Aegis Rwanda, Kigali Genocide Memorial Education Program

"Learning from the Past: Building for the Future"
Student Workshops

Follow Up Evaluation

February, 2012

Judi Stevenson, principal investigator
* * * * *
Minerva Research & Communications
631 Mount Belcher
Salt Spring Island, B.C., Canada V8K 2J3
Telephone: 250-537-5599
Email: minerva@saltspring.com

Executive Summary

Since January of 2009, Aegis Rwanda has been delivering day-long educational workshops entitled ***Learning from the past; Building the future*** at the Kigali Genocide Memorial (KGM). The rationale for the program is an assumption that exposing students to Rwandan history, including the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, in a safe and inclusive manner, and engaging them in facilitated exploration of the skills and values that support cooperative co-existence in post-genocide Rwanda, is critical preparation for their contribution to a united and peaceful country, free from discrimination on ethnic grounds.

So far, the opportunity to attend the workshop has been offered to secondary school students and accompanying teachers from 11 of the 30 school districts in Rwanda, one school at a time. In the first three years of the program's operation, a total of 214 schools have participated, sending more than 8,800 students and teachers to the workshop.

The day-long program generally includes the following components:

1. A presentation and discussion on Rwandan history and the genocide;
2. A presentation and discussion on genocide in a global context: steps and causes;
3. Group discussion and activities to promote critical thinking and problem solving, and values to support social cohesion;
4. Lunch, with a personal (and optional) visit to the mass graves;
5. A briefing by a staff counsellor to prepare students for the visit to the exhibition;
6. A tour guided by a member of the guide department that encompasses the permanent exhibition on Rwanda, including the 1994 genocide, and the permanent exhibition on genocide elsewhere in the world;
7. A debriefing with the staff counsellor;
8. Closing and evaluation.

To help assess students' responses to the workshop, Aegis Rwanda had an analysis done of the short, end-of-day evaluations completed by attending students during a period of several months. The results were extremely positive, but included a small number of suggestions for program revision which were then implemented. In order to test the accuracy of those very positive results, and also to follow-up by gathering impact data in the schools themselves, Aegis commissioned a more elaborate evaluation, in two phases, to be carried out in 2011. In phase 1, the attending students from a sample of six randomly chosen schools completed a slightly revised end-of-day workshop evaluation form. The six headmasters of those schools as well as all the attending students and teachers agreed to a phase 2 follow-up which took place in the subsequent term, at their schools.

Phase 2 was designed essentially to find out "what happened next". In other words, would students continue to feel strongly positive about the workshop and their experience at KGM after a few months had passed? Would they have acted on their commitments to share what they learned there with others in their schools, and show other evidence of program impacts on their attitudes and behaviour? If so, what would the effects of their activities be on the other students with whom they interacted and on school climate generally , especially in relation to program goals about the history of Rwanda and the struggle to integrate and overcome the vestiges of the 1994 genocide?

To follow up, the six original schools were visited by a team of two independent, specially trained field researchers. They collected both questionnaire and interview data from students and teachers who had attended the workshop in the previous term, as well as a sample of *non*-attending students in each school and all six headmasters (or their equivalents). Data from non-attending students and headmasters was expected to provide a form of proof (or disproof) of attending students' intentions/claims to (i) bring the information and images from the workshop that had so impressed them to the attention of others, and (ii) find ways to contribute to unity and reconciliation at the scale of their own lives at school and at home.

The results from phase 2 of the evaluation provided impressively strong confirmation of the continuing impacts of the Aegis workshop on both attending students and teachers. Among the highlights are that high percentages of the 161 students who completed the 10-item follow-up questionnaire reported that they had increased their level of activity or made other positive gains across the board: for example, in relation to unity activities, speaking out about the genocide both at school and beyond, participating in genocide-prevention activities through school-based clubs, and experiencing "changes in my heart" as a result of the workshop—boys at generally higher rates than girls. Overall rates of positive response remained high, but they showed more range and variation than in previous evaluations, providing a basis for more confidence in their accuracy.

Answers from attending students to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire (n=161), and especially in their interviews (n=46), built on the quantitative data by providing further detail, in students' own words, in response to 17 questions about the workshop and its subsequent impacts on them. Almost 100% of students provided examples of the many ways they were engaging in a broadly shared undertaking to 'bring the workshop back to their schools,' with the support of attending teachers and headmasters. This alone would be dramatic evidence of the success of the Aegis program. As well, however, they described a wide array of impacts that the workshop had had on them personally, some of them touching to read. They also provided details about the ways they saw their schools changing as a result of the workshop. This data included references to school-based "problems" and "conflicts" (code for ethnic tensions and divisionism) which they said were greatly lessened as a result of the discussions, lessons and dramatic presentations on the genocide that they had initiated after their return to school.

Teachers also provided evidence that they had been engaging actively in the dissemination of information and ideas from the workshop, and that they had gained from it personally in terms of their understanding of the genocide and their confidence to teach about it. They acknowledged in their interviews that it could be hard to talk about, and noted the absence of clear, compelling and authoritative sources that they could base their teaching on; some said that curriculum materials (like the Aegis workshop) are needed throughout the school system, at all age levels.

Non-attending students indicated clearly that they were involved in the activities described by attending students and teachers. Upwards of 90% said that they had learned more about Rwandan history and the genocide as a result of the visit to KGM by their colleagues, and that relationships in their schools were better because of the discussions and other activities that followed. Fully 98.7% said that they themselves now wanted to attend the Aegis workshop.

It seems certain from all of the evidence taken together that the workshop program is succeeding extremely well in meeting its goals. Recommendations about ways to extend and build on this success are offered at the end of the report.

Table of Contents

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APPENDICES

* * * * *

[1] Identical to the one used for attending students.

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Program description

Since January of 2009, Aegis Rwanda has been delivering day-long educational workshops entitled ***Learning from the past; Building the future*** at the Kigali Genocide Memorial (KGM). The rationale for the program is an assumption that exposing students to Rwandan history, including the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, in a safe and inclusive manner, and engaging them in facilitated exploration of the skills and values that support cooperative co-existence in post-genocide Rwanda, is critical preparation for their contribution to a united and peaceful country, free from discrimination on ethnic grounds.

So far, the opportunity to attend has been offered to secondary school students and accompanying teachers from 11 of the 30 school districts in Rwanda, one school at a time. In the first three years of the program's operation a total of 214 schools participated, sending more than 8,800 students and teachers to the workshop.[2]

Table 1: Attendance at Aegis workshop, by year

Years	Number of Students /year	Number of Schools/year
2009	3,430	81
2010	2,756	56
2011	2,648	79
Total	8,834	214

Headmasters sign up their schools for the workshop after they or their delegates attend an information session at the Kigali Genocide Memorial. Participating schools determine which students and staff will attend. It is suggested that they choose students in leadership positions with the expectation that those students will actively share what they have learned and seen at the Memorial, and in this way extend the impact of the Aegis program beyond their own numbers.

Goals for the workshop include:

- providing an understanding of the causes and consequences of genocide, both in Rwanda and internationally;
- providing an understanding of Rwandan history from pre-colonial to the present;
- contributing to the development of students' ability for critical and independent thinking and problem-solving skills;
- encouraging personal responsibility for actions;
- deterring collective blame.

Students and accompanying staff arrive at the Memorial at approximately 9 am and leave at 4 pm, travelling for up to 1.5 hours each way. Aegis Rwanda provides workbooks, pens,

[2] According to Ministry of Education statistics, there were 1,399 secondary schools in the country, with a total enrolment of 425, 587 students in 2010.

refreshments and lunch for the attendees, while the schools are responsible for organizing and paying for transportation to KGM. The workshop program is delivered by qualified secondary school teachers (graduates of the Kigali Institute of Education), with the support of other Aegis staff. The day-long program for school groups generally includes the following components:

1. A presentation and discussion on Rwandan history and the genocide;
2. A presentation and discussion on genocide in a global context: steps and causes;
3. Group discussion and activities to promote critical thinking and problem solving, and values to support social cohesion;
4. Lunch, with a personal and optional visit to the mass graves;
5. A briefing by a staff counsellor to prepare students for the visit to the exhibition;
6. A tour guided by a member of the guide department that includes permanent exhibition on Rwanda, including the 1994 genocide, and the permanent exhibition on genocide elsewhere in the world;
7. A debriefing by the staff counsellor;
8. Closing and evaluation.

Students are provided with a 14-page workbook for use during the workshop and to take away with them.[3] It includes information on Rwandan history and the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, a description of the steps to genocide, some information about genocide in other countries, and activities to support critical thinking. It is hoped by Aegis that this material, albeit limited, will support further discussions and/or lessons in the schools, and perhaps in some of the home communities, of attending students.

1.2 Preliminary program evaluation

Since the inception of the program, Aegis Rwanda has asked all workshop participants to complete a short end-of-day questionnaire about their experience at KGM. Based on informal reviews, their responses were found to be highly and consistently positive. More systematic analysis was then undertaken in 2010, when the questionnaire data collected over a period of several months was compiled, translated and analyzed.[4] A report was submitted in February, 2011. The feedback from workshop participants was again found to be remarkably positive.

Although this data was not coded for all topics, three main themes emerged from the analysis:

- first, participants emphasized the importance and relevance to them of learning about the history of the country, especially the genocide against the Tutsi, and the need for unity and the prevention of further divisionism;
- second, they saw the need for many more students (and Rwandans generally) to have access to the workshop, both at Kigali Genocide Memorial and in schools and communities around the country;
- third, they provided constructive suggestions for improving the Aegis program.

The majority of suggestions were implemented immediately: the students' workbook was translated into Kinyarwanda; full access to the KGM exhibitions (including grave sites) was provided; development of classroom resources and presentation approaches is on-going.

[3] Students' Workbook for "Learning from the Past; Building the Future" is available from Aegis Rwanda.
[4] Funding was provided by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

This preliminary review was clearly useful for program development; however, Aegis recognized that it had a number of limits. In particular, since the data was gathered on-site at the end of the workshop day, it did not provide any evidence about the long term durability of the program's impact on participants, the activities they undertook to communicate what they learned, or the impact of dissemination activities on non-attending students. As well, the uniformity of high scores raised questions about the validity of the data. Were they truly reflective of students' engagement and response to the program, or were they an exaggeration based on a belief that positive opinions were expected, thus possibly reflecting a tendency toward compliance with authority? Would more variation in students' views be found if a more complex research design and methodology were employed in a follow-up evaluation? Would the results of such a design provide greater certainty about the impact of the workshop on attending students?

Accordingly, a more extensive evaluation was planned, funded and undertaken almost immediately. The research design called for a two-phase approach, to be implemented in the remainder of the 2011 school year.[5]

1.3 Phase 1

In phase 1, which took place in term 2 (April 25-July 29, 2011), questionnaire data was gathered on site at the Memorial from all the students and teachers who attended the workshop from six schools chosen at random from two school districts located on the outskirts of Kigali (Kamonyi and Rulindo Districts).[6] The total number of participants in phase 1, by category, was:

- 161 students,
- 31 teachers
- 5 head teachers or headmasters.

The results from their questionnaires were analyzed and a report on the main findings was submitted in August, 2011.[7] Responses from the participants in phase 1 reiterated the highly positive attitudes to the KGM workshop expressed in the earlier "preliminary" evaluation. To summarize briefly:

> Over 95% of attending students (N=161) replied with the most positive choice available to six of the nine closed (multiple choice) statements with which they were asked to agree or disagree on a scale of 1 to 5. Those statements were: "the material provided was clear and easy to understand"; "I am more aware of how genocide could be prevented"; "this workshop has helped me understand how important critical thinking is for Rwanda today"; "this program is helpful in building a united Rwanda"; "as a result of this workshop, I am more likely to get involved in my community and the world around me"; and "I am more likely to talk with others about Rwanda's history after taking this workshop."
>
> Two of the other three statements received the same high level of agreement (5 on a scale of 1 to 5), from over 85% of students. They were: "I am more aware of the steps that lead to genocide" and "I am more aware of genocide in other countries". Over 80% agreed at that level with the third statement, "Overall my level of satisfaction with this workshop was high".

[5] The Aegis Trust Evaluation design for 'Learning from the past; building the future' workshops was finalized in March, 2011, with funding support from the Canadian International Development Agency.
[6] The schools will not be named to protect the anonymity of the participants.
[7] The complete final report on phase 1, dated August 24, 2011, is available from Aegis Trust.

Students who did not agree at the '5' level with one of the nine statements almost always agreed at the '4' level.

In response to the three open-ended questions which were asked, the majority of students wrote that what made the biggest impression on them was learning "the truth" about the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, and to a lesser extent, learning about Rwandan history leading up to the genocide. Many indicated that they had been unaware, uncertain or confused about the facts of the genocide until they attended the workshop at KGM.

Students made few suggestions for improvements to the workshop; however, as in the earlier review, many requested or urged that the Aegis program (or something like it) should be available to more students, or as some said "all students" or indeed "all Rwandans".

A particularly powerful form of affirmation for the program was that many of the attending students (and some teachers) said they had made profound decisions that day to share what they had learned with others, and to take action in various ways to contribute to a peaceful future for Rwanda. Some spoke of the workshop in language indicating that it had been a life-changing experience for them, and thanked those who had provided and guided them through it.

Attending teachers (N=31) expressed similar sentiments to those of students in response to the open-ended questions, and a large majority showed similarly high levels of agreement with the closed (agree/disagree) statements. In a few cases teachers made suggestions for possible program improvements but, like students, their main suggestion was for more Rwandan students, teachers and members of the public to be able to visit KGM and experience the workshop for themselves.

1.4 Phase 2

Phase 2, which took place in term 3 (August 22-October 28), was designed in part to find out "what happened next". In other words, would students and teachers confirm the strongly positive feelings and motivations to act that they expressed on the day of the workshop, not just in words but by taking action and making personal behaviour changes when they returned to their schools? If so, what would the effects be on those with whom they interacted?

To follow up, the six original schools were visited by a team of two independent, specially trained field researchers. They collected both questionnaire and interview data from students and teachers who had attended the workshop in the previous term, and also from a sample of *non*-attending students from each school and all six headmasters (or their equivalents). Data from non-attending students and headmasters was expected to provide a form of proof (or disproof) of attending students' intentions/claims.

The broad goals of phase 2 were:

- to identify the lasting attitudinal and behavioural impact(s) of the Aegis student workshop at the Kigali Genocide Memorial on those who attended;
- to identify the indirect impacts of the workshop on their school communities (and their families and communities, if mentioned).

Its specific objectives were:

- to identify the attitudinal and behavioural impact of the student program on the student attendees through questionnaires and interviews;
- to identify the attitudinal and behavioural impact of the program on the teachers and head teachers who attended the student program;
- to identify how attendees (students and teachers) view the student workshop program several months after their original experience;
- to establish whether the attendees (students and teachers) have shared learnings and experiences from the workshop with others (within their clubs, classes, school communities generally, and families);
- to identify the nature and impact of shared learnings (through feedback from non-participating students);
- to gain information from headmasters regarding (a) the general climate regarding unity and genocide ideology in his school in relation to the student education program, (b) their reasons for signing up their school for the program and (c) whether there has been a noticeable impact from the student workshop program on the school environment.

1.5 Outline of this report

From this point on, the focus of this report will be on phase 2 evaluation results. It is organized as follows:

- Section 2 describes the methodology used in the research.
- Section 3 discusses the impacts of the workshop on attending students to that point.
- Section 4 discusses the impacts of the workshop on attending teachers to that point.
- Section 5 discusses the indirect impacts of the workshop on the concentric social circles surrounding the two groups of attendees, i.e. their "colleagues" (friends at school, classmates and school populations) and to a much lesser extent, their families and communities.

Positive outcomes, effects and impacts are defined to include evidence from workshop attendees in three general categories:

- the expression of attitudes and values that reflect the curriculum of the Aegis workshop;
- retention of new knowledge or understanding of key workshop topics and ideas that were gained on site;
- self-reports of behaviour or activity which supports or extends the goals of the workshop beyond the participants themselves.

Note that the evaluation design was an ambitious one. A generous number of questions was asked of participants[8] in the phase 2 follow-up, in both written and interview formats, generating a large quantity of data. This approach was deemed appropriate because of the exploratory nature of the research. As would be expected, not all of the questions produced insightful or valuable results for the purposes of this report. Accordingly, and for reasons of length, the report will focus on selected questions and themes in the data. Some of the questions which are omitted from this analysis will be recommended for review at another time.

[8] Participant categories were (i) attending students, (ii) attending teachers, (iii) non-attending students and (iv) headmasters/headmistresses or their equivalents.

Section 2: Methodology

2.1 Research design

2.1.1 General approach

The evaluation was designed to be "developmental" rather than "summative". That is, since the Aegis student workshop program "Learning from the past; building the future" is an on-going one at KGM, evaluation is an opportunity for staff and funders alike to gain systematic feedback on its strengths and weaknesses, insight into its effects and effectiveness in relation to program goals, and ideas for changes or modifications, in order to further its development. The results of the evaluation are also intended to guide the development of new education programs, in particular a planned outreach program.

The evaluation was also designed to take advantage of the complementary strengths of quantitative and qualitative data sources. Quantitative data offers the advantages of breadth, efficiency and focus: a larger number of respondents can answer a larger number of questions in a shorter period of time than is possible to achieve with qualitative approaches. As well, the questions and the range of pre-set choices can be well tailored to the evaluator's specific research questions. Qualitative data offers the reverse advantages: depth, detail, nuance, unexpected information and the opportunity for probes and supplementary questions. It also provides a complex context for understanding the issues under investigation, and requires (or allows for) more interpretation on the part of the evaluator.

2.1.2 Addressing the limitations of phase 1

To understand (and hopefully verify) the unusually positive results from phase 1, the evaluation design for phase 2 included a number of measures.

- First and foremost, it would go beyond the notorious 'short-term workshop effect' of an intense learning experience which takes place outside the context of people's everyday lives, such as the Aegis education program, to look for evidence of longer term effects that had carried forward into the school-lives of students and teachers, and possibly further, into their interactions with their families and communities.
- It would also attempt to find out how successful students and teachers were in carrying out their post-workshop commitments to (i) share the knowledge and insights they gained at the workshop with others in their schools, and (ii) take steps toward the reconciliation of past tensions among Rwandans of different ethnicities by forging new bonds of common humanity.
- It would look for evidence of appropriate emotionality in students' and teachers' comments and accounts of their reactions to and conversations about the workshop and the exhibitions at the Memorial, which would help to confirm the validity and reliability of their overall responses.
- The process of data collection itself was modified to include measures taken by the two field researchers collecting the data at the schools (see below), requiring them to stress the importance, as well as the anonymity and confidentiality, of all written and verbal

responses. The goal was to encourage participants in the evaluation to speak frankly about charged topics such as the possibility of on-going "divisionism" in their schools or communities, and to offer not just unstinting approval of the workshop itself but also constructive criticism.

- A professional translator was hired to ensure the greatest possible sensitivity to individual variation in participants' speech patterns and vocabulary in Kinyarwanda, thereby adding credibility to the analysis and interpretation of responses done by the English-speaking evaluator.

The goal of these measures was to push back against the limitations of phase 1 and to provide more depth of analysis and more certainty of interpretation.

2.1.3 School selection and data gathering

The six schools were selected for the evaluation at the beginning of term 2. The selection procedure consisted of inviting the first three schools from each of the first two districts slated to visit KGM in term 2 to participate in the evaluation. Reasons for taking this approach were, first, that it amounted to random selection since Aegis education department staff had no influence over the order in which schools signed up for the workshop and, second, that it allowed for the greatest passage of time between the experience in term 2 and the follow-up research in term 3. Accordingly, it was the best possible test of the durability of attendees' reactions to and assessments of the workshop, and it also gave them the longest possible time to implement their intentions to share what they had learned with others, both at school and at home.

Headmasters were informed at the outset of the two phases of program evaluation that were planned, involving data collection both on-site at KGM in term 2 and at their schools in term 3. Students and teachers who attended the workshop received further information while they were at KGM, and were asked to complete consent forms. All six heads agreed to the two phases of research, and everyone who attended the workshop signed a consent form.

The evaluation design specified the following data-gathering guidelines *for each of the six schools*:

- All of the students who attended the workshop would complete a follow-up questionnaire with both scaled (quantitative) and open-ended questions.
- A sample of six attending students, chosen at random, would also be interviewed.
- A sample of 3 non-attending students *per class*, chosen at random, would complete a written questionnaire.[9]
- All attending teachers would complete a follow-up written questionnaire.
- Two attending teachers or head teachers, chosen at random, would also be interviewed (one male and one female, where possible).
- The headmaster would be interviewed.

In addition, a decision was made that the head boys and head girls of each school would be interviewed as well, for a total of 8 students per school. This was considered advantageous both

[9] Since the number of classes per school varied, the number of non-attending students who participated in the evaluation from each school did too.

to acknowledge and add weight to their leadership role in their schools, and also to permit (perhaps in the future) the comparison of their views to those of other students.

Given a small number of absences, the total number of participants in phase 2, by category, was:

- Attending students (questionnaires) = 161
- Attending students (interviews) = 46
- Attending teachers (questionnaires) = 24
- Attending teachers (interviews) = 11
- Non-attending students (questionnaires only) = 151
- Headmasters (or equivalents) = 6

Among the attending students, girls outnumbered boys in part because one of the schools randomly selected for the evaluation was an all-girls school. The ratio was about 60: 40 girls to boys overall, depending on the specific question being tabulated. In the Rwandan education system as a whole, data for 2010 shows that boys slightly outnumbered girls in the upper secondary grades (52% to 48%).[10] However, Table 2 (below) shows that the six schools in the evaluation have a disproportionately high enrolment of girls, a difference which is reduced but not eliminated when school #2 is taken out of the equation. Therefore, the evaluation data over-represents girls in relation to national figures, but under-represents them in relation to the six schools.

Table 2: Secondary school enrolment in sample schools, by gender, as reported by heads

	Girls	Boys	Totals
School #1	137	134	271
School #2	415	0	415
School #3	125	70	195
School #4	267	145	412
School #5	190	140	330
School #6	114	197	311
Totals	1,248 (64.5%)	686 (35.5%)	1,934 (100%)

Because of an unintended omission, the gender breakdown for the non-attending students in the evaluation is unavailable. For the 24 attending teachers who completed the follow-up questionnaire, the gender breakdown was 14 men to 10 women. For the 11 who were interviewed, it was 5 men and 5 women, with one who did not indicate his/her gender.

The questionnaires and interview guides for each category of respondents is included in this report as Appendices 2 to 7. It should be noted that they differ in some ways from those that were published in the Evaluation Design document, including the addition of new questions.

2.2 Field research process

Two (male) Rwandan researchers, external to Aegis Trust, were hired to carry out the field work. A male-female team would have been preferred but there were no suitable female candidates. The two men had relevant experience and both were members of the same

[10] The total secondary enrolment was 425,587 students, 51% girls to 49% boys.

consulting firm. They were provided with two days of training at KGM in September, before undertaking the work. The first day of training involved observation of the day-long student workshop, and discussions with the two teaching staff who guide and facilitate the Aegis program. The second day involved orientation to the fieldwork, and was delivered by the education program advisor (a volunteer working for Aegis through CUSO-VSO).

The field researchers were fully competent in English so, as part of their training, they were given the questionnaires and interview guides in both Kinyarwanda and English and asked to ensure that they matched, and that the English meaning of each question was always carefully conveyed in Kinyarwanda to those they were working with in the schools. They studied both versions in order to fully understand the intention of the questions.

Arrangements for their visits to the schools were made by a staff member in the Aegis education department who contacted each headmaster. Headmasters were given the set-up instructions they needed to prepare for the two researchers, who worked in tandem in each school. While one administered the questionnaire to non-attending students, the other administered it to attending students and teachers. They then divided the interviews as evenly as possible, each one conducting half of them.

2.3 Challenges in the research process

2.3.1 The challenges of translation

Translation was a major challenge in phase 1 of the evaluation. The inescapable fact that the key documents had to be developed in English, then translated into Kinyarwanda, were answered in Kinyarwanda and then the answers translated back into English created unease and uncertainty about precise meanings, exacerbated because the translation was done 'in-house' (albeit by bilingual staff) rather than by professional translators. Content analysis of the answers to open-ended questions was especially problematic, since it was not possible for the evaluator to be sure that similarities in wording and phraseology were indications of real trends in the meaning of participants' responses or artifacts of the translation process.

The funding provided for phase 2 allowed for a more exacting process. Translation of questionnaires and interview guides into Kinyarwanda was done in-house by Aegis; two people worked on the translations and a third reviewed them for overall accuracy and clarity of intention. As indicated above, the two field researchers assisted in ensuring both accuracy and intention. After all the data was collected, the field researchers transcribed the audio tapes into written Kinyarwanda, and then a professional translator was hired to translate it into English for the evaluator to analyze. These steps, taken together, provided a higher standard of translation and greater subtlety of interpretation in English than was available in phase 1 of the evaluation, and therefore ensured a stronger basis for confidence in the analysis done in phase 2.

2.3.2 Technical challenges in the field research

Half of the original interview data was lost from three schools as a result of a break-in at the home of one of the field researchers, resulting in a stolen computer and field recorder. The schools were contacted and graciously agreed to a return trip by the researcher. Rather than re-interviewing the same teachers and students, new random selections were made to avoid "stale" responses. However, since approximately a week had passed between the two sets of interviews, questions may have been discussed amongst students and teachers, including

those who were selected for re-interview. The headmasters from those schools also agreed to be re-interviewed.

A further interview, also with a headmaster, was lost as a result of a virus contamination on one of the recorders. The headmaster agreed to have the researcher return to talk to him (or her) again. This means that four of the six headmaster interviews are in fact re-interviews.

2.3.3 Cultural challenges in the field research

Although it is best to avoid cultural generalizations, especially by those from other cultures, Rwandans themselves frequently characterize their society as somewhat secretive. Information is not freely shared, and explanations for one's decisions and views are not commonly offered. Cultural proclivities in this direction were certainly exacerbated by the 1994 genocide, in which trust (within families, between families, within communities and toward those in positions of authority) was thoroughly undermined; for many, it may not yet have been rebuilt beyond a superficial level. This legacy of mistrust has implications for the detail, openness and reliability of interviews, especially on sensitive topics related to the genocide and its consequences.

Respondents' concerns about the possible risks associated with expressions of opinion, let alone critical opinion, might partly explain the lack of specifics and examples provided in a number of the interviews in phase 2. When questioned about this, one of the field researchers said that, when interviewees were asked for examples, they often seemed unable to provide them. Further, it was his opinion that Rwandans do not have a great deal of understanding of the kind of information being sought for research purposes and, for this reason too, some were reticent in answers. He explained that this has been his experience in other evaluation interviews, even on non-sensitive topics (such as agriculture). Genocide-related interviewing is particularly sensitive and some interviewees, he said, simply did not want to say much at all.

Because the field research was conducted in Kinyarwanda, a language not spoken by the Aegis project coordinator, in conjunction with a variety of technical issues, it was not possible for the coordinator to supervise and provide feedback to the field interviewers during the interview process. In her view, it may be that greater quality control during that period would have resulted in more direction for the researchers, enabling them to access deeper responses.

The field researcher acknowledged that in fact he could have pushed respondents further at times, but chose not to. Thus it appears as if some reluctance to cross cultural boundaries may have been present in the Rwandan field researchers themselves, despite training and encouragement to probe for detail and specificity in responses.

Section 3: Impact of the workshop on attending students

3.1 Introduction

Schools were encouraged to send students in leadership positions to the Aegis workshop in May of 2011 (phase 1) on the grounds that they would be most likely and most able to become active in following up in their schools afterwards to share what they learned.[11] When asked if they held such positions, the students' responses confirmed that 79% did. [12] Of those, the majority were elected class representatives.

Table 3: Attending students' positions at their schools

Position by school	School #1	School #2	School #3	School #4	School #5	School #6	Total
Class reps	6	21	11	13	16	14	81 (50%)
Club reps	8	2	6	0	9	3	28 (17%)
School reps	7	2	2	4	2	2	19 (12%)
No formal pos'n	10	0	10	3	0	11	34 (21%)
Total	31	25	29	20	27	30	162 (100%)

All of the students who had attended the workshop were asked to complete a written questionnaire as part of the phase 2 follow-up evaluation: that is, a total of 161 students from phase 1. The effective response rate was an admirable 100%. The questionnaire consisted of three "yes/no" questions, ten "agree/disagree" questions for which the choices ranged along a 5-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree", and three open-ended questions. As well, a total of 46 attending students were interviewed, including the head boys and girls from each school. For the questionnaire, see Appendix 1, and for the interview guide see Appendix 2. Tables summarizing the quantitative questions, by gender, appear in Appendix 7.

In phase 1, responses from the attending students gave the workshop itself high marks for clarity and value, and indicated that they were ready and willing to talk to others about what they had learned and to become more active in response to their new-found understanding.[13] Phase 2 was designed largely to explore (i) how students felt about the workshop in retrospect, (ii) whether their intentions to engage with others about the themes of the workshop ("Learning from the Past, Building the Future") were being realized, and (iii) what form their on-going engagement with the issues was taking.

Key dimensions of retained knowledge, sustained attitude change and evidence of new behaviours and activities were investigated. Only those questions which, in the evaluator's judgment, yielded significant and useful insights are discussed in this report.

[11] Interviews with headmasters suggested that this guideline was also useful to them in explaining why other students (or all students) were unable to attend.
[12] Note that the precise numbers in this and other tables will vary because not all students chose to answer each question, or may have provided unclear answers, or (as in this case) legitimately checked more than one category.
[13] In retrospect, some of the agree/disagree statements are less specific than they could have been, and might have contributed to the unspecific and oblique nature of some of the students' responses.

3.2 Questionnaire data

3.2.1 Perspectives on the Kigali Genocide Memorial

The three "yes/no" questions asked attending students for some basic information about their familiarity with and perspectives on KGM (see section 1 of the questionnaire, Appendix 1). About 13% said they had visited the Memorial before their workshop experience, as compared with 1.3% of the non-attending students. As students were not asked about the circumstances of their prior visits, it is not possible to speculate on possible reasons for this difference.

Only 1.2% had been back again since their visit with their school's group in the previous term.

Every student except one (i.e., 99.4%) answered "yes," that they had recommended to other students that they visit KGM for themselves, a strong endorsement of the Aegis program and the Memorial itself. It also signals a conviction, voiced elsewhere in the data, that "seeing is believing" and that as many Rwandans as possible should see what the Memorial presents.

3.2.2 Behaviour change

The four of the "agree/disagree" statements focused on students' self-reported behaviour change since attending the Aegis workshop. They measured active leadership in key areas that the workshop program was designed to encourage. Table 4, below, shows the distribution of responses. It can be seen that an extremely strong majority said that they "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they were more active in all four areas since taking part in the workshop, a very positive indicator of the program's impact and effectiveness.

Table 4: Changes in behaviour by degree of agreement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
I have been more involved in unity activities since taking part in the workshop.	**0 0%**	**7 4.5%**	**0 0%**	**80 51.0%**	**70 44.6%**	**157 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with my fellow students*.	**1 0.6%**	**3 1.9%**	**0 0%**	**59 37.3%**	**95 60.1%**	**158 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with my family and close friends*.	**0 0%**	**9 5.7%**	**1 0.6%**	**61 38.9%**	**86 54.8%**	**157 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with members of my community*.	**3 1.9%**	**30 19.4%**	**3 1.9%**	**66 42.6%**	**53 34.2%**	**155 100%**

Looking a little more deeply at differences in the distribution of students who agreed or strongly agreed from statement to statement, it is instructive to note that more students said they were

"more active" in speaking about the genocide with *other students* since taking the Aegis workshop than with family and friends, and that the gap was considerably wider with reference to members of their community. It is still a positive result that those differences were primarily in degree (from "strongly agree" to "agree"). In the case of speaking to members of their community as many as 21% "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed". It does not seem surprising that this would be the most challenging target group for the students, suggesting that greater emphasis on 'how to talk to your community' may warranted in the workshop–a possible topic for discussion by program staff.

Of additional significance here is the fact that there are real differences from statement to statement in how students answered, including the numbers who disagreed. A spread of this kind, though still limited, helps to build confidence that students were answering honestly, even if some inflation toward the positive remains. In this sense, the wider spread of responses in the results compares favourably with the near-unanimity found in earlier, end-of-day evaluations.

The overall results for these four statements mask some important gender differences.[14] For each one, there was a difference of about 20% between the percentage of boys and girls who reported the highest degree of behaviour change, in each case favouring the boys. It could be that "speaking out" is a gendered activity in Rwandan culture generally, and that girls are less likely than boys to show this kind of leadership for culturally engrained reasons. However, it is also possible that the Aegis program and/or the follow-up activities by the schools in some unintentional way encourage boys more than girls to play this role, or do not compensate.

3.2.3 Increased capacity

Three of the statements in this set asked attending students about their perceptions of the Aegis workshop and how well it equipped them to share with others what they had learned there, which is an important program goal. Table 5, below, summarizes the results.

Table 5: Changes in capacity by degree of agreement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
I was given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others.	**0 0%**	**3 1.9%**	**0 0%**	**41 26.1%**	**113 72.0%**	**157 100%**
I am able to educate others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it.	**1 0.6%**	**14 8.9%**	**1 0.6%**	**69 43.7%**	**73 46.2%**	**158 100%**
I have been more effective in contributing to unity in my school since attending the workshop.	**0 0%**	**5 3.3%**	**0 0%**	**46 30.1%**	**102 66.7%**	**153 100%**

A large majority (72%) "strongly agreed" that they had been given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others, which seems surprising in light of the limitations of a one-day workshop. A slightly smaller majority (67%) "strongly agreed" that they were able to be more effective in contributing to unity at school as a result of the workshop.

[14] Tables showing gender differences appear in Appendix 7.

The percentage dropped considerably when it came to educating others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it. Only about 46% "strongly agreed" that they were more effective, and a slightly smaller percentage registered that they "agreed". The distribution of responses suggests a complex reading of this item. Almost 10% *disagreed*, adding weight to speculation that the attending students were resisting the temptation to "give the right answer". Both the disagreement and the lower rates of agreement signal that, if Aegis considers critical thinking to be an essential learning objective for the workshop, there is room for program improvement. In that regard, it should be recognized that critical thinking is a challenging skill for a one-day program to take on. Responsibility for achieving greater competence in this area might properly lie with the schools themselves. In fact there is evidence in later sections of this report that teachers and headmasters are very interested in the potential of critical thinking, not just in relation to genocide prevention but in relation to decision-making in general.

Gender differences are interesting in this data set. Boys expressed considerably more confidence that they had enough information in hand to "share lessons with others": 82% strongly agreed that they did, as compared with 66% of girls. Boys were also more confident about critical thinking, but the gap was much smaller. There were no significant gender differences in relation to "effectively contributing to unity in my school".

3.2.4 Attitude change

The final three statements in this part of the questionnaire asked attending students about changes in themselves as a result of the workshop: changes in motivation, awareness and feelings. Evidence of behaviour change is often considered a more certain indicator of program effectiveness than attitude change. However, in the extraordinary case of healing and rebuilding after a national genocide that left almost no one in Rwanda unscathed, it can be argued that internal changes in these secondary students may be deeper and therefore more significant than behavioural ones, which can possibly be enacted at a more superficial level, demonstrating compliance rather than change. Results for these three questions appear in Table 6, below.

Table 6: Changes in attitude by degree of agreement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The students' workshop motivated me to start a unity and reconciliation club or to become more involved in an existing club.	**4 2.5%**	**27 17.0%**	**2 1.3%**	**43 27.0%**	**83 52.2%**	**159 100%**
As a result of the student workshop, I am more aware of problems between students in my school.	**8 5.1%**	**18 11.4%**	**1 0.6%**	**58 36.7%**	**73 46.2%**	**158 100%**
The feelings in my heart have changed as a result of attending the workshop.	**1 0.6%**	**1 0.6%**	**0 0%**	**21 13.4%**	**134 85.4%**	**157 100%**

The first statement above is somewhat problematic because it refers only to "unity and reconciliation" clubs. In fact, an array of clubs with some kind of focus on the 1994 genocide exists in Rwandan schools, sometimes several in one school. As well as "Unity and Reconciliation Club", they have names like "Anti-Genocide Club" and "Never Again Club,"

among others. It is hoped that the students interpreted the question as intended, to refer to any such club activity, but it isn't certain. Even so, it can be regarded as positive that over 50% of the students "strongly agreed" that they were more motivated to "start or become more active" in such a club, and another 27% agreed more weakly. Boys were more likely than girls to agree, with about a 15-point spread favouring the boys in the two "agree" categories taken together.

The second statement in this group is also somewhat problematic, though in a different way: in the absence of a clear definition of what is meant by "problems between students" we cannot be sure whether respondents had the intended meaning in mind when they replied. The intent was to refer to tensions or conflicts based on ethnicity, or on personal/familial experiences that took place during the genocide. In fact, the interview data from this research confirms that the phrase is cultural code for exactly that. If so, it is a positive result that almost 46% of students "strongly agreed" that they were more aware of such problems after the workshop and 37% agreed more weakly. The fact that fully 16.5% disagreed (weakly or strongly) may reflect compliance with a culturally prescribed expectation that their schools *should not* have such problems. In their interviews, many students spoke as if there were none, though they were contradicted in statements made by others. It does not seem surprising that both perspectives would be represented, given the sensitivity of this issue. Gender differences were fairly small here.

The third statement here produced the strongest result of all, not just in this set of responses but in all ten of the agree/disagree statements: more than 85% of attending students "strongly agreed" that the "feelings in my heart" had changed as a result of attending the workshop. It is theoretically possible that students' feelings could have changed in a negative way, since they were not asked for examples, but the qualitative data which will be discussed later in the report make it clear that the changes they were referring to were positive ones. This outcome adds further weight to the interpretation that in phase 2 of the evaluation, attending students did demonstrate a degree of openness and emotionality in their answers that was not present in the previous evaluations, and offered evidence of increases in empathy.

Gender differences fell to just 5% in relation to "the feelings in my heart": 88.5% of boys "strongly agreed" with the statement, as compared with 83.3% of girls.

3.3 Open-ended questions

Attending students were asked three open-ended questions as part of the follow-up questionnaire they completed by when the field researchers visited their schools. Only one of them is considered to have a direct bearing on the key issue of impact and behaviour change as a result of their experience at the KGM workshop.[15] The question read as follows:

> "*Give a specific example of an activity you have engaged in as a result of this workshop. Describe this activity. If you have not engaged in any new activities as a result of this workshop, explain why not.*"

Almost every student (159 out of 161) gave at least one example of something they had done or were doing as a result of the workshop, and sometimes several. Responses were categorized in terms of the kind of activity they referred to, using content analysis that focused on verbs and action words to signal specific behaviour (see Table 7, below). Note that a majority of students

[15] One of the other two questions is discussed in section 5 of the report, and the third one was considered to repeat findings from phase 1 of the evaluation.

provided more than one example of an activity they were engaged in, and all were counted, so that the total number of responses exceeds the base number of respondents. Note too that gender differences in this data set, which are shown in the table, are insignificant.

Table 7: Post-workshop activities, by gender

Activity	Boys (N=61)	Girls (N=98)	Total (N=159)
Engaged in discussion or "sharing" with other students about "what we learned", either in general (unspecified) or about the genocide (unspecified)	31 (28.2%)	46 (29.3%)	77 (28.8%)
Corrected wrong information or "confusion" about past history/genocide; promoted accurate thinking or critical thinking	5 (4.5%)	7 (4.5%)	12 (4.5%)
Engaged in discussion or "sharing" with other students about achieving positive change or prevention: e.g. promoting unity & reconciliation; discussing how to fight divisionism; doing direct reconciliation/resolving conflicts among students	18 (16.4%)	22 (14.0%)	40 (15.0%)
Joined/founded a club; urged others to join a club; became more active in a club	22 (20%)	29 (18.5%)	51 (19.1)
Engaged in helping orphans, widows etc	15 (13.6%)	22 (14.0%)	37 (13.9%)
Talked/shared info with parents, neighbours, community, others (non-school)	8 (7.3%)	15 (9.6%)	23 (8.6%)
Participated in commemoration events or other community-based activity, e.g. visited Gacaca court	3 (2.7%)	5 (3.2%)	8 (3.0%)
Encouraged colleagues/others to visit KGM, other memorials	5 (4.5%)	7 (4.5%)	12 (4.5%)
Other: (a) used the materials from KGM to teach (b) mentions need for KGM to do more (c) unclassifiable	3 (2.7%)	4 (2.5%)	7 (2.6%)
TOTAL	110 (100%)	157 (100%)	267 (100%)

The main activity cited was engaging in discussion or sharing information from the workshop with others in a variety of ways and contexts. This is an important outcome for several reasons:

- it shows that most students felt both committed and confident enough to talk about topics and presentation material from the Aegis workshop that are not an easy part of everyday conversation in Rwanda—indeed, are often avoided;[16]
- it shows that at least a small percentage were able to share what they learned with family or community members back home, providing evidence that ideas from the workshop have circulated beyond the schools;

[16] If it were possible to extend the research still deeper into the schools, it would be interesting to find out what this "sharing" actually looks like—what it consists of, how it is done, and how well it is done.

- it also shows that club-based activity in support of genocide prevention was revitalized and extended, a particularly encouraging outcome because of the significance of clubs in the lives of Rwandan students.

What follows is only a small sample of the many quotations which could illustrate the points above; some are straightforward and others suggest some underlying drama being lived out by the student. Those marked with an asterisk seem to refer to untold (and perhaps transformative) personal stories.

> **I engaged in sharing with my colleagues some discussion about what really happened in Rwanda, drawing upon the learning from the workshop, urging them to reject opinions disseminated by negationists who deny the genocide. We also sensitized them about the negative consequences of the genocide.* (Boy, school #1)
>
> *I engaged in an activity where I explained the history of Rwanda to my fellow students and my parents, urging them to visit different genocide memorials so as to learn more about the history of our country.* (Girl, school #2)
>
> **The example of an activity I engaged in is that for my first holidays after visiting the Kigali Genocide Memorial, I went home and there were some neighbors who had gathered at my place. I told them that we have been to Gisozi* [where KGM is located] *and one of them said: "what are these people starting to involve our children in. They want to traumatize them and to distress them." I told him that it rather helped me because I was able to know the history of Rwanda. I added that if you don't know and remember where our country came from, the risk is high that conflicts can come round again. His next reply was that my answer is constructive and that I should also go [to KGM] with his children so that they can learn the history Rwanda has gone through.* (Girl, school #2)
>
> **Since [non-attending] students were curious to know what we learnt from the workshop, I shared some discussion with them about what happened in Rwanda and how it should not happen again. And together, we founded the anti-genocide club.* (Girl, school #4)
>
> **I engaged [with others] in founding the anti genocide club and we created plays and songs [opposing] genocide and promoting unity and reconciliation. They impacted on many students and they are participating more in the activities of the club. It would be better if you would come to see how the club is performing. We are even planning to visit other schools and educating them too. We hope you can support this good activity we are planning.* (Boy, school #5)
>
> *After I attended the workshop, I actively participated in activities of education about the genocide and promotion of unity among my colleagues. I am very keen on this.* (Girl, school #6)
>
> **For example, I sensitized my parents in order that they could change their mentality and look forward to building a better future for the country. I owe this to the workshop I attended at the Genocide Memorial because I used to have the same mentality as my parents. So, my parents have changed and some students have changed too, all due to my sensitization.* (Girl, school #6)

Most of the examples given by the students of an activity or activities they had engaged in as a result of participating in the workshop are a form of "discussion"—a word that seems inadequate for the breadth and impact of what they described themselves doing. It is clear from this data (in

response to several of the questions) that the attending students saw it as a serious responsibility to "share what they learned" from the workshop and were in many cases fired up to do it; accordingly, they were likely to write about some form of "discussion" in answer to this question. Still, a minority did list other kinds of activities. One important "other" category was helping victims of the genocide and other vulnerable people, an activity which was mentioned by roughly 15% of these respondents.

> *I visited genocide-orphaned children, yet before attending the workshop I had a very negative attitude towards them. After I had learnt about the history, I found that I had a wrong mentality and resolved to visit those orphans and comfort them.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *The activity I engaged in is to join others in the initiative to help poor students by buying school uniforms for them….* (Girl, school #3)
>
> *For example, I engaged in providing assistance to genocide-orphaned children because their parents were killed innocently by wicked people.* (Boy, school #6)

The grouping of open-ended responses such as these into broad categories in order to identify trends inevitably masks interesting small-scale specifics. One of those was the references made by a small number of students to resolving conflicts among their peers or in their communities: not only did they apparently have the courage to identify conflicts with roots in "divisionism" and/or the effects of the 1994 genocide, but they also engaged in unspecified forms of conflict resolution with reportedly positive outcomes. The examples cited below are drawn from the questionnaire, but further evidence on this point will come up when we discuss the interviews.

> *What I engaged in after visiting the Memorial is that I shared some discussion with my fellow students about what the genocide is and we reconciled those who had conflicts among them.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *Since I attended the workshop, I played a role in educating my fellow students about unity and reconciliation, and in mediating to solve conflicts [which involved opposition among] my colleagues.* (Boy, school #3)
>
> *The activity I engaged in was to reunite my family: during the genocide, one of my uncles attempted to kill my grandfather's family and because of that, he was banned from our family. Due to my intervention, he was reintegrated.* (Boy, school #4)

This last quotation here is an example of a kind of account that is not uncommon in this data. On the one hand it is almost breath-taking in its hopefulness; on the other hand, without more detail and corroborating evidence, it is hard to accept its magical simplicity. The evaluator's interpretation is not that such stories are fictions or gross exaggerations but real events seen through the eyes of adolescents, who tend to be optimistic, sometimes over-confident and also self-centred at that stage of life. Further investigation into such stories would be valuable.

3.4 Interviews

Forty-six attending students were interviewed for the evaluation, almost 30% of the total. The interview guide was 15 questions in length, (see Appendix 2), including a number of items that were also asked of the attending teachers and/or the headmasters in their interviews. Not all of the questions yielded insightful information for the purposes of this evaluation, so not all will be discussed in this report. The most interesting responses will be discussed either here, in Section

3, or in Section 5 (in relation to the impact of the workshop on schools as wholes), or else in Section 7 (in relation to recommendations).

3.4.1 Personal impact

One of the central questions students were asked in their interviews was to describe the impact of the workshop on themselves, personally.[17] At the interviewer's discretion, the topic of impact was sometimes probed further with a question about whether their thinking had changed as a result of the workshop, or whether their ways of talking to others about the genocide and the future of Rwanda had changed.

All 46 students described a positive impact of some kind. One of the themes in their responses was the ways in which their eyes and minds had been opened by what they had seen and heard and learned at the workshop. Some said they gained in understanding as a result, referring to a depth of knowing that goes beyond simple awareness. Some of their statements are surprisingly self-revelatory, with the ring of authenticity in their detail and choice of words.

> *The impact on me personally is that I used to think that hating one individual is not a big deal, but I learnt that it is the beginning of divisionism, and it is better to prevent it for a brighter future. (*Boy, school #1)

> *The impact on me personally is that, even as a member of the AERG*[18] (a student survivors group)*, I did not know the truth about what happened well enough so that I could share it with others. But after learning [at Gisozi] about the bad history our country has gone through, I understood well enough to share some discussion with colleagues about it.* (Girl, school #1)

> *The impact of the workshop on me personally is that I have now been able to understand the problems facing genocide survivors, especially genocide-orphaned children of my age, and this enabled me to approach them with a message of comfort that the future will be bright even if the past was almost too hard to bear.* (Girl, school #2)

> *Before the workshop, divisionism was not a big deal for me because I knew nothing about it. But after I visited the memorial, I understood that I must fight against it because it was even the cause of the genocide and all of its consequences that I saw.* (Girl, school #4)

> *The impact of the workshop on me personally is that I have changed my mentality. I used to have genocide ideology because I would view some classmates as my enemies, but I now consider everyone as my human counterpart. So, I left the workshop with a new spirit. (Boy, school #5)*

An extension of this theme had to do with gaining interest in the history and future of the country, and the confidence and courage to talk about it, sometimes for the first time.

> *Before attending the workshop, I could not bother about talking to other people about the history, but after the workshop I felt the courage to share with others some discussion about it.* (Boy, school #1)

[17] Appendix 2, question 4.
[18] Association des Etudiants et Elèves Rescapés du Génocide.

The impact of the workshop on me personally is first that I have acquired confidence to share the learning with my classmates. Second, any time I hear about this on the radio or elsewhere, I pay attention now and I feel concerned as a Rwandan. I am no longer trying to close my ears to it because I know that anything about Rwanda is also about me. (Girl, school #2)

What I learnt is that, before the workshop, you could refer to what happened as 'Tutsi genocide' and you would offend some students, especially orphans. But now, we started by approaching them and showing them that we all are the same as human beings, drawing upon what we learnt from the workshop. We even do the same [when talking] to old people and to people outside the school community. (Boy, school #3)

There is a big change because I normally fear to be jailed and so, I was afraid to say anything [about the genocide] that I was not sure of [in case] it is wrong and then, be jailed. But now that I have attended the workshop, I learnt so much, and I am confident to explain it to anyone with no problem. (Boy, school #5)

I actually could not talk about the genocide because I felt that I practically knew nothing about it to share with others. But after the workshop, I was confident to talk about it as I have been trained now, I have the evidence and I have some educational materials. So, as a result, many students if not all students have changed as well. (Boy, school #6)

As has been demonstrated in some of the earlier quotations, a significant number of the attending students who were interviewed spoke openly about vestiges of ethnic prejudice and divisionism that they had had, and said that the workshop had helped them change, either in attitude or behaviour or both.

The impact of the workshop on me personally is that I feel I must help genocide survivor students while in the past, I would just trivialize trauma when any students had it and would just spend a second to help them. But now, I help them and comfort them. And I feel I should do more to make sure they are well taken care of. (Girl, school #1)

The impact of the workshop on me is actually that I used to judge anyone from another ethnic or social group than mine, and I could not socialize with them. I was feeling that my social group is superior and so, I needed to stick to it, cherishing it like the way people have fan clubs to support their team and criticize other teams. But now, I have resolved that we are all one and need to work hand in hand to build our country. (Boy, school #3)

The impact of the workshop on me personally is that I am no longer suspicious of anyone and I can socialize with anyone regardless of the divisions that colonizers have disseminated among us. (Boy, school #4)

Before the workshop, I used to hear people saying that this student is a Tutsi and that one is a Hutu. So, according to what my parents had told me, I had to avoid any Tutsi student at all costs, and I believed that they should also avoid me because I thought that their parents also briefed them about it. But now I have understood that we can socialize and help one another, because any student is my colleague without discrimination. (Girl, school #4)

The impact of the workshop on me personally is that I have changed the attitude I used to have about reacting to any offense by revenge. I learnt that I would rather discuss with the offender, sort out the problem and reconcile. (Girl, school #6)

3.4.2 Talking to others

The attending students were also asked directly if they had taken the initiative to talk to others, either to non-attending students or to family/community members, about what they learned at the Memorial.[19] Forty-five out of forty-six said "yes" (one did not reply), and provided details about how they went about it. Some of the examples they gave are:

> *As each class was represented by their class monitor and his/her assistant, they are the ones to share discussion with the whole class. But if any student comes to me after the discussion and asks me a question, that's when I can deal with an individual only. Otherwise, all the talking is done in groups.* (Girl, school #2)

> *The workshop helped me a lot to help others because I came back and shared some discussion with my colleagues and they understood it. They were very curious to know what we learnt from there and we shared with them about the genocide and its consequences, and urged them not to be in conflicts as children because of what parents did to one another without the children's consent.*
>
> *I also shared the learning with my family members and they also understood. Before, my siblings and I were always afraid whenever something about the genocide was said on the radio because we thought that we would also die. But our mother used to tell us: "no, you will not die. Just live in harmony with everyone." Now that I also know the truth I say, yes that (genocide) happened because it was organized, but it will never happen again if we keep on enhancing social cohesion.* (Girl, school #3)

> *As we spend most of our time at school, we share what we learnt in discussion sessions with small groups like classmates or in a large group for the whole school. But just after the visit, I went back home and shared with my family all what I have learnt. I even gave them the educational material we had received for them to read, and they were happy about it. They also wished to attend such a workshop as they are curious to visit the KGM as well.* (Boy, school #4)

> *When we came back from the workshop, we sat together as attending students, teachers and head master, and we agreed that we should create a forum to keep discussing and solving problems: that is how we founded the anti-genocide club.* (Girl, school #5)

> *Actually, when we came back from the workshop, we divided the students who attended into small groups and deployed them in different classrooms to share some discussion. And afterwards, we would administer an evaluation to see how much did the students learn or what change was made. But there are also times when I share some discussion about the visit at Gisozi with just my friends, one by one.* (Boy, school #5)

> *Yes. It has been very helpful because I use [what I learned at KGM] to mediate between students who are in conflict and show them that what they have in common is stronger than the differences they have.* (Boy, school #6)

In response to this question, one girl spoke very frankly about the difficulties of talking about the 1994 genocide in her home community, and identified fear as a silencing factor:

[19] Appendix 2, question 11.

I also shared the learning with my family members and some people in my neighborhood. But some people were skeptical [when I said] that the genocide was organized, and they argued that it was only a sad result of the death of the president. There are even others who do not understand why the Rwanda genocide is referred to as the' Tutsi genocide' while there were also Hutus who were killed. So, I explained all about those questions, drawing upon what we learnt. But I did it only with those I feel free to talk to; there are others to whom I could not say this because I fear them. (Girl, school #1)

3.4.3 Critical thinking

Partly as a result of findings from the previous stage of the evaluation and partly based on their own experience with the workshop program itself, the Aegis staff at KGM were interested to find out about the impact of two specific teaching/learning objectives on the students. The first of these was the introduction of critical thinking skills. Accordingly, students were asked in their interviews to explain critical thinking and provide an example of it.[20]

The workbook which students take away with them from the Aegis workshop defines the concept of critical thinking in the following ways, which do not exhaust its many meanings as expressed in educational and philosophical writing:

"The art of thinking about your thinking, while you're thinking, so as to make your thinking more clear, precise, accurate, relevant, consistent, and fair; the art of identifying and removing bias … and one-sidedness of thought; the art of self-directed, in-depth thinking…."

"Critical thinking is … (1) interpreting, analyzing or evaluating information, arguments or attitudes, skills and abilities…. (2) reasonable thinking that is focused on what to do and what to believe OR to guide our thoughts, beliefs and actions…. (3) examining the thinking of others to improve our own."

A majority of the definitions and examples put forward by the students captured fairly well the ideas that critical thinking is a rigorous form of analysis and decision-making which requires independence of mind and avoids impulsive, simplistic or ill-considered actions taken without regard for their consequences. Only a few definitions made reference to the positive role of empathy (considering others) in critical thinking, and none referred to the negative role of agitated emotions. Perhaps more notably in this cultural context, students made few if any references to the dangers of compliance to authority in their definitions.[21]

Examples (where they were provided) sometimes referred to the 1994 genocide and sometimes to more immediate, school-based or personal situations in their lives where critical thinking in relation to action can be seen as useful. Their focus was almost exclusively on thought/analysis in relation to action, not in relation to the development of values, beliefs or points of view.

Critical thinking involves analyzing the consequences and impacts of whatever action I am going to take. It actually involves doing a thorough investigation about what you want to do in order to have a good outcome. (Boy, school #1)

[20] Appendix 2, question #14.
[21] The latter points are considered by the evaluator to have relevance to the concept of critical thinking in the Rwandan context, but do not appear in the workbook definitions. Unless they are already presented and discussed in the workshop itself, Aegis staff might consider their inclusion in both places.

Critical thinking refers to thinking about something beyond the appearances and doing analysis for hidden details in order to avoid making a decision that will have negative consequences.

If I take the example of the genocide, someone would be ordered to machete other people and they killed them without thinking critically about why they are killing them or what the consequences would be afterwards. There are many examples and let's also say that, here at school, someone may tell you something and after analyzing why and the consequences of doing it, you accept or refuse to do it. (Girl, school #2)

We learnt about critical thinking at the workshop and I retained that it refers to thinking deeply about something, I mean, to do a deep analysis about something. It is important because some people just think superficially and they don't analyze the pros and cons of what they are going to do or even the obstacles they are likely to face while doing it. So, they abruptly do whatever comes to their minds, sometimes with the risk of generating bad consequences. (Boy, school #4)

It refers to how you process information before taking an action: thinking about anything you want to do and analyzing all of its positive or negative consequences in order to avoid an abrupt action. For example, I was going to take some actions where I thought they had no negative consequences on me but after learning about critical thinking, I resolved to be analyzing also consequences on other people too. Even if it is only one or two people I am dealing with, I need to analyze the whole thing thoroughly and so, to avoid abrupt decisions. (Boy, school #6)

Critical thinking refers to looking at everything with an analytical eye, scrutinizing the consequences of anything you are involved in. (…) I am going to give an example in terms of definition. It is like someone comes to me and says: "This [name of a school] is really a threat to us and we should exterminate everyone there." Critical thinking comes in before making any decision or taking any action, when you must ask yourself: why does the person say that? How is [name of the school] a threat? Is extermination the right solution? What will be the consequences? (Girl, school #6)

These and other examples in the data are encouraging, but students' answers to other questions indicate that they may not be applying critical thinking to their new learning about the history of their country or the 1994 genocide. Some of their references to pre-colonial and colonial history, and to reasons for the genocide (e.g., "bad government"), show no signs of having been subjected to critical thinking. Although the evaluation was not structured to probe deeply into this issue, future analysis of the existing data may shed further light on it.

3.4.4 Genocide in other countries

The second question that applies directly to the teaching methods of the workshop is about genocide in other countries. The curriculum refers to this topic, and exhibits in the Memorial include evidence that genocide is not just a fact of Rwandan experience but of human experience in other places and times in history. The international exhibition at KGM includes sections on the Nazi Holocaust, Cambodia, Armenia, Namibia and the former Yugoslavia. It is assumed that this perspective will help to contextualize the 1994 genocide and reduce its horror and the guilt that at least some Rwandans no doubt feel.

To assess the impact of this aspect of the curriculum, students were asked if they had been "thinking or talking about genocide in other countries" since the workshop.[22] A majority answered yes, that they had been. However, compared to other questions, this one did not yield a richly engaged or detailed set of answers (with a few exceptions), an outcome which suggests that it was not and had not been a significant topic to most students.

Many seemed to relegate it to being an occasional matter for discussion in their history classes, even when they said that it does have some significance for Rwandans. If they mentioned any other genocides, their usual reference was to the holocaust against the Jews in Europe in World War II. Occasionally, their responses were unclear or, in a small number of instances, wrong. Perhaps most tellingly, almost none of the answers refer to either the exhibits at KGM or any discussion on this topic during the workshop.

A typical range of responses came from school #1, although the last one in the set is quite unusual:

> *Yes, like the Holocaust.* (Boy, school #1)
>
> *No.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *We did not discuss more about the genocide in other countries among ourselves but we hear about it in our [history] class and I personally think that it is important to discuss about it so that I can know about it and prevent it.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *We do discuss about it [at school] so that we can not be limited to the history of Rwanda but also know about other countries' history.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *If we compare genocide in other countries with the genocide in Rwanda, we find that the latter killed more people than the former.[23] It is good to discuss about this because if there is anyone attending the discussion who has genocide ideology or whose parents have genocide ideology, s/he changes or educate their parents to change; and this is good for the Rwandan society.* (Boy, school #1)
>
> *We talk about it and study about it in the framework of history courses. For example, there's the genocide in Cambodia and the Holocaust.* (Boy, school #1)
>
> *Yes, we must talk about it as young people because we learnt that wherever there has been genocide, young people mostly participated in it. So, it is a good thing for us to learn about it in order to prevent it.* (Girl, school #1)
>
> *We have discussed about how it happened in other countries. We wonder whether they used traditional tools like knives, etc. as they were used in Rwanda or modernized ones like conventional weapons. Then you say* [meaning who?]*, maybe there were so many people killed in Rwanda because perpetrators were using locally available tools that they could even make for themselves, and elsewhere there were less people killed because there was more time and money needed to acquire the weapons!?* (Boy, school #1)

From this evidence, it does not seem that the workshop made a significant impact on this topic.

[22] Appendix 2, #17. In retrospect, this question was probably not clearly enough tied to the workshop.
[23] This statement is inaccurate.

Section 4: Impact of the workshop on attending teachers

4.1 Introduction

The perspective of teachers is important to the evaluation both as a method of confirming students' perceptions and claims about what they did or are doing, and also in their own right. Attending teachers have a big role to play in disseminating the information and ideas presented in the Aegis workshop at KGM, both because they are in positions of authority and because they are likely to stay on in their schools for a longer time than students, who graduate and move on. Working effectively with teachers presents itself as an opportunity for Aegis.

All of the teachers who attended the workshop at KGM in phase 1 of the evaluation were asked to complete the same written questionnaire in phase 2 that attending student did. Twenty-four of the original 31 teachers did so, for an effective follow-up success rate of 77.4%. Response numbers varied from school to school, as did the numbers in the original contingents.

Table 8: Teacher response numbers by school

School #1	2	School #4	7
School #2	6	School #5	5
School #3	1	School #3	3
Total: 24			

In their questionnaires, teachers were asked the same three "yes/no" questions, as well as ten "agree/disagree" questions and three open-ended questions, as the students were. The goal to interview two teachers per school fell short in one school but was successful in the other five, for a total of 11 interviews: six with male teachers, four with women, and one with no gender identification. The numbers in both cases are too small for meaningful analysis by gender.

4.2 Questionnaire data, results[24]

4.2.1 Perspectives on the Kigali Genocide Memorial

The three "yes/no" questions (see section 1 of the questionnaire) asked attending teachers for some basic information about their familiarity with and perspectives on KGM. Fully 50% of those who responded had visited the Kigali Memorial at some time before they attended the Aegis workshop; however, since the attending teachers are not likely to have been a random sample, this percentage cannot be generalized to all teachers.

None of the respondents had visited KGM *since* the workshop, but all of them had recommended to other people that they visit the Memorial.

4.2.2 Behaviour change

Table 9, below, shows the number who agreed or disagreed with the four behavioural statements in the questionnaire.

[24] Item by item tables showing the teachers' response data can be found in Appendix 9.

Table 9: Changes in behaviour by degree of agreement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
I have been more involved in unity activities since taking part in the workshop.	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13 54.2%**	**11 45.8%**	**24 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with (…) students*.	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7 30.4%**	**16 69.6%**	**23 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with my family and close friends*.	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8 33.3%**	**16 69.6%**	**24 100%**
Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity *with members of my community*.	**0**	**0**	**2 8.3%**	**8 33.3%**	**14 58.3%**	**24 100%**

Almost every teacher "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with each of the statements that focus on increased activity in relation to key Aegis program goals, indicating a high level of positive behaviour change, even allowing for some bias in self-reporting. Note that their overall levels of agreement are a bit higher than those of the students (see Table 4), especially in relation to speaking in their communities. This probably reflects a greater degree of self-confidence and superior communication skills. It is regrettable that the evaluation has no information on teachers' background and experience to help shed light on their activity choices and levels.

4.2.3 Increased capacity

The teachers displayed a similarly high level of "strong agreement" and "agreement" with the three statements that tapped into capacity development. In particular, over 70% "strongly agreed" that they had the facts they needed to "share lessons" with others, one of the key goals of the workshop. Ideally, it would been helpful for the evaluation to have had an independent measure of their effectiveness in comprehending and presenting the information they were exposed to, questions which in retrospect could have been asked of teachers and headmasters.

Ability to teach critical thinking skills received the lowest number of "strongly agree" scores, as was true for students. This result suggests the possible need for staff to review and assess how critical thinking is taught and/or provide more "take-home" resources at the end of the workshop.

Two-thirds of this group of attending teachers "strongly agreed" that they were better able to contribute to unity in their schools as a result of the workshop. The fact that 8.3% felt only "neutral" in relation to this statement may raise some concern but it should be remembered that, given the small sample size, this percentage represents only two teachers.

See Table 10, below, for results on the statements representing capacity development.

Table 10: Changes in capacity by degree of agreement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
I was given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others.	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7 29.2%**	**17 70.8%**	**24 100%**
I am able to educate others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it.	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10 45.5%**	**12 54.5%**	**22 100%**
I have been more effective in contributing to unity in my school since attending the workshop.	**0**	**0**	**2 8.3%**	**6 25%**	**16 66.6%**	**24 100%**

4.2.4 Attitude change

A strong majority of the 24 teachers agreed that they were motivated to start or become more involved with a unity and reconciliation club, though a number disagreed or chose the "neutral" option (perhaps a sign that the question was hard for them to answer). As indicated earlier for the data on students, these responses are somewhat difficult to interpret, because we don't know for sure how many schools already had such a club or may have had one with similar objectives but under another name. Moreover, we don't know whether teachers' participation in such clubs is common, or perhaps a job requirement for some, or whether attending teachers in particular were already involved. That said, almost 68% said they *were* motivated by their experience at the workshop, and discussion of club activity was widespread in interviews.

Almost 80% of teachers "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were more aware of "problems between students" because of the workshop. The phrase "problems between students" may appear to be vague but, as discussed earlier, it was used deliberately in the belief that it is code for conflicts or tensions that reflect post-genocide ethnic differences or dynamics. Responses from students both to the written, open-ended questions and in their interviews confirmed this interpretation, and also confirmed that such tensions do exist. Since denial is widely agreed to be a counter-productive response to conflict, it is a positive outcome for the Aegis program that a strong majority of teachers said they were "more aware" of these problems. Nearly the same percentage of students (78%) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement, but a higher percentage of students (46.2%) than teachers (39.1%) chose "strongly agree".[25]

As with the students, an overwhelming majority of teachers (83.3%) "strongly agreed" that the "feelings in their hearts" had changed as a result of the workshop, and the few whose answers did not fall into this category also "agreed" though more weakly, for the strongest result in the entire agree/disagree data set for teachers. This can be considered a very positive indicator of impact from the workshop, especially because the language used in the stimulus statement is clearly emotive in tone, which is not a common quality of public discourse in Rwandan culture.

See Table 11, below, for these results.

[25] A very different response from headmasters will be discussed at the end of section 5,

Table 11: Changes in attitude by degree of engagement

Question	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The students' workshop motivated me to start a unity and reconciliation club or to become more involved in an existing club.	1 4.3%	2 8.7%	4 17.4%	5 21.7%	11 47.8%	23 100%
As a result of the student workshop, I am more aware of problems between students in my school.	0	2 8.7%	3 13%	9 39.1%	9 39.1%	23 100%
The feelings in my heart have changed as a result of attending the workshop.	0	0	0	4 16.7%	20 83.3%	24 100%

4.3 Open-ended questions

As part of exploring the impact of the workshop on them, the teachers were asked to give an example of an activity they had engaged in, or were engaging in, as a result of their attendance there. All but two of them gave one, two or several examples; this means that the total shown in the table below (35) is greater than the number of teachers responding (24). The framework for analysis was developed for the same question asked of the sample of attending students.

Table 12: Post-workshop activities (teachers)

Category of activities	# of mentions
Engaged in discussion or "sharing" with other students about "what we learned", either generally (non-specific) or with reference to the genocide	10 (28.6%)
Engaged in discussion or "sharing" with other students about making positive change and doing prevention – e.g. promoting unity & reconciliation; discussing how to fight divisionism; doing direct reconciliation/resolving conflicts among students	7 (20%)
Corrected wrong information or "confusion" about past history/genocide; promoted accurate thinking or critical thinking	1 (2.9%)
Joined/founded a club; urged others to join a club; became more active in a club	8 (22.9%)
Engaged in helping orphans, widows etc	6 (17.1%)
Talked/shared info with parents, neighbours, community, others (non-school)	-
Participated in commemoration events or other community-based activity, e.g. visited Gacaca court	2 (5.7%)
Encouraged colleagues/others to visit KGM, other memorials	1 (2.9%)
Total	35

Twenty-three of the twenty-four teachers gave at least one example. As with students, the majority of the teachers referred to some sort of "discussions" that they were involved in, which indeed seems natural for them in their position. A large number mentioned new or increased club activity, including clear indications from school #5 that attending students and teachers (together) founded an anti-genocide club after the workshop, as a result of their strong commitment to prevention. Some examples of their activities follow:

> *The activity I engaged in is that I was not afraid of teaching the history of Rwanda in my class because I was sure that I could answer to their full satisfaction all the questions they could ask me*. (Male teacher, school #2)

> *I engaged in different activities aiming at educating people about the history of Rwanda and especially the history of the genocide and its consequences. As a member of the Civic Education and Anti-genocide Commission, I organized a discussion session that gathered all teachers and students where we talked about the consequences of the genocide, and the result was that they committed to help genocide-orphaned children in and around the school. At the very beginning, we collected 75,000 Rwf to help 5 of them, and this activity will be done every year, and any other time deemed necessary.*
> (Female teacher, school #4)

> *Together with students who attended the workshop, we founded the anti-genocide club and I was honored to lead it. The club is doing a great job within and outside the school: students are socializing freely and you find that they have assimilated unity and reconciliation*. (Female teacher, school #5)

> *I was engaged in sensitizing other people to be open to talk about the Tutsi genocide. This is because many people are afraid of talking about the genocide for various reasons: fear to be misinterpreted, fear to be accused of the genocide ideology, fear to be identified, fear to remember what happened with the risk of trauma. I also sensitized other people to visit Genocide Memorials*. (Male teacher, school #6)

4.4 Interviews

The interview guide for teachers was 15 questions in length (see Appendix 4), including items that were asked of the attending students and/or the headmasters in their interviews. As with each of the interview sets, not all the questions yielded insightful information for the purposes of this evaluation, so not all will be discussed in the report. Some of the information and reflections provided in the teachers' interviews is discussed in later sections of the report, in particular in Section 5 (where their comments relate to the impact of the workshop on their schools as wholes), and in Section 7 (where their assessments relate to recommendations).

The feedback from teachers that is of most significance in this section of the report relates to the impact of the Aegis workshop on them, along several dimensions. For reasons which are not clear to the evaluator, only one of the teachers was asked the question that addressed 'impact' directly.[26] His answer provides a powerful affirmation of the Aegis program.

[26] The reason may have been because the wording referred to "the student workshop". It is often referred to this way, but it is clear that the teachers were not simply spectators: they were engaged and significantly impacted. It seems clear that they are an important target group for the Aegis program.

> *As a result of the workshop, I resolved to take a leadership role in changing Rwandan people's mentalities…. I used to think that there are other people who are responsible for doing this and I need only spare some time for discussion sessions, but I now have a strong feeling that I must help the Rwandan society to change in its thinking. So, the impact of the workshop on me personally is that it made me own that responsibility.*
> (Male teacher, school #6)

As a group, teachers were asked two questions that tap into 'impact on them' at a broad level, although without using that term. The first was, "what stands out for you" when thinking back on the workshop experience at KGM in the previous term?[27] What was memorable for them varied considerably and richly from one teacher to another, but there were also some commonalities, as follows:

- Five of the eleven teachers focused on presentation features of the workshop: how well it was organized; how much it helped to have a knowledgeable guide to the exhibits; the lasting impact of the images they saw; the specifics of one of the teaching staff's comments about the breadth and depth of the impact on the genocide on every Rwandan.

- Three talked about specific elements of or messages in the workshop that have stayed with them: the need for unity among Rwandans in order to prevent any future occurrences of ethnic violence; the transcendence of human dignity showing that we are all equally human beings; the value of critical thinking.

- Two gave unclear responses. One made a simple but strong statement, quoted below, confirming the workshop's goal that all attendees would be moved to extend the impact that the workshop had on them to others in their school.

  "What stands out for me is to rebuild hope and to expand my knowledge more because, together with the students who attended the workshop, we feel indebted to share the learning with others and have more impact on our colleagues that way."

The other broad question asked if, as a result of the workshop, teachers felt more able to effectively address the 1994 genocide and contribute to social cohesion.[28] Ten of the eleven said a pretty clear "yes", despite the tendency in their interviews for some arguably evasive answers. Three quotations will illustrate the leading theme of their comments, which was that they felt on stronger ground to engage with others about the genocide because of the clear and well documented evidence presented in the workshop and the exhibits, and in fact felt *less fearful* about doing so.

> *There is really a big change [in me] because, honestly, talking about our history is not easy. We sometimes talk about it with the fear that what we say can be interpreted differently and get us into trouble. But now that we have been at the Kigali Genocide Memorial and acquired good references to support the truth about what we teach in Political Education, I can say (for example), "this was said by Leon Mugesera," and I know that whoever wants to check can find out it is true by listening to his recorded speech at KGM.*
> (Male teacher, school #2)

[27] Appendix 4, question #4.
[28] Appendix 4, question #5.

Yes, there has been some impact on me because I used to teach history and political education, but I would get stuck when it comes to explaining deeply about the genocide. I was afraid that [what I would say] could hurt students. But with the workshop, I learnt that it is worth telling them all the truth about the genocide, the causes and consequences as well as about the liberation war, so that they are able to distinguish the war from the genocide. (Female teacher, school #5)

It empowered me because talking about the history requires references and now we have [seen and] received educational material. So, whenever we say something now, it is not perceived as our own invention but it rather as reliable because we have some documentation. (Female teacher, school #6)

Indications that teachers often feel silenced when it comes to the ethnic dimensions of Rwandan history, including the genocide, also came up in other places in these interviews. As well, one of the specific questions asked what, for them, is the hardest part about talking to others about the genocide and the other issues brought up during the Aegis workshop.[29] Two said that in fact it wasn't hard for them, and another that it was no longer hard because of the evidence provided at the workshop and in the exhibits at KGM. Three said that talking about or simply naming ethnic groups was, in different ways, hard for them.

With students, it is very hard to tell them anything about ethnic groups, but you can't talk about the genocide without talking about Tutsi, Hutu, and Twa. When you start saying about it, students get embarrassed [upset?] and some genocide-orphaned students even can have trauma. (Teacher, school #3)

What is difficult for me is to name ethnic groups. When teaching students about ethnic groups, it is very hard to refer to them as Hutus and Tutsis because then, students ask you questions that go beyond your understanding. (Female teacher, school #5)

Something difficult for many people is to name ethnic groups: Hutu, Tutsi and Twa people. I think that everyone is worried to name them because of the history of ethnic groups in our country. It is a challenge also to refer to the Tutsi genocide because many people find it hard to accept that we are talking about history to be targeting a better future. So that is actually the hardest part. (Male teacher, school #6)

Two of the teachers were primarily concerned that talking about the genocide would cause distress for people who are still in pain, and one acknowledged that her own terrible story and great pain prevented her from engaging with the topic. Two others identified continuing genocide ideology as the problem for them; their comments are quoted below.

What is hard for me is to convince some people who still have genocide ideology today or the inspiration of it. Some may not openly express it but they have it in mind and when you discuss with them, it proves very hard to change their opinion. (Male teacher, school #1)

The challenge that I have is mainly to discuss about this topic with someone who is not on the same page. You know that after the genocide, there were infiltrators, and if these guys were able, they would have done the genocide again. Thanks be to God that they failed, but there are still some people who have the same ideology and who believe in double

[29] Appendix 4, question #6.

> *genocide. If you discuss about the 1994 genocide with such people while you do not agree with them, it becomes so challenging that you cannot express some of these ideas.* (Female teacher, school #6)

To follow up on the question about what they find hard to talk about, teachers were asked if they thought the training they received during the workshop would help them. All but two said yes; the exceptions were the teacher who had never found it hard and the one whose personal story made talking to others about the genocide just too painful.

Another of the questions which teachers were asked was intended to test their understanding of "critical thinking", a topic discussed in the previous section of the report in relation to attending students. Teachers' definitions ranged in complexity, but usually included one or both of two key elements: (a) the need for research and analysis to get below the surface of what one hears or reads, and (b) the need not to act precipitously, but to take time to think through implications and consequences before taking action. Additional elements that appeared less commonly were (c) the need to think about the impact of a particular action on others, and (d) the need to consider what interests may lie behind what one hears or reads, a sophisticated point.

Four of the teachers referred to the genocide or to ethnic tensions directly in their examples, while the other seven spoke in more generic terms about the application of critical thinking to school and life problems. In several of the more generic answers, the genocide may have been an unnamed point of reference. Two of the particularly strong definitions were:

> *Drawing upon what I learnt [at the workshop] and what I read afterwards, critical thinking refers to not swallowing whatever you are told or not taking action to whatever idea comes to your mind. It requires analyzing how true it is and, if it is an idea for action, analyzing what [effects] does it bring not only on you personally but also on others, especially considering if it is not harmful to anyone's rights.* (Male teacher, school #1)

> *Critical thinking looks at the root causes of everything through analyzing problems before you solve them, without creating side-effects on yourself or on other people. In that sense, we advise students not to react abruptly on what they are told. For instance, if someone insults them,*[30] *they should first think about why before they react. The person insulting you may have learnt it from their parents, but you don't immediately become what they say….* (Male teacher, school #4)

If it can fairly be said that Rwandan culture includes a strand of compliance, or obedience to authority, it may also be fair to say that traces of it appear as a component in some of these definitions, such as in the last sentence below:

> *I know that critical thinking involves doing further investigation and analysis about something before you take action. For example, I urge (students) not to consider as true everything you are told before you verify. If someone tells you something, you can double check with the teacher, with your guardian, with the head teacher or director of studies so that you may know whether it is true….* (Male teacher, school #5)

Finally, at least for the purposes of this report, when asked if they had continued to "think and talk about genocide in other countries" after the workshop, the teachers (like the students) gave

[30] Throughout the data, references to "insults" have seemed likely, based on context, to be references to ethnic slurs or distinctions, though the evaluator cannot be certain.

brief answers, suggesting that this topic has a defined place in the school curriculum and that the teaching focus is on the Rwandan genocide. The only reference they made to the exhibits on genocide in other countries at KGM, or to any discussion there, was to say that it was limited. Two examples of their responses to this question, one unusually engaged and the other more typically disengaged, are as follows:

> *This is very important because history is not a single event: genocide was perpetrated in some other countries like Germany and Armenia. So, we learn about this to compare the genocide in Rwanda and in other countries so that we can analyze the differences where you especially realize that, while in other countries, genocide was mainly done by foreigners,*[31] *in Rwanda, it was done by fellow Rwandans who have the same culture, speak the same language and fetch from the same water source.* (Male teacher, school #2)

> *We did not learn much about genocide in other countries [at the workshop]. They only listed them for us and told us when each of them happened. They showed us some pictures about them, but we did not learn about how they were prepared. Among other genocides, we mainly talk about the Holocaust because it has a more notorious history.*
> (Male teacher, school #6)

[31] This is not accurate.

Section 5: Impact of workshop on schools and beyond

5.1 Introduction

The impact of the workshop on those who participated in the workshop at the Kigali Genocide Memorial in term 2 of 2011 can reasonably be expected to extend beyond themselves to others in their lives, especially because of the activities toward that goal they have described. The concentric effects are likely to be greatest at school (on non-attending students and whole-school communities) but may ripple out to families and home communities. The perceptions of attendees on this diffusion will be discussed in this section of the report.

As well, however, it is very useful from an evaluation research point of view to have data from other sources to confirm, elaborate on or, if necessary, call into question the reports provided especially by attending students. This would be true in any situation in which self-reports were the principal form of data, but it is especially true in this case because of the unusually high rates of praise for the workshop and very positive assessments from students since the beginning of the Aegis program.

Accordingly, this section of the report begins by discussing what attending students have to say about the impact they see in their schools from the workshop. It goes on to present the perspectives of teachers who, because of their maturity and position are likely to be particularly reliable witnesses. Then, of greatest importance, we look at those who might be thought of as 'the receiving audience': non-attending students and headmasters. Their views provide the best test of the accounts offered and claims made by attending students.

5.2 Views of attending students

5.2.1 Impact of workshop on school

One of the three open-ended questions that attending students were asked in their written questionnaires in phase 2 of the evaluation is relevant here. It asked, "What impact do you think the workshop has had on your school?"[32] Not all students responded as intended: specifically in terms of their school communities. Some found it easier or more certain to respond in terms of themselves, and some responses slid between selves and the broader school community. Coding and summation included all responses on the grounds that the line between impacts on self and others is hard to draw in this context, and all are positive program outcomes.

The content of these responses was analyzed in terms of three dimensions: changes to attitudes (including values and feelings); new activities and behaviours; and gains in knowledge and understanding. In the coding, they were marked as [A] for attitudes, [B] for behaviour and [K] for knowledge. About two-thirds of respondents listed impacts in more than one category, and all were counted. Multi-dimensional responses can be regarded as evidence of complex, multi-dimensional changes in the respondents.

Table 13, below, shows the number of attending students who cited "impacts on your school" in each of the three categories, by gender.

[32] Appendix 1, section 3, question #1.

Table 13: Attending students' perceptions of impacts on schools, by gender

	Boys (N=60)	Girls (N=95)	Total (N=155)
[**A**] Changes in attitudes, values, feelings	22 (23.4%)	52 (32.9%)	74 (29.4%)
[**B**] New activities and behaviour(s)	45 (47.9%)	67 (42.4%)	112 (44.4%)
[**K**] Gains in knowledge/understanding	27 (28.7%)	39 (24.7%)	66 (26.2%)
Total	94 (100%)	158 (100%)	252 (100%)

Overall, attending students noted the highest number of examples in relation to (B) behaviour change, followed by (A) attitude change and then (K) gains in knowledge, understanding or skills (capacity). Boys were more likely than girls to focus on behaviour change and gains in knowledge and capacity, while girls were more likely than boys to focus on attitude change, including values and feelings. Two examples from each school, with emphasis on the more complex and interesting ones, follow below.

> *There is a big impact because, in our school before the workshop, there were students who [were] orphaned by the genocide and others not. Between both categories, there was suspicion. With the workshop, we understood a lot of things to be different from how we used to conceive them: anyone who used to feel bad about socializing with another student from a family suspected to have killed theirs, realized that this is the old-fashioned mentality and that we better move forward, especially because young people constitute the hope for the country's better future.* (Boy, school #1)

> *The impact is that students who attended the workshop shared with their colleagues about what they learnt, and those others want to visit the Memorial also while they were never willing to do it before.* (Girl, school #1)

> *Even if it seems hard to assess the impact of the workshop had on our school, I can say it is good because when we were sharing some discussion about what we learnt during the workshop, our fellow students were motivated and they were asking questions. Considering the questions they were asking, I see that there is impact both at the level of the mentality and of the understanding of the history of our country from the colonial period to the genocide, especially about the actual causes of the genocide in Rwanda.* (Girl, school #2)

> *For me, I think that the first impact is that some of us enhance mutual help [in our school] even if it is not easy for all students to understand it the same way, or change. I would suggest that as many people as possible attend such training workshop so that we can have harmonized knowledge about what happened in Rwanda.* (Girl, school #2)

> *Yes, there is an impact on the school. Before the workshop, there used to be some conflicts among students but after we attended the workshop, we put efforts in promoting unity and reconciliation. Also, there used to be groups of students that wanted to use violence against other students but that no longer exists. The impact on me personally is that I was able to understand how the genocide was organized and implemented.* (Boy, school #3)

> *The impact on our school is that students have learnt to solve their own problems peacefully and mutual help has become their culture. Thanks to the workshop we attended and the learning from that we shared with colleagues, students have been able to provide assistance to child-headed households and they also proved to have changed while buying school uniforms for a student in primary school.* (Girl, school #3)

The impact is that students live together in peace and many of them have joined the unity and reconciliation club. Together with teachers, students are now committed to helping the 1994 Tutsi genocide-orphaned children studying at our school and they also participate actively to do community work at a genocide memorial neighboring to our school. These are initiatives by students themselves as a result of all the discussions we shared with them about the learning visit we did at the Kigali Genocide Memorial. (Boy, school #4)

The impact of the workshop on our school is that it revived the [unity and reconciliation] club which was lacking visibility, and this helped us manage some conflicts that were arising. It also prompted more students to join the club and more efforts were put into discussions with other students about the history of Rwanda and its people. (Girl, school #4)

The impact is that more students participate actively in the anti-genocide club. We also created some games that help us socialize more.[33] (Boy, school #5)

The workshop made it possible for Tutsi and Hutu students to socialize freely. We now understand that we share the country and we help one another in everything, without suspicion. But before we attend the workshop, there was discrimination and you could only help or seek help someone who belonged to the same ethnic group as you. (Girl, school #5)

There is of course an impact because, after attending the workshop, I started sensitizing students and other people about the genocide and they understood very well what it is. Another impact on our school is that we have now achieved unity and reconciliation because we used to have students who were involved in ethnic-related conflicts but they now know that they all are Rwandans. They have now opted to join efforts to build unity and reconciliation and to avoid divisionism. (Boy, school #6)

There is impact because some students were jealous of FARG[34]*-supported children, and this was due to the fact that they did not understand that these are vulnerable children. Now, they have understood and they no longer are jealous, and they even help them as much as they can.* (Girl, school #6)

In seven of these quotations, students spoke openly about both the existence of and the reduction of "ethnic-related conflicts" because of the Aegis workshop. It is encouraging that students felt able to write about such problems in a direct and non-coded way, referring in an open manner to ethnicity-related issues. It is also to be hoped that their statements about transcending historical and ethnic differences are true, even while allowing for some over-simplification, since it would be such a good result for the program. The perceptions of non-attending students and headmasters, later in the section, will help to provide a test.

5.2.2 Change in your school

In their interviews, the sample of 46 attending students was asked if they had "noticed anything changing" in their schools as a result of the workshop.[35] Their responses added further evidence of the positive perceptions of "impact" discussed above. Forty-three of the students (93.5%) said

[33] It is clear from many comments in questionnaires and interviews that references to how much students do or do not "socialize" is code for ethnic boundaries across which mixing may not be freely done. This is made very clear in the subsequent quotation.
[34] Fonds d'Assistance pour les Rescapés du Génocide, a source of financial assistance.
[35] Appendix 2, question #10.

"yes", they could see things changing as a result of the workshop. One of the other three did not answer, and two said "no", without elaboration. Key themes raised above, including alleviation of ethnicity-based tensions and conflicts, were repeated in these answers.

> *Yes, there is some change. Other students are curious to attend such training workshops. This is a change because they used to have no interest in such things but now, if they have the possibilities, many of them would attend them.* (Girl, school #1)

> *The change I see is that students have been able to know about the history of the country and have enhanced their social cohesion. I say this because there were some genocide-orphaned students who would feel like their problems matter only to themselves but with the discussions we have shared, they now feel that other non-genocide survivor students care about their problems and [will] provide them with some assistance.* (Girl, school #2)

> *Yes, there are some changes because there were some students who used to be having conflicts but through the different discussion sessions, we kept sensitizing them that the genocide should never happen again (…) and as we emphasized on unity among Rwandans and fighting divisionism, we were able to sort them out.*
>
> *As students who attended the workshop, we also provided some assistance to orphans in terms of school uniforms and school materials like notebooks, pens, etc…. [A]nd we contributed manpower to farming activities for one other student. This was done by a mixture of students who attended the workshop and others who didn't, and we made a total of more than fifty students helping.* (Boy, school #3)

> *There is a big change because students have really united and if there is anyone who has a problem, they join their efforts to help him/her. So, the workshop has really impacted on everyone in general.* (Girl, school #4)

> *There is a big change because there are no longer divisionism-related conflicts among classmates, because they have learnt from us, because we shared with them the learning from the workshop. And if there are still some cases reported, they will be resolved soon because we are working on them.* (Boy, school #5)

> *There is change in our school because we came back and recruited non-genocide survivor students to join the genocide survivor students in the AERG,*[36] *and they share ideas without [reliving] what happened in the past.* (Boy, school #6)

5.3 Views of attending teachers

The first of the three open-ended questions in the written questionnaire asked "what impact" teachers thought the workshop had on their schools. Most of the 24 respondents appear to have answered in terms of the impact on those who attended the workshop, students and teachers, but in many cases the spillover effect into the broader school community was also indicated. All but one teacher described at least one, and often more, positive impacts. The tone and number of impacts listed by teachers were particularly notable in schools 4 and 5. Endorsements were strongly positive overall; some of the most positive are quoted below.

> *The workshop helped teachers and students to have a deep understanding of the Tutsi genocide in Rwanda, to set up strong measures to prevent it, and to enhance unity and*

[36] Association des Etudiants et Elèves Rescapés du Génocide, a student survivors group.

reconciliation among students, teachers and Rwandans in general towards building a Rwandan society free of divisionism where the genocide will never happen again. (Female teacher, school #1)

Before we attended the workshop, there were actually some problems in our school especially among teachers who did not have a common understanding of their work but after the workshop, there have been many changes at the extent that there are no more conflicts as before. Also among students, there were some who had strange behaviors and who could for instance tear up their colleagues notebooks, but after the discussion sessions we organized, they have changed and many of them are now in the unity and reconciliation club. (Male teacher, school #3)

At our school, there has been a really remarkable impact. Teachers together with students have improved the civic education activities of the anti-genocide club. Its other activities include support to genocide-orphaned children in and around the school. The students bought goats that were given to 6 children as a way of their economic empowerment and enhancing reconciliation among children. They also organized some discussion sessions, after which the school community has really improved relationships. (Female teacher, school #4)

The workshop's impact can been seen in different ways but the main one is that students now socialize without suspicions: they feel they are one united community. I say that because last year, I went to teach in one class and found that some students have quarreled using words based on ethnic groups but today, it is an exemplary class where students are really united. During the discussion sessions we organized, we had urged students to join efforts in whatever they do and they have adopted that. They are working hand in hand and they even created some educational sketches with no discrimination and this helps even in shaping their character. (Male teacher, school #5)

There is impact because you could see some students whose [problematic] behaviors would even degenerate into genocide ideology but after the visit at the Memorial, they have remarkably changed. (Female teacher, school #6)

As can be seen in these quotations, a few teachers were quite frank in identifying previous conflicts based on ethnic tensions among students, and others made more indirect references to "enhanced unity", "reduced conflicts", "students viewing themselves as siblings" and other, veiled phraseology (i.e. implying a previous, opposite condition) as impacts of the workshop.

5.4 Views of non-attending students

Specific objectives for the non-attending students' questionnaire were to establish whether or not the attending students and teachers had in fact actively shared their learning with the rest of their schools' population; and to identify the kind and extent of impacts that the workshop had on non-attending students.

In total, 151 randomly-selected non-attending students completed a 12-question survey, comprising 11 yes/no questions, four of them with a request for explanatory comments, as well as one fully open-ended question. A summary of the quantitative data from questions 1 to 11

appears in Table 14, below.[37] Note that the questions with an asterisk beside their number are the ones which asked for additional information in discursive form from the respondents.

Table 14: Questionnaire, non-attending students

Question	No	Yes	TOTAL
*1. Have you ever visited Kigali Genocide Memorial?	149 98.7%	2 1.3%	151 100%
2. Do you know that a group of students from your school attended a workshop for students at Kigali Genocide Memorial in Term 2?	7 4.7%	143 95.3%	150 100%
3. Do you know personally any students who attended the workshop at KGM?	6 4.1%	142 95.9%	148 100%
4. Did you approach anyone who attended the workshop, to talk or ask questions?	14 9.4%	135 90.6%	149 100%
5. Did anyone who attended the KGM workshop approach you personally, to talk about what they learned?	22 14.6%	129 85.4%	151 100%
*6. Did any of the students who attended the KGM workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of?	31 20.5%	120 79.5%	151 100%
*7. Did any of the teachers or head teachers who attended the workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of?	39 26%	111 74%	150 100%
8. As a result of students and teachers from your school attending the workshop, have you learned more about Rwandan history and the genocide?	6 4%	144 96%	150 100%
9. Are you aware of any club activities that began after the students and teachers from your school attended the workshop?	26 18.3%	116 81.7%	142 100%
*10. Do you think the visit to KGM by students /teachers has helped good relationships between people in your school?	7 4.6%	144 95.4%	151 100%
11. Would you be personally interested in attending the workshop [at the KGM] if given the opportunity?	2 1.3%	149 98.7%	151 100%

5.4.1 Familiarity with KGM and the workshop

The first three questions established the basic picture of their familiarity with (i) the existence of the Memorial Centre, (ii) the fact that students from their school attended a workshop there in the previous term, and (iii) one or more attending students on a personal basis.

In answer to questions 2 and 3, almost all of the non-attending students said they were aware that a group from their school had visited the Kigali Centre in the previous term (95%), and

[37] Tables showing the data for each question by school (but not gender since the question on gender was accidently left off the questionnaire) can be found in Appendix 5.

almost every one of them knew one or more of the students personally (94%). The latter response rate provides a basis for confidence that the sample group of non-attending students from the six schools' are in a position to answer the rest of the questions on the basis of direct experience with attending students.

In answer to the first question, fully 98.7% of the non-attending students said no, that they had never visited the Memorial Centre themselves. This suggests that even students living relatively close to the Centre are unlikely to visit without the impetus and assistance of the Aegis program. By way of contrast, the same high percentage said in answer to question 11 that, "if given the opportunity", they would like to visit the Memorial themselves. Their explanatory comments (made in response to question *1) demonstrated that their goals in visiting would be to engage with the Memorial's core purposes. For example:

> *Yes, I sincerely want to visit it because there is so much to learn from there about the history of our country, Rwanda.* (School #1)
>
> *Yes, I would like to visit the Memorial and learn more about the bad history Rwanda has gone through. Then I would share the reality with people who only hear about it on the radio.* (School #3)
>
> *Yes, I would like to visit the Memorial because those who visit it told us about the history of Rwanda and I felt I should visit it personally to learn firsthand. Their experience changed us because we improved our knowledge about what the genocide is.* (School #3)
>
> *I would like to visit it so that I can know the truth about the genocide which happened while I was still very young.* (School #4)
>
> *Yes, I would like to visit it and see the bodies of ours who lost their lives.* (School #5)
>
> *Yes, I would like to visit it and know about the bad history that Rwanda went through, and how we can avoid its repetition.* (School #5)

The fact that almost every non-attending student now wants to visit KGM is a good indicator that the Aegis education program has been successful in stimulating and motivating the students who *did* attend to communicate its value and significance to their non-attending colleagues, and that they have done so effectively.

It also supports Aegis' desire for the capacity (both the space and the funds) to bring more students to the Kigali Genocide Memorial, as well as the current development by Aegis of a traveling exhibition which will have the capacity to bring some of the resources of the Memorial to more distant, rural and cash-strapped schools.

5.4.2 Sharing information from the workshop

In answer to questions 4 and 5, almost 90% answered yes, that they had taken the initiative to approach someone who attended the KGM workshop "to talk about it or ask questions". Slightly fewer (85%) reported the reverse, that one of the students who had been at the KGM workshop had approached them "to talk about what they learned".

A comparison of responses to questions 5 and *6 suggests that informal one-to-one contact with attending students was more common for non-attending students than exposure to "lessons" and group presentations by those students. Comparison with question 7 data suggests that non-attending students were slightly less likely to have "shared lessons or discussion" with attending teachers than with attending students. However, teachers' level of pedagogic engagement was nonetheless high; indeed the responses from two of the schools showed greater leadership taken by teachers than by students in having discussions. These findings reinforce the need for further training for teachers in the subject matter covered by the workshop, especially history and political education teachers.

Also in answer to question *6, about 80% of the non-attending students said yes, that they had participated in an organized discussion group or lesson in which attending students shared some of their experiences or learning from KGM. If they said yes, respondents were asked to give an example. Nearly every student did so, although many of the examples they offered were too general and unspecific to interpret. Content analysis (see Table 15 below) focused on identifying the most common themes and tabulating their frequency, along with some other themes of particular interest to Aegis staff.

Table 15: Themes in discussions, non-attending students

Themes	Number of references
1. Very general, no substantive content	40 (28.8%)
2. How/why genocide was started/planned	29 (20.9%)
3. Role of "bad leadership" as explanation	7 (5%)
4. Meaning of genocide/genocide ideology	11 (7.9%)
5. Explicit reference to oppression of Tutsis	10 (7.2%)
6. Reference to "bad consequences" that remain	7 (5%)
7. Prevention, importance of/how to do it	35 (25.2%)
TOTAL	139 (100%)

Some interesting differences among the schools were identified. For example, many students unexpectedly interpreted the request to "give an example" as asking them to identify a specific student, by name, who had "shared lessons or discussion" with them. The range was from just three named at one end of the continuum to 18 at the other end, suggesting the possibility of considerable variation from school to school in the numbers of attending students involved in subsequent presentations to their colleagues back at school. As well, it could be inferred from their substantive examples they gave that in some schools, the main focus of presentations was on the genocide itself (explaining and understanding it), and in others the focus was on the prevention of future occurrences by encouraging beliefs and behaviour in the direction of unity and non-discrimination. Without having asked specific questions on these points in this context however, these inferences are speculative.

A sampling of examples that *do* answer the intended question is as follows:

> *[Students who went to the workshop]] shared with us some discussion about how the genocide started in Rwanda, how the Tutsi people were oppressed, and how there was bad leadership.* (School #1)

[The class monitor] explained to us what is genocide: it refers to mass killings planned and executed with the aim of exterminating a group of people of the same race or ethnic group, speaking the same language, sharing the same religious beliefs of the same political opinions. (School #2)

What they wanted to tell us was about how we should avoid offending one and another but live together in peace and unity so that the genocide may never happen again. They insisted that we need to "eradicate ethnic discrimination and to be one". (School #3)

[Name] told me that what happened [must] never happen again because they hurt many people. [The attending students] learned a lot from there and they shared their learning with us, and we are curious to visit that place. (School #3)

Some member students of the Anti-Genocide Club organized some discussion sessions about unity and reconciliation, as well as about living together without ethnic discrimination. The discussion was led by students who visited the Memorial. (School #5)

[Name] has visited every single class sharing some discussion about what they learnt. He told us about [the] genocide and how it started. (School #6)

[Name] shared with us some discussion and told us that we ought to talk about happened in Rwanda so as to prevent [it] from ever happening again. (School #6)

Question *7 probed the engagement and outreach by teachers to non-attending students by asking for examples. Overall, the examples they gave were, for the most part, very similar in substance to those they gave for student-led discussions, and were not subjected to detailed content analysis. What did stand out was that in one school (school #3), 100% of responding students said yes, a teacher or head teacher had "shared some lessons or discussion" that they were part of, indicating a highly engaged contingent of teachers. Moreover, with few exceptions, the examples they provided illustrated a broad spectrum of perspectives on reconciliation and unity, contributing evidence that this school had developed an active and effective follow-up program to their visit to KGM—one which put an emphasis on positive, non-discriminatory relationships among the students. Selected examples, all from school #3:

Our head teacher shared some discussion with us and changed the minds of those who had the bad mentality of not helping others, like orphans. We resolved to help one another more.

Drawing upon the learning at the Memorial, our head teacher helped us to create an Anti-Genocide Club. Everyone must destroy bad behaviours that [used to] characterize the Rwandan population.

There have been some discussion sessions [with teachers] and we learnt that we need to live together peacefully and avoid ethic discrimination because we are one people.

The teacher told us that they visited the Memorial and saw bodies of the victims of the genocide and they also saw movies about how students in Nyange accepted to die together rather than dividing themselves.

Another response from the same school offered praise for the Memorial itself:

[The teacher] shared with us some discussion about how they visited the Memorial, saying that it is a good place and when you arrive, there is good customer care. You visit and see

whatever you want and then you ask questions about what you don't understand. They explain to you and ask you some questions also.

In their examples of what had been shared by students and teachers who had attended the Aegis workshop, a number of non-attending students from several of the schools referred to presentations and performances made by Anti-Genocide Clubs. When asked specifically in question 9 if they were aware of any club activities that had had been stimulated by the visit to KGM, almost 77% of the non-attending respondents answered yes, confirming the importance of this strand of school life and their ability to disseminate information and values that support a non-discriminatory perspective.

5.4.3 learning more and relating better

Fully 96% of the non-attending students surveyed said yes, they had learned more about Rwandan history and the 1994 genocide as a result of the visit to KGM by students and teachers from their school (question 8). Almost the same high percentage (95.4%) said yes, they thought the workshop/visit had contributed to the development of "good relationships" in the school community (question *10).

When asked to explain their yes/no answers in relation to the development of "good relationships", replies from school to school were similar in their conclusions – a resounding "yes" – but varied in wording and detail. This natural variation in wording lends credibility to their near unanimity that the visit to KGM had been beneficial in this way. Of the 151 non-attending students surveyed, almost all provided an explanation for their yes/no responses, as requested. Of their comments, 97.2% were positive. Particularly notable was the number that linked their enhanced understanding of Rwandan history with an enhanced climate of "harmony" in the schools, implying or referring outright to past tensions – again, an encouraging outcome for Aegis program goals.

For example in the past, students would discuss about the genocide and never come to an agreement, sometimes with the risk of quarrelling. Today, they have learned the truth and they can live in harmony. Even some school officials who used to have misconceptions about some students, they now take good care of them. (School #1)

Yes, [the workshop] helped good relationships because some students didn't have correct information about the history of Rwanda before. (School #4)

The visit by students and teachers at the Kigali Genocide Memorial helped good relationships among students because we have been able to understand what is the genocide, how to prevent it and eradicate it with all of its roots. (School #5)

Another feature of these responses was that those from individual schools differed somewhat in emphasis, suggesting differences in the direction that "good relationships" are taking from one to another. For example, in schools #2 and #3, many replies focused on increased mutual help among the students:

After understanding the history of our country during the genocide, we found that no one chose to be born where and how s/he was born. This made us [decide] to be united among us, and now we help those of us who lost their parents, siblings and friends. (School #2)

It helped us because we managed to know the true history of Rwanda, and it made us empathize with those who experience trauma and help them. (School #2)

I say [yes] because [name of teacher] created a Club in charge of psychosocial support to trauma victims and it has helped many of those who experienced trauma, and we also fight divisionism in our school. (School #2)

Yes, the visit [to KMG] by students and teachers taught us to live in harmony with another, to avoid ethnic discrimination. It helped us a lot and now we help our colleagues who are orphans. (School #3)

It made us join our forces for mutual help: helping orphans, buying uniforms for anyone who doesn't have, et cetera. (School #3)

[Yes] because in the past, you could lack a pen or notebook and you wouldn't get [one] from anyone. But when you now seem to lack it, they immediately give it to you before you ask. (School #3)

Students from school #4 also described ways in which they were doing more to help one another, particularly survivors. As well, however, they made a number of interesting references to "things having changed" after the visit, indicating the possibility of a significant shift in the underlying culture of their school—a highly desirable outcome. For example:

This visit by students and teachers changed something in our school. Some students could have bad attitudes [before the visit], like hating your colleagues, but with the discussions we had after the visit, this has changed.

Yes, because there were students who used to have wrong mentalities because of what they learn from their parents. But after the visit at the Memorial and the discussions that followed, some of them have changed.

It is "yes", because no one still says, that one is a Tutsi, a Hutu or a Twa.

It helped us a lot because they told us how to prevent divisionism and ethnic discrimination. It changed many of us, including myself.

I say yes because before, we used to have students who really had bad relationships due to the genocide, but after the discussions we had, it has totally changed.

Comments from school #5 stood out because of their references to forgiveness, and to the importance of club activities.

It changed many people because we all learnt that we are the same, and that what happened was mainly due to the colonizers of Rwanda. We learnt how people can ask for forgiveness toward reconciliation.

It helped a lot because there were those who couldn't think they could forgive someone who killed their [relatives], but after the visit, we are in good relationships: no suspicion or wondering where this one comes from.

After the discussions, I felt that I could even forgive someone who killed my parents, as it is often said that anyone who asks for forgiveness, deserves it.

After the visit, there were organized discussions that helped us to know how to prevent anything that can lead to genocide, and clubs were created, like the Anti-genocide Club, where we learn how to live together in unity and reconciliation.

Because of the lessons learnt from our colleagues who visited the Memorial, we all participate in the Anti-genocide Club, and it is now getting stronger.

The last question that was asked of the non-attending students (question 12) was to "describe the situation in your school in regard to unity and reconciliation". This is a phrase commonly used to describe the requirements for a peaceful future in Rwanda, referring to reconciliation of past differences and unity of basic social values organized around a sense of common identity. Every student replied to the question, and almost every student replied positively: out of 151 responses, only 1 was negative and 4 were unclear. The degree of confidence and optimism they expressed was high, and sometimes seemed at odds with previous answers. Examples:

Unity and reconciliation in our school is doing great. There are no harmful attitudes, no divisionism and no hatred within our school community. Whatever we do, we do it peacefully. (School #1)

The evidence that we have achieved unity and reconciliation is that we don't have ethnic or regional discrimination. We are all Rwandans. (School #2)

The situation of unity and reconciliation in our school is very good. For example, anyone who offends a colleague will promptly and sincerely apologize. The evidence is that our school [has] never had cases of genocide ideology. All students live as siblings and [are] ready to help one another as much as possible. Our school officials are also on our side and they are supportive of our initiatives. (School #2)

The situation of unity and reconciliation is really good because there is no divisionism among us. We are united, and we have a unity and reconciliation club. When we see students who are in conflict, we mediate and help them reset good relationships. We also do farming as an incoming generating activity, and we use part of the income to help poor students among us. (School #3)

The situation with unity and reconciliation in our school is good because we socialize with all students, and we have even given a goat to a student survivor of the genocide. (School #4)

There is no divisionism among students and teachers: everything is all right. Before the training [at KGM], *it was not very good among students but now, there is nothing about ethnic discrimination in our school. Thank you.* (School #4)

Before visiting the Memorial, the situation of unity and reconciliation in our school was not very good but now, we have improved. We work together to build our country, promoting peace among us and fighting against divisionism within and outside the school. (School #5)

Sincerely, we have become one: no more Tutsi, Hutu or Twa. We are all Rwandans, studying at the same school in our country. (School #5)

Unity and reconciliation is being progressively disseminated among students thanks to the efforts of the anti-genocide club using drama presentations and discussion sessions for students. Thank you and keep up with such good initiatives. (School #5)

Due to trainings we received from students and teachers who visited the Memorial, there is unity in our school. We live together in harmony and overcame the genocide for [the sake of our] development. I want to end by thanking you for this activity you organized and followed up. Thanks. (School #6)

5.5 Views of headmasters and headmistresses

5.5.1 Introduction

Headmaster and headmistress interviews[38] were considered necessary in this evaluation because of their position of authority and corresponding influence in their schools. It is a common finding in educational research that the leadership of "principals" or equivalent administrative superiors is a critical factor in the outcomes of education policies, programs and experiments. Accordingly, the evaluation investigated heads' views of the Aegis/KGM program, particularly its impacts on the students who attended from their schools and any on-going impacts it was having on their broader school communities.

It should be remembered that four of the six interviews were in fact re-interviews, following the unfortunate loss of the original records. All four heads agreed to a second interview, which in itself can be regarded as a mark of the importance they ascribed to the Aegis program, although one was reported by the field researcher to have had limited time to spare for it. In all four cases, some loss of spontaneity can be assumed, although we can't know whether the effect (if any) was to make their responses more guarded or more forthright.

5.5.2 Impacts of the workshop

Four of the headmasters/mistresses attended the workshop themselves. They were asked what impact it had on them, and what they thought were its most important aspects. They each had a slightly different perspective or emphasis.

One said that although she knew a certain amount already about the genocide, she had learned more at the workshop, and felt that what she learned contributed to her ability to do a good job of teaching the students, especially during the commemoration period. She also noted the impact it had had on her to hear how some teachers had contributed to "the dissemination of hatred" among their own students, adding that:

"I resolved to be exemplary in educating young Rwandans so that they never have divisionism among them, or have any thoughts about offending their colleagues."

The second one said that he learned a lot about how the genocide had been organized, and commented on listening to the powerful evidence of deliberate manipulation from the taped speeches. He also noted the importance to him, in his role as a leader of youth, of learning about the four steps of critical thinking to help solve problems in a sound, rational way. About the students in his school he spoke in optimistic language:

"As far as the students are concerned, they have really changed and they are now united. For anything they do, they go through the four steps of critical thinking to solve a problem in a sustainable way."

[38] There were three of each gender. See interview guide, Appendix 6.

The third said that she had visited the Memorial before, so she knew what to expect. She commented particularly on the impact the experience had on the teachers who attended and the importance of the direct learning which the Memorial makes possible:

"It is remarkable to see that there is some change in people's mentality, especially for teachers, about interpreting and teaching the history better now because they have learnt about it firsthand."

The fourth, who had attended commemoration events at KGM in the past, said that he went with a different goal in mind this time: to learn alongside his students. He too identified critical thinking as an important new approach that he had gained:

"As the head teacher,[39] I went there and sat down with the students. We were educated together, asked questions together and evaluated together, and I really learnt a lot. Specifically, there was something that sounded new and interesting to me: critical thinking. For me, it really stands out."

The heads were also asked if they thought the KGM program had helped their students and their school *as a whole*. Four of the six said a clear "yes", and provided support for their view. Not surprisingly, they tended to see the primary impacts as having been directly on those who attended, but they also noted indirect impacts on other students and their school communities.

"[Yes]. It helped our school a lot, especially for the students who attended the workshop. As we mainly have young students who were born after the genocide, (…) they know nothing about it. But while at the KGM, they saw pictures and watched movies, and it changed their mentality about what happened. They have actually developed a spirit of mutual help and they especially provide some assistance to their colleagues who were affected by the human tragedy Rwanda has gone through."

"[Yes]. About the impact on the school, I can see that after the students attended the workshop, they enhanced mutual help among themselves and they try to solve their own problems among themselves. Even in regard to issues of discipline, students are now able to tell one of their colleagues that s/he is wrong and needs correcting. So, the workshop really helped them. Also (…) the workshop made it possible for them to understand the Rwanda genocide better than they did before. One history teacher has told me that [s/he] no longer has difficulties making classes understand because there are always some students who attended the workshop who help [him/her] to clarify about it to their colleagues, and it becomes easier."

"[Yes]. It helped all of us, especially the students because there were some of them who used to have a trauma fit whenever they heard about the 1994 genocide, but in the workshop, they learnt about the reality, and they got more strength as they understood that the history has passed – that we must avoid sinking into despair and move forward. There is a genocide memorial in this neighborhood where students go to commemorate the victims and we used to have many trauma cases, but those who used to experience it are the very ones who are now helping their colleagues."

[39] It is not clear whether the phrase "head teacher" used here is an error in translation, or whether one of these interviews was in fact not with the principal. In any case, the perspective on record is that of a senior administrator in that school.

"Yes, because after the workshop students who attended promptly started to share the learning with their colleagues and then they also felt curious to share the information with more colleagues… ."

The head who did not answer this specific question spoke to the general point later when asked the wrap-up interview question ("is there anything you would like to add?"):

"What I can add is just to share with you some outcomes of the workshop in our school. Actually, all the students who attended the workshop came back with a clear understanding about the genocide and they were able to share some discussion with their colleagues about what they learnt, urging them to help vulnerable people and genocide-orphaned children. That is how they ended up fundraising in every class, and were able to buy 7 goats that they distributed to genocide-orphaned students at our school. And they even went beyond the school where they identified other vulnerable people to whom they also gave some goats. So, I think that is a commendable achievement that we owe to the workshop."

The head who was somewhat noncommittal nevertheless did refer to "sharing" by the attending students:

"It is too early to say. I think I will be able to notice some changes by the next school term. Maybe I can mention the fact that, from the workshop, [the attending students] did share the learning with the fellow students. But for other changes, let's wait a bit."

5.5.3 Sharing what they learned

Precisely this matter of "sharing" was one of the indicators of impact that the evaluation was most interested in assessing. In their answers (which were discussed in section 3), attending students answered several different questions with strong evidence that they did a great deal of sharing. Non-attending students confirmed that they had all been the recipients of such sharing. For additional confirmation, heads were asked whether or not they were aware of lessons or discussions initiated by the attending students as a result of the Aegis workshop. Four said a definite "yes", and provided examples; two gave unclear answers.

Three of the headmasters also talked about challenges they saw in bringing the learning from KGM as fully into their schools as they would like, including the limitations of a one-day workshop and the lack of available teaching materials from the workshop made available to the schools. These latter comments are important for the evaluation in suggesting changes or "next steps" for Aegis in building on the successes of the program so far.

One headmistress provided insight into the supportive dissemination process she set in motion for ensuring that the learning from the workshop was shared effectively:

"When we were choosing students to attend, we considered the leaders of different groups because we believed that, since we have not had a chance for all students to attend, they were best able to share with them the learning (...). It is [with that in mind] that we showed them how they can go about sharing some discussion with their fellow students, and we would meet with them again after [the discussion sessions] to hear and discuss about the feedback they have from their colleagues."

In response to a follow-up question about whether the attending students (and teachers) came away with enough information and confidence to share what they learned, she was cautiously

optimistic about this outcome from the workshop and added that her school was also taking steps to support the attending students to share their experience effectively:

> *"Yes, I think they have got the crucial information (…) and we also keep close to build their confidence as far as public speaking is concerned. As they are meant to lead discussions for colleagues they are familiar with, some confidence is already there."*

Another of the headmistresses did not directly answer the question, but did state that further training at KGM would be helpful. Her comments also indicated that she saw the clubs as the best mechanism by which the students who went to KGM could take responsibility for sharing what they learned, and she wished that Aegis could provide further training at her school specifically in the club context.

> *"Especially because the students work together in clubs, it would be [helpful if Aegis would] send specialists from the Memorial [to the school after the workshop], and provide them with more training even here. For I think that one training may not be enough for them to have that understanding and confidence. Their fellow club members ask questions that they sometimes can't answer, but if they were trained sufficiently, they could answer any question by their colleagues."*

One of the headmasters said not only that students and teachers were indeed bringing their knowledge and experiences forward, but also that the school was focusing time on the further development of critical thinking skills. He added that it would be desirable for students to spend more time in the Aegis program, indicating (as other respondents did) that those who attended went away with unanswered questions.

> *"Students and teachers who attended the workshop have had time to share with their colleagues about what they learnt; and one of the teachers who understood it better than others and who is a member of the unity and reconciliation club helps us to explain about such topics to more students. We also do this as school officials.*
>
> *And we also asked some students to lead exercises to help others acquire some capacity about critical thinking for problem solving. For example, there was a time when we discussed about solving the problem of teenage pregnancy (…) and there were students who came up with really good recommendations. So it showed that the part about critical thinking in the workshop made a good impact on them.*
>
> *Yes, they have learnt a lot and the outcome is remarkable in the way they solve problems but I can't say that it was enough because one day is short. If the workshop had been extended to two days, then the discussion would have been longer, and all the questions could have been asked and good conclusions would have been made. But I think that they learnt and changed a lot, especially about unity among Rwandans and the contributions they can make to it."*

Another headmaster indicated that the attending students at his school were holding monthly discussion sessions *with all students*, an impressive commitment, and "sensitizing" them about the need to prevent genocide ideology from taking hold. In a similar vein, another of the headmistresses reported that meetings had been organized with the students who did not go to the Memorial, "and it was like we were also training them". She reported that many of the students who did not attend the workshop wanted the opportunity to do so, adding her own assessments that a one-day program could not cover all the necessary ground, and that teachers in particular should be the target group for further education.

"They have learnt a lot but, to be honest, the workshop was short to the extent that there were some topics that have not been explored deeply. I would suggest that you plan for a longer workshop or even a continuous training program so that teachers can be able to learn thoroughly about different topics. Yes, they acquired some more knowledge and it is useful, but it is not enough: the deeper their understanding, the better the impact."

The sixth head also regretted that so few students and teachers were able to attend, and spoke particularly strongly about the need for more teaching materials:

"As I mentioned earlier, [the workshop] did not manage to reach a significant number of attendees if we consider that only 32 out of 311 students and 3 out of 11 teachers [were able to go]. And for them to be able to share the learning with others, they need enough educational materials. Yet, they only have one syllabus[40] received from the Memorial, which they can read in just a few minutes and it is over. It would be better if they were able to have enough educational materials to train more students and increase their peer education team. Moreover, some of the students [who attended] will be moving on to other schools next year and we will be left with fewer trained students…."

5.5.4 Additional student attendance at the workshop

The final indicator of the heads' overall assessment of the value and effectiveness of the workshop to be presented here is their responses to two questions they were asked about sending additional students (and teachers) to the workshop at KGM.

One question asked them if they knew of students and teachers in their schools who were not chosen to go but wanted to. Four said yes, using phrases such as: "almost all of them"; "there were many of those, it was hard to make a selection"; "all would have liked to attend"; "all were willing to attend". One of the others gave a defensive reply as if she interpreted the question as a criticism of the choice process. The sixth was apparently not asked this question or chose not to answer.

The second of these two questions asked if the heads would "sign up" other students to attend the workshop if that were a possibility at any future time. All six said yes, using strong phrases such as: "I would, definitely"; "if we were given the chance, we would all attend;" and "our long term goal is that all of our students should visit the KGM".

These are strongly positive indicators of the impact of the workshop at all levels of the schools, from non-attending students to heads.

5.5.5 Headmasters' perceptions of social cohesion

Following from the original evaluation goals, heads were asked about social cohesion in their schools in an attempt to understand more about the context in which students' daily lives take place. It was also expected that this information would assist Aegis Rwanda to decide if modifications to the workshop program might be needed to address social cohesion more directly or in any way more effectively. The question that heads were asked was:

[40] This is presumably a reference to the 14-page students' workbook, which does indeed seem limited in relation to the scope of the educational opportunity provided by schools willing to do follow-up work.

"Can you tell us a little bit about social cohesion or problems with social cohesion in your school? For example, have you ever noticed any genocide ideology in your school?"

It will be remembered that data reported earlier in this report, from both students and teachers, made it very clear that problems rooted in ethnic tensions and lingering repercussions from the genocide definitely do exist among the students. Some of our respondents were not explicit, choosing to use oblique phrases such as "problems" or "bad behaviour". But some referred quite clearly to social divisions in the student body, outright conflicts, lack of sympathy for survivors, and what appeared to be instances of verbal abuse and even fear of violence.

Their frankness came as something of a surprise, given strong social pressures in Rwandan culture to take an optimistic view of recovery from the genocide. But given that so many were at least somewhat open about the "problems" they had experienced or were aware of, it was then a reverse surprise to have the heads say firmly and unanimously that there were no problems of social cohesion or genocide ideology in their schools. They answered this question briefly (one might say tersely) in comparison to other questions, and although the inference could be debated, they seemed to be uncomfortable with the question.

There is no genocide ideology in our school. There is mutual help and social cohesion among our students. At the moment, there is no genocide ideology or any warning sign of it. (School #1)

No, there is no genocide ideology in our school. Our students follow the school's motto "PEACE: Prière, Etudes, Amour, Collaboration et Excellence," literally translated as "Prayer, Studies, Love, Collaboration and Excellence". This helps them to keep good relationships and there is no ethnic discrimination among them. So, there is no genocide ideology in this school. (School #2)

In this school, there has never been any case of genocide ideology and students are secure…. This is mainly because of the discussion we, as school officials, regularly share with them about positive attitudes to building a better future. So, there is no problem here. (School #3)

What I learnt at my arrival [this year] in the school is that there have not been cases of genocide ideology reported here. (School #4)

[In the time I have been here] there have never been such cases. Even since the beginning of this year, there has been no problem…. If by accident, there would ever be any case of genocide ideology to any student or teacher, we would advise them, and if it still persists, we would seek a judicial solution. (School #5)

Since I arrived, I never had any case of genocide ideology. For example, we have an AERG[41] *club* [for student survivors] *here at school and this club includes both genocide survivors and non-genocide survivor students who feel they have everything in common. So, no one excludes anyone else by saying 'go away, you are not allowed to join us because you are not a genocide survivor'. All students are entitled to join it with no problem. Among teachers, it also fine.* (School #6)

[41] Association des Etudiants et Elèves Rescapés du Génocide.

In retrospect, the wording of this question was unfortunate. It is one thing to ask about “social cohesion” but quite another, it seems, to ask about “genocide ideology”. Heads tended to skip over the interviewer’s reference to social cohesion and focus immediately on the rejection of any possibility of genocide ideology, as if a red flag had been waved. And unwittingly, on the part of the evaluation, it had been. Rwanda has government legislation with attached penalties for engaging in “genocide ideology,” which is defined as denying or minimizing the genocide, or arguing that there was a “double genocide,” or engaging in hate speech, and so on. It seems very likely that heads viewed the question from the legal point of view. Indeed, one of them confirmed as much by referring to “a judicial solution” to persistent genocide ideology.

And yet, it seems unlikely that any let alone all of the heads would be unaware of the kinds of ethnicity-based dynamics cited by so many students and teachers. We cannot know if other phraseology in the question would have allowed them to speak about it more freely. However, given the responsibilities of administrative heads in schools the world over to manage “public relations” (not to mention any legal ramifications of what happens in their schools), and given the spectre of genocide ideology in the question, the six heads who were interviewed for this evaluation probably had little choice but to present a picture that emphasized unity and cohesion. It would take further research to find out if they have off-the-record views that are different, or whether the policies and actions in their schools take account of the tensions of which we have evidence.

The contrast between their caution and the relative openness of many students (as well as some teachers) poses a challenging question for the Aegis program: how far can the day-long workshop go in engaging students in discussion of their daily realities if they conflict with the official version of their lives at school?

Section 6: Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

6.1.1 Meeting goals and objectives

The Aegis Rwanda student workshop has five main goals, and it is worth noting that they set a high bar for a one-day workshop. They are:

i. providing an understanding of the causes and consequences of genocide, both in Rwanda and internationally;
ii. providing an understanding of Rwandan history from pre-colonial to the present;
iii. contributing to the development of students' ability for critical and independent thinking and problem-solving skills;
iv. encouraging personal responsibility for actions;
v. deterring collective blame. [42]

A summary review of the evidence found in the evaluation about the degree to which these goals are being met shows what can fairly be called a remarkable amount of success, along with some challenges.

The first goal is two-fold: "to provide an understanding of the causes and consequences of genocide, both in Rwanda and internationally." In respect to the Rwandan genocide, this goal is being well met. Both in the previous evaluation and in the follow-up, responses from attending students delivered overwhelming evidence that, at least compared to their own starting point, students' understanding of the 1994 genocide as a result of the workshop (including the exploration of exhibits) grew appreciably. Many said that they started off knowing little or nothing, noting that they hadn't been born when the genocide took place; others said that they had been "confused" by conflicting accounts of how and why it happened and hadn't known what to believe; still others, that they had been curious and perhaps fearful to learn what the workshop at the Memorial could teach them. It was also notable that many felt they had been misinformed, and had themselves held mistaken views and beliefs, and that they were relieved and/or grateful to learn "the truth".

Of particular significance in accomplishing this goal were the exhibits, which were cited over and over again as having had a powerful effect *precisely because they were unmediated*: students could see and hear for themselves what happened in 1994, and how it happened. This gave them the solid foundation of understanding that many had not had, and at least some had been longing for. As engaging and powerful as the verbal presentations and discussions in the workshop were, the exhibits provided a higher level of certainty.

In terms of understanding genocide in its international context, the results of the evaluation are less positive. Neither students nor teachers spoke about other genocides or their significance spontaneously. When asked a direct question,[43] many gave what seemed like

[42] It is perhaps also worth noting that these goal statements demonstrate a problem that is common in educational programs: they state *teaching* goals rather than *learning* goals. Since teaching a subject or concept (the intention) does not ensure that it will be learned (the outcome), it is generally a good idea to frame goals for the latter. Learning goals also provide a more structured basis for evaluation.
[43] In retrospect, the particular question was not as well worded as it could have been.

pro forma statements: they acknowledged the value of learning about other genocides, but their responses were limited. Only a few gave evidence of much understanding, and several said explicitly that their focus was on the Rwandan genocide, indicating that it eclipsed the others. That result does not seem surprising, and it is both natural and appropriate that the Rwandan genocide should predominate, both in the workshop and in students' minds. That said, however, the result in terms of students' understanding the dynamics of genocide in an international and historical context may not be considered adequate by Aegis program designers.

The second stated goal is "to provide an understanding of Rwandan history from pre-colonial times to the present." The evaluation results are a strong demonstration that, as a result of the workshop, attending students were seeing Rwandan history in new and significant ways. The data from phase 1 showed that, at the end of the day-long workshop, students and teachers felt that they had been greatly enlightened about their country's history. The largest number identified what they had learned about the 1994 genocide as the foremost new insights for them, but a significant number identified new learning about the pre-colonial period, the colonial period, and (in smaller numbers) new understanding of the difference between the genocide and the war for the first time.

Phase 2 of the evaluation added to the above findings by showing that when students went back to their schools (and communities), and talked to others about what they had learned, a large part of what they talked about was the history that they had learned. This was demonstrated both in their written responses to a question about "what activities they had engaged in" as a result of the workshop, and in their verbal responses to an interview question about "the impact that the workshop had had on them" and whether it changed their thinking. In reference to impact, one of the main themes in their responses reflected all the aspects of Rwandan history. It was especially impressive in terms of learning outcomes that some students remarked on the value of understanding their history in helping them to think more clearly about their future.

Those very positive indicators that goal #2 is being met are somewhat tempered by the suggestion in the data that some students may have taken away an over-simplified version of history and what counts as "the truth". For example, in making reference to pre-colonial history, they often presented a picture of uncomplicated peace and harmony, as if a kind of "Eden" existed until the arrival of the colonial powers. Similarly, they referred to the colonial period in a reverse over-simplification, as if ethnic rivalries and tensions among Tutsi, Hutu and others were purely the product of colonial manipulation. Some presented the genocide as if it had been entirely the result of "bad government" or "bad leaders". There are, of course, important elements of "the truth" contained in statements like these; however, the evaluator was left with some feelings of discomfort about the cut-and-dried version of complex historical dynamics that came across in statements like those.

At the same time, it has to be acknowledged that the kind of research methodology used in this evaluation *requires* participants to simplify: the time and space to answer questions is too brief to permit much subtlety of response. As well, if students are meeting complicated (and contested) new information about their history for the first time, as many said they were, it would not be surprising if they started out by retaining only a boiled-down version of it. New learning is built up in layers, and it is beyond the scope of this assessment to see or measure that process—a process which, for many students, is still in its early stages.

What is very promising is the number of attending students who seemed excited by what they had learned about their history at the workshop; what seems important for Aegis Rwanda (but also challenging) is to figure out how to help them build on that starting point, and begin to see history (including their own) as a multi-layered set of truths.

The third goal is to contribute to the development of students' critical and independent thinking and problem-solving skills. This must be recognized as an ambitious goal, especially given the timeframe for the workshop and the competing curriculum. Despite the limited amount of time they had to learn about and practice the skill that day, the evaluation results showed that most recognized its value and understood at least its main outlines.[44]

At one level, students demonstrated a considerable amount of critical thinking, even if they didn't identify it as such, in the many examples they gave of having reconsidered their own assumptions and beliefs as a result of the workshop. This is especially true in relation to the evidence forthcoming from phase 2, after they had had time to absorb and reflect on all that they had heard there. When they reported that they had changed their attitudes and behaviour in relation to significant matters such as eliminating rules about whom they could appropriately or safely "socialize" with, deciding they would actively support genocide-survivor students for the first time, increasing their involvement in genocide-related clubs, etc., students may well have been exhibiting the results of critical thinking. Similarly, those who talked about reconciling with people they'd been "in conflict" with (or helping other students to do so) may have used the skills of critical thinking to get the good results they spoke of. Without more detailed information on these examples, it is not possible for the evaluator to be certain, but it is a reasonable inference.

In terms of students' self-assessments about understanding and "educating others" about critical thinking, they were somewhat cautious. Fewer felt confident about having gained this capacity at the workshop than the others they were asked about. The definitions and examples that they offered in their interviews presented a mixed picture, including some of the key elements of the skill but omitting others. Most students cited the two main attributes of critical thinking as (i) the need to carry out research and analysis before making up their minds and (ii) the need not to act in haste without considering pros and cons. These are indeed central tenets, and evidence of good basic understanding. What seemed to be lacking was an awareness of the role of strong emotions and the dangers of compliance to authority in relation to *non*-critical thinking. These are aspects that Aegis Rwanda might want to consider adding in.

Many students demonstrated that they understood how critical thinking can be useful in a variety of everyday decision-making situations. However, the goal of the workshop is presumably to teach this skill in reference to the genocide—a time when the *absence* of critical thinking was a factor in violence and murder—and to stress its value in support of genocide prevention. Accordingly, it seems to the evaluator that for students to gain a full appreciation of critical thinking, they need to apply it to the assessment of historical and contemporary accounts of power and ethnicity, of colonialism, and of the daily "news". Whether or not the workshop can reach this far is a matter for discussion.

[44] It also seems possible, based on a few comments made by students and teachers, that some made time in their schools to explore critical thinking further.

The fourth and fifth goals—encouraging personal responsibility for actions and deterring collective blame—appear to be two sides of a coin and will be discussed together. There were no specific questions in the evaluation that addressed these goals directly, at least not using those words; however, there was considerable evidence from participants to suggest that they had indeed been effectively met as a result of the workshop. Students' answers across a number of questions indicated that they were, for example, choosing to take responsibility for sharing important and potentially contentious ideas and information from the workshop with other students (and, in some cases, family and community members). They also provided considerable evidence that they were acting on the commitments so many had made in the phase 1 evaluation that they would play a part in building a peaceful and unified Rwanda by fighting divisionism in both words and deeds. In some schools, anti-genocide clubs or their equivalents were founded or else re-activated, more signs of personal responsibility.

To some degree, deterring collective blame is an aspect of all or most of the above activities. As well, many students talked explicitly about steps they had taken to cross boundaries of ethnicity in relation to their colleagues at school and/or family and community members in a few cases. References to a realization that they didn't have to think of any other people as their enemies or to hate anyone for some physical or cultural attributes they were alleged to possess—that they were all "siblings" at school, all Rwandans in their essence, and all equally members of the human race—were frequent.

In short, the evaluation shows that the goals of the workshop were met to an impressive degree.

6.1.2 Impacts on participants

Using a broad definition of the term, this evaluation was framed largely in terms of "impacts." The questionnaire for students, for example, documented the impacts they reported in terms of behaviour change, gains in capacity and attitude change. The biggest impacts were found in relation to increased discussion with other students about the genocide (=behaviour), gaining enough information to share lessons with others (=capacity), and experiencing change in "the feelings in my heart" (=attitudes).

Major impacts could be seen in students' written responses about the extent and breath of the "activities" they were motivated to engage in as a result of the workshop. The impact could be seen at its greatest in the words of the 56% who reported discussing what they learned with other students (and to a lesser extent, family and community members), an outcome which was confirmed by non-attending students. The words students used to refer to these discussions suggested that many felt a new or increased level of confidence in their ability to initiate conversations or make presentations on sensitive topics relating to the genocide, to speak from a greater knowledge base, and to be able to handle the range or responses they might encounter—an interrelated set of positive impacts.

Students also reported engaging in new activities in relation to clubs, reconciling students and others in conflict, support for genocide-survivors, and in a few cases, community-based activities such as helping out at other memorials or visiting a Gacaca court. Many of their stories, whether brief or more detailed, showed considerable evidence of appropriate emotionality, including empathy. This was strong confirmation that the 85% who reported changes to "the feelings in my heart" were speaking truly.

Further evidence on these points was found throughout their interviews. Of particular importance were the themes in their answers to a direct question about "the impact of the workshop on them personally". Some described gains in understanding at a deep level, using encompassing phrases like "I have changed my mentality" or referring to significant shifts such as opening up to genocide orphans for the first time. A surprising number were frank about having felt and even acted on feelings of divisionism in the past, and said that the workshop had shifted their feelings and actions toward unity and a sense of connectedness with all their colleagues as Rwandans first and foremost—a very good outcome. The many different ways the students described these impacts added to their credibility.

Teachers, answering the same questionnaire as students, showed similar rates of impact in relation to specific indicators of behaviour, capacity and attitude change to those of students. They also provided evidence that they had shared what they learned with groups and classes of students and directly supported an increase in club activities by participating in various ways, Perhaps most importantly, they said they felt more confident about their teaching in relation to the genocide, indicating that they recognized the Aegis program and KGM as an authoritative source on which they could base their lessons and conversations. Overall, teachers showed themselves as natural allies of the program, motivated by the impacts it had on them to take it forward to others in their schools.

6.1.3 Impacts on non-attending students and school communities

The impact of the workshop on non-attending students was well summed up in their answers to two simple questions about the Memorial Centre: 98.7% of them said they had never been there; 98.7% said that they would now like the opportunity to go and to attend the workshop that their colleagues attended. This indicates that the overall impact of what they heard from the attending students and teachers, who indeed "shared what they learned" in all the ways they said in the evaluation that they had done, was so powerful that nearly 100% of them wanted to see for themselves what the others saw, and experience the curriculum they experienced. The fact that non-attending students were randomly chosen from every class in their schools adds credence to this indicator. The headmasters, in their interviews, also confirmed it to be true. In the evaluator's experience, this outcome would count as a stunning result.

More specific and immediate school-based impacts were reported by the non-attending students in two broad categories: learning more about Rwandan history and the genocide, and relating better to one another across the whole school community, i.e. without divisionism. The questionnaire asked them to elaborate only on the second of these two items. In doing so, the themes they wrote about were: (i) increased mutual help and support across previous boundaries, referring obliquely to ethnic tensions, (ii) increased ability to forgive past wrongs, and (iii) a general shift in ways of thinking that suggested a change in school culture.

The extent to which the workshop contributed positively to "the situation in regard to unity and reconciliation" at their schools was not entirely clear since the open-ended question on that subject did not make explicit reference to the workshop as a determining factor. However, students' answers were optimistic on the subject generally, and many spontaneously invoked the workshop as a factor. Their comments in answer to other questions, particularly whether the workshop "has helped good relationships between people in your school," add weight to this interpretation.

Both teachers and headmasters were asked to comment on “changes” or “impacts” in their schools. Teachers were consistent in saying that there had been positive impacts, listing a range of them and providing reinforcement for what was said by non-attending and attending students. It was particularly powerful to have a number of teachers confirm that there had been “problems” among students (based on ethnic tensions) before the workshop, and that these had shifted significantly in the time since then, implying that all the work attendees described doing (having discussions, making dramatic presentations, etc.) was proving to be effective.

Headmasters spoke in particular about the way in which the workshop and subsequent discussions with the rest of the school population had led to a new or greater spirit of mutual help and support among them all, using words to the effect that there had been a really significant change. The changes they noted also included some students having come away from the workshop with a much greater understanding of Rwandan history, particularly in relation to the genocide, which they were able to share, Overall, they presented strong evidence confirming the extensive efforts students and teachers were making to “share what they learned” at the workshop, which is arguably the key to long-term effects in the school system and beyond.

6.2 Successes and challenges

6.2.1 Major successes

The major success of the Aegis workshop is an encompassing one: it cannot be reduced to one or two results, but should be thought of as the extent and number of the many specific successes discussed in this report. They range impressively over the numerous dimensions assessed in the evaluation and were confirmed by all categories of respondents, if not in every particular, at least in broad terms. The concurrence of opinion about its beneficial impacts and effects, in line with its stated goals, is remarkable. The positive outcomes from earlier evaluations were supported, and more certainty about those findings was generated methodologically by (i) seeking information from several categories of respondents, (ii) obtaining greater variation and less uniformity in responses, (iii) seeing greater variety in language use and details cited by respondents, and (iv) finding that key themes in the data were expressed in different ways by different participants in response to different questions. These features of the data support the conclusion that students in particular were answering from inside themselves, not in rote response to particular questions or phrases in the questions. In other words, we can be as confident as this kind of research permits that respondents were generally “being real”.

Evidence of successful outcomes for the workshop was wide-ranging, and it covered many bases in terms of major and minor program goals:

Regard and appreciation for the workshop was high.

Students displayed an interest in the history of their country, both the good and the bad chapters, and an appetite for more information than they could absorb in one day.

Students displayed a conviction that Rwanda can be a peaceful and unified country, and that youth—including themselves—have both a responsibility to engage in the on-going change process and an important part to play in it, including the possibility of seeing both the past and the future in different terms than their parents do, or did.

Teachers were thoroughly engaged by the workshop, experiencing it as participants rather than simply as 'supervisors' of their students. Several teachers said that, as a result of the workshop, they were more confident in teaching about the genocide, and/or talking about it to others generally, referring to a gain in certainty and a loss of fearfulness. As indicated, they expressed many evaluation responses that were similar to those of their students, which suggests that it is not just those who were very young or not yet born at the time of the 1994 genocide who can benefit from attendance at the workshop.

Evidence was widespread and consistent that attending students and teachers actively engaged their school communities in learning about the genocide and thinking about their role in a positive future for Rwanda, after they returned to their schools. Based on their accounts, they were both diligent and successful in "sharing what they learned", and used a number of methods. This means that the workshop succeeded in achieving both *durability* (lasting past the day of the experience) and *diffusion* (spreading beyond direct participants).

Declarations by attendees about the impacts of the workshop on themselves personally, and on non-attending students and school communities generally, were many and convincing.

Those impacts covered not just significant and specific new behaviours, such as respondents reaching out to "socialize" with students of other ethnicities and help victims of the genocide, but also included new attitudes and beliefs such as coming away with "new mentalities" about the causes and consequences of the genocide, and new convictions about the need to end "divisionism" and consider one another as Rwandans, sharing a common humanity. In other words, impacts reached not only minds but hearts.

Evidence of diffusion included a small but encouraging amount to suggest that students were engaging families and even neighbours and other community members in discussions about the workshop and memorial experience.

6.2.2 Challenges

The context is clearly one of great success but even so, the evaluation pointed to some weaknesses or omissions in the workshop program, with implications for possible revisions.[45]

Teachers are not now a focus of the workshop program, and yet their potential significance as agents of dissemination for its ideas and values is enormous. Considering how to engage them more directly and provide support for them in that role is an important challenge.

Gender differences in some of the responses of attending students (which was the only respondent group in which gender was examined) showed that girls had lower rates of behaviour change in relation to "speaking out" about what they learned in the workshop than boys. This suggests that girls were perhaps less confident than boys about their capacities for leadership. The evaluator is not in a position to know if this is a general cultural trait, but even if it is, the Aegis workshop developers could consider ways to support girls.

Critical thinking was recognized by both students and especially teachers as a valuable way of approaching the assessment of information and decision-making in relation to action.

[45] It is the evaluator's view that some of the most important lessons that can be learned in any evaluation are those that identify what isn't working or could be working better.

However, a relatively low level of confidence was expressed by students about being able to use it, and their definitions and examples indicated some limitations in their understanding. Earlier discussion in this report suggested the need for a review of the curriculum in relation to critical thinking, or perhaps the development of follow-up materials for the schools.

Genocide in other countries does not seem to have been well covered at the workshop, or to have made a significant impact on students or teachers.

A few participants indicated, not surprisingly, that they found it hard to talk about the ideas and information discussed or seen at the workshop with those who hold different views about the 1994 genocide, including some who would be in serious opposition to the presentation at KGM. It is not clear that it would be possible or even wise to discuss that particular challenge during the workshop, but it exists for at least some who attended.

Many of the other challenges are a result of the program's very strengths. They have to do with the identification especially by headmasters of "limits" in what the workshop covered in its day-long duration, and expressions of the "need" for more time, more depth and other extensions of the program. These are, in their own way, further affirmations for the program.

There was a difference of opinion in the data about whether students came away from the workshop with "enough information" and training (skill development) to share effectively what they had learned. Students tended to express confidence that they could; teachers and headmasters expressed more reservations. It seems likely that both are correct in their different ways. The students clearly *did* learn a lot that was new and illuminating to them. With the enthusiasm of youth, almost all of them appeared keen to talk about it, lead discussions and/or develop dramatic presentations to engage others—and were doing it. Only a very small number expressed any concern that they were not well enough prepared. Headmasters, however, were aware of the limitations of a one-day workshop in relation to the complexity of the issues being raised in the curriculum and pointed out the desirability of more time and training, for example an extension of the program to two days.

The idea of a two-day program was also raised by some who noted that not all the material on the agenda for the workshop could be well covered in a day, not all questions could be asked and answered, and not all of the important topics could be adequately discussed. There were also indications that not enough time was available for the exhibitions.

The evaluator also noted the possibility of over-confidence in students' unqualified statements about having (i) assisted colleagues who are in conflict to "reconcile" and (ii) provided support for students who experience trauma when faced with an aspect of the genocide that deeply affected them. The evaluation did not examine those topics directly, but since they are high order skills, it seems possible that students might need further training to perform these beneficial services in the best way.

Heads also pointed out that, if the schools are to do a good job of disseminating the information and ideas presented at the workshop, they need much more in the way of material support. Some pointed out that the workbook sent home with the students is very limited, and since the copies belonged to the students personally, they didn't serve as resources for the schools in any case. More materials would allow more follow-up.

Heads also wanted opportunities for more of their students to go to Gisozi, or for the team from KGM to come to their schools. This challenge is already being addressed by Aegis, at least in part, by the development of a travelling exhibition. It is not clear to the evaluator whether this initiative will address the desires expressed here. Heads would like more or all of the students in their schools to experience the workshop program that made so much impact on those who attended it at KGM. Some would like follow-up from Aegis staff with the students who did attend, to help them build their knowledge and skills. At least one noted the value of Aegis developing materials or a program specifically for the clubs.

The matter of 'who attends' the workshop may represent a challenge, although the evaluation data is not entirely clear on this point. Selection of attending students (and teachers) is left to the schools to work out, although they are apparently encouraged to send at least some students in leadership roles. Based on the information provided by heads, this is advantageous (i) because the leadership abilities and stature of such students can help them to be effective in the diffusion process, (ii) because they are seen to be responsible people, and (iii) because, if they have been elected to their positions, other students have given them a kind of "rank," which can be used as a basis on which their selection for the workshop can be justified. Mention of the latter point by some heads seemed to suggest the possibility of tension or conflict over the selection of students, which heads were naturally anxious to avoid. For the evaluator, the question arises: who is left out by this process? First, should "ordinary students" have a greater chance to be included? Second, given that students *do* still think in terms of ethnicity, at least sometimes (however hard they are working to move past it), are there any hidden dimensions of ethnicity in the current selection process? If so, could they be addressed?

6.3 Recommendations

The recommendations made here are mostly derived from the challenges discussed above. They are made without consideration of cost implications or reference to the possible role of the ministry of education or other agencies in achieving them. It is also possible that readers of the evaluation may find grounds to develop additional recommendations or elements of an action plan, based on the full discussion of evaluation outcomes in this report and the data presented here, or on their own readings of quotations from students, teachers and headmasters.

I. **Programming designed for teachers** should be considered, whether that be in the form of a specially targeted training program ("professional development") held on site for more teachers or all teachers from a participating school, or more printed support materials with a combination of information and teaching ideas for the few to take away and use in their own teaching or share in their schools, or another approach designed to fit the particulars of the Rwandan education system.

II. More than one of the heads and teachers raised the idea that a version of the workshop program be developed for **primary school children**, who also need to begin to understand their history.

III. **Gender differences**, including those identified in this report, should be discussed by Aegis staff at KGM, and the possibility of developing strategies to support girls considered.

IV. **Critical thinking** is an important skill in relation to genocide prevention. Attendees receive an introduction to it at the Aegis workshop, which is all the time allows. It is

possible that the curriculum could be revised to improve on this component, but not likely that a thorough job of teaching it could be done within the one-day timetable. Aegis could consider providing more take-away teaching materials for the schools. More immediately, the definition provided could be expanded as per the discussion on pages 28-29 of the report.

V. Critical thinking is also important in relation to **Rwanda's history**. Given the evidence that some students are (not surprisingly) taking away a simplified understanding, Aegis might want to review the learning objectives they have for what they want students to absorb about the causes of the 1994 genocide.

VI. Learning objectives for the workshop component on '**genocide in other countries**' should be established, and the program revised to ensure they are being met.

VII. Whether students (and teachers) are **well enough prepared to "share what they learned"** effectively with others depends in part on what Aegis' expectations are about what should be shared, with whom, and with what result. Unless the evaluator is simply unaware of learning objectives that already exist for this program goal, it is recommended that such objectives be developed and used as the basis for considering the question of appropriate preparation for students and teachers.

VIII. It is recommended that the question of 'adequate preparation' be extended to include **conflict resolution and trauma support**, and that some consideration be given to appropriate preparation for students to intervene appropriately and safely in these areas. (It is likely that some further research would be needed to establish in more detail what students mean when they say they have been undertaking these two impressive activities.)

IX. It may be that some discussion of, or training on, **how to talk to people who disagree** with the contents of the workshop and KGM exhibits, even genocide deniers, should be included in the curriculum, but the evaluator does not feel certain enough about the implications of this to raise it as more than a suggestion.

X. The idea of a **two-day workshop** was raised by several participants in the evaluation, and doubling the time available would clearly open up the workshop in a number of beneficial ways. However, that option seems unlikely for a number of reasons, including both cost and logistics, and is not recommended for those reasons.

XI. What *is* recommended is the idea of developing and making more **support materials** available to participating schools to help them carry out the expectation that attending students and teachers will bring the Aegis program back with them, and share it. Without well-designed curriculum materials, this is not only difficult for them to do, it leaves open the possibility that misinformation will be conveyed. The starting place for such a development could be **the 14-page workbook** which, though useful as far as it goes, does not go very far. As well, apparently school budgets don't stretch to permit it to be copied for non-attending students, a further restriction on its use.

XII. The scope for additional teaching materials and resources for student-led discussions and presentations is great. One of the headmistresses made an interesting one, "*I also have a suggestion that, if possible, the recordings we listened to (at KGM) should*

be made available on CD or flash drives so that they can be played for students who did not attend the workshop and then, their colleagues who did attend could be leading further discussion rather than telling them just stories."[46]

XIII. It would seem highly desirable for **more students** from the participating schools to be able to attend the workshop, which was a general wish of the headmasters, e.g. a new contingent every year. Evidence from the evaluation is strong that students *all* want to do that, which presents an enormous opportunity for Aegis and KGM to build on the success they have had with past attendees. However, it seems likely that this would only be possible, at least given present limitations in capacity, if Aegis/KGM stopped offering the workshop to entirely new schools, an undesirable option. It is nevertheless recommended that Aegis **consider ways to expand their relationship** with the schools that have attended the program in the past. It is clear from the evaluation that they value the relationship, some thanking Aegis/KGM not just for the original workshop but also for visiting their schools to conduct the evaluation, which they saw as a continuation of the relationship. The sense of having established a connection was also evident, for example, in the hopes expressed by one student that KGM staff would come to their school and see the good work they were doing in the anti-genocide club there (like parents witnessing kids' accomplishments elsewhere). To extend the connection, perhaps a **newsletter** could be developed, to share ideas from KGM and perhaps stories from attending schools located around the country.

XIV. It was clear in phase 1 of the evaluation that many students and teachers were greatly moved by what they saw and heard at the workshop and, at least in the moment, wanted to take action in a number of directions. Phase 2 results indicate that they have been remarkably successful in doing so. That said, it might be worth considering the idea of "action planning" as part of the Aegis curriculum or as part of a follow-up package for schools, to help student move effectively from intention to action. In this regard, one of the strategies that can be used to bolster and solidify the enthusiasm of a day's events is the development of a series of "commitments to change" by individuals, groups or whole schools.

These recommendations are offered in the spirit of making possible improvements to what is clearly already a strong and successful program. It has succeeded in inspiring students and teachers from around the country to take the clarity and power of its factual information, along with a fortified determination to live in peace "as siblings," back to their schools. It has also succeeded in meeting the highest test of an education program: changing established attitudes and behaviours for the better. In the words of just a few of the enthusiastic students from the six schools:

"The change I see [after the workshop] is that students have been able to know about the history of the country and have enhanced their social cohesion. I say this because there were some genocide-orphaned students who would feel like their problems are just felt by themselves but with the discussions we have shared, they now feel that other non-genocide survivor students care about their problem and they will provide them even with some assistance."

[46] If this suggestion were followed, it could clearly be linked to further work on critical thinking.

"Yes, there is change because after the workshop, we educated students and some bad behaviors disappeared. There are no longer groups of students from the same neighborhood who use violence against all others, and no longer conflicts among students at our school."

"*There is a big change because clubs were revived with more members and more participation in their endeavors to solve conflicts and fight against violence. There used to be clubs even before, but after the workshop, more people joined them and made them more dynamic."*

"Yes, there is change because, you know that students are from different backgrounds and so, they have different mentalities. I can now see that some students who used to be angry because of what they experienced have now changed. For us [who went to the workshop], we shared the learning from there with that aim."

"I notice some changes because, before the workshop, there was no one (or only a few people) who knew about what happened. After we attended the workshop, we came back and shared with our fellow students about what we learnt from there and they understood. Of course, they did not understand it as well as we did, but the level of ignorance about that history had decreased in our school."

"Something definitely changed [after the workshop] because everyone is now considering the others as his/her human counterparts and the clubs that we created helped a lot to bring us together, so all of this is enhancing unity and peace among us."

APPENDICES

* * * * * * *

Appendix 1: Term 3 Follow Up Questionnaire, Attending Students

General instructions:

- The information given will be kept private and is only for this research. It will be destroyed afterwards. You will not be identified in any way.
- Read carefully the questions before responding.
- Do not mention your name.
- Use **x** in the appropriate cases.

SECTION 1: Respondent details

Sex: Female ☐ Male ☐

Age: District:

School: Class:

Position at school: Class representative ☐ Association club representative ☐

School representative No position ☐ ☐

1. Had you visited KGM before attending the student workshop? No ☐ yes ☐
2. Have you visited KGM since attending the student workshop? No ☐ yes ☐
3. Have you recommended to others that they visit KGM? No ☐ yes ☐

SECTION 2: Agree/disagree questions

On the following table (see next page), please tick the box that most accurately represents your answer for each statement.

	STATEMENTS	Disagree completely	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree completely
1	I have been more involved in unity activities since taking part in the workshop.					
2	Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my fellow students.					
3	Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my family and close friends.					
4.	Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with members of my community.					
5.	The student's workshop motivated me to start a unity and reconciliation club or to become more involved in an existing club.					
6.	The feelings in my heart have changed as a result of attending the workshop.					
7.	I was given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others.					
8.	I am able to educate others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it.					
9.	As a result of the student workshop, I am more aware of problems between students in my school.					
10.	I have been more effective in contributing to unity in my school since attending the workshop.					

SECTION 3: WRITTEN QUESTIONS:

WRITE YOUR ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

1. What impact (if any) do you think the workshop has had on your school?
2. When you think back to the workshop, what stands out for you now as the most important to you?
3. Give a specific example of an activity you have engaged in as a result of this workshop. Describe this activity. If you have not engaged in any new activities as a result of the workshop, explain why not.

Appendix 2: Term 3 Follow Up Interview Guide, Attending Students

NOTE: Supplementary questions are designed to draw out the information if the interviewee has trouble engaging with the question, or if the answers are very superficial and short and not capturing the deeper intention of the questions. Supplementary questions are at the discretion of the interviewer as many aspects may be captured in the main question. Interviews will be done by the field researcher(s).

1. Tell us what you knew about the KGM before you attended with your class last term? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Had you visited the site? Did you view it as a place for survivors only or for all Rwandans? If you had been to KGM before, what was the purpose of your visit? If you had not been, what did you think/feel about your visit before you arrived?)

2. Several months have passed since you attended the daylong student workshop at KGM. On reflection, have your opinions about KGM changed as a result of you visited? If yes, how? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Did the visit change your opinions about the purpose of KGM? Have you recommended to others that they visit KGM? What is the most important thing you tell others about KGM?)

3. What stands out for you now when you think about the session you attended at KGM?

4. How would you describe the impact of the student workshop on yourself? (SUPPLEMENARY QUESTIONS: Can you talk about any ways in which your thinking has changed as a result of the visit (describe)? Has it changed anything in the way you talk to others about Rwanda and genocide and the future? Can you give a concrete example?)

5. Overall, do you feel that attending the workshop has enabled to you to more effectively address Rwandan history related to the 1994 genocide and contribute to social cohesion? How?

6. Before attending the workshop, you were told you were expected to share the lessons with others afterwards. Do you think this was a realistic expectation? Why or why not?

7. Since attending the workshop, have you spoken with any of the other students who attended about the workshop? If yes, what did you discuss and what were the outcomes of the discussions? If no, why not?

8. What is the most difficult aspect of talking with others about topics related to the workshop?

9. Can you think of anything that would have made it easier to talk about topics related to the workshop?

10. Have you noticed anything changing in your school as a result of students attending this workshop? (For example, have any of the students who attended initiated any activities? Is there anything else you have noticed?

11. After attending the student's workshop, did you use the information to connect with others? If yes, could you give an example? (For example, have you spoken with other students? Did you do that informally – like talking to friends? Did you do that formally – i.e. speaking to a club, organizing a club? What have you shared? Have you spoken with anyone in your family?
12. How have others responded to your actions (behaviours named in #2?) Are there any challenges you are facing when sharing the lessons from student workshop? If yes, what?
13. Is there anything else that you can say about how the student workshop at KGM has influenced your thinking and behavior?
14. Can you explain critical thinking? Can you give an example of how critical thinking has been helpful to you?
15. Have you been given some explanations or information about the workshop before you attend?
16. When you look back at the workshop, how satisfied to you feel now?
17. Have you been thinking or talking about what you learned about genocide in other countries?

Appendix 3: Term 3 Follow Up Questionnaire, Teachers

(Identical to the one used for attending students.)

Appendix 4: Term 3 Follow Up Interview Guide, Teachers

1. Tell us what you knew about the KGM before you attended with your class last term. (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Had you visited the site? Did you view it as a place for survivors only or for all Rwandans? If you had been to KGM before, what was the purpose of your visit? If you had not been, what did you think/feel about your visit before you arrived?).
2. Were your opinions about KGM changed as a result of your visit? If yes, how? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Did the visit change your opinions about the purpose of KGM? Have you recommended to others that they visit KGM? What to you say to others about the workshop?
3. How were students prepared for attending the workshop? Do you think this preparation was adequate? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Were you involved in preparing the students? Were you as a teacher given any information or preparation for the day?)
4. What stands out for you now when you think about the session you attended with your students at KGM?

   ~~How would you describe the impact of the student workshop on yourself? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Can you talk about any ways in which your thinking has changed as a result of the visit (describe)? Has it changed anything in how you teach in your classroom? Can you give a concrete example?)~~ [47]
5. Overall, do you feel that attending the workshop has enabled to you to more effectively address Rwandan history related to the 1994 genocide and contribute to social cohesion?
6. For you, what is the hardest part about talking with others about genocide and the topics of the workshop?
7. Do you think the training you received was adequate for addressing these issues in the classroom? If so, why? If not, why not?
8. If Aegis Trust developed a teacher-training workshop, specifically for teachers to help them address these issues in the classroom, would you attend? What would you like to see included in such a workshop?
9. Have you noticed anything changing in your school as a result of students attending this workshop? (For example, have any of the students who attended initiated any activities? Is there anything else you have noticed?
10. In your opinion, what could be done to improve on the student workshop?
11. Is there anything else that you would like to say?
12. Can you explain critical thinking?

[47] Question accidently omitted in the field research.

13. Have you been given some explanations or information about the workshop before you attended?
14. When you look back at the workshop, how satisfied are you now?
15. Have you been thinking or talking about what you learned about genocide in other countries?

Appendix 5: Term 3 Follow Up Questionnaire, Non-attending students

SECTION 1: YES/NO QUESTIONS

1. Have you ever visited Kigali Genocide Memorial? No ☐ yes ☐

If you answered YES, what was the purpose of your visit?

If you answered NO would you like to visit KGM?

2. Do you know that a group of students from your school attended a workshop for students at Kigali Genocide Memorial in Term 2? No ☐ yes ☐

3. Do you know personally any students who attended the workshop at KGM? No ☐ yes ☐

4. Did you approach anyone who attended the workshop to talk or ask questions? No ☐ yes ☐

5. Did anyone who attended the KGM workshop approach you personally to talk about what they learned? No ☐ yes ☐

6. Did any of the students who attended the KGM workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of? No ☐ yes ☐

If you answered yes, give an example:

If you answered no, would you have liked someone to tell you about what they learned?

7. Did any of the teachers or head teachers who attended the workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of? No ☐ yes ☐

If you answered yes, give an example:

If you answered no, would you have liked them to tell you something?

8. As a result of students and teachers from your school attending the workshop, have you learned more about Rwandan history and the genocide? No ☐ yes ☐

9. Are you aware of any club activities that began after the students and teachers from your school attended the workshop? No ☐ yes ☐

10. Do you think that visit to KGM by students and teachers has helped good relationships between people in your school? No ☐ yes ☐

Explain your answer:

11. Would you be personally interested in attending the workshop if given the opportunity? No ☐ yes ☐

SECTION 2: Written (open-ended) question:

12. Describe the situation in your school in regard to unity and reconciliation:

Appendix 6: Term 3 Follow Up Interview Guide, Headmasters

Name of school: _____

Name of headmaster: _____

Number of students in school: _____

Number of students in school by gender: Female _____ Male _____

---

1. Can you say a little about what you know the Kigali Genocide Memorial? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Have you personally visited Kigali Genocide Memorial? Were you familiar with the programs of KGM before attending the information session for headmasters last December? Specifically, were you familiar with the genocide education program?)

2. What motivated you to attend the information session and to sign up your school to attend the student workshop?

3. How were the decisions made in your school to choose the teachers and students to attend the class? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Was it you who made the decisions? Are you aware of students or teachers who would have liked to attend but were not chosen?)

4. Did you yourself attend the workshop session? If so, can you say what impact it had on you and what you think were the most important aspects of the workshop?

5. Can you tell us a little bit about social cohesion or problems with social cohesion in your school? For example, have you ever noticed any genocide ideology in your school? Specifically in the last year have their been any incidents of genocide ideology? What form did it take (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: How often did it happen? Was it directed towards specific individuals? How was the problem addressed? How are these problems addressed generally in your school? If students were having a problem, how would you know? (NOTE: Make sure you ask about things such as tracts, hate messages, comments in dormitories, toilets and desks, etc.

6. In your school, are some clubs/associations aiming at promoting unity and reconciliation? If yes, please describe. What are their main activities? How many students are involved in the clubs? How many students are involved in the activities done by the clubs?

7. Do you think that KGM program has helped your students and your school as a whole? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: After the visit to KGM, have you noticed any changes amongst your

students as far as social cohesion is concerned? If so, do you think this is related to the KGM workshop? Why?)

8. Are you aware of any lessons or discussions that have been initiated in your school by students or teachers who attended the workshop? If so, please describe. If not, why do you think that has not happened? (SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS: Do you think that the teachers and students had all the information they needed in order to share lessons? Do you think that teachers and students have the confidence they need to share lessons? Are there people in your school who oppose these lessons and make it more difficult to share?)

9. Is there any kind of support from the school and teaching staff to students who attended the workshop in order to implement what they have learned at KGM?

10. Would you sign up more students to attend the KGM workshop?

11. What further assistance would you like your school to receive in regard to genocide education and social cohesion education?

12. Is there anything else you would like to say?

Appendix 7: Tables, questionnaire data, attending students by gender

(N = 161)[48]

Section 1: Yes/No Questions

1. Had you visited KGM before attending the student workshop? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	54 88.5%	7 11.5%	61 100%
Female	84 85.7%	14 14.3%	98 100%
Total	138 86.8%	21 13.2%	159 100%

2. Have you visited KGM since attending the student workshop? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	61 98.4%	1 1.6%	62 100%
Female	97 99.0%	1 1.0%	98 100%
Total	158 98.8%	2 1.2%	160 100%

3. Have you recommended to others that they visit KGM? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	0 0%	62 100%	62 100%
Female	1 1.0%	96 99.0%	97 100%
Total	1 0.6%	158 99.4%	159 100%

[48] Because not all students answered every question, total responses vary from table to table.

Section 2: Statements, disagree/agree on a scale of 1 – 5

1. I have been more involved in unity activities since taking part in the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	2 3.2%	0 0%	26 42.0%	34 54.8%	62 100%
Female	0 0%	5 5.3%	0 0%	54 56.8%	36 37.9%	95 100%
Total	0 0%	7 4.5%	0 0%	80 51.0%	70 44.6%	157 100%

2. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my fellow students.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	1 1.6%	1 1.6%	0 0%	15 24.2%	45 72.6%	62 100%
Female	0 0%	2 2.1%	0 0%	44 45.8%	50 52.1%	96 100%
Total	1 0.6%	3 1.9%	0 0%	59 37.3%	95 60.1%	158 100%

3. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my family and close friends.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	2 3.3%	1 1.6%	18 28.5%	40 65.6%	61 100%
Female	0 0%	7 7.3%	0 0%	43 44.8%	46 47.9%	96 100%
Total	0 0%	9 5.7%	1 0.6%	61 38.9%	86 54.8%	157 100%

4. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with members of my community.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	3 3.9%	3 4.9%	1 1.6%	27 44.3%	27 44.3%	61 100%
Female	0 0%	27 28.7%	2 2.1%	39 41.5%	26 27.7%	94 100%
Total	3 1.9%	30 19.4%	3 1.9%	66 42.6%	53 34.2%	155 100%

5. The students' workshop motivated me to start a unity and reconciliation club, or to become more involved in an existing club.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	2 3.2%	5 8.15	0 0%	18 29.0%	37 59.7%	62 100%
Female	2 2.1%	22 22.7%	2 2.1%	25 25.8%	46 47.4%	97 100%
Total	4 2.5%	27 17.0%	2 1.3%	43 27.0%	83 52.2%	159 100%

6. The feelings in my heart have changed as a result of attending the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	1 1.6%	0 0%	6 9.8%	54 88.5%	61 100%
Female	1 1.0%	0 0%	0 0%	15 15.6%	80 83.3%	96 100%
Total	1 0.6%	1 0.6%	0 0%	21 13.4%	134 85.4%	157 100%

7. I was given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	1 1.6%	0 0%	10 16.4%	50 82.0%	61 100%
Female	0 0%	2 2.1%	0 0%	31 32.3%	63 65.6%	96 100%
Total	0 0%	3 1.9%	0 0%	41 26.1%	113 72.0%	157 100%

8. I am able to educate others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	0 0%	1 1.6%	27 44.3%	33 54.1%	61 100%
Female	1 1.0%	14 14.4%	0 0%	42 43.3%	40 41.2%	97 100%
Total	1 0.6%	14 8.9%	1 0.6%	69 43.7%	73 46.2%	158 100%

9. As a result of the student workshop, I am more aware of problems between students in my school.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	3 4.9%	6 9.8%	0 0%	19 31.1%	33 54.1%	61 100%
Female	5 5.2%	12 12.4%	1 1.0%	39 40.2%	40 41.2%	97 100%
Total	8 5.1%	18 11.4%	1 0.6%	58 36.7%	73 46.2%	158 100%

10. I have been more effective in contributing to unity in my school since attending the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	19 30.6%	43 69.4%	62 100%
Female	0 0%	5 5.5%	0 0%	27 29.7%	59 64.8%	91 100%
Total	0 0%	5 3.3%	0 0%	46 30.1%	102 66.7%	153 100%

Appendix 8: Questionnaire data, non-attending students, by school[49]

*1. Have you ever visited Kigali Genocide Memorial? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	Total
#1	18	0	18
#2	36	0	36
#3	18	0	18
#4	29	1	30
#5	23	1	24
#6	25	0	25
Total	149 98.7%	2 1.3%	151 100%

2. Do you know that a group of students from your school attended a workshop for students at Kigali Genocide Memorial in Term 2? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	N/A	Total
#1	2	16	-	18
#2	0	36	-	36
#3	1	17	-	18
#4	1	28	1	30
#5	1	23	-	24
#6	2	23	-	25
Total	7 4.6%	143 94.7%	1 0.7%	151 100%

3. Do you know personally any students who attended the workshop at KGM? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	N/A	Total
#1	0	17	1	18
#2	0	36	-	36
#3	0	18	-	18
#4	2	28	-	30
#5	0	24	-	24
#6	4	19	2	25
Total	6 4.0%	142 94.0%	3 2.0%	151 100%

[49] Gender data not available. Questions with asterisks asked for written explanations.

4. Did you approach anyone who attended the workshop, to talk or ask questions? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes		Total
#1	1	16	1	18
#2	2	34	-	36
#3	0	18	-	18
#4	4	25	1	30
#5	4	20	-	24
#6	3	22	-	25
Total	14 9.3%	135 89.4%	2 1.3%	151 100%

5. Did anyone who attended the KGM workshop approach you personally, to talk about what they learned? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	Total
#1	2	16	18
#2	2	34	36
#3	2	16	18
#4	8	22	30
#5	2	22	24
#6	6	19	25
Total	22 14.6%	129 85.4%	151 100%

*6. Did any of the students who attended the KGM workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	Total
#1	3	15	18
#2	2	34	36
#3	2	16	18
#4	10	20	30
#5	1	23	24
#6	13	12	25
Total	31 20.5%	120 79.5%	151 100%

*7. Did any of the teachers or head teachers who attended the workshop share some lessons or discussion that you were part of? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	N/Ans	Total
#1	11	7	-	18
#2	15	21	-	36
#3	0	18	-	18
#4	3	27	-	30
#5	1	22	1	24
#6	9	16	-	25
Total	39 25.8%	111 73.5%	1 0.7%	151 100%

8. As a result of students and teachers from your school attending the workshop, have you learned more about Rwandan history and the genocide? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	N/Ans	Total
#1	2	16	-	18
#2	1	35	-	36
#3	0	18	-	18
#4	0	30	-	30
#5	0	24	-	24
#6	3	21	1	25
Total	6 4.0%	144 95.4%	1 0.7%	151 100%

9. Are you aware of any club activities that began after the students and teachers from your school attended the workshop? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	N/A	Total
#1	6	12	-	18
#2	7	29	-	36
#3	3	15	-	18
#4	2	22	6	30
#5	2	22	-	24
#6	6	16	3	25
Total	26 17.2%	116 76.8%	9 6.0%	151 100%

*10. Do you think that visit to KGM by students and teachers has helped good relationships between people in your school? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	Total
#1	1	17	18
#2	1	35	36
#3	0	18	18
#4	1	29	30
#5	0	24	24
#6	4	21	25
Total	7 4.6%	144 95.4%	151 100%

11. Would you be personally interested in attending the workshop [at the Kigali Genocide Memorial] if given the opportunity? [Yes/No]

School	No	Yes	Total
#1	0	18	18
#2	0	36	36
#3	0	18	18
#4	0	30	30
#5	0	24	24
#6	2	23	25
Total	2 1.3%	149 98.7%	151 100%

Appendix 9: Questionnaire data, teachers, by gender

SECTION 1: Yes/No questions

1. Had you visited KGM before attending the student workshop? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	7	7	14
Female	5	5	10
Total	12	12	24

2. Have you visited KGM since attending the student workshop? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	14	0	14
Female	10	0	10
Total	24	0	24

3. Have you recommended to others that they visit KGM? Y/N

	No	Yes	Total
Male	0	14	14
Female	0	10	10
Total	0	24	24

Section 2: Statements, disagree/agree on a scale of 1 – 5

1. I have been more involved in unity activities since taking part in the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	7	7	14
Female	0	0	0	6	4	10
Total	0	0	0	13	11	24

2. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my fellow students.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	4	10	14
Female	0	0	0	3	6	9
Total	0	0	0	7	16	23

3. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with my family and close friends.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	5	9	14
Female	0	0	0	3	7	10
Total	0	0	0	8	16	24

4. Since taking the workshop, I have been more active in speaking about the genocide and promoting unity with members of my community.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	1	5	8	14
Female	0	0	1	3	6	10
Total	0	0	2	8	14	24

5. The students' workshop motivated me to start a unity and reconciliation club or to become more involved in an existing club.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	1	1	3	4	5	14
Female	0	1	1	1	6	9
Total	1	2	4	5	11	23

6. The feelings in my heart have changed as a result of attending the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	3	11	14
Female	0	0	0	1	9	10
Total	0	0	0	4	20	24

7. I was given enough information at the workshop to share lessons with others.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	5	9	14
Female	0	0	0	2	8	10
Total	0	0	0	7	17	24

8. I am able to educate others about the importance of critical thinking and how to do it.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	0	8	6	14
Female	0	0	0	2	6	8
Total	0	0	0	10	12	22

9. As a result of the student workshop, I am more aware of problems between students in my school.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	1	2	7	4	14
Female	0	1	1	2	5	9
Total	0	2	3	9	9	23

10. I have been more effective in contributing to unity in my school since attending the workshop.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Totals
Male	0	0	1	4	9	14
Female	0	0	1	2	7	10
Total	0	0	2	6	16	24