nonviolently under precarious conditions. Circumstances often do not allow for the luxury of learning slowly in a safe environment but call for immediate engagement, or for conscious waiting and the adoption of alternative roles (Strimling 2002, 265/266; Prakashvelu 2006).

3. Lessons for Good Practice and Challenges

In reviewing the quality of training workshops and programmes for conflict transformation, it must be noted that there has been considerable effort to improve the design, implementation and evaluation processes for training curricula and formats over the past decade. This has resulted in much improved knowledge and also improved practice.

Nine cornerstones for good practice have thus far emerged across all contexts and are highlighted consistently in the literature (see footnote 7):

First, baseline analysis and needs assessment must shape all of the training components. Ideally, this step should integrate the participation of all important people (i.e. prospective trainees, trainers/training organisations, mandating organisations, funders, etc.). This and all
following steps should be firmly rooted in local cultures and contexts (Zelizer/Rubinstein 2009, 12). Furthermore, analysis and assessment need to be gender sensitive.

Second, joint goal formulation early on in a planning process can help to improve the strategic focus and ensure that training measures are context-sensitive. This pays early tribute to the fact that joint learning of those across the divide of conflict (or those involved in joint missions) can be very powerful and should be employed more often.

Third, trainee selection and preparation needs to be purposeful and address expectations and commitments; it should also be transparent to participants. Smaller groups allow for work with more lasting effects. In today’s environment, especially in an era of more public diplomacy, training in mixed groups (e.g. integrating diplomats, civil society actors, development workers, etc. in one setting) can provide most valuable learning opportunities for people who will be working together in the field (Hemery 2005, 204/206; Truger 2007). In terms of effectiveness, it appears that training key people is more promising than indiscriminately training more people.

Fourth, choosing and shaping a learning environment needs to be guided by creating safety for trying things out, for making mistakes and learning from them; it should instil creativity and connect to participants’ realities. Building trust, respect and relationships between trainees is necessary in order to lead to effective training, especially in contexts of violent conflict. Cross-cultural education and training can lay foundations for culturally sensitive and informed practice. Mixed groups are generally “richer” – but can also be more challenging to accompany and train.

Fifth, curriculum and methodology development must be tailored to the needs and purposes of those involved and should be explored jointly. It can be instructive to exchange curricula and discuss different methodological approaches, especially with a view to increasing context-sensitivity and cultural appropriateness. In general, a mix of short input lectures, discussion, experiential learning, feedback and coaching is seen as most effective. Interactive/participatory/elicitive training methods are seen as more powerful (yet in some cultures and contexts they may be met with more resistance). Finally, it is necessary to think broadly about relevant skills (strategic planning, project management, communication, curriculum development, group dynamics, critical thinking, etc.) and integrate them creatively into training for conflict transformation.

Sixth, characteristics of trainers/teaching teams should model diversity and respectful relationships. Also, trainers need to have authentic experience and credibility in the subject matter that they cover. Finally, they should be prepared to embrace elicitive methods that accept each participant as someone who has expertise to contribute in the training session (two-way learning).

Seventh, flexible and purposeful implementation is crucial, i.e. trainers and trainees should come prepared, yet ready to adjust if necessary (and learn to recognise when adjustment is needed).

Eighth, systematic reflection and/or (action) research need to become regular programme activities. Feedback, monitoring and evaluation can enhance creative learning and further development and evolution of training formats. Supervision and coaching can further improve individual and team support and reflectiveness.

Ninth, follow-up and long-term support is absolutely necessary to improve the sustainability and impact of training interventions. One-off events rarely have long-term impact, whereas a well-thought-through training process can hope to have such an effect (Sprenger 2005). Hence
strategic embedding of training is absolutely necessary: training workshops that are not part of a broader vision at best remain inconsequential; at worst they can discredit the whole enterprise of nonviolent conflict transformation.

Box 1 – A Checklist for Good Practice in Conflict Transformation

One useful checklist for trainees to quickly assess the quality – and quality outcome – of a training process has been compiled by Responding to Conflict’s Richard Smith and colleagues:

During the planning stages
- Is the process inclusive, are all the stakeholders involved? Is there a checklist of stakeholders?
- Is the process reflective, i.e. not pre-decided?
- Is the process flexible? Are you able to change and adapt? Are stakeholders involved in monitoring the process?
- Are you breaking down traditional power groups and promoting those that are marginalised?
- Is your agenda inclusive of everybody’s needs and experiences?
- If something goes exactly according to plan, is this an indicator of success or inflexibility?

During the training event
- Did your emotions change during the event?
- Ask yourself – did I learn anything?
- Look for indicators like body language, blank expressions, lack of interest, silences. Are people asking questions, are you being challenged?
- Is everyone involved?
- Does the facilitator become invisible? Do participants start dialogues among themselves?
- If people keep bringing up the same issues, is it because they aren’t following the process or because they are not being heard?
- What kinds of open-ended questions are you using?
- Are you open to criticism? Are you receiving any?

Afterwards
- Have you achieved your objectives?
- Has the process led to changed practice or behaviour?
- Has there been an increase in the participation of previously marginalised groups?
- The next time you meet, is there continuity in the level of understanding?
- Are there any signs of progressive change?
- Are there any signs of sustained change?
- Are there any signs of positive thought or growing levels of confidence?
- Is there any evidence of a growing confidence to criticise?
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While these insights and elements are increasingly well-known and often implemented in training design, there remain a number of crucial shortcomings and challenges. These become particularly pressing if we recall that training for conflict transformation does hope to have an impact on the way in which conflicts are dealt with and transformed: between individuals, within organisations, and in societies in violent conflict. Training, after all, forms the backbone of one of conflict transformation’s primary strategies: capacity-building.

Challenge 1: Addressing Underlying Assumptions, Theories of Change and Values – On Expectations

Training in contexts of violent conflict can serve many purposes: it can be seen as a relatively risk-free entry point for external actors to work with local activists, it can gradually train a “critical mass” of people to use nonviolent alternatives in inducing social change, or it can equip a wide range of actors, among them staff of international organisations, with conflict-sensitive eyes and ears. Training will always have some effect on the context, so at the outset of training workshops or programmes it is important to be aware of assumptions and hypotheses that guide training and capacity-building, as these – consciously or unconsciously – influence their shape and effect.

The most basic assumption is that training can further individual and social/political change which will create more peaceful and less violent societies (in terms of attitudes, behaviour and structures). The scope of such envisioned change can vary from small communities to cross-country relations (for examples of such change see Meerts 2009, 646).

There is an implicit assumption, too, that there are conceptual and behavioural skills that indeed will improve the way communities and individuals deal with conflict – and that while conflict is an essential dimension of human relationships, violence is not.

We assume that these skills can be taught and learned across cultures, and improved with reflection and practice (Fetherstone/Kelly 2007). And we assume that the application of such skills by the right and/or by enough people will help create more peaceful relations (Anderson/Olsen 2003, 78, introducing the dimensions of More People and Key People; Babbitt 1997, 367/368).

On a different level, all trainees and trainers bring personal and societal values to the training setting that shape their expectations and interactions (Francis 2002b; Lederach 1995). External actors as well as local peacebuilders similarly have their own diverse and implicit assumptions, aspirations and values. If one is not aware of such underlying currents, the training process may run into unexpected resistance and difficulties.
Box 2 – A Story on Understanding Differences

A trainer-colleague tells a nice story to illustrate what can happen if we do not address the issue of assumptions and interpretations during a training process. Imagine, he says, a cat and a dog meet. They are “natural enemies”, speak very different languages and may often reach opposite conclusions from the same data. What does a cat do when she sees a stranger? Raises and swishes the tail to express caution and threat. What does the dog do? Starts wagging the tail, expressing curiosity and a happy greeting. The dog puts the ears back when satisfied – the cat puts them back when defensive; the dog crouches down to play – the cat to attack. Now if they encounter each other, given all the cat does, the dog reads, “yippee, a new friend”, while the cat thinks, or so we imagine, “oh s*...”. There are two ways out of this initial miscommunication: a repeated encounter that teaches the “opponents” that things may not always be as they appear (exposure, unlearning/re-learning of attitudes); and the simple question of “what do you mean by saying this or doing that?” (communication). For both, training workshops can provide a relatively safe environment.9

Everyone involved in a training process therefore needs some time and space to examine their sets of values and assumptions and engage in thinking about how these might influence the training process – as well as the long-term purpose of conflict transformation. In current practice, this is too rarely done. At the same time, some caution needs to be expressed regarding the expectation that learning and “doing” conflict transformation are easy tasks that can and will be put readily into practice by all (Fetherstone/Kelly 2007, 281).

Challenge 2: Rooting Training in Joint Analysis and Long-Term Strategic Vision – On Being Useful

The foundations for good training results lie in a thorough initial analysis and strategy formulation that give preliminary answers to the questions of what is needed (in terms of skills and people) as well as what the objective of the training activity is. Regularly repeated analysis and strategy-building exercises should involve trainees, trainers, organisers and funders, and should focus on goal formulation and process planning. Still too seldom, though, do organisations or trainers in international contexts afford the “luxury” of thorough preparatory and follow-up work. In part, this shortcoming can be blamed on a lack of resources to invest in such staff-intensive programme activities. In part, though, needs assessment and strategy formulation are also willingly sidestepped in favour of ready-made training modules and programmes, which are assumed to work in any context.

Lately, there has been a gentle backlash against the related professionalisation and subsequent “technisation” of the field of conflict transformation:

“Discussions have emerged between those who believe that responding to conflict and building social change in settings of deep-rooted conflict is primarily a learned skill and those who see it as an art. […] Building constructive social change […] requires both. But the
evolution of becoming a profession, the orientation toward technique, and the management of process in conflict resolution and peacebuilding have overshadowed, and in too many instances forgotten, the art of the creative process” (Lederach 2005, ix).

Awareness-raising about the problematic consequences of such ready-made, “technical” approaches should be increased (Schmelzle/Fischer 2009). It should also be noted that in some situations, initial analysis and strategy formulation might lead to an acknowledgement that conflict transformation training is not the appropriate way to engage, as other activities might be more important and efficient at that given point in time (Strimling 2002; Prakashvelu 2006).

**Challenge 3: Overcoming the Selection Bias – On Reaching the Unlike-Minded**

Little comparative evidence is being published about specific experiences in working with groups other than the easily accessible or self-selected peacebuilders. In fact, a general criticism of conflict transformation work has been that there is a tendency to work with like-minded and like-situated groups, often targeting the urban, well-educated, English-speaking, and, in situations of violent conflict, ‘converted’ parts of society.

On the other hand, little is known, for example, about working with armed or formerly armed groups. Several factors are at play: for one, such groups are usually not predisposed to sign up for training workshops addressing conflict transformation with nonviolent means. Furthermore, they are often operating clandestinely or at least in opposition, and are, therefore, more difficult to seek out. In many circumstances, it may be – politically or physically – unsafe for them to engage.

At the same time, one of the values at the centre of nonviolent conflict transformation is affirming the shared humanity of those who have become used to seeing each other as enemies, so approaching and working with more extremist groups does make sense. The necessity to integrate groups engaging in so-called ‘spoiler’ behaviour into peace processes to ensure their sustainability, for example, has gained many proponents over the years (e.g. Zupan/Schönegg 2006). Also, as more external actors become engaged in post-war environments and as post-conflict regeneration and reintegration gain prominence in peacebuilding, groups become more accessible and are crucial for peace processes to move forward. The context of reintegration and reconstruction programmes makes, for example, ex-combatants and child-soldiers more likely recipients of conflict transformation training. Finally, fighters who give up their weapons and start supporting a different way of changing society, if they do so credibly, hold strong persuasive power.

Carefully balanced efforts should therefore be made to expand the remit of conflict transformation training to create, where appropriate, spaces for encounter and debate among the whole range of forces that shape the course of a (violent) conflict – and its transformation.

**Challenge 4: Providing Ongoing Support and Follow-Up – On Building a Process of Development**

Ongoing support (access to a network, coaching or supervision, ongoing contact with the trainer team) and follow-up opportunities are crucial factors for successful training programmes. If external trainers and agencies cannot be reasonably sure of providing these, their programmes might do more harm than is usually acknowledged. Disappointed expectations, insufficient
preparation and nurturing, a sense of futility or frustration – all can discredit not only a training event and its organisers, but also the concepts and ideas of conflict transformation it was designed to spread in the first place. At the same time, it is important to engage participants in also taking responsibility themselves for developing concrete ideas for continuing their work, for example through action planning (Strimling 2002, 273/274).

Opportunities to reflect on the practice of what has been learned are most important in ensuring ongoing engagement. This is particularly true for training for trainers workshops, as many trainees still experience a lack of “safe” opportunities to “practise” – both for the sake of their own development and for the sake of the (conflict) parties on whom they try their emerging skills. Here, mentoring and a form of apprenticeship would be welcome additions to training programmes. Ongoing, long-term financial, organisational and personal commitment on behalf of those working with local and international activists would go some way to ensuring empowerment and supportive networking that are regarded as crucially important in building sustainable capacities for peace.

Challenge 5: Transfer from Individual to Social Level Change – On Adding Up
In training, individual change – of attitudes and behaviour – comes first. Such change involves seeing things in a new way, un-learning old patterns and learning and testing new patterns of thought and behaviour. Yet conflict transformation training also aims to bridge the gap between individual, micro-level and social, meso- or macro-level change. Through processes of “multiplying” (enhanced by a careful choice of participants) and “networking” (enhanced by careful group composition and continuous follow-up), social change – of collective attitudes, behaviour and structures or processes – is meant to follow personal change.

Yet, we have only initial indications of whether the ways we choose to manage transfer are actually working (Anderson/Olson 2003; Cuhadar-Gurkaynak 2006; Malhorta/Liyanage 2005). Further (action) research will be required in order to learn more about the transfer that already does happen and about ways of improving transfer and strengthening the “adding up” of individual change to structural and cultural shifts.

4. Perspectives

Training for peace is not an end, but a means – conflict transformation training specifically aims to shift the way in which conflict is experienced and engaged. Such training must, therefore, cover fully the spectrum in which humans learn and comport themselves: facts/knowledge, behaviour/skills and attitude/emotion. Also, it must strive to be an ongoing activity, allowing for re-training, reflection and supervision/mentoring at appropriate moments over the long term: many training participants, be they NGO activists or diplomats, face their greatest challenges when they come back to their institutions after having been trained and find that their
attempts to implement what they have learned are blocked by others or the structures and systemic environment in which they act. In all contexts, training is but one piece of the puzzle and should be applied strategically. If there is no transfer of the training content and skills to the real world, there will be little or no impact.

Much has been invested into improving training for conflict transformation in the last decade. Lessons have been learned, materials have been developed and honed, formats and methods have been adjusted. Also, the overall number of people who have received training has significantly increased along with the number of training providers. And there is some evidence that training can improve conflict “performance”.

Yet, we will need more comparative studies to find out whether these adjustments have also increased the quality of conflict transformation training and practice. Where do trainees go after having been trained, what do they do with their knowledge and skills? When do they find it sufficient to induce change in their conflict-affected environments, and when and why do they find they fall short? The questions and focus of further inquiry need to be tailored to the different trainee groups:

In complex and dynamic conflict situations, where training is also an explicit attempt to create contact between people from different ethnic groups, it is very difficult to assess a limited intervention’s impact. What is needed is more long-term “tracking” (or reporting back) in order to find out who does what with training, with what effects and later insights. It might also be an interesting approach to turn this inquiry around and ask change agents in nonviolent movements for their personal development path. How many of those engaged will have come through conflict transformation training of one kind or another?

Many training programmes for third-party staff have only recently been established. Curricula and materials are now available from many new sources. However, a systematic review of theory and practice of more standardised training for third-party interveners has not yet been undertaken,10 nor have there been any broad impact studies.

A next round of evaluation, reflection and comparative research will have to find further answers to these questions and creative solutions for the problematic areas outlined above. Ultimately, training for conflict transformation will, in the coming years, have to address the dual challenge of testing the techniques it has developed and spread, and at the same time allowing back in some of the creative and searching processes of relationship-building and achieving deep social change, which peacebuilding and conflict transformation are essentially about.

10 A first stocktaking is available from the Associations and Resources for Conflict Management Skills (Arajärvi 2007; ARCA 2008).
5. Resources

5.1 Tools and Methods – Workbooks and Manuals


5.2 Institutions and Internet Resources

5.2.1 Local Capacity Training (Basic Training and Training for Trainers)

Alternatives to Violence Project: http://avpinternational.org

African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, South Africa: www.accord.org.za

Applied Conflict Transformation Studies (ACTS), worldwide: www.globalacts.org/index.php

Association for Conflict Resolution (formerly SPIDR), USA: www.acrnet.org

Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution: www.aspr.ac.at

CDR Associates, USA: www.mediate.org

Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), South Africa: http://ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za

Centre for Education and Networking in Non-Violent Action (Bildungs- und Begegnungsstätte für gewaltfreie Aktion) KURVE WUSTROW e.V., Germany: www.kurvewustrow.org

Centre for Nonviolent Action, Sarajevo/Belgrade, BiH/Serbia: www.nenasilje.org

Clingendael – Netherlands Institute of International Relations: www.clingendael.nl

Coverdale, worldwide: www.coverdale.com

Creative Associates, USA: www.caii.com

Educators for Social Responsibility, Cambridge, USA: www.esrnational.org

Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding (IICP), Austria: www.iicp.at

Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding (IICP), Switzerland: www.iicp.ch

Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD), Washington, DC, USA: www.imtd.org

International Alert, UK: www.international-alert.org

International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, USA: www.nonviolent-conflict.org

InWEnt – Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung (Capacity Building International), Germany: www.inwent.org, especially the Global Campus at www.gc21.de (merged into GIZ since Jan 2011)

LEAP Confronting Conflict, UK: www.leaplinx.com

Partners for Democratic Change, USA: www.partnersglobal.org

Peace Action Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR): www.patrir.ro

Movement pour une Alternative Non-Violente, France: http://nonviolence.fr

Nairobi Peace Initiative, Kenya: www.npi-africa.org
Training for Conflict Transformation – An Overview of Approaches

Nonviolent Peaceforce, worldwide: www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org
Public Conversations Project, USA: www.publicconversations.org
Responding to Conflict, UK: www.respond.org
Search for Common Ground, USA and worldwide: www.sfcg.org
Transcend, USA and worldwide: www.transcend.org
Training for Change, USA: www.trainingforchange.org
West African Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP): www.wanep.org

5.2.2 Training for Third-Party Intervention
Academy for Conflict Transformation / Akademie für Konflikttransformation im ForumZFD: www.forumzfd-akademie.de
Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienst für den Frieden (Action Committee Service for Peace) (AGDF), Germany: www.friedensdienst.de (lists professional training opportunities for civilian constructive conflict management; in German)
Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT), USA: www.conflicttransformation.org
Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre / Pearson Peacekeeping Center, Canada: www.peaceoperations.org
Care International: www.careinternational.org
Center for International Peacekeeping Operations (Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze – ZIF), Germany: www.zif-berlin.org
Crisis Management Centre (CMC) Finland: www.cmcfinland.fi
Department for International Development (DFID), UK: www.dfid.gov.uk
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ): www.gtz.de (merged into GIZ)
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ): www.giz.de
Direktion für Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit (DEZA), Switzerland: www.deza.admin.ch
European Group on Training: www.aspr.ac.at/egt/index.php
Field Diplomacy Initiative, Belgium: www.fielddiplomacy.be
Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden: www.folkebernadotteacademy.se
Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst (“Civilian Peace Service“): www.forumZFD.de (German only)
German Federal Association of Mediators: www.bmev.de
International Association of Peacekeeping Centres: www.iaptc.org
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC): www.icrc.org
International NGO Training and Research Centre (INTRAC), UK: www.intrac.org
Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, Ghana: www.kaiptc.org
NTL Institute, USA: www.ntl.org
Oxfam International: www.oxfam.org
Program on Negotiation (PON), Cambridge, USA: www.pon.harvard.edu with a clearinghouse for negotiation simulations and case studies: www.pon.org/catalog/index.php
Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, worldwide: www.sietar.org
swisspeace/ KOFF, Switzerland: www.swisspeace.ch
Tavistock Institute, UK: www.tavinstitute.org and www.grouprelations.com
Trigon, Austria: www.trigon.at
United States Institute of Peace: www.usip.org
Verein für Friedenspädagogik, Tübingen e.V., Germany: www.friedenspaedagogik.de
zivik, Germany: www.ifa.de/zivik

5.2.3 International Organisations
EU: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/index_en.htm as well as www.eugroupontraining.eu
OSCE: www.osce.org/training
Department of Peacekeeping Operations Integrated Training Service (ITS):
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations – Peacekeeping Resource Hub: Policies,
  Lessons Learned and Training for the Peacekeeping Community (former Peacebuilding Best
  Practices Unit): http://peacekeepingresourcehub.unlb.org/PBPS/Pages/Public/Home.aspx

5.2.4 Academic Training Programmes
Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (AFK), Germany: www.afk-web.de
Bradford University, Centre for Conflict Resolution, UK: www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/confres
Brandeis University – Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict, USA: www.brandeis.edu/slifka
Centre for Conflict Studies, University of Marburg, Germany: www.uni-marburg.de/koenfliktsforschung/
  startseite-englisch?set_language=en
Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland, USA:
  www.cidcm.umd.edu
Eastern Mennonite University – Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, USA: www.emu.edu/cjp
Escola de Pau, Universidad Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain: http://escolapau.uab.cat/english/index.php;
  http://escolapau.uab.cat/docencia/recursos.htm
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, USA: http://fletcher.tufts.edu
Initiative on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity (INCORE), Derry, Northern Ireland: www.incore.
  ulst.ac.uk with information database on the Northern Ireland conflict CAIN (Conflict Archive
  on the Internet): www.cain.ulst.ac.uk
Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) at George Mason University, USA: http://icar.
  gmu.edu/
Institute for Peace Research and Security Studies at the University of Hamburg, Germany:
  www.ifsh.de/IFSH_english/studium/mps.htm
Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation, University of North Dakota-Conflict Resolution
  Center, USA: www.hofstralawit.org/transformativemediation/
International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), Oslo, Norway: www.prio.no
Johns Hopkins University’s School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS), USA: www.sais-jhu.edu
Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, USA:
  www.wws.princeton.edu
Program on Negotiation (PON), Cambridge, USA: www.pon.harvard.edu
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Sweden: www.sipri.org
University for Peace, Costa-Rica (UN mandated): www.upeace.org; with an Africa Programme:
www.africa.upeace.org
University of Notre Dame’s Jean B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, USA:
www.nd.edu/~krocinst/index.html

5.2.5 Information Resources: Platforms, Networks and Research Centres
Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT), USA: http://conflictttransformation.org
Alliance for Peacebuilding, USA: www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org
Associations and Resources for Conflict Management Skills (ARCA): www.peacetraining.org
Berghof Conflict Research, Berlin, Germany: www.berghof-conflictresearch.org, with its Berghof
Berghof Foundation for Peace Support, Berlin, Germany: www.berghof-peacesupport.org
Beyond Intractability: www.beyondintractability.org
Coexistence International, Waltham, USA: www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/
CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, Cambridge, USA – Reflecting on Peace Practice (RPP) and
Local Capacities for Peace / “Do no harm” projects: www.cdainc.com
Committee for Conflict Transformation Support (CCTS), UK: www.c-r.org/ccts/index.htm
Conciliation Resources (including the publication Accord Series), UK: www.c-r.org
Conflict Resolution Consortium, University of Colorado at Boulder, USA: http://conflict.colorado.edu,
including CR Info: www.crinfo.org
Conflict Resolution Network (Australia): www.crnhq.org (includes free training materials)
Eldis Knowledge Base, published by the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK: www.eldis.org
(includes the service “Eldis Manuals and Toolkits Reporter”)
European Centre for Conflict Prevention & Global Partnership on the Prevention of Armed Conflict
(GPPAC), NL: www.conflict-prevention.net (includes directories; an updated version is accessible
on the web via www.gppac.net, “directories”) 
European Network for Civil Peace Services (EN-CPS): www.en-cps.org
European Peace Liaison Office (EPLO), Brussels: www.eplo.org
Initiative for Peacebuilding: www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu
Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, Peace Education Programme: www.ineesite.org/
index.php/post/peace_education_programme
Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung, Germany: www.konfliktbearbeitung.de
Peacemakers Trust, Canada: www.peacemakers.ca/education/educationlinks.html
Peace and Collaborative Development Network: www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org (includes a
guide to training programmes in conflict resolution and related fields)
Reliefweb: www.reliefweb.int
United States Institute of Peace – Peace Media Clearninghouse: http://peacemedia.usip.org
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