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Abstract

An unprecedented 65.6 million persons are forcibly displaced (e.g., refugees, asylum-seekers, IDPs). Half are youth. Hope is often the feeling that sustains youth through intolerable conditions. Basic education in protracted areas is seen as a protective factor that nurtures hope and psychosocial wellbeing in the lives of children and youth. This research sought to extend this concept to the higher education in protracted refugee context, where refugees (ages 18-35) were able to co-create spaces of hope that recognized their own agency and their ability to question the status quo while developing critical thinking skills. Based on a theoretical framework of the philosophy of hope, psychology of hope, pedagogy of hope, and critical hope, I explored with refugees their perceptions of hope before, during, and after their participation of my psychosocial peace-building education course over a period of six months. Using a pragmatic mixed-methods community-based action approach, I collected: 31 Hope Index of Staats surveys (pre, post, and a follow-up six months later), eight semi-structured interviews (two interviews and then a follow up six months later for each participant), student reflection journals, and researcher field notes. A thematic analysis revealed four themes: Reflecting on critical hope and critical despair; reconciling identities; resurfacing narratives and creating new narratives of hope; and restoring hope and agency in higher education. By nurturing hopeful views and co-creating opportunities for critical thinking skills, refugees seem to be able to continue to play a pivotal role in rebuilding a stronger, just, and peaceful civil society.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

“My Mind is Dreaming of Learning” – Kakuma Refugee Participant

Laticia (pseudonym) arrived at the IrieLitArt Project defiant and tired. Five young Jamaican women sat in a circle and patiently waited for Laticia to start her story. She stammered. They waited. She waited. Dressed in a blue t-shirt and black shorts, she took a deep breath and said, “I wanted to tell you a story. You see my stepfather hates me. He makes me sleep out on the porch.” As her story continued, the young women listened intently. As her confidence grew, so did her voice. Stronger. Louder. She spoke with righteous anger, power, and strength. After her story ended, one participant said, “I didn’t know.” Another participant explained she was in similar circumstances. Each participant affirmed her with a positive comment, offered suggestions, and asked questions. The adults in the room sat back and bore witness to the brave space these six young women had co-created.

One of the adults who happened to be observing remarked, “I didn’t realize that students could have a conversation in such a way.” Young people (15-35)\(^2\) have the ability to offer hope and possibility to each other. My drive and determination is to co-create spaces like in the story above where everyone is seen, heard, and valued. These are spaces that are not giving voice to the voiceless, but rather co-creating spaces where those voices can speak for themselves and be heard. In this space, people are affirmed, recognized so that they can use their voices to change their own.

\(^2\) Youth is defined by the Africa Youth Charter (2006)
lives. I am grounded in the hope and understanding that, indeed, our stories play a critical part in constructing the realities, we, as a society, want to see.

Below is an anecdotal example showing that individuals can co-create what they want to see. Three months after I left Jamaica, I received an email from a co-facilitator about what happened to the previous storyteller mentioned above. Ms. Minott\(^3\) said,

Just wanted to let you know that evidence of the programme continues to be experienced. Some students have been transformed. One particular student, Laticia has totally turned around. She is now very outgoing. In fact, behavioural problems that teacher had has [sic] ceased. The guidance counselor has attested to this; she said that before the programme Laticia did not participate in guidance classes but now she actually teaches the class. Today we had a reading competition and she participated in a reader's theatre presentation and was awarded the best reader trophy. She was absolutely magnificent; you should have seen her (you would have been proud). I will send you pictures as soon as I get them. Love and best wishes (S. Minott, personal communication, 27 May 2010).

This is just one email among many that offers hope that these projects I have co-developed in South Africa (Nthabiseng, 2001), Nepal (Khelera Sikou, 2012), and Jamaica (Irie LitART, 2010) are effective. As a tribute to the power of the

\(^3\) Permission given to use real name
community-based action approach, these projects continue to run in some form in their respective countries.

I entered this doctorate wondering why these projects seemed to have staying power and the ability to transform some participants, like Laticia and myself. I wondered if these projects offered spaces of hope, or that they supported a different type of listening, or that they offered a time, place, and space for educators and learners to be heard, seen, and valued. Perhaps it is all of these factors and more.

I was interested in expanding this course to areas of conflict and protracted refugee context. Although all of the courses (South Africa, Nepal, and Jamaica), I have developed have not been in conflict areas, all were in areas that experienced issues not uncommon to conflicted areas, that is, most experienced extreme violence, poverty, and uncertainty for the future.

Due to protracted conflict areas like Syria, South Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan, among others, are forcing an unprecedented 65.6 million persons (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2017) to flee danger, persecution, and/or natural disaster. All of them are displaced (e.g., refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons) and half are children and youth. Emergencies in Education (EiE) is an emerging field that fulfills a mandate from the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals that “ensure[s] inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” (United Nations [UN], 2016). Recently, Higher Education in Emergencies (HEiE), as well as, higher education in protracted refugee context have surfaced and is gaining momentum.
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(UNHCR, 2014a) because of the forcible displacement that is happening around the world. Higher education in protracted refugee context is defined as the expansion of basic education to the tertiary education level in protracted conflict and emergencies. One example of this is Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL: HEM) program where they have an online diploma in Liberal Studies (Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins [JWL:HEM], 2017).

Most youth see educational institutions as beacons of hope (Watkins & Zyck, 2014). To foster hope and psychosocial well being in our youthful refugees, we need to find ways to co-create spaces of hope in our educational institutions. It is paramount that we prioritize, give access, and mobilize learning opportunities for youth who seek higher education in conflict and protracted areas. The purpose of this research study was to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context.

**Background of the Problem**

According to the United Nations High Commission on Refugees [UNHCR] (2014a), "The need for higher education for refugees is increasing exponentially with the global increase in displacement and a higher number of refugees completing secondary education" (p. 4). In 2015, the Institute of International Education, along with others, hosted a two-day conference on Higher education in protracted refugee context. According to Kaisth (2015) explained, Sampaio, President of Portugal said,
Higher education matters: it is a window of hope that is open to the future.

We must act now to find new avenues for cooperation and new mechanisms to help. While there are challenges and a heavy agenda ahead, many others like Maryam are waiting. (para. 8)

Maryam is a Syrian refugee that finished her Masters in a Portuguese university. She stated that she would like to return and “help re-build Syria, once the conflict subsides. Most of all, she said the program gave her back her future and gave her back her hope” (para. 8). Most refugees who are in protracted conflict and/or displacement “frequently want either to continue studies at tertiary level, which they had to interrupt due to entry into exile, or to build on the secondary education they completed in their country of origin” (UNHCR, 2014a, p. 9). While others want the opportunity and access to education, regardless if it is basic or higher education.

A young Liberian woman also presented her desire for a higher education and could have been a “Maryam” if she had access to education. For it was not that she did not have motivation or the capacity to learn, it was because, as she said, “I was in fifth grade when the war came to my village 10 years ago. Since then, I have not gone back to school. I cannot go back now and sit in the same class; I am too old for that. But I still want to learn” (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund [UNICEF], 2007, p. 12). Many individuals have aged out of basic education and yet many still persist and go to school. In the results section, the reader will see in Kakuma Refugee Camp, it is not unheard of to see adult women or men sitting along with secondary students attempting to learn.
Disruption in school plays not only a dramatic role in education but also in the psychosocial wellbeing of children and youth. Dryden-Peterson (2011) noted that education is seen as a protective factor for children and youth. I argue that education and hope is also a protective factor for young adults as well. Simply put, by offering and co-creating spaces of hope for youth to recognize their own agency and the ability to question the status quo, they are developing critical thinking skills (Freire, 1994) that will eventually support a stronger, vital, and capable civil society. In the next section, I talk in depth of the background of the problem that will focus on three conditions based on the historical, socio-political, and cultural contexts.

**Historical Context**

When addressing the historical context, I am referring to moods, attitudes, and conditions that are creating situations that deter and promote hope in higher education in protracted refugee contexts. First, I outline the rationale of focusing on an international setting. Then, I discuss why higher education in protracted refugee contexts and persons with refugee status outside of the United States were chosen.

**International setting and students.** According to the UNHCR (2017a), the global number of forcibly displaced people worldwide is estimated to be 65.6 million, which means “20 new displacements every minute” worldwide (p. 2). The UNHCR estimates that 22.5 million are refugees and over half the population are under 18 years of age. The global number of forcibly displaced people has almost doubled from 10 years ago when the number reached 37.5 million displaced people. The rationale for focusing on an international setting is because most of the migration and
conflict is happening outside of the United States.

However, I do acknowledge that domestically we do have our own issues. Over 60,000 unaccompanied children and youth attempted to cross the United States (US) borders in October through June 2014 (Park, 2014). According to Krogstad (2016) “During the first six months of fiscal 2014, there were 19,830 apprehensions of children and their families, compared with 28,579 apprehensions of unaccompanied children [in 2015]” (para. 3). Recently, Jordan (2017) indicated the number has fallen since U.S. president Trump has taken office.

Few voices in the mainstream media asked about what was happening to the parents’ respective countries that would force them to make a heartbreaking choice. Perhaps, Shire Warsan's (2011) poem, Conversations about Home would resonate with parents as she wrote, “You have to understand/that no one puts their children in a boat/unless the water is safer than the land” (para. 4). Most families have little choice but to leave traumatic situations because of drug violence, poverty, and other kinds of violence (Tobia, 2014). The mainstream media does not lead with these reasons, instead emphasizes public health concerns, potential gang activity, and unaccompanied children just wanting a free pass to stay (Leung, 2014). My rationale remains focused on youth (ages 18-35) that are not minors, as well as, having the status of refugees that are living in conflict and protracted areas.

*Higher education in protracted refugee context and students.* There is an expectation around the world that civil society and governments will create conditions that meet basic needs. Yet, in conflict areas, governments often neglect to
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protect, educate, and to provide the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. One particularly detrimental effect of this neglect falls on a country’s young adults (ages 18-35) whose hopeful view of life and psychosocial well-being, both in and outside the classroom (Ager et al., 2011; The World Bank, 2005), are decimated.

Currently the emphasis of education is on the primary and secondary school. According to The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] Institute for Statistics (2016), “263 million children and youth are out of school” (p. 2). Those who are left behind are more apt to be female and young (ages 15-17). UNESCO Institute for Statistics pointed out since “primary and lower secondary education are compulsory in nearly all countries, the same is not true for upper secondary education” (p. 3). They noted that, although many youth of the upper secondary schooling have a legal right to education, they often join the workforce to support the family. This decision is often not their own.

Particularly, in protracted conflict areas, educational institutions often have been a place of safety, hope, and respite for the displaced, neglected, and discouraged children. However, for those who are youth (ages 18-35), there remains no space, nor priority for their learning. Moreover, higher education is seen as an unattainable possibility for them. Presently the opportunities and access to higher education in protracted refugee context are less than 1% of the youth who become refugees. There is a gap to fill and this is the reason why the boundary of this study focuses on higher education in protracted refugee context and not P-12 (also known as Education in Emergencies [EiE]).
Higher education in protracted refugee context has a limited history; however, the impact of students having access to higher education has socio-political ramifications. When there is investment in higher education in protracted refugee context, conflict often decreases because communities have the ability to bring their skills, knowledge, and inherent worth back to their countries (Pacheco & Johnson, 2014; Redden, 2015).

**Socio-Political Context**

When addressing socio-political context, I am interweaving the social and political factors of hope in higher education in protracted refugee context. First, I outline the background policies that are creating hope for higher education in protracted refugee context and highlight the leaders, policymakers, and countries that are also thinking about the ramifications of investing in higher education. Then, I set the social-political impact of higher education in protracted refugee contexts, psychosocial peacebuilding education activities, and role of hope to understand the consequences (unintended or intended) of these policies that policymakers, leaders, and decision-makers created.

**Global education policies.** The 65th session of the United Nations General Assembly reaffirmed the eight anti-poverty Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) with a global action plan (UN, 2013). Since two of the frameworks of the MDGs were focused on education, UNESCO modeled their six key goals to be complementary with the MDGs. UNESCO Education for All (2000a) focused on
education rather than a broad based public investments such as infrastructure, health, and so on.

In 1990, at the World Conference on Education for All, the World Declaration of Education for All was adopted by most of the world’s governments. A decade later, few countries followed through on the promise to “universalize primary education and massively reduce illiteracy by the end of the decade” (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2015, para. 1). In 2000, delegates from the World Education Forum adopted by Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments (UNESCO, 2000b). The Education for All had six goals. While Goal 1, 2, and 5 are focused on basic and secondary education, Goal 3 and 4 are significant because they focus on supporting post-secondary/higher education.

Goal 3: Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes.

Goal 4: Achieving 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults. (UNESCO, 2000a, para. 4)

According to the UNESCO (2015), the indirect benefits from the Education for All goals were primary and secondary level of education became popular, social protection programs (e.g., school feeding programs, stipends for girls) increased, and basic infrastructure (e.g., roads, electricity, roads) improved. In addition to that,
funding was directed to specifically vulnerable populations (e.g., children and youth with HIV/AIDS, girls, children and youth with disabilities), which resulted in more support and visibility. Specifically addressing gender parity, the Education for All helped support in changing attitudes about girls and young women education.

In 2012, during the Rio+20 conference, the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was developed to replace the Millennium Development Goals, with a mandate to be reached in 2030. SDGs focused “more efforts on education in emergencies and protracted crises” (Overseas Development Institute, 2016, p. 14). The SDGs also looked closely at the Global South and North relationships with regard to sharing knowledge and understanding, noting that the Global South plays a vital role in creating their own civil society leaders.

**Social-political consequences of policies.** All of these global policies that are driving inclusion, providing more funding, and changing how we view education are important because these leaders and policymakers from wealthier countries often dictate what is being taught in the classroom. They often dictate how children are seen in the classroom, and determine what kinds of support (e.g., funding, teachers) are offered to children with these kinds of circumstances. However, the global policies are shifting in a direction in that some leaders and policymakers (e.g., The World Bank, creators of the Sustainable Development Goals, to mention a few) from the economically powerful are attempting to learn from the communities that are most affected (Mohamedbhai, 2015). These communities and countries often have realistic
goals, practical solutions, and concrete understanding of the context that is far better
than those leaders are dictating from the top.

Those who are moving in this direction are finding that youth who are
engaged in higher education are playing a role that not only supports themselves, but
asserted, “Education at all levels is needed if economies are to climb from subsistence
farming, through an economy based on manufacturing, to participation in the global
knowledge economy” (p. 16).

In August 2016, after a recent suicide bombing at the American University of
Afghanistan, Mark English, President of American University of Afghanistan, was
asked if the university was attacked because it was a symbol of education, a symbol
of the West. He remarked:

This university is a lasting legacy of the United States in Afghanistan. We
produce graduates that go on to actually change things on a day-by-day basis
in this country. We are a beacon, I think, of hope for many Afghan youth. I
don’t want to conjecture [about] why we were attacked but I can tell you that
as a university we are doing all we can to advance education of the young
people in this country. (Kennedy & Domonoske, 2016, para. 20-21)

Simply put, the role of young people rebuilding their country is vital. It is paramount
we invest and value young people as a reflection of our humanity and as a way that
young people can drive their own pathway for a just society. By investing in higher
education in protracted refugee context, we are investing in the very young people who will be the leaders, change-makers, and policymakers of their countries.

Also, along with access to higher education in protracted refugee context, psychosocial peacebuilding education-structured activities strengthen the “role of youth as peace builders [and] may be a vital part of global efforts to limit terrorism” (Wessells & Monteiro, 2006, p.137). In other words, supporting youth (18-35) to be peace-builders plays a significant role in deterring terrorism. Often these activities support hopeful views and youth are more reluctant to engage in activities such as terrorism (El Sarraj, 2002; Sela-Shayovitz, 2007). In supporting hopeful views, understanding cultural contexts is essential.

**Cultural Context**

When addressing the cultural context, I am referring to the values, norms, and customs that factor in generating hope and despair in refugees. First, I focus on the Global North, in particular the USA culture. Then, I outline the movement towards strengthening hope in a global context.

**USA context.** When we talk about hope within the American culture, we often see it as optimism. This proposal is not talking about optimism. Rather, it is about the operational definition of hope that emphasizes having a goal, a pathway to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so. This definition is both cognitive and affective, which produces actionable results.

In the Republican presidential debates of 2008 in criticism of Obama’s “audacity of hope,” Mayor Rudy Giuliani (2008) argued that “hope is not a strategy”
Mykleby and Porter (2011) argued that believing ‘hope is not a strategy’ is contradictory to the ethos of American values. They explained, “America is a country conceived in liberty, founded on hope, and built upon the notion that anything is possible with enough hard work and imagination” (p. 5). From my perspective, hope alone is not a strategy, but if one has actions that follow that hope then anything is possible. Just like social justice is not social justice if there are not actionable results that follow.

Some of the current American rhetoric on refugees is often seen as divisive, isolationist, and nationalist. When President Trump was a candidate, he called for a “total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what is going on” (Johnson, Boorstein, Clement, & Pulliam Baily, 2016, para. 20). Whereas, our past President Obama (2016) sharply deviated from the divisive, isolationist, and nationalist rhetoric when he said:

I stand firmly with Muslim American communities in rejection of the voices that seek to divide us or limit our religious freedoms or civil rights. I stand committed to safeguarding the civil rights of all Americans no matter their religion or appearance. I stand in celebration of our common humanity and dedication to peace and justice for all.

And in this month of reflection, we cannot forget the millions of lives that have been displaced by conflict and struggle, across the world and in our own backyards…we must continue working together to alleviate the suffering
of these individuals. This sacred time reminds us of our common obligations to uphold the dignity of every human being. We will continue to welcome immigrants and refugees into our nation, including those who are Muslim. (para. 4-5)

Otherwise stated, the United States of America was founded on the hope that our civil liberties will be upheld and an inclusive society will be enforced. Perhaps this is the reason why Zong and Batalova (2015) noted that refugees rated United States as their intended resettlement destination. They also explained, “in fiscal year (FY) 2015, the United States resettled 69,933 refugees and in FY 2013 (the most recent data available) granted asylum status to 25,199 people” (para. 1). DeSilver (2015) from Pew Research Center ranks the US 14th worldwide of refugees hosted. He argued this could be explained because of geography and due to the fact that United States has capped the numbers to 70,000 refugees.

In 2016-2017 fiscal year, President Obama raised the cap to a 110,000-person cap (Connor & Krogstad, 2017) and then as of July 2017, Trump’s administration has decreased that to a 50,000-person cap and now many who have gone through the resettlement process remain in limbo (Hauslohner, 2017). This limbo is also due to President Trump’s “Executive Order: Protecting the Nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States” that banned foreign nationals from six Muslim-majority countries who did not have a current valid visa to enter the United States (Department of Homeland Security, 2017; Executive Order 13769, 2017). This ban has been in and out of courts and as of writing this dissertation. The ban has abruptly curtailed the
resettlement of refugees in the United States. Most progressive organizations (such as ACLU, Arab American Action Network, Southern Poverty Law Center) and over 100 tech and business companies (such as Facebook, LYFT, and Netflix) are against the travel ban and some have either filed lawsuits or filed amicus curiae briefs “to support of a lawsuit against Trump’s immigration orders by Washington state Attorney General Bob Ferguson” (Drange, 2017, para. 4).

**Global context.** Meagher (2016) reported on the ten Olympic refugee athletes that competed in the Olympics. She explained that Thomas Bach, International Olympic Committee president announced that a team would be created. Bach asserted,

> This will be a symbol of hope for all the refugees in our world, and will make the world better aware of the magnitude of this crisis. It is also a signal to the international community that refugees are our fellow human beings and are an enrichment to society. These refugee athletes will show the world that, despite the unimaginable tragedies they have faced, anyone can contribute to society through their talent, skills, and strength of the human spirit. (para. 4)

If there is access, people will come and fill up the spaces of hope. Those spaces of hope will be filled with resilience, courage, and power. Yolande Mabika, an Olympian participating in Judo echoes this notion when she says, “Everybody in the world talks about the refugees having no major importance. We are going to show that the refugee is capable of doing everything that other people around the world do” (para. 13). Yusra Mardini, Olympic swimmer reinforces Mabika statement when she
CO-CREATING SPACES OF CRITICAL HOPE

says:

I want everyone to think refugees are normal people who had their homelands and lost them not because they wanted to run away and be refugees…But because they have dreams in their lives and they had to go. A lot of people in Syria forgot their dreams and I hope everyone will follow their dreams to achieve something good in the future. (para. 15)

There are some skeptics (Grossman, 2016; Lind, 2016) who are stressing that they are unsure that these Olympians will change policymakers approach to the refugee crisis. However, they hope that it may offer a counternarrative and raise awareness of the plight of refugees.

As the plight of the refugees come to the shores of the Global North, Banulescu-Bogdan and Collett (2015) noted that there is a climate of “anti-immigration rhetoric on the far right” within the European Union (para. 3). A minority feels this way. In contrast, ordinary Germans are opening their doors through a program called “Refugees Welcome, a volunteer initiative matching asylum-seekers with German hosts” (para. 26). Le Blond and Prickett (2015) shared a story about Mohammad, a Syrian who is a refugee and law student in Syria. He fled Syria and now he may have the opportunity to finish his studies in Berlin.

Media also plays a role in the global context. It seems as though there is currently more instability around the world and refugees, asylum seekers, and internally displaced persons are featured more prominently in the media. In their meta-narrative discourse analysis, Haynes, Devereux, and Breen (2004) noted they
found five key themes in English-language newspapers worldwide that covered refugees and asylum seekers. Refugees were represented in five themes: “an economic threat; a threat to national and local integrity; a criminal element; social deviants and as illegal aliens” (p. 2). Philo, Briant, and Donald (2013) have offered a more current perspective with a book that addresses everyday language used in the British media about refugees and migrants. They argued that the media plays a role in how government policies are made and implemented. In The Guardian newspaper, Kenyon (2010) noted the sensationalism, inaccuracy, and repetition of various tabloid headlines that ultimately create a narrative of refugees as a threat. The media played a role in dehumanizing refugees (Esses, Medianu, & Lawson, 2013).

In contrast, there are counternarratives that are creating spaces for refugees to voice their own stories and oppose the dominant narrative. For example, Eltahawy, Comer, and Elshimi (2009) have collected oral narratives of refugees in Egypt. Elshimi noted, “Many Egyptians, at the time, viewed them as a 'cluster' of people, not as individuals with human stories, families and hopes” (A. Elshimi, personal communication, 18 February 2015). Eltahawy, et al. noted that they hope to “go beyond the image of refugees as victims” and share stories that “transcend the horrors of genocide to demonstrate a more shared human experience—an experience, we hope will counter the apathy with which Sudan’s trauma has been regarded” (p. 1). In other words, it is important to see and recognize the counternarratives of resilience, strength, and courage that are also dominant in refugees’ lived experiences.
Statement of the Research Problem

An unprecedented number of people worldwide are being forcibly displaced. The UNHCR (2017a) estimated that out of the 65.6 million who are displaced, 22.5 million are refugees. Too often in conflict areas, governments often neglect to protect, educate, and to provide the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. Children and youth (under 18) are often prioritized and focused on every humanitarian level. The problem of practice is that youth (ages 18-35) who are refugees often have limited spaces of hope and access to higher education in conflict areas or emergencies. Higher education in protracted refugee context is emerging and yet exists in very few places. Considering the inaccessibility of higher education in protracted refugee context and the increase in youth who are displaced, there is a great demand for education (UNHCR, 2014a). This is a demand of education that goes beyond the primary and secondary schooling. This research responded to this demand.

The purpose of this research study was to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context. In reviewing literature on hope, psychosocial peacebuilding education, higher education in protracted refugee context, I hope to inform the reader in understanding how educators and students can co-create spaces and places of hope so that students can use their voices to determine their own destiny. My primary concern of my research
is to offer the time, place, and space for individuals to be heard, seen, and valued based on empathic and culturally responsive ways.

**Educational Significance of the Research Problem**

Recently, Education in Emergencies (EiE) has been at the forefront of migration as people who are leaving conflict areas increased. The EiE is defined as an “urgent policy response to violence and social disruption” and it plays a vital role in “humanitarian aid, meant to bridge the gap between the present conflict and future peace” (Burde, Arnstein, Pagen, & Zakharia, 2004, p. 5). As education is earmarked for the primary and secondary level, more policymakers and educators are seeing higher education in protracted refugee context as an answer to support and prepare young people to rebuild their countries. Higher education in protracted refugee contexts is defined as expanding the basic education to the tertiary education level in protracted conflict and emergencies.

According to the UNHCR (2014a), "Highly educated refugees reduce economic and psychological dependence of whole communities in asylum, improving their self-reliance and preparing them for long-term solutions" (p. 6). The World Bank (2005) explained, too often schools are complicit in perpetuating the conflict. To deter this, higher education, psychosocial peacebuilding education, and hope can play a role in preventing this. UNHCR explained,

Higher Education in particular nurtures a generation of future change-makers that can take the lead in identifying sustainable solutions to refugee situations. It provides young refugees and their families with an opportunity for
increased self-reliance through gainful employment. The hope of participation in higher education contributes to greater enrolment and retention throughout primary and secondary school, reinforcing the protection of children and the wellbeing of refugee communities. (p. 4)

Otherwise stated, when higher education is prioritized it could have a ripple effect on the whole education system and civil society.

Considering the inaccessibility of higher education in protracted refugee context, there is a great demand for higher education (UNHCR, 2014a). Most, if not all refugees would like to return to their homeland and “contribute to the reconstruction of their country, so they can involve themselves in something besides just existing” (Redden, 2015, para. 5). This means that young people can, will, and are playing a critical role in addressing the challenges related to global and local stability.

The Emergency Academic Support: Global Platform for Syrian Students (2016) was an example of this as shown in their insistence that, “Education not only saves lives in emergencies, but it also sustains life by giving a sense of hope for the future” (para. 4). This group has been instrumental in pushing the agenda with regard to “how to integrate higher education opportunities into humanitarian responses” (para. 5). They have shown the real need of higher education in protracted refugee context. Their stories and voices say they matter. They do matter.

LeBaron and Ashooh (2016) argued that not only do these students matter, but also supporting higher education is “not simply a matter of technical policy, or of
regional concern, but of crucial national-security importance for the United States (para. 3). Since half the population are youth in the Middle East, they believe “promoting widespread and meaningful education in the region would be more fully transformative—and less costly—than almost any other policy measure the United States could undertake, military or otherwise” (para. 3). They are referencing a Middle East context, however I argue this sentiment could transcend borders into other conflict areas, too. Furthermore, LeBaron and Ashooh commented about transformation resonates with Freire’s (1994) understanding of liberation, when he said:

Oppressors, wreaking violence upon others, and forbidding them to be, are likewise unable to be. In withdrawing from them the power to oppress and crush, the oppressed, struggling to be, restore to them the humanity lost in the use of oppression. (p. 87)

In other words, when students understand that they matter and they have a voice in the political, civil, and academic discourse, they may start movements that demand to be seen, heard, and valued, not unlike what the Syrian students are doing currently. In this ‘awakening’ students may offer solutions that government officials or civil society could never have imagined.

The World Youth Report stated, “warfare magnifies existing impoverishment and despair” (UN, 2003, p. 373). Even though it seems that living in conflict areas can negatively impact young people’s hope and psychosocial well being, it does seem not to deter refugee youth from wanting to learn. In fact, youth that may have had
missed opportunities to engage in education due to conflict, long to have that opportunity (UNICEF, 2007).

**Presentation of Methods and Research Question**

I used a pragmatic mixed methods research–intervention process model (Morgan, 2014a; Nastasi et al., 2007) that used a community-based action research approach (Openjuru, Jaitli, Tandon, & Hall, 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001) to explore how students’ (18-35) perceptions of hope change through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context. The Figure 1 outlines the mixed methods intervention model that I used. In the methods section, I will go into more detail.

![Dual-track alternating mixed method intervention model](image)

*Figure 1.1. Dual-track alternating mixed method intervention model*

The first quantitative phase used Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey (pre-survey) that assessed the cognitive-affective nature of the perception of hope in students at Kakuma Refugee Camp. The concurrent qualitative phase included in-
vivo memos and ongoing process field notes of the training of the psychosocial peacebuilding education course. The second quantitative phase used the Hope Index of Staats survey (post-survey) again. The concurrent qualitative phase included 8 semi-structured 30-minute interviews that had a follow-up interview to have a member check in and/or clarify any questions. The third quantitative phase used the Hope Index of Staats survey (after six months) again. The concurrent qualitative phase included 8 semi-structured 30-minute interviews (same group of participants interviewed in the pre/post interview) to explore the evolution of their hope.

A community-based action research approach (Openjuru et al., 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001) was used. This is an approach that offers a collaborative way for researchers to work alongside potential non-researcher based community members in the hope of co-creating spaces of critical hope, social action and positive change through the use of multiple knowledge sources and research methods. Data collected was from Kakuma Refugee Camp, Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM) refugee students ($n = 31$). Of the 15 people who volunteered to take my psychosocial peacebuilding education course, 13 filled out the survey. These thirteen were considered the intervention group, while the 18 who just filled out the survey served as the control group.
Research Questions

Since my research was a pragmatic mixed methods research, my research questions were in the form of quantitative, along with qualitative questions. The primary research question was: In what ways, do refugee students (18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participating in a psychosocial peace building education course, in a higher education in protracted refugee context.

Qualitative Questions

1. How does a student’s perceptions of hope evolve over time while the student is participating in a psychosocial peace-building education course?
   a. How do participants describe their experiences during the course that they perceived to contribute hope?
   b. How do participants describe their experiences during the course that they perceived to hinder hope?

2. How do participants describe the role that does higher education plays in supporting hopeful views in protracted refugee context?

Quantitative Questions

1. What is the difference between personal and collective refugee hopes in Kakuma?

2. What is the progression in participant’s level of hope over time, in the context of a changing reality and participation in a psychosocial peace-building education course?

In the next section, I go over key concepts and words that I regularly use in this research.
Key Concepts and Terms

In this section is an overview of key concepts and terms that I use in this dissertation. Highlighted in this dissertation are concepts and terms of hope, psychosocial, and education, as well as, definitions of participants in the research. Last, there is an overview on the methods terminology.

Concepts and Terms of Hope

Hope is a feeling/desire for something to turn out for the best. The philosophy of hope is striving to be better and cognizant of the tension between what was, what is, and what could be. The psychology of hope is having a goal, a pathway to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so. The pedagogy of hope is a philosophy of being that anchors hope in a teacher’s practice. Last, critical hope is a pedagogical tool or practice of teaching that uses a critical theory lens to address unjust systems through meaningful dialogue and empathic responses.

Concepts and Terms of Psychosocial

Psychosocial is the interrelation between social and psychological factors. Psychosocial educational peace-building curriculum are activities that provide space to strengthen the social, psychological, and educational spheres with the goal of contributing to the political, economic, and social transformations in post-conflict society.

Concepts and Terms of Education

Education in Emergencies (EiE) creates basic education in protracted conflict and emergencies. Higher Education in Emergencies (HEiE) is the expansion of basic
education to the tertiary education in emergency context. *Higher education in protracted refugee context* is the expansion of basic education to the tertiary education level in protracted refugee contexts. *Protracted refugee contexts* are the result of wars, policies, and political actions that create a prolonged conflict leading to people being prevented from returning home. The wars, policies, and political actions result in the limitation of refugees’ political, economical, and social participation in their former countries and the places where they are located now (adapted from United States Department of State, 2017).

**Refugees**

*Refugees* are defined by the United Nations, Refugee Convention Act, of 1951, which are people who are escaping harm that are unable to return to their country because of substantiated “fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion” (Article 1(A)(2).

**Methodology**

*A pragmatic approach* is a research approach that applies methods that are responsive and meet the needs of the research problem (Morgan, 2014b). The benefit of this approach is having the ability and flexibility to use methods, techniques, procedures that appear to match the context to the research problem. *A proof of concept* is documented evidence that verifies certain concepts, programs, or courses have real world applications. *Culturally responsive practices* are sets of teaching methods and activities that seek to affirm the cultural knowledge and experiences of
students while at the same time, the teacher’s methods, activities, etc. are designed to counter the bias of these identities (Gay, 2010; Reyes, 2014). A community-based action research is a research approach, where the community identifies the problem, the research is designed around that problem, and the community uses the research to decide and inform them on the steps to take to resolve the problem (Openjuru et al., 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001).
Chapter 2: Literature Review

“At first, it was impossible but now it is possible” – Kakuma Refugee Participant

I tried unsuccessfully to loosen the tangled brown fuzzy yarn. As I put it down, another hand took it from me. It was Sesana’s hand. She smiled and for the remainder of the group session, she gently untangled the ball of yarn. Knot by knot. She patiently waited as the knots became loops and the loops became loose enough to wind up in a ball. At the end with a wide smile she handed me a beautiful brown ball of yarn.

I open with this story because, perhaps as educators and learners, we are not unlike that ball of tangled yarn. Perhaps hope is the one that patiently waits and untangles us, knot by knot. Hope is essential for human survival (Bloch, 1986; Freire, 1994; Snyder, 2002). The act of hope transcends cultures. When we hope, we give rise to possibilities, multiple narratives, and multiple outcomes.

The purpose of this research study was to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context. The goal of this literature review in light of the study’s purpose is to untangle this ball of yarn that consists of four parts. One strand explores the role of hope from philosophy, psychology, and education. While two strands delve into the research of
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psychosocial education peacebuilding and the role of higher education in protracted refugee context. The last strand explores the methodological literature.

**Role of Hope: Theoretical Framework**

The purpose of this part of the literature review is to anchor the reader to the theoretical framework of hope from three disciplines: philosophy, psychology, and education. These three were chosen because they articulate my theoretical assumptions and inform my methodology and research design, as well as reflect my personal beliefs and understanding of the concept of hope. By focusing on these three disciplines, my desire is to help the reader understand why in my methodology I chose to use the psychometric instrument, Hope Index of Staats (1989), a social indicator that stems from the cognitive and affective psychology of hope. Also to familiarize the reader in Nastasi et al.'s (2007) culture specific mixed methods recursive research–intervention process model that is reflected in my research design.

I want to familiarize the reader in the literature of the philosophy of hope, psychology of hope, and pedagogy of hope. These are relevant theories that build support for my preferred theory, critical hope. Critical hope combines three disciplines as it draws from the affective and cognitive psychological aspects while creating spaces that support social action and social awakening. Critical hope is the pedagogical tool or practice of teaching that uses a critical theory lens to address unjust systems through meaningful dialogue and empathic responses. As an educator, I see myself like a doula, removing barriers, bearing witness, and offering guidance to birth an idea, thought, and/or to deepen an understanding that we matter in this world.
Choosing the construct of hope as a metaphor, we will see that all three of these classical bodies of studies will indicate the breadth and the depth of thinking that surrounds this topic. I review the philosophy of hope (Bloch, 1986; Fromm, 1968; Heisod, 1914) and after that, I discuss the psychology of hope (Averill, Catlin, & Chon, 1990; Lopez, 2013; Snyder, 2002), emphasizing Staats and Stassen's (1985) work. Then, I elaborate on how hope is co-created inside and outside the classroom (Dewey, 1910; Fishman & McCarthy, 2007; Freire, 1994; hooks, 2003). Thus, ending this literature review and discussing when and where critical hope can manifest (Boler, 2014; Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Zembylas, 2014).

**Philosophy of Hope**

Hope is defined as the feeling/desire for something to turn out for the best (Merriam-Webster, 2016), whereas, the philosophy of hope is defined as striving to be better and cognizant of the tension between what was, what is, and what could be. Starting with mythology, Heisod's (1914) *Works and Days* told a story about the myth of Pandora’s box and Prometheus, the fire-giver. Zeus was angry with Prometheus. Instead of punishing him, he punished the human race that Prometheus loved. Zeus withdrew fire from the human race only to have it stolen back by Prometheus and then “passing it to mortals, a deed for which he suffered an eternally gruesome fate” (Horton, 2014, p.143). The human race was punished by hard toil[s] and heavy sickness which bring the Fates upon men; for in misery men grow old quickly…countless plagues, wander amongst men; for earth is full of evils and the sea is full. Of themselves diseases come upon men
continually by day and by night, bringing mischief to mortals silently; for wise Zeus took away speech from them. (Heisod, 1914, lines 90-105)

As the humans toiled, so did Prometheus. He endured immense pain as an eagle devoured his immortal liver each day and night. His liver was regenerated each day and night to start the whole cycle again (Heisod, 1914).

The story continued with Zeus creating a woman called Pandora. She has given a box and was forbidden to open it. She did and unleashed the world’s evils (e.g. famine, death, jealousy, and so on). In the story, only hope persisted.

Only Hope remained there in an unbreakable home within under the rim of the great jar, and did not fly out at the door; for ere that, the lid of the jar stopped her, by the will of Aegis-holding Zeus who gathers the clouds. (Heisod, lines 90-105)

Thus, with hope and fire, the human race believed that they had control of their own destiny (Barney, 1999). Horton (2014) explained that this story has “three symbolic breakthroughs for humanity: a more hopeful future for the human race, an open portal to new and liberating knowledge, and a template of audacious agency in the service of mankind” (p. 143). Later in the hope literature review, Duncan-Andrade (2009) picked up on these themes in his definition of critical hope.

In contemporary times, Ernest Bloch (1986), a Marxist philosopher wove in the myth of Prometheus and believed “hope preserves human beings' capacity to strive at good things that are not currently present” (Meyer, 2008, p. 1). In other words, Bloch drew on how we can strive to create a better world through awakening
our hopes. His vision offered possibilities of a utopian society that is just, open, and transformational. Bloch believes that hope is “the discovery and unmistakable notation of the ‘Not-Yet-Conscious’” (p. 201). In his view, hope is teachable; however, one needs to recognize or educate her own hope. In this recognition, she needs to daydream of what could be. It is when these daydreams are concretized into hopes, the hope serves as a tool to counter fear. Bloch has established a philosophy of hope that is a

_docta spes, dialectical-materialistically comprehended hope_. The basic theme of philosophy which remains and is, in that it becomes, is the still unbecome, still unachieved homeland, as it develops outwards and upwards in the dialectical materialistic struggle of the New with the old” (Bloch, 1986, p. 9).

From this perspective, Bloch’s philosophy of hope is not unlike Freire’s (1994) pedagogy of hope in that often there is a “relationship between an indispensable occupation in the new construct, and a preoccupation in the which the original context [h]as to be reconstituted” (p. 25, emphasis in the original). Both are recognizing when we really hope that we are struggling between the tension of what was, what is, and what could be.

Another concept that Bloch (1986) talked about is the difference between subjective hope and objective hope. Subjective hope is a hope that has already been determined and “it appears as the only unchanging thing in history: happiness, freedom, authenticity” (Meyer, 2008, p. 3). Objective hope is a hope that “needs to be found and worked on, so that the true liberation of human beings could
materialize” (Moisio & Suoranta, 2007, p. 239). Objective hope is the kind of hope that is not only an emotional hope “but more essentially as a directing act of a cognitive kind” (Bloch, 1986, p. 196). This is a hope that is not necessarily certain nor fulfilled to what is actually hoped for because hopes are often incomplete. Nonetheless, it is the act of hoping, the striving to be better that awakens and educates our own hopes, and thus transforms our own thinking and agency.

Erich Fromm (1968) offered another angle to this ‘Not-Yet-Conscious’ sense in that hope is an “inner readiness, that of intense but not-yet spent activeness” (p. 12). Fromm believes that hope is an increased engagement of “greater aliveness, awareness, and reason” (p. 6). Where Fromm differed from Bloch (1986) is that hope for him stems from a social-psychological perspective in that Fromm is not necessarily interested in what one thinks about their feelings, but rather desires to understand what one is actually feeling when they have hope. To be in touch with that feeling is to “be ready at every moment for that which is not yet born, and yet not become desperate if there is no birth in our lifetime” (Fromm, 1968, p. 9). Having hope means to be aware, not losing your compassion, and empathy. It also means not being passive and waiting for hope, for it rarely comes and always disappoints.

Bloch also emphasizes that hope often needs to be awakened or brought to consciousness. Fromm (1968) would reverse this concept and suggest “there are many who feel consciously hopeful and unconsciously hopeless, and there are a few for whom it is the other way around” (p. 10). For Fromm, the remedy is more about understanding what hope is and what it is not. In this context, Fromm asserted “hope
is paradoxical” in that “it is neither passive waiting nor is unrealistic forcing of circumstances that cannot occur” (p.9). Like Freire, Fromm believed hope is intrinsic, as well as an ontological need. He noted that ultimately, hope, “is not a prediction of the future; it is the vision of the present in a state of pregnancy” (p. 13, emphasis in the original).

Now that we have a foundation from the philosophical and historical point of view (Bloch, 1986; Fromm, 1968; Heisod, 1914), that is, the critical investigation of the existence of the construct of hope. I move to the psychology of hope (Averill et al., 1990; Lopez, 2013; C. R. Snyder, 2002; Staats & Stassen, 1985) that examines the role of hope in behavior and affective, as well as cognitive functions.

**Psychology of Hope**

The psychology of hope is defined as having a goal, a pathway to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so. In recent discussions of hope, a controversial issue has been whether “the role of education is not conceived as one of instilling hope but rather of evoking it and providing it with guidance” (Webb, 2010, p. 329, emphasis in the original). Some argue that hope is a learned cognitive process that can be measured, sustained, and maintained (Averill et al., 1990; Lopez, 2013; Snyder, 2002). From this perspective, Averill et al. (1990) believed hope is involved when the future is unknown, a moral value is adhered to it, priority is given, and there is an end goal or action. Lopez (2013) also saw hope as a choice in that a person has the ability to “create a picture of a meaningful goal, and then describe a path–filled with both struggles and exciting challenges – to get there” (p.183). Snyder, Rand, and Sigmon
(2005) also explained hopeful thoughts are defined as having a goal, a pathway to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so. However, Snyder et al. (1991) are different from the other authors, in that they proposed that there are two major elements of hope: A sense of agency and recognition that one can accomplish the goal. Their work has been foundational in defining the psychology of hope. Their research led to developing three scales: State of Hope, Traits of Hope, and Hope in Children (Snyder et al.).

Averill et al. (1990), Lopez (2013), and Snyder (2002) came from the positive psychology field. Positive psychology is the study that “seeks to understand positive emotion, build strength and virtue, and provide guideposts for finding what Aristotle called the ‘good life’ (Speligman, 2002, p. xi). It is strength-based and these authors above connect the construct of hope with positive psychology. However, I would argue that approaching hope in just this way denies and ignores the mechanisms that prevent people to have hope. These mechanisms, that is, systems of oppression, create barriers for people. Through no fault of their own, but the mere fact of being born, they are targeted.

Other perspectives from psychology and education are also critical. Christopher, Richardson, and Slife (2008) argued that positive psychology “fails to take into account fully its own cultural context,” in that this approach has an American centric tone that focuses on “personal autonomy and individually-defined fulfillment” (p. 557). From the point of view of education, Stevenson (2011) outlined Henry Giroux’s, a theorist of critical pedagogy, stance on positive psychology when
he said, “Such an argument would turn education over to a branch of ‘positive’ psychology where teachers simply reaffirmed the vision of the students” (p. 64). In other words, when we just reaffirm the vision of the student we negate any opportunity for critical thinking that is needed for emancipation and liberation.

Although Snyder et al.’s (1991) psychometric hope scales are used widely, they ground their work in positive psychology that focused on the individual and the achievement of the individual. In light of this, my research proposal will use Hope Index of Staats (1989) because Staats and Stassen (1985) emphasized the individual and collective interactions in the real world and how one makes sense of it. In contrast, Snyder et al., (1996) focused on how one’s thinking can influence individual hope levels.

Staats and Stassen (1985) stated "Hope is here operationalized as a predominance of expected future positive feelings over the future expected negative feelings. Hope, comprised of both desire and expectations, involves the interaction of affect and cognition" (p. 235). Later Staats (1987) defined hope as “Both a cognitive component (the expectation of a future event that has some probability of occurring) and an affective component (i.e., the things that we hope for are pleasant events or good outcomes)” (p. 358). Staats (1989) continued to strengthen her definition of hope as she arrives with “hope refers to future referenced events that are wished for, have positive affect, and have some cognitively perceived probability of occurrence” (p. 366). The Hope Index of Staats is considered a social indicator that takes into
account the social, economic, and psychological welfare of the individuals and communities.

Staats and Partlo (1993) argued that the Hope Index of Staats (1989) could be used as a social indicator. In their longitudinal case studies, they surveyed college students and their parents during 1988, 1991, and 1992. In context, the survey was administered during the United States ground war in the Gulf (’91) and during the recession (’92). Staats and Partlo found hope increased in times of threat. They asserted that “threat leads to greater need and this need may serve as a stimulus of hope” (p. 239). They also maintain that hope differs from individual to individual. They report that the “Hope Index, primarily through changes in expectations, is sensitive to significant threatening cultural changes” and “particularly sensitive to threat” (p. 241). The Hope Index of Staats has been used and adapted in other countries (Braun- Lewensohn & Sagy, 2010; Pacico, Bastianello, Zanon, & Hutz, 2013; Sagy & Adwan, 2006).

Braun- Lewensohn and Sagy's (2010) study was a longitudinal study measuring spirituality that included the sense of coherence, hope, and values impact on youth in a conflicted region in the Middle East. They were interested in what the impact of living in a protracted conflict context did to adolescents understanding of the world as it pertained to their values, hopes, and beliefs. Using the Hope Index of Staats (1989) and other metrics, they surveyed students in 2006 and 2009 during times of missile attacks. They found that in this particular situation, in a threat, adolescent youth’s perception of hope decreased and contradicted their own
hypothesis as well as others (Fisher, 1997; Staats & Partlo, 1993). They argued that
the “low expectations in both years seem to reflect the sense of reality among
adolescents who grew up in an intractable violent conflict, and could represent their
despair and hopelessness” (Braun- Lewensohn & Sagy, 2010, p. 256). Simply put, in
a protracted conflict, which appears to have no ending, the context could exacerbate
despair or undermine hopeful views.

Sagy and Adwan’s (2006) study is another one that focuses on protracted
areas. This was a longitudinal study of the impact on hope of youth in a conflicted
region in the Middle East. They were interested in the “differentiation of personal
and collective hopes” in Israeli Jews and Palestinians students (p. 128) over time.
Using the Hope Index of Staats (1989), they surveyed students during the Oslo
Accord Talks (framework for peace process) and then during the events of the Second
Intifada (second uprising). Sagy and Adwan argued that there was little research of
the impact of hope in the social context. Due to this, their conceptual framework was
primarily drawn from researchers that focused on psychological aspects, such as
Snyder (1994) and Staats. They also drew from theories from Fisher’s (1997) work on
interactive conflict resolution.

When using the Hope Index of Staats (1989), Sagy and Adwan (2006) found
differences and similarities in the collective and individual hope with regard to the
two samples. The Jewish youth had more individual hope than that of their
Palestinians counterparts, whereas the Palestinians youth had more collective hope.
They also noted for both youth groups, hope of peace was relatively low and
decreased throughout time. They asserted that the context that their study was under was drastically different than that of Staats and Partlo’s (1993) study where they found American students and parents had an increase of hope in times of threat. One being is that the Americans were not living in the conflict and the other that the “perception of peace among these youngsters is not of a pleasant event but of a complex and painful process” (p. 132). Despite these differences and similarities, Sagy and Adwan found the perceptions of hope changed over time and “reveal[ed] that hope could be not only a sensitive measure of individual human needs but also a significant indicator of cultural and social changes” (p. 133). Pacico, et al. (2013) study also showed how this measure can be used to understand hope in a different context.

Pacico et al., (2013) study demonstrated that the Hope Index of Staats (1989) could be adapted to measure hope in adolescents from southern Brasil. Pacico, et al. used two other different psychometrics besides an adaptation of Hope Index of Staats. They were the Adult Dispositional Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991), revised Life Orientation Test (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). In addition to the 16 original questions from the Hope Index of Staats, added 5 questions with regard to “sexual satisfaction, love relationship, children’s success, conditions to help other people, and conditions to travel and know new places” (p. 669). They adapted the scale and made it culturally specific and culturally relevant. They found the perception of hope is similar between Brasil and US, regardless of cultural differences (Pacico et al., 2013).
Since the concepts of hope from the psychological point of view (Averill et al., 1990; Lopez, 2013; Pacico et al., 2013; Sagy & Adwan, 2006; Snyder, 1994; Staats, 1989; Staats & Stassen, 1985), that is, the cognition and affective construct of hope have been reviewed. We will move to the pedagogy of hope (Dewey, 1910; Freire, 1994; hooks, 2003) that practices hope in the classroom that offers spaces of inclusivity, critical thinking, and action.

**Pedagogy of Hope**

For Freire (1994) the pedagogy of hope is a philosophy of being that anchors hope in a teacher’s practice. Hope is intrinsic—the innate hope—that develops in each soul, in each person, when they arrive in this world. However, relying on just hope, without action can lead to hopelessness. Furthermore, Horton (2014) explained that for Freire, “Hope has to be embedded in the larger struggle, or praxis, which cycles through theory, application assessment, reflection, and returns to theory” (p. 151). This means that there is a process, or rather iterations of actions that need to happen in order for spaces of transformation and emancipation to emerge.

According to Duncan-Andrade (2011), Freire’s pedagogy of hope “require[s] educators to identify and analyze the oppressive conditions facing their students” as well as using “education as a pathway to develop, implement, and evaluate action plans that respond to those conditions” (p. 313). Moreover, when students have the time, place, and space to be engaged in their own critical thinking, there is hope that students working alongside educators will have the ability to defend themselves from systematic oppression.
Freire (1994) reflected on critical points that created transformation for himself in his personal and professional life where he learned from his own hope. This can be seen when he said, “at the bottom in seeking for the deepest “why” of my pain, I was educating my hope . . . I invented the concrete hope in which, one day, I would see myself delivered from the depression” (p. 29, emphasis in original). Freire is not saying that, as educators, we must all sink into a deep depression. However, we need to understand the origins of our own feelings of hope and despair so that those feelings that surface out of our own despair may inform us how to better support students.

When students are heard, seen, and valued, they are more willing to engage in critical thinking. According to Freire (1994), educators need to be a witness and model critical thinking. This means that educators need to be critically self-reflective and give themselves the space to question where their own stories, beliefs, and values are coming from. In many ways, Freire is asking how do we change the perceptions and mindsets (Dweck, 2006) of how students, teachers, and society are seen, heard, and valued in the classroom, in their community, and the world.

To support and offer spaces that move and transform students into a place of hope, Freire (1994) explained that “the critical effort through which men and women take themselves in hand and become agents and curiosity, become investigators, become subjects in an ongoing process of quest for the revelation of the ‘why’ of things and facts” (p. 96). This questioning may lead to a struggle, despair, or a desire
to revert to something that is known. This questioning also could lead to hope and possibility. Simon (1992) explained:

Hope is the acknowledgement of more openness in a situation than the situation easily reveals…the hopeful person does not merely envisage this possibility as a wish; the hopeful person acts upon it now by loosening and refusing the hold that taken-for-granted realities and routines have over imagination (p. 3).

Both Simon and Freire asserted to sustain hope, students need a sense of agency that says we matter and we can do something about it.

Fishman and McCarthy (2005) also talked about agency and hope with regard to Dewey’s theory of democratic hope. Although Dewey and Freire are different in their perspectives of the world, Fishman (2007) explained Dewey and Freire “view being active in the world as people's primary need” and “share the belief that social action–intelligently wholehearted, critical action–is essential to living in hope” (p. 55). He compared and contrasted the two theorists and found common threads of hope. Fishman explained that both believe curriculum and instruction will not change in the dominant mainstream until educators "alter the educational practices" (p. 55). He asserted that both Dewey and Freire believed that people have the ability to transform themselves through social action and struggle for a just society. Both are grounded in hope as a "way of life" that encompasses "respectful dialogue with others, critical reflection, and cooperative action" (p. 56) and results in promoting democracy.
According to Fishman (2007) where Freire and Dewey diverge is the origin of hopelessness, whereas, the origins for Freire takes capitalism to task and speaks of the exploitation of workers that rewards competition, power, and dominance. Fishman believes Dewey’s origin’s are the “widespread failure to use our intelligence, to recognize that the habits and beliefs that helped us successfully meet the challenge of the late-eighteenth and nineteenth-century America are no longer appropriate for present-day conditions” (p. 72). In other words, our education is mismatched with what the purpose of school is for, what kind of subject matter needs to be taught and how, and how the school can promote social progress (Dewey, 1897).

Hooks (2003) offered another voice to the topic of hopelessness or despair when she says, “Despair is the greatest threat. When despair prevails we cannot create life-sustaining communities of resistance” (p. 12). She asserted building a community in a classroom needed to be at the forefront of educators’ pedagogical framework. Hooks provided a solution to Freire’s hopelessness as she noted when teaching that we need to recognize everyone’s value to add to the dialogue. This solution also plays a central role in critical hope. Hooks defined the pedagogy of hope as a philosophy of building an inclusive community that addresses power and privilege through action, dialogue, and self-awareness of both the teacher and learner.

In hooks (2003) dialogue with Ron Scapp, an American educator, she noted that in “promoting critical consciousness” (p. 107) that engagement is not just reacting to the external but rather we need to be self reflective and questioning our own actions. Hooks (1994) asserted that this means “teachers must be actively
committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students” (p. 15). If this is not possible, the engagement will become an unproductive dialogue. There is no hope in unproductive dialogues.

In an African context, Carolissen et al. (2011) explained hooks concept of pedagogy of hope in that it “highlights mechanisms that perpetuate systems of oppression and how to mobilize educators and students to build ‘just’ communities” (p. 158). They specifically explained the actions they took in their university that focused on teachers, learners, administration, and the university. In this project, they asked the participants to “critically examine their assumptions about their disciplines through engagement with ‘the other’ (p. 159) and discussed how, when they created this space, it allowed “risk-taking” and “became a potentially transformative space for students and educators where they could engage in dialogue about intensely political issues through their lived experiences” (p. 165). In this space, perhaps they created a dialogue that hooks (2003) explained as creating trust that highlights our common threads in the discourse.

Specia and Osman (2015) also found a common thread through the works of Freire, Dewey, and hooks with regard to the pedagogy of freedom and hope within a Kenyan context, which was

In that field of possibility, we have the opportunity to labour for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, openness of mind and heart that
allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries to transgress. (p. 199)

They focused on the implications these theorist have in the Kenyan classrooms, curriculum, and beyond. They compared and contrasted about the issues that hooks brings up and offers at times similar issues such as minority groups that do not have space to have a voice. They explained that her pedagogy of hope approach is a “hopeful one” that “learning is a place where paradise can be created” (p. 198). In this co-created space, the Kenyan teachers can struggle together as they build a just community.

Covered in this literature review were theoretical frameworks of hope from three disciplines: philosophy, psychology, and education. All three of these disciplines are relevant to the preferred theory, critical hope. It is a combination of the three disciplines. It draws from the affective and cognitive psychological aspects while creating spaces that support social action and social awakening. Critical hope is the pedagogical tool or practice of teaching that uses a critical theory lens to address unjust systems through meaningful dialogue and empathic responses. Critical hope theorists (Boler, 2014; Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Zembylas, 2014) contextualized hope in the classroom and offer ways that critical hope can manifest. Critical hope is born out of the pedagogy of hope and is grounded in the recognition of the “affective, political, intellectual and spiritual aspects” (Bozalek, Leibowitz, Carolissen, & Boler, 2014, p. 3).
Critical Hope

When it comes to the topic of hope, some authors say hope can be learned (Averill et al., 1990; Lopez, 2013; Snyder, 2009). Where the conversation ends, however, is on the question of how we learn hope and can we learn hope? Whereas some (Bloch, 1986; Freire, 1994) are convinced that hope is intrinsic—the innate hope—that develops in each soul, in each person when they arrive in this world; others (Bolar, 2014; Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Zembylas, 2014) maintained that, as teachers and learners, we can build critical hope through our actions, feelings and thoughts.

My perspective is that I have been involved or been a witness to all general concepts of hope from these three disciplines. Though I concede I am less inclined to quantify hope as authors such as (Snyder et al., 1991; Staats, 1987), I see the value in quantitative research in that it uncovers patterns, can generalize findings, and explain relationships between continuous dependent variables from two or more independent variables. For example, the Braun- Lewensohn and Sagy (2010) study that used Hope Index of Staats (1989) connected spirituality with the context of beliefs and values for certain populations in the Middle East. Another example would be Staats and Partlo, (1993) who made a generalized statement that specifically addresses American students perceptions of hope in times of threat. I am more inclined to lean toward the pedagogy of hope/critical hope because it is based on questioning power and privilege. Furthermore, critical hope functions as a step towards empathic responses and action that strengthens connectedness and solidarity.
Critical hope is a construct of pedagogy of hope and stems from critical theory in which there is a link between understanding of self and the self in relation to society. This theory is an examination of power dynamics through the context of history, and social and political influences. It asks who has the power and why? Giroux (1997) said, “There is a link between knowledge, power and domination” (p.43). Critical theory promotes social change through liberation, freedom, and addressing power dynamics. Critical hope is defined as the “relational encounters among people through which unpredictable possibilities of connectedness, solidarity and action are created” (Zembylas, 2014, p.14). Otherwise stated, in the terms of my work, critical hope is the practice of teaching that addresses unjust systems through meaningful dialogue and empathic responses.

The role of critical hope can play a central role in education because it acknowledges that there are systems that favor a dominant society at the expense of others (Boler, 2014). When we address these unjust systems through meaningful and reflective dialogue, often times decentering and disruption happens, and this is where critical hope can manifest and ultimately foster change and transformation in students, teachers, and communities. When we use critical hope as a pedagogical tool, pertinent questions are asked about whose voices are heard in describing the refugee and immigrant experience, and whose voices are absent. When majority populations tell the stories of others—the minority populations—the essence of those stories changes, and the resulting truths are often compromised in favor of the majority’s truths and worldviews (Solorzano & Yosso, 2009). Critical hope pushes
discourses and creates space for authentic and lived experiences of refugees that allow them to be seen, heard, recognized, and valued for who they are (UNHCR, 2014a).

Duncan-Andrade (2009) defined critical hope as “teaching in ways that connect the moral outrage of young people to actions that relieve the underserved suffering in their communities” (p. 182). He identified false hopes that are “reactionary distortion[s] of the radical premise of hope” (Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p. 2). False hopes can be more dangerous than despair. False hopes are based on the erroneous notion that if we are just optimistic and positive things will change. He uses the effects of the Obama Campaign and election throughout his article to illustrate how hope is used and misappropriated. Duncan-Andrade offered the three concepts of critical hope and how they are used in the classroom. They are: (a) material hope is seen as supporting the physical needs of a student (e.g., book bag, lunch, computer access, ride home, etc.); (b) socratic hope is the need to develop authentic relationships with students; (c) and audacious hope is the notion that we all carry some responsibility. He stated that most important thing is that teachers form “deep and caring relationships” (p. 191) with students. Last, he argued that we must acknowledge that “their [students] pain is our pain” (p. 190) and we, as educators, need to be willing to share the burden.

Hooks (1994) embodied Duncan-Andrade’s (2009) concept of critical hope when she stated, “She wanted me to bear witness, to hear again both the naming of her pain and the power that emerged when she felt the hurt go away” (p. 74). In
many ways, hooks exhibited Socratic hope, when she described an interaction with a woman from a diner. She explained their “lives and actions within an unjust society and to share the sensibility that pain may pave a path to justice” (p. 188). Hooks reinforced this notion of audacity of hope when she states, “I am grateful to the many women and men who dare to create theory from the location of pain and struggle . . . as a means to chart new theoretical journeys” (p. 74). Duncan-Andrade saw this pain and struggle as “humanizing hope in our collective capacity for healing” (p. 190).

When we engage and when we start questioning, we will be decentered and unsettled, and we might just do something.

When using critical pedagogy, educators as learners need to be mindful of the concept of the pedagogy of discomfort (Boler & Zembylas, 2003). It is defined as the engagement of “critical inquiry regarding the emotional investments that shape both educator’s and students’ attachments to particular worldviews” (Boler, 2014, p. 27). In other words, the framework adopts the position of analyzing the student’s beliefs and decenters their view of themselves, their community, and the world. The challenge of using this framework is “to work with the appropriate levels of comfort/discomfort, depth/intensity” (Boler, p. 43). Educators need to be cognizant of the cast of learners–their roles, especially in terms of their experiences and expertise—and how they take in knowledge, particularly knowledge that may disrupt their worldview. In this process, we do not want to lead our students to a false narrative of hope that ultimately leads to a path of despair.
In a South Africa higher education context, Bozalek, Carolissen, and Leibowitz (2014) collaborated with two universities, one that was historically advantaged and primarily white, while the other was an historically disadvantaged and primarily black institution. The study was to develop a course that explored ways to foster critical hope in order to transcend borders of “institutions, disciplines, and social identities” (p. 43). Critical hope is an “appropriate antidote and action-oriented response to conditions of inequality” (p. 40). There were a variety of participatory techniques that included the arts that fostered critical hope. They created a learning space that involved both the educator and student in a meaningful reflective dialogue about differences.

Bozalek, et al. (2014) described how they applied Bolar and Zembylas’s (2003) pedagogy of discomfort. By using the pedagogy of discomfort, educators need to be “reflexive and continually vigilant regarding their own preparedness to reconfigure or reconstruct their own frameworks” (Bolar & Zembylas, 2003, p.52). One of their concluding findings was that some students from the privileged university did not transform and remained “patronizing” and continued their “missionary attitude” (Bozalek, et al., 2014, p. 52).

Using a critical framework is a challenging task. Participants are asked to grapple with the prospects of their own unlearning and relearning. Theorists (such as Bloch, 1986; Freire, 1994; Fromm, 1968; hooks, 2003) have eloquently noted this is not easy and despair can emerge. However, hooks (2003) urged us to approach each other from a different place when she said, “Moving through fear, finding out what
connects us, reveling in our differences; this is the process that brings us closer, that gives us a world of shared values, of meaningful community” (p. 197). In many ways, hope educates us, and the action of critical hope—engagement, dialogue, and critical thinking—educates our hope in return. With this shared hope is also a shared education, a shared community that is based in hope, hope we can strive to be better.

My desire in the above part of the literature review is to give the reader some theoretical underpinnings of hope from three disciplines: philosophy, psychology, and education in order for us to move into the context in which I will be researching. The rest of the literature review will cover the role of psychosocial peace-building education programs and Higher education in protracted refugee context because exploring these concepts will create an argument that my research is indeed filling a gap.
Role of Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education: Theoretical Framework

In the psychology of hope section, Braun-Lewensohn, et al (2010) and Sagy, et al. (2006) found that their sample of youth in protracted conflict areas had their perceptions of hope decrease during times of threat. In both articles, they did note that the existence of social supports and a sense of control supported youth’s hopeful views. Braun-Lewensohn et al. (2010) asserted, “Hope is a potential factor which enables individuals to cope well and achieve well being when facing stressful events in general and during political violent events” (Landau 1998; Landau et al., 1998; Sami and Kraus, as cited in Braun-Lewensohn, et al, 1985, p. 302).

According to Bücklein (2007), the emphasis of children and youth psychosocial research has been fairly recent. In 2001, the World Health Organization took a public health approach to mental health that linked “biological, psychological and social factors in the development and progression of mental and behavioural disorders are the grounds for a message of hope for the millions who suffer from these disabling problems” (Murthy et al., 2001, p. 32). In this report, there was also call for “new forms of psychosocial interventions” (p. 61). Psychosocial is defined as the interrelation between social and psychological factors.

This part of the literature review is about the role of psychosocial peace-building education support particularly in children and youth protracted conflict settings due to the fact that there is limited research in adults in protracted conflict settings (de Jong, Knipscheer, Ford, & Kleber, 2014).

De Jong, et al.’s (2014) literature review highlighted 16 articles that focus on
psychosocial interventions, such as group therapy with adults in “ongoing man-made violence” (p. 504). The review of articles focused on clinical interventions, which this proposal will not focus on. No articles were found that focused on the role of psychosocial peace-building education courses with adults in protracted conflict settings. In the section below, I discuss the research on psychosocial support, in particularly the role of psychosocial peace-building education support.

**Psychosocial Support**

In recent discussions on education in conflict areas, one of the issues raised is how do we increase youth’s psychosocial well-being in and outside the classroom. Some (Carrion & Wong, 2012; Perry, 2007; Perry & Pollard, 1998) asserted we fail to take into consideration, the neurobiological and psychological views of youth in educational settings. Perry and Pollard (1998) argued that a continued protracted violence has implications for children’s adaptive responses to trauma and how that is played out in their learning, processing, and behavior in school. When youth experience traumatic events, their suffering is not only psychological, but also biological. This view needs to be understood and integrated in educational settings (Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992; Perry & Pollard, 1998)

In a United States context, Perry, Pollard, Blakley, Baker, and Vigilante (1995) discussed how children and young people are impacted and adapt neurologically and biologically to traumatic events. The age, nature of the trauma and gender seem to play a role of the adaptive responses and has “implications for
understanding a way a child is processing, learning, and reacting to a given situation” (p. 274). They discussed how the response patterns not only become “states” (often regressed) of adaptive responses but seen as “traits” in adolescence and adulthood. During adolescence, girls tend to internalize their response to trauma (e.g. depression, dissociation), whereas boys tend to externalize their response to trauma (e.g. conduct disorder, ADHD).

Other researchers (such as Loughry et al., 2006) in conflict areas are focusing on skill-building and psychosocial structured programs that aim “to establish normalcy, confidence, engagement and trust” (p. 1212). Psychosocial structured programs address a spectrum of experiences, rather than focusing on one factor. The program emphasized “the need to view these issues within the interpersonal contexts of wider family and community networks in which they are located (International Rescue Committee, et al., 2009, p. 9). These programs assist in restoring hope and dignity to affected people.

Loughry et al.’s (2006) study was about the impact of structured activities that supported resilience on youth in a conflicted region in the West Bank and Gaza. They measured the children twice and used four metrics, one in particular is the Hopefulness Scale: Youth Version. Loughry et al. argued that while the structured activities supported the psychological and emotional aspects of the child, they found that it didn’t really have an effect on hopefulness. However they found that they had two methodical contraints that might impact the numbers, which were that “given the similar level of exposure to conflict in these settings, comparison sites were not
devoid of humanitarian action of potential influence on children’s well-being” (p. 1216). They also pointed out “no data was collected on the intensity and quality of activities in which children engaged once enrolled” (p. 1217). In both cases, this could have had important consequences when a child rated her hopefulness.

Ager et al.’s (2011) study also showed how difficult it is to do research in protracted conflict contexts. Their study was also on psychosocial structured activities in schools in a protracted conflicted region in Africa. Ager et al. focused on eight schools and used a variety of techniques and methods to collect data, such as participatory focus groups, and pre and post assessments. Although at first the groups were randomly selected, they circled back and covered the ones that did not get the intervention. They explained, “There have been few studies of implementation of school-based psychosocial activities in conflict and post-conflict environments” (p. 1125). They asserted that it is difficult to conduct research in unstable areas and it is unethical to have a control group that receives little care when their need is so great. They also noted the lack of culturally appropriate psychometric measurement tools. To resolve these shortcomings, they used a technique called “free-listing” which is a process in which they developed local indicators for resilience and used their “wait-listed” groups for psychosocial structured activities to serve as a baseline.

Ager et al.’s (2011) study showed “that exposure to the psychosocial structured activities intervention had an additional benefit for children, which accelerated further the processes of recovery associated with broader social and
economic reconstruction” (p. 1131). Dryden-Peterson (2011) also connects this idea of linking education to the broader idea of supporting civil society.

Dryden-Peterson (2011) asserted that education plays a role in normalizing a child’s situation in an abnormal situation. She notes that education is a “protective in meeting cognitive and psychosocial needs, providing space for conveying survival messages, and developing skills for conflict resolution and peace-building” (p. 85). Dryden-Peterson’s study was a longitudinal ethnographic case study of the education experiences of refugees in Uganda. She drew from three stories that illuminated three central points: 1) Education supports future economic stability; 2) Education offers space to imagine a better life through “integration into a social economic, and political system” (p. 98); 3) Last, education strengthens connections to the past, present, and future hopes and goals.

Yohani’s (2010) study focused not on the children and youth affected but rather on psychosocial early intervention staff. Although the study was not in a protracted conflict, her study explored how the staff “view hope in refugee children, what they perceive as engendering hope, and what they see as the barriers to a child’s ability to be hopeful” (p. 865). Her conceptual framework was based on the work of Snyder (2000), a positive psychologist and hope theorist, as well as Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological systems theory. Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory explains how different environments in a child life, affects how a child grows and develops.
Yohani's (2010) methodology consisted of a case study, two 60 minute group interviews, two 60 semi-instructed interviews with two staff members that were absent from the group interviews, and a thematic analysis. She also used a member check that allowed participants to help the researcher clarify and validate the themes. The three themes that were identified: hope is like a seed, invisible seed, and visible seed (Yohani, 2010). The visible seed was when staff saw that the children who had refugee status saw themselves as engaged and successful in their environment. The invisible seeds were home, school, and community-based challenges that staff felt hindered hope.

Perhaps these seeds of Yohani's (2010) themes, could also be seen in Arafat and Musleh's (2006) study which focused on the aspirations of young people in Palestinian children. Their qualitative focus group study wanted to “learn what children have to say about their situations and to understand how they are dealing with the conflict that permeates their lives” (p. 113). They identified risk factors through the focus groups. They found that children were impacted by economic and social conditions that created instability, unemployment, and relocation. They also identified lack of feeling safe, psychological distress (witness or experience of trauma), physical injuries, as well as death.

Arafat and Musleh's (2006) focus groups identified as protective factors “positive and hopeful attitudes” (p.119), playing an active role and having access to education. Often school served to “ameliorate the sense of isolation that many children living in conflict situations experience due to breakdown of other systems in
their lives and the prolonged times of closure and curfew’ (p.122). In other words, when everything surrounding a child appears to be falling apart, school can be a stable, consistent, and valuable pathway to support a child in a protracted conflict area.

Arafat and Musleh (2006) noted that “psychosocial recovery” happened through “positive social interactions with caring adults and to facilitate participation in activities that encourage them to express themselves and to act as ‘helpers’ within society” (p. 128). This concept of ‘helpers’ could also be what Freire (1994) referred to people recognizing their own agency and opportunity to question the status quo. These children are finding ways that they can make sense of the world around them, as well as, being an agent of change. As noted above, psychosocial support activities are broad, but some researchers focused specifically on peace-building activities that create ways for youth to have emotional and physical stability.

**Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education**

Psychosocial educational peacebuilding activities are defined as activities that provide space to strengthen the relationship between social, psychological, and educational spheres in order to contribute to the political, economic, and social transformations in post-conflict society. According to the UN (2003) report, youth can “play an important role in peace-building and conflict prevention”(p. 381). Some researchers (Bartlett, 2008; Danesh, 2006) emphasize the importance of developing these programs in schools because “schools are at least partially charged with the task of communicating and transferring societal norms and expectations, they are naturally
important breeding grounds for both war and peace” (p. 3). Education could be a platform for societal change and stability (The World Bank, 2005).

Bartlett's (2008) peace education pedagogy connected Paulo Freire’s work by using his “concept of conscientization [that] provides the foundation of peace education’s hope for a link between education and social transformation” (p. 5).

Education is never neutral because it asserts and mandates a position, value, and authority (Barlett, 2008). Otherwise stated according to the World Bank (2005), “Schools are almost complicit in the conflict. They reproduce the skills, values, attitudes, and social relationship of dominant groups in society; accordingly, they are usually a contributory factor in conflict” (p. xv). However, Bartlett posits the desire to use peace education pedagogy is to surface the “critical consciousness [that] ultimately requires questioning the status quo rather than taking it as given (p. 2). To put it differently Giroux, (2010) explained:

It [education] is always directive in its attempt to teach students to inhabit a particular mode of agency; enable them to understand the larger world and one's role in it in a specific way; define their relationship, if not responsibility, to diverse others and to presuppose through what is taught and experienced in the classroom some sort of understanding of a more just, imaginative, and democratic life. (p. 11)

Bartlett also advocates for the link between education and a just society that not only transforms the student, but also the teacher, the community, and society as a whole.
In contrast or perhaps a discordant harmony, Howlett (2008) offered a perspective from John Dewey that connects his interest in peace education as defined by a “curious mixture of moralistic beliefs, democratic values, and nonreligious ethics” (p. 1). Not unlike Freire’s position of understanding that a student has a place, a voice in the classroom, and the ability to use that voice to change their lives, Howlett asserts that Dewey also understands this dynamic transformation, too, when she said:

Given proper direction, schools could become dynamic instead of reflexive agencies; as instruments of reform schools could search out and reinforce concrete patterns to remake society in the name of peace while at the same time enabling each student to realize his or her potential for building a nonviolent world. (p. 2)

Howlett explained that Dewey’s central idea is that we need to support critical thinking and sees “war as an institution [which] thrives because no one is taught to question contemporary values and beliefs” (p. 3). We must question this. Both Dewey and Freire (albeit in very different directions and positions) believed fostering critical thinking offsets the habits, positions, and values that got us into the conflict itself.

Next, I move from theory to practice on how psychosocial services are linked to peace building. Lambourne and Gitau’s (2013) case study exemplified this link in Rwanda. Data were collected through “interviews, observed local community justice gacaca hearings, visited memorial centres and participated in conferences and other
events in Rwanda in 2005, 2010 and 2012” (p. 24, emphasis in original). They believed that psychosocial services should be an “integral part of a holistic approach to peacebuilding” because they contend it strengthens “national capacities for dealing with conflict and building sustainable peace” (p.24). Moreover, they explained that the psychosocial activities strengthen individual and collective resiliency.

Lambourne and Gitau (2013) asserted that peacebuilding must have the commitment to establish the “security, legal, political, economic, structural, cultural and psychosocial conditions necessary to promote a culture of peace in place of a culture of violence” (p. 26). Put simply: when and if violence ceases, if there is not commitment to change the conditions that are unjust, then are we really changing the system that oppresses the narratives in the first place? In an interview John Paul Lederach (2012), a Professor of International Peacebuilding, echoes this sentiment, “The field [peace and conflict resolution] that I am in is better at ending violence than it has been at building justice” (36:35-36:41).

Lambourne and Gitau (2013) also found that gacaca hearings were supportive in that they offered “stories of survivors who have forgiven and reconciled with perpetrators” (p. 29). However, they found that ongoing psychosocial support is needed to readdress the potential retraumatization from hearing those stories. They concluded that psychosocial interventions combined with “individual healing with relationship-building in local communities could provide an important avenue for developing the social trust, resilience and cohesion necessary for sustainable peace and development in Rwanda” (p. 29).
Hamber and Gallagher (2014) also advocated for a holistic approach that offers an expansive appreciation of the “complex interplay between marginalisation, poverty, conflict legacy issues, self destructive behaviour, mental health problems and low aspiration” (p. 56). Their study focused on the need for psychosocial support for adults in a peace-building process in a protracted conflict. Hamber and Gallagher used psychosocial support to mean “generic support groups” (p. 47) whereas, most researchers are more specific (this author included) in what psychosocial means.

Hamber and Gallagher (2014) found the transition from conflict to peace has been challenging, especially for young people in Northern Ireland. Their study focused on young men in particular. They found that in this transition to violence being “externalised and socially accepted” (p. 45) to not being accepted or tolerated, men in particular, tended to internalize the violence and sought negative coping mechanisms such as drug and alcohol abuse, suicidal ideation, and so on. The psychosocial support, in the form of victim/survivor support groups, brought an opportunity for individual transformation. Hamber and Gallagher noted:

Participants saw developing self-esteem, confidence and interpersonal skills, as well as attitudinal change about ‘the other’, as vital to being emotionally healthy. This was, participants argued, the first step needed in order to be equipped to engage in peacebuilding activities. (p. 53)

The concept of recognizing ‘the other’ is also intertwined in Zembylas and Bekerman’s (2012) peace building work and Zembylas’s concept of critical hope. In an interview, I asked Dr. Zembylas how he put critical hope in practice. He said:
It is a long-term and often painful process. One has to be open and find the pedagogical tools, appropriate tools that will bring recognition to one’s own and the other side’s feelings. We need the recognition that the other side is in pain, too. We need the recognition that all sides, all point of views need to be heard. ‘I know how you feel because my family has suffered, too.’ There needs to be an empathetic response. When this recognition happens, hope, critical hope, is grounded in the situation, contextualized, and empathized.

(M. Zembylas, personal communication, March 2, 2016)

To illustrate this concept of an empathic response, Zembylas and Bekerman (2008) did a longitudinal ethnographic study of people who have experienced traumatic histories and memories in Cyprus and Israel. Zembylas and Bekerman asserted that while collective memories could offer a sense of solidarity, however they often marginalize others while creating a mentality of us vs. them. They described two stories that support a concept called pedagogy of dangerous memories. This concept is the practice of disrupting individuals and collective memories of the status quo and offering alternative ways of understanding collective memories, thus opening spaces of hope and new solidarity. The alternative ways emphasized empathy, bearing witness, and anamnestic solidarity. Anamnestic is a process in which collective memories are interrogated and self-reflected on.

Zembylas and Bekerman's (2008) work addressed how history is written, interpreted, and remembered. From their perspective, “the debate is not just about whether children should be taught to remember the past, but also about how the past
is interpreted” (p.126, emphasis in original). They implied in education, as teachers and learners, we need to lead with hope and empathy. In other words, we need to have the understanding and witnessing that the other is suffering, too, so that a classroom can be a “potential place of political transformation and anamnestic solidarity” (p. 148).

To conclude the emerging research with regard to psychosocial programs, most academic research is on children and youth in conflict areas, however there is limited research that studies researching alongside children and youth. These studies speak with and not for them (Bengtsson & Bartlett, 2011). Because if one of the most important elements of psychosocial support is to offer space for children and youth to voice their concerns (Arnston & Knudsen, 2004), there would be value to highlight the youth voices, also. Obura (2003) is among s few who chose to interview children because she wanted to “hear the voices of the children and to get a flavour of their perceptions and experiences” (p.151).

Psychosocial support is important in conflict areas because it establishes “an atmosphere of normality that builds on children’s resilience and assists them in dealing with psychological trauma” (The World Bank, 2005, p. 59). While children and youth benefit from psychosocial peace-building education programs, teachers can benefit, too. When teachers receive training to help students, this often helps them heal from their own traumas as well. Society as a whole also benefits when people are able to heal, survive traumas, and then thrive.
As noted above, psychosocial peacebuilding education has been focused on children and youth (Arnston & Knudsen, 2004; The World Bank, 2005; United Nations, 2003). Besides limited research in higher education in protracted refugee context, there seems even more limited research with regard to psychosocial peacebuilding education in higher education in protracted refugee context setting (The World Bank representative, personal communication, 2 August 2016).
Role of Higher Education In Protracted Refugee Context: Theoretical Framework

This section of the literature review touches on the interwoven layers of higher education in protracted refugee context, conflict areas, and/or violent areas when it comes to limited research. The literature review shows gaps that have implications beyond my research.

Higher education in protracted refugee context research, policies, and programs are limited and yet there are attempts to create access to higher education of young people who are refugees (Global Education Monitoring Report [GEM Report], 2016; Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins JWL:HEM, 2015; UNESCO, 2002). However, few address directly how higher education impacts young peoples’ hopeful view and psychosocial well-being in and outside the classroom (Ager et al., 2011; The World Bank, 2005).

The field of higher education in protracted refugee context is receiving increased attention, within policy UNESCO (2015) in media (Buchanan, Grillo, & Threadgold, 2003; Esses et al., 2013; Haynes et al., 2004; Kolowich, 2014; Philo et al., 2013), in the academic field (Emergency Academic Support: Global Platform for Syrian Students, 2016; Johnson, 2013; Kosha et al., 2014; Safi, Nadir Sahak, & Noormal, 2014), and from policymakers and practitioners. Pacheco and Johnson (2014) posited “Research consistently shows that increased investment in education drives down the potential for conflict; when refugees are repatriated, they take with them the knowledge and skills to rebuild a more peaceful society” (para. 25).
Johnson's (2013) qualitative study focused the contributions of what the university faculty and administrations supported to nurture peace building in a volatile situation. Her study was on how Kenyan faculty and administrators described their contributions to development after Kenya’s 2007 elections examined through a conflict transformation lens. Her focus was not necessarily on peace education, but rather on the “indirect practices that may foster peace, and subsequently, development” (p. 330). Her findings were that universities adapted to the conflict and created an “infrastructure for peace” via “counseling, training in conflict resolution, and charity projects for affected students and staff, along with building competence in mediation, changing perceptions, and capitalizing on human resource capacity” (p. 335).

Another finding Johnson (2013) saw was that collaboration within the various levels of the university played a significant role, as well as this idea of solidarity and “togetherness produced by the conflict” (p. 339). This concept of “togetherness” changed the people within the university and showed them that they played a vital role in society (Johnson, 2013).

Johnson’s (2013) conclusion was that “peacebuilding, as a function of education, must be more than just a reaction to conflict; it must be infused throughout the educational systems in fragile states” (p. 342). When we provide spaces that offer opportunities for the university to “play a role in peacebuilding and funding university activities to reduce conflict may contribute to sustainable solutions to
violence in East Africa and resound across the sub-Saharan region” (p. 342). Her research was specific to Kenya and yet it could have a rippling effect.

The World Bank is creating rippling effects in research. Their innovative research is providing space, time, funding, and capacity building within countries. This means that instead of external researchers coming in doing the research and often dictating the parameters of the research, the World Bank is recruiting researchers within their own countries to do the research. They are doing the research while being supported through the Resilience in Education Setting–Research training module (Kosha et al., 2014).

Reyes (2014), a senior institutional development specialist, asserted that content and curriculum must be “locally relevant and culturally grounded with appropriate activities” (p. 36). This means that curriculum is culturally responsive in that it affirms the cultural knowledge and experiences of students. Reyes’s work is strength-based and focused on building resilience through “innovative processes such as peer-to-peer learning, experiential programs (community projects)” that have minimal risk to students while “protecting and using assets, and contributing to learning and skills relevant in difficult contexts” (p. 36). In other words, the systems and structures within the education institution need to reflect this position, that is, being culturally relevant and contextualized.

Under the World Bank's (2016) Education Resilience Approaches program which Reyes developed, provides a “broad framework to guide relevant FCV [Fragility, Conflict, and Violence] assessments” (p. 6). Along with Education
Resilience Approaches program that mandates supporting the most vulnerable, the Education Resilience Approaches program focuses on long-term process for the intervention and prevention of violence. The Systems Approach for Better Education Results Education Resilience Approaches (SABER) specifically fosters “education resilience in fragile, conflict and violence-affected situations” (The World Bank: SABER, 2016, para. 1). Instead of just quantitative research for which the World Bank is known, the SABER- Education Resilience Approaches focused on case studies and mixed method approaches. Two research papers that are highlighted in this literature review is Kosha et al. (2014) and Safi, Nadir Sahak, and Noormal (2014) studies.

Kosha et al.’s (2014) study was a qualitative study that identified challenges and strengths that existed in Afgan women when entering and completing a higher education degree. The collected data consisted of focus groups and interviews. Their sampling consisted of female highschool students, univeristy students, and faculty. They focused on a number of factors which were based on cultural, economic, family, security, and social challenges. Each factor appeared to play a pivotal role in supporting Afghan women’s move towards higher education.

They found that “education is valued in the family, but career is dictated by gender” (Kosha et al., 2014, p. 13). This was emphasized by one story in the research, where Kosha et al. (2014) said that a participant said, “However, my mom told him [father], “Let her choose her own interest and attend the faculty that interests her. My father said, “No, she is a girl, she can’t decide and think about her future” (p.
13. The father wanted her to become a teacher like her mother. The participant eventually became a teacher at the university level. Along with cultural, economic, and family factors, Kosha et al. also found facilities needed to be safe and secure for retention and graduation to occur.

Safi, Nadir Sahak, and Noormal’s (2014) study was a mixed methods study that consisted of interviews and survey that “sought to understand the reasons why female doctors want[ed] to enroll in postgraduate residency programs and the factors that support, influence or hinder their enrollment” through a “resilience framework applied at the individual, social and institutional levels” (p.16). The quantitative data analysis was not present in this report, however the qualitative data was seen in the risks and assets. Similar to Kosha et al. (2014) study, Safi, et al. found challenges and strengths within the cultural, economic, family, security, and social spheres. They found that individuals who had the ability to make their own career decisions, had strong family support, and better institutional systems (e.g. access to education for girls, facilities that are secure and safe, female trainers, etc.) influenced and strengthened the retention and graduation of postgraduate residency programs (Safi et al., 2014).

As I explained earlier, the research in the field of higher education in protracted refugee context is limited overall, as well as being limited from a Global South perspective. Too often “youth from the Global South see themselves talked about in academic research, but never producers of the research” (Martin, et al., in press). Abu-Ghazaleh, Christman, and Ferrari (2013) explained in order to have a
transformative education model, an empowerment paradigm must be applied
“wherein partners at many levels are encouraged to contribute solutions to shared
problems on their own terms” (p. 10). In other words, higher education in protracted
refugee context can be a vehicle in that refugees can be producers of that knowledge.
Review of the Methodological Literature

My research was a pragmatic mixed methods design that used both a quantitative and a qualitative approach. In light of the situation of doing research with participants in a refugee camp, I chose a pragmatic research design because I needed to change my approach at a moments notice because things were not entirely certain. I also wanted to be culturally responsive and adaptive to the needs of the students I was working with. My research consisted of a pragmatic mixed methods research–intervention process model (Morgan, 2014a; Nastasi et al., 2007) that used a community-based action research approach (Openjuru et al., 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001)

In this section, I review mixed methods. The mixed methods are divided into three sections. One section, I focus on qualitative approaches, specifically focusing on thematic analysis, action research, community-based action, along with the rationale of using a qualitative approach. In the next section, I focus on quantitative approaches and describe, specifically the usefulness of the Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey instrument, convenience sampling, and rationale for using a quantitative approach. Last, I hope to inform the reader about relevant methods that build support to my preferred method– using mixed methods.

Qualitative Methods

Qualitative research is a term that employs a variety of approaches and methods to explore and understand human experiences (Saldaña, 2015; Strauss &
Corbin, 1998). Qualitative data is collected through non-quantitative methods. Otherwise stated, Glesne (2016) explained that qualitative research is

A type of research that focuses on qualities, such as words or observations, that are difficult to quantify and that lend themselves to interpretation or deconstruction. Various approaches or methodologies are included under this rubric that tend to reply on participant observation and in-depth interviewing as research methods. (p. 299)

Qualitative research is often used to provide a depth of understanding and how people make sense of the world. The way the data are interpreted offers rich, thick description (Geertz, 1973), and a space for reflection, “where the role and perspective of the researcher in the research process is acknowledged (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 4). Stake (1995) noted that a “…qualitative case researcher tries to preserve the multiple realities, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening” (p. 12). One qualitative approach that is established is thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2014).

**Thematic analysis.** In my research, I used a thematic analysis approach. A thematic analysis approach is defined as a “method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2008, p. 7). Otherwise stated, thematic analysis is a way to organize, identify patterns, and code your collected data by sorting them into categories from generality to specificity (Glesne, 2016; Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Saldaña, 2015). Braun and Clarke (2008) argued, “thematic analysis should be considered a method in its own right” (p. 4).
According to Glesne (2016) using a thematic analysis “is not about stipulating the norm” rather it is about “help[ing] reveal underlying complexities…to explain where and the people differ from a general pattern” (p. 184). This is important because often research focuses on the norms and/or creating specific norms that dictate, demand conformity, and silence divergent voices. Researchers need to keep in mind what Cameron (2014) explained that we need to be cognizant of Foucault’s concept of ‘power/knowledge.’ She said, “…social control is exercised…by the activities of ‘experts’ who are licensed to define, describe, and classify things and people” (p. 16). Keeping this in mind, a community-based action approach may support this concept of understanding whose knowledge is valued and why it is valued. Before I explain community-based action research, action research needs to be understood.

**Action research.** Action research has diversity, depth, and reach in a variety of fields of study (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003). Reason and Bradbury (2001) defined action research as

A participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview, which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities. (p. 2)
Action research is used on a practical level and based in generating new forms of understanding that lead to some action. Reason and Bradbury (2001) noted that action research is based in reflection and understanding, and that without action, the research could be seen as empty and meaningless.

Action researchers recognize that research can be a place that determines how a group of people are seen and valued. Action research is a tool that allows the researcher, along with participants, to understand “social systems or organizational learning that would lead to social action and change in the status quo” (Ivankova, 2015, p. 28). Lewin (1946) explained that we should consider “action, research and training as a triangle” that strives to find solutions collaboratively and acknowledges that we must understand the positions we come from and could go (p. 42). When we understand our positions and others, we are in a sense what Zembylas and Bekerman (2012) noted as offering action through empathic responses.

Critical hope is very similar to this notion of action; if there is no action with hope, it is a false hope that just increases despair. Darder (2015) said, “Educators, activist, scholars, and leaders committed to the struggle for our humanity, Freire firmly believed that your connection and contact with the world is essential to a political change” (p. 94). In this same vein, community-based action research values the community’s knowledge and supports possibilities for social change that is community driven.

**Community-based action research.** A community-based action research approach (Glesne, 2016; Ivankova, 2015; Senge & Scharmer, 2001) is an approach
that offers a collaborative way for this researcher to work alongside potential non-researcher based community members in the hopes of co-creating spaces of critical hope, social action and positive change through the use of multiple knowledge sources and research methods. In other words, in community-based action research (Glesne, 2016; Senge & Scharmer, 2001) approach, that is, where the community identifies the problem, the research is designed around that problem, and the community uses the research to decide and inform themselves on the steps to take to resolve the problem.

There are limitations to using community-based action research in that the researcher must recognize that they may have a different position and may find them in a place of self-other (Fine, 1994; Humphrey, 2007). Self-other is defined as “both separate[ing] and merg[ing] identities with out inventions of Others” (Fine, 1994, p. 70). Along with self-other, there needs to be consideration of what sort of action, who is promoting the action, where the action is coming from, and how that action will impact the community (Brydon-Miller et al., 2003; Fine, 1994). I return to this concept of self-other in my role of the researcher section.

**Rationale for qualitative methods.** My rationale for using quantitative research is because I am interested in exploring the change in perception of hope in depth and not necessarily to test a theory or hypothesis. I am also interested in getting multiple perspectives that may challenge the framework I am considering. The strongest argument for using a qualitative methodology is that I was able to
engage with the community in a manner of building skills, understanding the challenges, and benefits of having a hopeful view.

Qualitative research also has a lot of flexibility in that hope is a particularly complex concept and unexpected variables may arise. As noted, both a quantitative and qualitative approach is valued in my research proposal. Due to the constraints and limited ability to run a multiple linear regression model to examine the residual effects, I could not identify participants in the way I proposed. I used a self-selection approach based on who was available for the interviews. When participants were identified, I did three semi-structured interviews with each one (pre, post, and follow-up three months later) and used a thematic analysis to compliment the statistical descriptions. By doing this, I hoped that I would offer depth to a complex concept called hope in a conflict or emergency setting.

**Quantitative Methods**

Quantitative research is a method to describe a phenomenon or event by collecting numerical data that are analyzed through statistical, mathematical, or computer-based methods (Aliaga & Gunderson, 2003). Otherwise stated by Muijs (2010), quantitative research is “collecting numerical data to explain a particular phenomenon, particular questions seem immediately suited to being answered using quantitative methods” (p. 2). Quantitative research is often used to generalize findings to a population and can forecast “behavioral tendencies over extended intervals” (Hunter & Schmidt, Grove & Meehl, *cited in Lubinski*, 1996, p. 188). I use an instrument that uses a self-report survey.
Self-report. A self-report survey is a survey that a person fills out without the assistance of the researcher. The limitations of self-survey support are that they are relying on the honesty of the participant and may offer inaccurate reporting that is compromised by “recall bias, social desirability bias, and errors in self observation” (Nunes et al., 2009, p. 180). According to Nunes et al. (2009), quantitative self-report measurements offer a nominal, simple, quick method way of collecting data, as well as, understanding social, situational and behavioral factors.

I will use the Hope Index of Staats (1989) which is a self-report survey. Staats and Stassen's (1985) index stemmed from Bradburn's (1969) Scale of Psychological Well-Being (a.k.a. Affective Balance Scale, ABS). Bradburn's ABS measurement analyzed “self-expressed mood states” where the participants indicated which five positive and five negative mood states were applicable at a given point of time (Schuur & Kruijtbosch, 1995, p.49). Baker, Cesa, Gatz, and Mellins (1992) explained that Bradburn’s ABS was “primarily situational etiology for positive affect and a primarily dispositional etiology for negative affect” (p. 159). Schiaffino (2003) argued Bradburn’s emphasis on the independence of the 2 factors, that is, positive affect and negative affect, which “makes the use of a difference score to obtain an indication of “Affect Balance” conceptually problematic” (p. S166). Moreover, Staats and Stassen saw challenges in using Bradburn’s ABS due to the fact that they felt that in his model the “positive and negative affect are probably not as independent as Bradburn (1969) maintained” (p. 240).
Others (McDowell & Praught, 1982; Ryff, 1989) have also been critical of Bradburn ABS. McDowell and Praught (1982) echo Staats’s (1989) criticism when they assert, “the notion of independence between positive and negative affect does not hold for all of the questions” (p. 949). In light of this criticism, Staats developed her own modification of the Bradburn ABS, known as the Expected Balance Scale (EBS).

Staats's (1989) EBS used a “5-point response mode for nine positive and nine negative items” (p. 367). The questions in the EBS forced participants to think in the future and measures “expected positive feelings and expected happiness” (p. 367). Because the EBS focused on the feelings rather than the cognitive aspect of hope, Staats developed the Hope Index of Staats so that both are captured, the affective and cognitive. The Hope Index of Staats defined hope as “the interaction between wishes and expectations (Staats & Stassen, 1986, cited in Staats, 1989) and is theoretically based on the self-other-world depressive triad (Beck, 1967, cited in Staats, 1989)” (p. 367).

Using Beck’s (1967) theory of cognitive of depression, Beck, et al (1974) believed that “underlying assumption is that hopelessness can be readily objectified by defining it as a system of cognitive schemas whose common denomination is negative expectations about the future” (p. 864), thus, creating a sense of hopelessness that result in depression. Beck asserted that there was a cognitive triad consisting of three forms of negative thoughts about the self, the world, and the future.
Convenience sampling. To distribute this survey, I used a non-probability sampling, particularly, convenience, and self-selecting sampling. Due to the practical aspects and programming, my partners suggested that I recruit participants from their cohorts. Recruiting from a cohort that already exists is convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is defined as recruiting “participants that are easiest to obtain” for your sample (Symon & Cassell, 2012, p. 43). There are some advantages and disadvantages in doing this kind of sampling. Kivunja (2015) explained that there are “clear advantages of this sampling procedure included the availability of participants, the ease with which participation could be observed and monitored, and the quickness with which the data could be gathered for analysis” (p. 8). However, there is more of a “higher probability of bias and skewed results” when using a convenience sampling (Doyle, 2011, para 9).

For the intervention, a self-selection of sampling was used. A self-selection sampling is defined when participants “identify their desire to take part in the research” (Symon & Cassell, 2012, p. 43). Participants volunteered to participate in the course. Then if they went through the course, they could volunteer to implement it in their community. Last, they could choose to be a participant-researcher. I talk more specifically about how I used the convenience and self-selection sampling approach in my recruitment section of the methods section.

Rationale for quantitative methods. My rationale for using quantitative research is I am interested in exploring how the perception of hope changes in a span
and breadth. Although I am not necessarily testing a hypothesis or theory, I do want to understand where and how hope is changed throughout a period of time.

The participants in my research were not randomly assigned. They chose to take the course (intervention). Due to the constraints and limited number of participants (I will go in depth in the participant section) in my proposal, I proposed using a multiple linear regression statistical model. This model had a predictive continuous outcome based (e.g. hope) on two continuous predictor variables (e.g. pre/post surveys). However, I did not have enough participants who went through all three continuous predictor variables (e.g. pre/post surveys, follow-up) to run a multiple linear regression model. In my results section, the reader will see that I used descriptive statistics and also ran a couple of ANOVA models that showed little to no statistical significance. An ANOVA model predicts a continuous outcome based on one or more categorical predictor variables.

While a quantitative approach has its strengths, the limitation of this study is that it may paint a simplistic picture and may not offer holistic approach that takes in account different factors that may influence their perceptions of hope such as, the experiences of the participants, their context, and their own voice. In a quantitative approach, we are often missing the stories behind the statistics. Each individual has a story that is equally powerful as the composition of numbers. For this reason, I applied a mix method approach to my research.
Mixed Methods

According to Mertens and Hesse-Biber (2013), mixed methods “employs designs that use both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques to answer a particular question or set of questions in evaluations” (p. 6). Other authors such as Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007) summarized, conceptualized, and defined mixed methods as:

Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration. (p. 123)

In other words, mixed methods is using both quantitative and qualitative approaches that are linked to questions that need to be answered and the specific methods that will answer those particular questions (Fishman & McCarthy, 2005). This does not mean that methods are just grabbed out of thin air but rather specifically “linking your purposes (in terms of your research questions) and your procedures (in terms of your research methods) at every step” (emphasis in original, Morgan, 2014a, p. 4).

Morgan asserted that Guba and Lincoln (2005) based their understanding on finding out the truth and knowledge, whereas Morgan believes that social sciences are more about understanding the human experience with warranted actions (D. Morgan, personal communication, 25 November 2015). When using a pragmatic paradigm, the emphasis is the “outcomes of action[s]” (Morgan, 2014a, p. 27-28). The pragmatic
paradigm is based on Dewey's (1910) concept of inquiry. Reality is experienced. From those experiences, we learn, share, and interpret our own realities.

Morgan (2014b) explained a couple of issues, among many by employing a mixed methods approach. One issue is that using a mixed method approach is that, one method could be favored more than the other. A Priority-Sequence approach could reconcile these issues by integrating the “complementary strengths of different methods through a division of labor” (Morgan, 1998, p. 366). Thus, the hope is that using these methods in a sequence, they could actually be the "convergence or confirmation when referring to the goal of seeking cross-validation between methods (emphasis in original, p. 365). Nastasi et al. (2007) work emulates this concept of cross-validation.

**Mixed methods recursive research–intervention process model.** Nastasi et al. (2007) used a mixed methods recursive research–intervention process model that uses quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches (Qual → Quant → Qual →Quant). The Nastasi et al. (2007) study was done as a multi-year research and development project focusing on promoting psychological well being of children in Sri Lanka. They applied a pragmatic approach that uses a qualitative research approach to develop and construct a theoretical model with multiple interventions. Then they use quantitative research approaches to attempt to test their theories and validate their interventions.

Nastasi et al.'s (2007) approach had four phases. The first phase was a formative/basic research that allowed them to learn from the culture and identify
possible partnerships. This phase consisted of focus groups, individual interviews, archival data, etc. They also sought out existing theory and conducted an ethnographic study to build a culture-specific model (Nastasi et al., 2007). The second phase developed a culture-specific psychological instrument that matched what they learned from the formative research. The third phase applied what was learned from the first and second phase and applied it to program development. This phase helped them understand how to implement, assess, and evaluate the program/intervention. The fourth phase repeated the three phases, but in a different context. Thus, the researcher builds on lessons learned and formulates a broader translation of the model in other regions or contexts.

**Summary of Research Literature and Application to the Study**

To conclude the literature review, I revisit the tangled ball of yarn story and metaphor. Educators and students who begin the journey of disrupting their worldviews are like the tangled yarn. Sometimes the yarn is easy to unwind for a few turns. As we go deeper and look more critically, the clump of knots grow. We are at an impasse. Tightly, we hold onto our beliefs. We ask each other how can we be complicit? The entanglement becomes tighter. We want to give up. We loosen a knot. And another one. We work together. We witness. As the next knot comes into focus, we are ready. If it is not hope that patiently waits and untangles us, knot by knot, then what is it?

The reality is that any of us could be a person in a protracted conflict area. In fact, many of us are. We need to move beyond *just* talking and being critical of the
situation of refugees (migrants, by association), and offer spaces of hope that have empathic action that will make a difference in the lives of young people. For, if we have “no action with hope, social justice cannot exist” (Burbach et al., 2016, p. 181).

This literature review was in four sections. The first was to outline a theoretical framework of hope from three disciplines: philosophy (Bloch, 1986; Fromm, 1968; Heisod, 1914), psychology (Averill et al., 1990; Lopez, 2013; Snyder, 2002; Staats, 1989), and education, pedagogy of hope (Dewey, 1910; Fishman & McCarthy, 2007; Freire, 1994; hooks, 2003) and critical hope (Boler, 2014; Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Zembylas, 2014). These three were chosen because they articulate my theoretical assumptions and will inform my methodology and research design, as well as reflect my personal beliefs and understanding of the concept of hope. I hope that I have awakened the reader to relevant theories to build support for my preferred theory, critical hope.

The second part was to explore the role of psychosocial research and specifically, peace building research. In the literature review, I also attempt to build a case of why there is a need for psychosocial supports that support young people’s hopeful views and sense of control.

In the third part, I explored the layers of higher education in protracted refugee context with regard to the limited research. My hope is that I provided a strong case for higher education for refugees in protracted context as the increase of displacement continues and the more students who have finished secondary school continue to rise.
The last section explores the methodological literature. This section highlights the preferred method, that is, mixed methods, as well as community-based action approach.

Hope is an inherently complex concept. As a researcher, I am interested in exploring the perceptions of hope in higher education in protracted refugee context. Through evaluating the course, my hope is to learn and understand how the pedagogy of hope/critical hope can be nurtured in classrooms. This study builds on existing narratives and counternarratives in order to deepen both participants’ and researchers’ understanding of the expertise of refugee lived experience of hope. In the next chapter, I will explain in my methodology how I explored how refugee students’ (18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context.
Chapter 3: Methods

“I remembered that I needed to be with you today” – Kakuma Refugee Participant

Sitting on child size plastic green chairs, Lubabalo⁵, Sphilile⁶, and I were getting ready to do some artwork. The two preschoolers were best friends and participating in a program for families who were homeless in downtown Johannesburg, South Africa. Sphilile announced he had 20 brothers and 20 sisters. Lubabalo laughed. As we started the art project, Lubabalo fell behind. Sphilile looked at me and said, “Wait for Lubabalo.” We waited for him to catch up and Lubabalo smiled, saying “Together!”

I open with this story because these two preschoolers taught me about patience and gently nudged me to see the bigger picture of what we were doing. For me, quality research is not about the speed in which I collect data, although limitations may cause me to do so with a bit of speed. Rather it is based in doing no harm and doing justice to the population that I am serving and advocating for. Quality research is often seen as an individual endeavor, however when deconstructed in order to do research, it is a collaborative effort (e.g. participants, colleagues, communities, etc.) that involves various actors and partners (Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenyatta University, and Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins), as well as participants that I am working alongside. This section is three-fold. In the first section, I review the purpose of the study, research design, questions, etc.

⁵ Pseudonym
⁶ Pseudonym
and context where the participants are from. Then, I discuss the procedures, instruments, data collection, and data analyses. I discuss my role as a researcher. Last, I discuss the limitations and benefits of my study. I reiterate my problem and the purpose of my study below and then move into my methodological approach.

An unprecedented number of people worldwide are being forcibly displaced. The UNHCR (2017a) estimates that out of the 65.6 million who are displaced, 22.5 million are refugees. Too often in conflict areas, governments often neglect to protect, educate, and provide the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. Children and youth (under 18) are often prioritized and focused on at every humanitarian level. The problem of practice is that youth (18-35) who are refugees often have limited spaces of hope and limited access to higher education in protracted and conflict contexts. Higher education in protracted refugee context is emerging, but yet exists in very few places. Considering the inaccessibility of higher education in protracted refugee context and the increase in youth who are displaced, there is a great demand for education (UNHCR, 2014a). This is a demand of education that goes beyond the primary and secondary levels. This proposal responds to that demand. The purpose of this research study is to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course, in a higher education in protracted refugee context setting. Moving to context, in the next section, I describe the context that the participants are coming from.
Research Methods: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Nairobi, Kenya

My research proposal consisted of a pragmatic mixed methods research–intervention process model (Morgan, 2014a; Nastasi et al., 2007) that used a community-based action research approach (Glesne, 2016; Openjuru et al., 2015).

The first quantitative phase used Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey (pre-survey) that assessed the cognitive-affective nature of the perception of hope in students at Kakuma Refugee Camp. The concurrent qualitative phase included in-vivo memos and ongoing process field notes of the training of the psychosocial peacebuilding education course. The second quantitative phase used the Hope Index of Staats survey (post-survey) again. The concurrent qualitative phase included eight semi-structured 30-minute interviews that had a follow-up interview to have a member check in and/or clarify any questions. The third quantitative phase used the Hope Index of Staats survey (after six months) again. The concurrent qualitative
phase included eight semi-structured 30-minute interviews (same group of participants interviewed in the pre/post interview) to explore the evolution of their hope.

I used a community-based action research approach (Openjuru et al., 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001). This is an approach that offers a collaborative way for researchers to work alongside potential non-researcher based community members in the hope of co-creating spaces of critical hope, social action and positive change through the use of multiple knowledge sources and research methods. Data collected was from Kakuma Refugee Camp, Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM) refugee students \((n = 31)\). Of the 15 people who volunteered to take my psychosocial peacebuilding education course, 13 filled out the survey. These 13 were considered the intervention group, while the 18 who just filled out the survey served as the control group.

**Context**

I divided this section into three threads. One thread describes the big picture of Kenya with regard to the impact of hosting refugees. The other two threads describe the participants taking the higher education course at Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM, formally known as JWL:HEM) in Kakuma Refugee Camp. It will also describe my rationale for excluding my Kenyatta University participants, due to teachers striking at all public universities (Nyamai, 2017; Wanyiri, 2017) at the time the study was happening.
Kenya

In the recent years, Kenya has been bordering significant conflict from civil war in Somalia, genocide in Rwanda, and famine in Ethiopia (Myre, 2013). According to the UNHCR (2016a) Kenya was “hosting more than 585,000 refugees and asylum-seekers (including 356,000 in the Dadaab refugee complex; 178,000 in Kakuma camp; and 51,200 in urban areas)” in 2015 (para. 1). As of June 2016, the total of refugee and asylum-seekers decreased to 562,357 due to the fact that, in Kakuma camp, UNHCR chose to not count inactive refugees and asylum seekers who had not accessed assistance or resources for a length of time (UNHCR, 2016b). With the potential of Dadaab camp closure and security issues (UNHCR), the research study happened in Kakuma Refugee Camp and at Kenyatta University. My partners were Dr. Josephine Gitome, Director at the Kenyatta University-Centre for Refugee Studies and Empowerment and JWL:HEM.

Participants

Through the collected data, 31 self-identified/volunteer refugees living in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya participated in the study. All participants said they had a lived experience of hope and had taken part in higher education. The demographic survey indicated that all participants were either enrolled in the Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins diploma program (25), or were incentive staff (refugees that are employed by non-governmental organizations but paid incentives and not salaries \(n = 31\)), and/or completed \(n = 3\) the diploma program. The participants consisted of male (≈70%) and female (≈30%). The ages
ranged from 18-36+. All participants were 18 years and older. Languages varied. However, participants had some English proficiency. Demographic characteristics of the sample are represented in Table 3.1., 3.2., and 3.3.

Table 3.1.

*Demographic Characteristics of Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Demographics Characteristics</th>
<th>Kakuma Refugee Camp Participants (n = 31)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2.

*Demographic Characteristics of Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Demographics Characteristics</th>
<th>Kakuma Refugee Camp Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 31 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill in the blank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kakuma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Stay in Kakuma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Kakuma Refugee Camp Participants (n = 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyatta University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two languages</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three languages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four+ languages</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten participants did not fully complete the Hope Index of Staats (1984) survey in the first survey. There were four in total that had partial demographics. Those were not removed. Below are narratives that contextualize the setting and the communities where the participants come from.

**Kakuma Refugee Camp Participants**

*The Kakuma News Reflector–A Refugee Free Press* (KANERE), is an “independent refugee-run news source” led and produced by refugee journalist
operating in Refugee Camp, Kenya (KANERE, 2016, para. 1). In their education section, Aznato (2016) wrote:

After I enrolled in Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia, for my first year, first semester degree program, I went to the university library periodicals sections to read some journals. As I was reading the New African magazine, I glimpsed the word “Refugee” and not knowing the meaning, I took the advanced learner’s dictionary and looked it up. I read the definitions that are now used by the UNHCR as a standard for determining refugee status. At that moment, I never thought I myself would become a refugee one day in my life.

The following year for two or three reasons included in those definitions I read in the dictionary, I found myself on the Kenyan side of Moyale, a border town, to be called a refugee. Today, I don’t only have a memory of learning the word but also I lived as a refugee for two decades, “refugee” being my “identity” (para. 4-5).

The identity Aznato was referencing was the definition of refuge. It is defined by the United Nations 1951 Refugee Convention Act that defined, “A refugee, according to the Convention, is someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion” (UNHCR, 1951, p. 5).

The Kakuma refugee camp was started in 1992 and is situated in the northwestern region of Kenya. It is the second largest refugee camp in Kenya. Boru
(2013) explained, “Kakuma, meaning ‘nowhere’ in Swahili, has been controlled through the Department of Refugee Affairs (DRA) since the adoption of the Kenya Refugee Act of 2006” (para. 3). Kakuma camp refugees and asylum-seekers are from South Sudan (84,427), Somalia (40,899), Ethiopia (5,585), DRC (9,356), Sudan (9,291), Burundi (5,650), Uganda (1,076), Rwanda (521), Eritrea (68), and other (59) (UNHCR, 2016b). UNICEF (2016) noted that the “influx of refugees from South Sudan continues, with 46,235 new arrivals recorded/registered (67% children) as of 25 June 2015” (p. 2).

Kakuma refugee camp historically has had a large population of youth, due to the influx of unaccompanied minors, mostly young Sudanese males fleeing decade long conflicts. Sungu (2016) explained, “about 58% are minors” in Kakuma (para. 4). Sungu noted that Kakuma refugee camp’s educational opportunities are inadequate for primary, secondary, and vocational. In the report, there is no mention of tertiary education. Sungu did offer some conclusions in what may happen with the “deprivation of opportunities,” in that they “can perpetuate conflicts when frustrated youth decide to join violent militias, as could be seen with Afghans who grew up in Pakistani refugee camps and were later recruited by the Taliban” (para. 4). Some organizations in Kakuma, such as Kenyatta University and JWL:HEM, may deter youth in joining extremist groups by placing higher education at the forefront of young adult’s lives. However the obstacles to create, implement, certify, and sustain higher education in protracted refugee context programs are broad and complicated.
Kenyatta University Participants

In my proposal, I had hoped to work alongside Kenyatta University’s Centre for Refugee Studies and Empowerment department because they have courses for refugees that focus on “project management, marketing, finance, and peace and conflict studies” (Chonghaile, 2012, para. 3). However, when I arrived to Kenyatta University (KU), they were on strike. In fact, all public universities in Kenya were on strike. They were on strike due to their collective bargaining agreements demands not being met and approved (Nyamai, 2017; Wanyiri, 2017). This was not seen as an issue in the beginning because my Kenyatta partners thought the strike would be over by the time I returned to Nairobi. However the strike ended at the end of March, right after I left Kenya. The result of this long strike was that students were not able to go to school (Nyamai). This greatly effected the 15 students I did the initial course and pre-survey with because most of them received financial aid through the United Nations (most likely Deutsche Akademische Flüchtlings Initiative Albert Einstein [DAFI] scholarship) for their schooling. Most students live outside of Nairobi in refugee camps. If they received the opportunity to go to school in Nairobi, they must have had permission to study outside their respective camps. Many students had to return to the refugee camps because school was halted due to the strike. In addition, the financial aid was withheld because they were not able to take courses. This situation became clearer for me when I received a text message from a participant that said s/he needed to return to Dadaab Refugee Camp. I was then told by another participant that most are leaving for the refugee camps because they cannot afford to
live in Nairobi without their financial aid; and their travel document only stated they could only be in Nairobi for school purposes.

Internet accessibility was also a concern for me. In the refugee camps there is internet but it is at a cost many cannot afford. So, in light of this, I was unable to run my post-survey and could not do the semi-structured interviews at KU. I entertained the thought of doing semi-structured interviews via Skype when school resumed in a couple of months when participants would be back in Nairobi and have Wi-Fi access. My experience in Kakuma taught me that would be a very difficult undertaking. In consultation with my chair, we decided it was best to keep the data (15 pre surveys) that were collected and set it aside for a later date.

**Procedures: Data Collection**

My research procedures loosely followed Nastasi’s mixed methods recursive research–intervention process model. The nature of working in a refugee camp caused me to change some steps. The reader will find Appendix A: Data Collection Timelines and Procedures [Proposed and Final], where I put side by side what was proposed and what actually happened. Below is a narrative of the procedures.

The criteria of participation included participants who have refugee status and were students at JWL:HEM (see Appendix B for script). Participants were asked to do a pre survey and post survey of Hope Index of Staats (1989) at a later date. They were asked to participate in a psychosocial peacebuilding education course (see Appendix B for script and Appendix E for course). If they chose to, they had the ability to train others in the program. This could be other students, community
members, and/or school teachers. Concurrently, field notes, research log activities, in vivo memos, and audio recordings were done throughout the project. I asked if students were interested in writing down their own observations (e.g. Participant-Researcher Reflective Log). These observations could, if the participants wanted to share, inform the research.

The first week consisted of me waiting for a flight to Kakuma Refugee Camp. I used my time to collaborate with Jesuit Refugee Services social workers and staff and did some fieldwork visits and trainings.

The second week consisted of recruiting JWL:HEM participants/students at Kakuma Refugee Camp for the course. Participants were asked to do a pre survey of Hope Index of Staats (1989) via paper-based due to the limited internet. I did not use Qualtrics, a user-friendly, efficient, and online way of collecting data from a survey. Students also volunteered for the psychosocial peacebuilding education course (please see Procedures: Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education Curriculum section for more details) at Jesuit Refugee Services. I facilitated two courses (four hours each) that consisted in of 13 students.

The third, fourth, and fifth week, we implemented the curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I co-facilitated alongside them. We partnered with schools, non-governmental agencies, community-based organizations, in the homes of the participants. We applied a Community-Based Action (CBA) approach to the implementation of the project. A CBA is where the community identifies the problem, the research is designed around that problem, and the community uses the
research to decide and inform themselves on the steps to take to resolve the problem (Openjuru et al., 2015; Reason & Bradbury, 2001). For example, participants wanted to promote more peace-building skills in higher education spaces. We researched where we could implement the course. Then we partnered informally with Norwegian Refugee Council’s vocational program and facilitated the course in their program. Another example was using the TAG approach (Tell something positive, Ask a question, and Give a Suggestion) that served as a catalyst for individual action as we were working with small groups during the course implementation. The facilitators supported participants to identify the conflict they wanted to work on and with the support of their peers, the participant went deeper, doing their own internal research to understand why there was a conflict. The result was a variety of solutions that surfaced from participants that appeared to be culturally relevant and responsive. We collected data on what the conflicts were, how we asked questions, and what happened as we went deeper, along with the variety of solutions. I applied this CBA approach because it is my belief that individuals and communities often have more realistic goals, practical solutions, and concrete understandings of the context that are far better than those from so called “experts” and who are only there for the short term, like me. I also administered the post survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) via a paper-based format with the same participants.

In the six week, I identified participants who would do semi-structured interviews based on who was available and wanted to do it. I am also grateful for the Jesuit Refugee Services education coordinator who supported me in recruiting and
scheduling interviews. I interviewed 8 participants. These interviews were transcribed and put in a thematic analysis.

Over the next 5 weeks, I had hoped to replicate the procedures at Kenyatta University at their Nairobi campus. However, this did not happen due to teacher strikes and students needing to return to their respective refugee camps. I instead worked alongside Jesuit Refugee Services social workers and helped them implement the project in their parishes.

**Procedures: Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education Curriculum**

In 2001, I spent a year and a half working in Diepsloot Informal Settlement, outside Johannesburg, South Africa. I received three individual grants to manage, develop, and implement a 10-week violence prevention and intervention program. The original program was called Nthabiseng Project (in Sesotho, Nthabiseng means, “Makes Me Happy”). In 2010, I was invited to work with Jamaica’s teachers, literacy officers, and students to develop and implement a shorter version psychosocial peace building educational program that emulates the original program I developed in South Africa called Irie LitART program (in Jamaican Rasta/Patois, Irie means, “Alright, excellent, powerful”). Then, in 2012, I was invited to work with Vishwa Shanti School and their local Buddhist monasteries in Nepal to implement a similar program called Khelera Sikou project (in Nepalese, Khelera Sikou means, “Learning by Playing”). Readers will notice that each project has different names. When I was in South Africa, I learned that when a community gives you a name, they have accepted you.
In my first project, the Diepsloot Informal Settlement community granted me the name, “Nthabiseng.” When we brainstormed a name for the project, the participants chose that name as well. This process of developing a name for the project has transcended borders. Each time, I arrive with the core components of the project, and then ask if the community if they would like to name the project, so that the community has ownership. This has given added meaning to the participants.

Below is a snapshot of the psychosocial peacebuilding education curriculum (see Appendix Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education Curriculum). All three projects are based on a collaborative inquiry, with critical thinking that enhances cultural identity, voice, and vision of the community. Critical hope may emerge in any of these sessions. The art and literacy-based projects focus on continuing to deepen one’s understanding of personal voice, story, and context. The core elements of the course: Book-making/Journaling, Doll-Making, Story-Making/Story-Telling, and Co-creating Solutions. Please see Figure 3.2. for a visual.
The first session started with journaling and creating books to contain the stories. The co-facilitators began with a couple of icebreakers. One icebreaker was to determine how many sides and corners does a paper have. Often participants would say one side and four corners. We would count them in their home language to see if they are correct. We count until we have two sides of the paper and eight corners. We repeated this in all the languages that are spoken in the group. This allowed the participants to show that they have skills to share, too. The purpose of the ice breakers were to help participants understand that we are not going to just talk about one side of the story, we were going to go deeper and touch all corners and both sides of the story. We also asked participants to use their imagination. We presented a white piece of paper and ask them if this wasn’t a white piece a paper what else
could it be? Often the facilitator needed to offer some examples, like wings or steering wheel to a car. When an idea was presented, we tried it out. For example, a participant said, it could be an umbrella. We all put a piece a paper above our head and pretended it was pouring down rain. We ran to places where it appeared to be dry. The purpose for this activity was to help support participants to build confidence and create curiosity. Then, we made a book and talked about the values of journaling. A side stitch book served two purposes: (a) it created a physical containment of the fictional story, and (b) it also provided structure, a sense of safety, and firm boundaries for participants’ stories.

*Figure 3.3. Making a Book in Kakuma*
In the second session participants were asked to make a figure out of recycled material to signify the main character of their fictional or personal story. Making a doll was a physical endeavor. We asked participants to twist, smash, crunch, and squeeze newspaper. We asked them to wrap yarn around the newspaper in a way that created a figure. This served two purposes: (a) created an opportunity for participants to use engaging materials for inspiration for their story; and (b) opened space to work together.
In the third session, participants were asked to develop a fictional or personal story about their doll in a conflict without a solution. Story-making and story-telling often gave participants the greatest likelihood of accessing their feelings, regardless of their literacy levels or language abilities.
In the fourth session, after the participant read aloud her/his story and the TAG approach was applied, peers offered solutions to the problem. Then the participant rewrote the story with solutions that were drawn from the suggestions of the peers.
In my experience of training teachers, social workers, literacy officer, and others in the core components, I have seen that the curriculum itself was flexible enough. In order to make the program culturally responsive and relevant, any modification to the curriculum was welcomed and needed. For example, a Jamaican literacy officer modified how the students listened to the stories. She brought the idea of using TAG: *Tell* something positive; *Ask* a question; and *Give* a suggestion. This idea was folded into the curriculum and is currently used in the present curriculum.

Another teacher from Jamaica thought about using different material for doll making. Most if not all the art materials come from recycled sources. It is rare that I bring art material that cannot be sourced from the host country. The reason why is for sustainability reasons, as well as for practical reasons. I want the programs to be able to run without me and not to be dependent on outside resources. To do this, I use a Kramer's (1986) third hand approach, which is supporting the facilitator in a way that does not do the work, but remains there if she needs assistance. I also assess what resources are available in the country that I visit.
After the initial training, I had four volunteers that used the program in the community. Again, this is the approach I have used in South Africa, Jamaica, Nepal and appears to be very successful for the sustainability of the program. I co-facilitated with the participants until they felt comfortable and confident doing it on their own. I did the implementation piece with participants because this approach has been useful in the sustainability of my other projects in South Africa, Nepal, and Jamaica.

In the next section, I describe the procedures used to conduct the study including recruitment, informed consent, and maintenance of data. I begin with recruitment.

**Recruitment.**

I recruited from the JWL:HEM diploma program, with a sample size of 31 refugee students. They were offered the opportunity to participate in the course, as
well. I recruited from Kakuma because all of them have lived or are currently living in emergencies and conflict situations while pursuing their higher education. The ages ranged from 18-35+ years.

For the purpose of this study, students used a paper-based consent form and survey that informed them of their rights as participants and outlined the research objectives. Due to limited internet availability, I did not use Qualtrics, an internet-based survey tool. I used hard copies of the survey and manually typed in the data. Participant interface was structured in such a way that participants could answer the survey in a confidential manner. I reminded that they were free to withdraw from the survey at any time without penalty. Because I was working with a vulnerable population, the partners introduced the survey and project so that I could not influence or coerce the students in anyway.

Jesuit Refugee Services gave me space to talk with and recruit JWL:HEM students. I had anticipated that recruiting and getting participants to see themselves as participant-researchers would be challenging in Kakuma, however it was not. Most often, these populations are researched on and not with. My hope was that my approach of taking time to listen and understand would help me to secure trust, mutual understanding, and promotion of hopeful views in Kakuma as it had in South Africa, Nepal, and Jamaica.

Due to the practical aspects and programming, my partners suggested that I recruit participants from their cohorts. Recruiting from a cohort that already exists is convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is defined as recruiting “participants
that are easiest to obtain” for your sample (Symon & Cassell, 2012, p. 43). My rationale to use convenience sampling is for these exploratory purposes: I want to understand how the perception of hope changes, to test the Hope Index of Staats (1989), and ultimately to sustain the program and create lasting partnerships to continue research with participants.

**Informed consent.** After recruitment, I gave a paper-based form. The informed consent form informed the participants of their rights and outlined the objectives and limitations of the research that was approved by an Institutional Review Board process. On the first page of the paper-based form, a consent form detailed what the survey is about and ensuring confidentiality of responses (e.g., IP addresses will be scrubbed prior to analysis). Participants were informed of the scope (e.g., time commitment, purpose, risks, and so on) of the research and their ability to withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason without penalty. Participants either signed to accept or not signed to decline participation in the study. Participants were not required to participate and could opt out of the survey at anytime for any reason. In addition to the surveys, participants were asked to complete a short demographic questionnaire to aid in examinations of group differences related to, but not limited to, gender, age, cohort, ethnicity/race, and so on (see Appendix I).
Maintenance of Data

I kept the records of this study confidential. I recorded the obtained information in a manner that the participants could be identified only for the purpose of the follow-up semi-structured interviews. The names were coded-confidential, that is, the survey data was collected with specific subject by codes, not by direct identifiers. Some of the data will be made public and the participants were informed which data will be made public and this was included in the consent form.

I placed the data in a locked office, inside a locked cabinet, and coded to a master list. The master list was kept separate from the data and all the data was password protected. Photographs of the artwork, audio digital recordings, and written notes will be kept for seven years and then destroyed. Ownership of the artwork and stories are with the participants.

Survey Instrument

The Hope Index Staats (1989) “measures rather particular expectancies in contrast to measures of optimism that are based on generalized outcome expectancies” (Scheier & Carver, 1985, cited in Staats, 1989, p. 367). There is limited mention of Bloch’s work in Staats research, nevertheless there is a connection between Staats research with regard to her adapted EBS and Hope Index of Staats (1989) where Bloch's (1986) subjective hope is the affective and the objective hope is the cognitive act (Pilkington, 1999).

In the Hope Index of Staats (1989), participants are projecting into the future the likelihood of something happening. Otherwise stated,
Students rate independently how much they would wish a particular future occurrence and the extent to which they would expect this to occur. The multiplication of the wish value by the expect value will generate a measure of hope. (Staats & Stassen, 1985, p. 240)

Staats and Partlo (1993) have developed how to score the psychometric instrument and developed a scale of ranges of where the standard deviations mostly fall on the wish, expect, hope-self, hope-others scales (See Appendix H for scoring).

**Pilot Study**

Currently, my colleagues and I are doing a mixed methods pilot study (under IRB Martin 153637) using the Hope Index of Staats (1989) in six classrooms. Dr. Johnson and I ran a pilot study of the Hope Index of Staats (1989) in our courses that we taught at Portland State University, Oregon, USA. This pilot was under a separate Institutional Review Board (IRB# 153637). Participants \((n = 184)\) were recruited from courses across the winter and spring 2016 quarters that either consisted of a traditional lecture format or an online lecture format. The traditional and online courses had a decreased level of experiential curriculum/discussion based on their rubric. We had a contrast of participants who chose courses that involved an increased level of experiential curriculum/discussion built into the course rubric.

We had participants use a Qualtrics survey format for both the pre and post Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey. A demographic questionnaire was also included. Three additional qualitative questions were added to the post-test follow up survey...
that helped us understand how hope changes throughout a term and what factors may be effecting that change. We are still in the process writing up our findings.

There has been limited criticism of the instrument. Bressler (2010) noted that while they were “sympathetic to Staats' general approach to hope; we do not believe the reliance upon a second self-report measure to capture the affective realm is appropriate. For this reason we chose to measure hope using an adaptation of Gottschalk's (1974) Hope Scale, which relies on content analysis” (p. 1). Despite this limitation, Lopez, Snyder, and Teramoto Pedrotti (2003) noted that the Hope Index of Staats (1989) has a “strong support” for construct validation and has a “.74 test-retest reliability” (p. 101).

**Role of Researcher**

Informed by the work of critical theorists (Freire, 1994; hooks, 2003; Zembylas, 2014), and my development of dual consciousness (Hartlep, 2013) as an educator and learner who is a Korean American transracial adoptee, my doctorate focuses on critical hope as it is manifested in the refugee counternarratives in conflict areas. Critical hope anchors teachers and learners in the ability to recognize, question, and change patterns that perpetuate dominance and power. When critical hope is practiced inside and outside of the classroom, pertinent questions are asked about *whose* voices are heard and *whose* voices are absent when describing and working with a certain population. This framework has helped me understand my own privilege and possible complicities in the dominant narrative as an adopted Asian American adjunct instructor at a predominantly white institution.
One of the main questions, both a qualitative and quantitative researcher may ask oneself is, “What do you notice and what do you not notice?” and “How does this research intersect with your own life?” I believe these are important questions to ask myself at different times of my research. I also feel very strongly that it is important to have multiple viewpoints—a more collaborative inquiry—to see what you are not noticing and what you are focusing on too much.

The programs that I have developed have been adapted to various settings. I wanted to not only train participants in the psychosocial peacebuilding education course but also, support participants to engage in a participant-researcher capacity, if they chose to continue. I taught them about how data is analyzed by coding and looking at patterns and themes. In doing this, I was aware of what Fine (1994) said about—‘othering.’

Self-Other

Fine (1994) spoke about the collusion of othering and how a conversation with her niece opened up the doors for her own self-interrogation. She encouraged that “researchers probe how we are in relation with the context we study and with our informants, understanding that we are all multiple in those relations” (p. 72). Fine noted that narratives are made in qualitative research. These narratives often serve purposes that may strengthen communities and/or be subversive. However, too often they serve to control, marginalize, and change the focus. She spoke of master narratives, also known as official narratives, that are stories that legitimize the dominant narrative at the expense of the non-dominant narratives (Peters &
Lankshear, 1996). Fine (1994) explained, we must to counter the narratives that oppress the marginalized voice. When the official narratives are presented, counternarratives need to be at the forefront. Counternarratives are narratives that counter the dominant or official narratives. Counternarratives take into account the social and political contexts within which the official narrative is made.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

During the data collection, I coded the data collected (survey, sem-structured interviews, and observation notes, and so on) so that all information is unidentifiable. I used descriptive statistics and ran Analysis of Variance models (known as ANOVA) for the quantitative data (e.g., surveys). I did a thematic analysis for the qualitative data (e.g., semi-structured interviews). Then, I took a mixed methods approach by applying and combing some of the descriptive statistics and interview findings.

For the quantitative data, I administered the surveys during three time periods (January, February, and June 2017). I used the IBM SPSS program to analyze the data. I ran several ANOVA models (e.g. Total Hope PRE, POST, FOLLOW-UP, difference between age groups, and so on). However, because I did not have enough data, I did not find any statistical significance in the data. I will talk more about the findings or rather, lack of findings, in the results section.

For the qualitative data, I transcribed interviews. I developed a draft of codes with symbols as I read all of the transcripts for the first reading. Then I synthesized those codes into more refined codes on the second pass of reading all the transcripts.
Then on the third pass of reading the transcripts, I made the final codes. I then coded all of the transcripts with the final codes/symbols.

I followed Saldana’s (2013) codes-to-theory model, in that I coded the transcriptions, then looked for patterns, categories, and themes. Throughout the process, I compared themes with observations from the participant-researchers field journals and my own in-vivo memos (Charmaz, 2014). Glesne (2016) described memo writing as “jotting down reflective thoughts” (p. 188). In other words, memo writing is a central place for self-reflection where one can write non-edited thoughts. My memo writing consisted of “in vivo” coding as it “prioritize[s] and honor[s] the participant’s voice” (p. 91). I am acutely aware that I do not want to lose the voice of the participants when I code.

I summarized the themes in paragraphs to create boundaries for my themes. When I had concrete boundaries for my themes, I pulled verbatim quotes that followed the determined themes and created a running list of quotes.

For mixed collected data, that is quantitative and qualitative data, I had 8 participants that had done all three surveys (pre, post, and follow) and all three semi-structured interviews. In my results section, I applied their data and the changes in their numbers and complimented them with the semi-structured interviews to offer a thick description of what was going on at the time that the surveys were given.
Chapter 4: Results

“If there was real justice, we wouldn’t be refugees”—Kakuma Refugee Participant

We enter a home where a woman showed me her beadwork. She handed me a clear tangled fishing line. She mimed to me that she wanted me to untangle the fishing line for her. As she handed me the plastic line, I found the end and started to work on it. A few minutes later, the Jesuit Refugee Services education coordinator explained that we had to leave. I handed it back to her, as she pulled from the end that I loosened, the knots became tighter and tighter. In a brief moment, staring at her weathered hands, I found myself lost. Lost in my thoughts.

I share this story because it highlights my process of going through my results. As I transcribed and listened to the recordings countless times, the more I found myself lost in my thoughts. As I stepped further back and started to code and recode the transcripts, then the metaphorical fishing line loosened and became untangled. I could see the threads that connected the themes. In the results section, I show how the transcripts, observations, and stories weave in and out of the themes but first I restate my problem of practice, purpose, and research questions.

Analysis of Data

My problem of practice is that youth (ages 18-35) who are refugees often have limited spaces of hope and access to higher education in conflict areas or emergencies. Higher education in protracted refugee context is emerging and yet exists in very few places. Considering the inaccessibility of higher education in protracted refugee context and the increase in youth who are displaced, there is a
great demand for education (UNHCR, 2014a). This is a demand of education that goes beyond the primary and secondary schooling. This research responded to this demand.

The purpose of my research was to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context. The primary research question was: In what ways, do refugee students (18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participating in a psychosocial peace building education course, in a higher education in protracted refugee context?

Qualitative Questions

1. How does a student’s perceptions of hope evolve over time while the student is participating in a psychosocial peace-building education course?
   a. How do participants describe their experiences during the course that they perceived to contribute hope?
   b. How do participants describe their experiences during the course that they perceived to hinder hope?

2. How do participants describe the role that does higher education plays in supporting hopeful views in protracted refugee context?

Quantitative Questions

3. What is the difference between personal and collective refugee hopes in Kakuma?
4. What is the progression in participant’s level of hope over time, in the context of a changing reality and participation in a psychosocial peace-building education course?

The participants were self-identified/volunteer refugees from Kakuma Refugee Camp in Kenya. All participants had a lived experience of hope and were some kind of variation of higher education. The participants consisted of male and female and their ages were 18 years and older. Languages varied. However, participants had some English proficiency.

**Presentations of Results and Interpretation of Findings**

At the conclusion of my thematic analysis, all the semi-structured interviews and collected surveys contained four themes: Reflecting on critical hope and critical despair; Reconciling identities, Resurfacing narratives and creating new narratives of hope and; Restoring hope and agency: Higher education. In Figures 4.1., 4.2., and 4.3., I show my coding process, patterns, categories, and themes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>Hopeful View (Actionable/Future-Oriented)</td>
<td>Hope and Despair (books, 2003-1985; Freire, 1994; Snyder, 2002)</td>
<td>Reflecting on Critical Hope and Critical Despair (Despair, False Hope, and Hope)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despair</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>Despair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>Collective/Personal Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Perspectives</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>Multiple Perspectives (The opportunity to be with people who are not like you nor have a perspective that you may not agree with)</td>
<td>Mindset (Dweck, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Perspective</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Perspective</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.1. Codes for Reflecting on Critical Hope and Critical Despair*
### Figure 4.2. Codes for Reconciling Identities and Resurfacing Narratives and Creating New Narratives of Hope
The first theme **Reflecting on Critical Hope and Critical Despair** (despair, false hope, and hope) addressed the despair and aspirations of the participants, as well as the circumstances that created false hopes. False hopes are defined as hopes that are impossible, unrealistic, and often misleading and will not materialize. The second theme **Reconciling Identities** (loss, trauma, and empathy) depicted the reality of being a refugee and the multiple identities that are needed to survive, maintain, and thrive.
CO-CREATING SPACES OF CRITICAL HOPE

The third theme *Resurfacing Narratives and Creating New Narratives of Hope* (narratives, counternarratives, and critical hope) described how participants were seen on the global level (media, academia, and so on), how they see themselves, and how they continue to strengthen their *conscientização* (Freire, 2003). Freire (2003) explained *conscientização* as:

> The truth is, however, that the oppressed are not ‘marginals,’ are not men living ‘outside’ society. They have always been "inside"- inside the structure, which made them "beings for others.” The solution is not to "integrate' them into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure so that they can become ‘beings for themselves.’ Such transformation, of course, would undermine the oppressors' purposes; hence their utilization of the banking concept of education to avoid the threat of student *conscientização*. (p. 74)

In other words, participants had the agency, self-determination, and critical awareness to question the status quo that created actions that changed their situation. The fourth theme *Restoring Hope and Agency: Higher Education* (challenges, benefits, and opportunities of education) theme examined the intended and unintended consequences of education, higher education, and beyond. Then the last section is not a theme, yet offers an overview of the limited statistical findings.

The verbatim quotes are grounded in the following constructs outlined by Corden and Sainsbury (2006) “as the matter of enquiry; as evidence; as explanation; as illustration; to deepen understanding; to give participants a voice, and to enhance readability” (p. 11). This direction was chosen because too often words are paraphrased
and misinterpreted by the reader and researcher. I wanted the words of the participant to stand on their own. After each quote, there is an analysis of what my understanding of what went on and the follow-up conversations that led to that understanding.

To keep anonymity and avoid gendered pronouns, at times I will use plural pronouns in the results section. I am also using pseudonyms. The names are different translations of the word “hope” (tumaini – Kiswahili, espérer – French, ‘amal – Arabic, rajo – Somali, ikizere – Kinyarwanda, tesifa – Amharic, umwizer – Kirundi, tšepo – Sesetho, ithemba – Zulu, and esperanza – Spanish). In the transcripts, the reader will also see SM my initials. I also want to note that for clarity, in the transcripts, I included punctuation for flow and readability. In the beginning of each theme, I open with a short story that is reflective of that particular theme.

**Theme #1: Reflecting on Critical Hope and Critical Despair**

One of the most profound comments that came out of co-facilitating a group was an experience I had with a group of service providers for refugees. One participant said, “The thing that the participant will take away with is that we need to interrogate this thought of false hope and what our agency is really doing.” This was profound to me because during much of the past seven months, I have been thinking less about hope, how it manifests, and is sustained and more about how false hopes, hollow hopes and hope without action are created and sustained and what purpose they serve.

The *reflecting on critical hope and critical despair* theme addressed the recognition of despair and false hopes from the participants. The theme also covers
what may appear to be false hopes, that is, hopes that are unrealistic and will never materialize. Last, it addressed hope from the participant’s words. Hope is defined as striving to be better and cognizant of the tension between what was, what is, and what could be while creating goals, pathways to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so (Freire, 1994; Snyder, 2002; Staats, 1989). Below, I focus on the sub-themes despair, false hope, and hope of the main theme reflecting on critical hope and critical despair.

**Despair**

In the thematic analysis there was a sub-thread I coin, *critical despair*. This is different from an “existential crisis,” that is, when students starts to question everything around them, as well as their purpose in life. Critical despair is confronting the status quo while having the perception or the reality that one cannot do anything about the situation. This was seen with a participant who was taking a higher education course on rights of people. ‘Amal said:

‘Amal: Why it [hope] went down. Okay the reason is that looking into the rights of people, people have rights but when you look deeply into the rights of people they are not implemented by the government's [sic], they are not implemented by the government's [sic] and that is why sometimes I see lack hope. Because although the rights are in the Constitution there but still the government's [sic] doesn't follow it that matters. So this is the reason also can make someone to think why that maybe when you're reading the political thought you see that your rights are there, other person's rights are there but
the way it is governed or the community is governed or government is different from the Constitution different from the rights of the human.

SM: So the suggestion of your course brought your hope levels down, it sounds like, is that correct?

‘Amal: Why it goes down. It goes down because there is no one in the government supporting the human rights to be better. But if it's just human need no one to improve those rights. It's like I'm just in class to improve the rights of others. (‘Amal, Interview #1, 8 Feb 2017)

‘Amal continued:

‘Amal: After I did it the time that I did it I came to realize that people wish to improve their lives but the way they should improve it they don't see someone bringing them [to] support or to improve their lives. Although they have the thought or the wish to improve their lives or get better lives something like the schools for a comfortable life. There was no one to stand in their back to support them or to back them up. Yeah, so that is some of the things that I discovered. People need to move ahead but outside matters a lot because they have nothing to help themselves to improve their lives. At least they need someone to support them. (‘Amal, Interview #1, 8 Feb 2017)

Some participants learn about their rights and yet also perceive that they could not do anything about it. These feelings can also be exasperating as unjust policies from their own countries are being enforced and the economically powerful countries are shifting their policies.
One participant was acutely critical of the United States policies and explained how it brought on despair and false hopes. Tumaini said:

Tumaini: So another thing is the issue of Trump. I can't comment. It's up to American people to say he is a good president or a bad president but for us refugees in Kakuma, we are affected. Because every organization in this camp there is a budget cut, there's a budget cut, a budget cut, so that is affecting me because for example I'm working and there's like 20 refugees and five national staff. Now we are reduced to 12 refugees. Now I'm doing a lot of work 7 in the morning to 5 p.m. receiving people. Some of them are coming at my home because of the work that has been done by 20 people working together is done by 12 people. Also national staff of people are always telling us no don't feel safe because next month we will reduce some other 5 people. We will reduce in terms of employment, in terms of assistance. (Tumaini, Interview #3, 9 June 2017)

Although refugees cannot be employed in Kenya, refugees assume the role of “incentive staff” in Kakuma. Refugees “volunteer” their time. This practice is “grounded in the idea that refugees should actively participate in efforts to support their own communities, which is seen to promote empowerment rather than dependency” (Morris & Voon, 2014, p. 3). Refugees receive their incentive payments through aid agencies that are funded by governmental donors. This particular participant is responding to the significant cutbacks that are reflective of aid agencies cutting back because of their limited funding. The participant is also commenting on
how those cutbacks affect the morale and workload of the volunteers. The interview continues on a personal note of how those cutbacks, through no fault of their own, are affecting their home life, as when Tumaini (2017) said:

Tumaini: For example, right now okay my non-food items at home they are not okay. In terms of maybe gerry cans, cooking pot because at least each 2 or 3 years UNHCR maybe you should give us an additional blanket an additional gerry can, an additional cooking pot something like that. But now since 2014 there is nothing. We were supposed to be receiving like this beginning of this year. But we were told no please. This is budget cut; only education and health issues will be considered. Otherwise you have to learn to be living substandard life because of this issue of the budget cut. When you look around you find [it] be the government, be UNHCR, be even the refugees directly. We are now affected because of the new policies of American government. (Tumaini, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

This participant continued to be even more critical about the resettlement process and how the individual’s hope has dwindled, due to the current policies. Tumaini said:

Tumaini: So even when you things you look around for example, for example each week or every two weeks, you could see a flight of refugees going for resettlement for America. But since January you have only seen only two flights, only two when it was like only 1 week or 2 weeks you will see maybe one flight of refugees, some four or five families will leaving that maybe those differences keep our hope very alive. When you see people leaving you,
maybe even me, I will even leave next year or whatever. But when you find
like, okay, people are not moving, there is no hope for the future or whatever
whatever whatever. And now that's why I'm saying my hope as reduced
instead of improving. (Tumaini, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

The participant explained how policies directly impacted the lives of refugees. The
individual touched on the tangible things such as gerry cans, cooking supplies, and so
on, but also touched on how hopes, often become false hopes.

**False Hope**

False hope is another sub-thread within the reflecting on critical hope and critical
despair theme. There were instances in the semi-structured interviews and observations
that were perceived as false hopes, that is, hopes that are unrealistic and will never
materialize. False hopes can be seen in concrete terms such as participants wishing or
expecting that they will have something in a certain timeframe. They also are not playing
an active role in making that something happen. Aforementioned, when policies change
of governments that are hosting and resettling refugees’ change, it can greatly affect
refugees. And yet, some of the false hopes can also be self-perpetuating, seen as wishes
and looking for external forces to drive an individual’s changes. This is seen when Tesifa
said:

Tesifa: Yeah I'm sure I'm going to finish it. Hundred percent I'm going to finish
it. There's no way leave it half way. I'm not and my worries what will I be next.
I'm asking I am basing the worry because we live in the camp. We are not
allowed to have a better job. We don't have papers or diploma that allows us so
we get this paper and we remain in the community. We can contribute good ideas to the community but we find out that can't be much in terms of money. For instance, I was saying if organizations will continue to take care of us it will be better because we are aiming higher. (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Many participants were thinking about the same thing; most of them were attempting to reconcile what they are going to do when they finish their diploma programs. Their reliance and dependency on organizations creates a false hope because organizations can only do so much with their limited funding and capacity. Another participant echoed this sentiment:

Ithemba: Is there any chance may-be selecting best 2-3 students per cohort who have found the way, to see if they can get another chance of may-be going to the degree level so that they can get another scholarship, okay I know it might be costly but I know of two people that dropped because they said I finished in the diploma but I don’t see any change in my life…” (Ithemba, interview #1, 8 February 2017)

In this particular example, a participant wished that there were more opportunities for furthering education, even though there weren’t. When later asked in the interview if they thought of their request would be honored, those who were interviewed said, yes that was an expectation. While Rajo, appeared to recognize the false hope and confronted it in the interview.
SM: You said something really deeply profound. You said it's a hope that is a hope. Can you unpack that and tell me more about that statement? It is really intriguing and interesting. What do you mean about it's a hope of a hope?

Rajo: When right now I have been studying for the past three consecutive years coming all the way from you know from home to here most of the time getting my own ways to get here and back about around very late and studying 8 hours if not more sometimes. By the end of this, I get that good and what does that give me? Well I have so many A’s and sure most of 14 courses, exactly 14 courses, I have A’s and B’s. If I have less marks I would even have the professor to allow me to redo it until I have an A. Grades are very important to me but what does that give me?

All my colleagues completed 2010-2011 all the way 2014 are here. They're not doing anything. They just use it for fun. Just keep it at home. The hope I will be finishing soon now. It will be a very pleasant wonderful day that I will be enjoying my family will be very happy day. After that it will be sincerely facing the reality just go back home tired the whole graduation day. You rest for the first week from the exhaustion of the long-term learning and working very hard. You rest for awhile and say a month okay: what's next? Nothing nothing. Now that I have left a number of organizations mostly because of their injustices they have been doing they have done to myself and others, it'll be very hard to find a job again. So if I will be doing I will be getting a job, see, like now creating my own job. I
would be even very happy to do that in this environment here this camp. It’s kind of a bit challenging, not impossible, but but [sic] difficult I would say.

(Rajo, Interview #3, 12 June 2017)

In this particular instance, the participant is unpacking the complexity of the reality of living in a refugee camp and how that fits into future plans. Perhaps the realization of false hope brought on despair however in this particular participant, through correspondence, it made the individual reconcile with the reality. The recognition offered the catalyst to restart and eventually start the process to register their community-based organization (Rajo, personal communication, August 16, 2017). This example showed the resilience, growth of their mindset, and hope of refugees.

**Hope**

Hope is the last sub-thread to the reflecting on critical hope and critical despair theme. When asked how participants defined hope they defined it similar to the general terms, that is, the feeling/desire for something to turn out for the best. For example, ‘Amal said,

Hope? Hope it's something that maybe you're thinking in the future to acting to happen in the future that you think that if maybe I say it my life will improve, will be with school. That's when you're putting hopes to yourself that in the future I will go to school. After finishing in my future my life will change; it will be better. (‘Amal, interview #1, 8 Feb 2017)
While Umwizero explained,

The meaning of hope is sometimes different meaning. Have seen you you [sic] think something to happen or you think something to be in a way you want a meaning of hope. Now in the survey, sometimes we work with you, we used to I think in the future. I will gain something to learn some experience, where you're in the position where you are perhaps I will be a research or somewhere. I will build the capacity learning and working with you and hope. Because I hope something happens in the future; that is hope.

(Umwizero, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

As they continued with the course, participants illustrated and expanded how they saw hope in their lives, family, and community. Participants were asked how they saw hope nurtured in their lives. Most replied that having the opportunity to be around a diversity of people, actually strengthened their hope. Umwizero (2017) explained it this way,

Umwizero: Because I know that the refugees are not at the end of their life. Things will change. You know when you go back to my country, I can do better things then what I did in my country. Because in my country, I studied and even did work. But in a refugee [camp], I could, I can, and be with South Sudanese, Burundi or Rwandese. All of them are there and now we live together. Now, even if I go back, I still have a hope feeling I can go to my friends [and ask], can I visit you in Rwanda? Welcome Rwanda.

SM: Yeah
Umwizero: If there is any business I can start my business and Rwanda. Because I have someone there (Umwizero, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Ikizere, another participant, spoke about how hope is nurtured in the family. The individual explained:

Ikizere: You know you just say, it's not hope for myself. But it is hope for my family, it's hope for everyone. It's women hope rising; it's everyone's hope. Whenever you see your kid happy, you see your neighbor happy when you see everyone happy. There's no complaints about what you do and what you had to do then you feel happy. So hope is much about the well-being of others and in different perspectives like a woman our hope rises in just small things. It rises in just making sure or just seeing that has got tea, has got something to survive on that is something. What is hope for means for us, if you are doing something seeing that is protective for you who your family.

If I remember there was a woman who they were poor, they were very poor. They couldn't afford porridge. She could fill cups for only the children only the neighbor children. They can drink from the cups; they empty the cups, and when her elder daughter asked her mom, what about you? What about you and everything? The mother was like I’m okay! I'm just okay, but when the kids go to sleep, you could find her just trying get just a little that the kid have left in their cups so that she can drink it, so she can have something in her stomach. And that is how it is even for hopeful, here in a refugee camp.
When you see kids going to school you have hope that the future will be okay.

Yeah I think that's hope.

SM: I love it. It's a wonderful definition.

Ikizere: On my part then just like… hope what I have hope for, what I possess hope for whenever I find myself doing something for someone. I am okay. I will think that the future is bright when I feel like I'm productive at least. Someone is counting on me to survive. Whenever I will be able to do so I have hope. (Ikizere, interview #2, 10 February 2017)

The same participant spoke about how the community nurtured hope. All participants who co-facilitated were asked if and when they found or did not find hope in co-facilitating the workshops with the researcher. Ikizere (2017) said:

Ikizere: Yes there is a lady who just that there was a time that you [Staci] were asking what would you help, how did you help, and that is what that lady said that she helped many people by providing medicine. Yeah it's something big.

SM: Yeah.

Ikizere: When we talk about poison it's like it's a problem that even clinics here cannot handle easy. I know that are some people who have herbal medicines for particular issues. Because I had another neighbor, a family who had a baby, the baby has been struggling with them poison problems for like 2 years. Two years now, and then someone came and just provided her herbal medicine. The kid was okay now. Okay and now I've seen so much
importance what the lady did and I felt like, ah, I have been seeing her just like a normal lady, but actually she's powerful.

SM: Wow

Ikizere: Yeah, that story really gave me hope that everyone has something special in him or her. So there is no reason to underestimate him or her.

(Ikizere, Interview #1, 9 February 2017)

The participant continued and explained the result of various types of interactions (e.g. the scenario above and below) that the participant’s hope has changed.

Ikizere: Before I thought like hope is like it's something that comes with potential opportunities of seeing the future. You just think that the future is going to be better that because this things are not but I found out that hope is not about potential positive outcomes and everything. It depends on its sort of about how you feel.

SM: Is it like a state of being?

Ikizere: Yes.

SM: Ok, fantastic. Is there anything we have not talked about that has made you more hopeful in the past month we've been together?

Ikizere: Oh yes, I think the idea becoming a co-writer, co-researcher, it's something that creates hope in me.

SM: How so, tell me more?

Ikizere: I didn't think I never thought that this could happen, actually being a co-researcher with a someone in universities from US and being in Kakuma
Refugee Camp is something that I am not able to do. It is something big. I hopeful that even if I am more.

SM: Tell me about the hopeful, the more. What would be the more part?

Ikizere: The more part is the research I will learn about. I learn a lot from the research on the outcomes and my skills are going to increase in researching and writing. And I already love to write. It's going to be much stronger my writings are going to be much stronger. (Ikizere, interview #1, 9 February 2017)

As the participants continued with the course and co-facilitating the workshops in their communities, they noticed that their definition of hope changed for them. This is seen when Ikizere said:

Ikizere: I think the day learned they learned additional skill and how to think deeply and create story and how to write a story just nothing. Just nothing, but just use imagination to write a story or a doll or solving some problems. Just as [sic] speak; I think that’s what they learned from.

SM: Do you think that they learned something from you or what major thing did you get from participating?

Ikizere: Hope.

SM: Tell me more.

Ikizere: When I think I mentioned this before. It’s just like when you see someone happy, you also feel happy. You also smile without thinking about
it. This is how it was. When you see other people hopeful you also get hopeful.

SM: Do you feel like it’s contagious?

Ikizere: [Both Laugh] Uh hmm, it is. You can see someone and it’s just like if I feel this way, think about that one, and when you talk to the person you find out that he or she is full of hope. And then you think, oh, why not me? I thought that she or he was the least person. To just I think someone who is poor you tend to imagine that he or she is not happy, but when you talk to them, you find out he is even happier. Then you say, what? Why not me? I also have to be happy if she or he does not have anything. What about me who has, who just has hope? I have to be happy. That is how it is with hope (Ikizere, interview #1, 1 February 2017)

While Umwizero explained:

Yes my hope has changed several times because the first time my hope was like I have a hope but I don't know what it is.

SM: Yeah.

Umwizero: Now after when we were discussing through workshops, through meeting with different people and opportunity a lot and got new ideas about how to think feel yourself. If you need something – how to deal with situations, how you can wait in the moment and how you can do when things go wrong, what you can do. (Umwizero, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)
In the semi-structured interviews, the participants expanded their definition of hope. Hope was not only felt on an individual context but also on a collective context that nurtured other people’s hopes.

Some of the participants explained that they felt a collective hope during the psychosocial peace-building education course because it brought a different kind of engagement than what they experienced in their courses in Kakuma and home countries. Espérer explained:

Espérer: When I'm doing the course, I remember what happened when I was in my home country. I remember many things the way we studied, the way we were together with others. I remember many things. Yeah, because the way we study is very different, the way we study in my home country. I was together with people who we speak same language. We were just planning that we were standing together. We go spend a weekend, things like that. But now together with people with different nationalities, it means that when we are together we don't speak things apart from our studies. We cannot take time [to] discuss about our lives. We don't speak a lot. We just go to school. Yes that's what I remember. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Espérer continued:

Espérer: When I was doing the workshop. When I was doing the workshop there was something that I like too much – to work in a group to work in a group being together just telling stories. Sometimes it arrived at the time that
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smiling. That's what empowered me. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Other participants remarked about what they expected from the psychosocial peace-building education course and what role of engagement played in changing their hopeful views. Ikizere summed up what others were feeling.

Ikizere: My first expectation was to see everyone happy and free to talk and like a creating relationships and making relationships. I saw that.

SM: How did you see that?

Ikizere: At the end of the workshop. When we started no one everyone was really shy including myself. But as we moved on I don't know later on I realize that I'm getting to be free with everyone, and everyone in the workshop and I have seen those there. There were two Ugandan ladies they were talking to themselves but again at the end the Ugandan the one Ugandan lady was talking to a Congolese lady. They were free to talk to each other.

SM: Do you feel like that is and usual that would happen?

Ikizere: Yeah it is.

SM: Ok.

Ikizere: It is unusual because when you see someone you suddenly know that he/she is not from your here culture and you not do not share the same language, but you don't have to talk to that person. So when at the end, you realize that she can talk to you in Swahili, why not talk to her? (Ikizere, Interview #1, 9 February 2017)
With this particular participant, the thoughts and feelings continued to expand and were reflected on. We co-facilitated together six months later in interview #3.

Ikizere: The one with the mamas with you [Staci]. I've had many stories since but not even from workshops but I've been able to engage some other people to see if what people have been saying, maybe, it's like what to compare. To compare remember the workshop the mamas at NRC, I found the day or even committed to help others even if they are in worse situations. It was like I was living in my own world there. But again I've been able to interact with some other mamas from my community and I've learned a lot.

SM: Why do you think that happen, that you were interacting more?

Ikizere: Well, I think I used to have my own world and my family and my work and my students and church maybe, but what was like outside not close to me now. I'm more interested in new people some other people. I remember the mama that said that she had some medicine poison. Nowadays I do tell mamas about children with poison problems and I just tell them in Kakuma 2 there is just a mama have such medicine can you go consult between others and see. And after some time the mama, see, tells me, “Oh thank you I went to Kakuma 2 to get the medicine my child needed.” And now it is in such a way now I'm interacting with many women that I was not used to interacting with.

I remember with one there is one who entered this very sad situation I met her at the hospital to see someone at the hospital. She had that kid that
was still suffering and she told me that even if I'm coming here that no medicine from this hospital is not going to help my kid. If only if I could have known to find medicine for her. I told her that maybe you can check, that you can check with other women in Kakuma 2. By the time, I'm in touch with some women. Even if I was not able to find that's one from the workshop I have been able to know who has those medicines, just herbal medicine that they've gotten from Tanzania for poison. That women could not go to Kakuma 2 to find the medicine and unfortunately her kid died. And after her child died she came to me and said I wish I could have followed you advice and look for medicine in Kakuma 2.

SM: Wow.

Ikizere: I told her don't worry, maybe that was the fate maybe it was too late. I don't know, maybe I felt somehow sad. Why didn't I insist; why didn't I go for her and find some medicine for her. But now she is one of my friends. You see we interact. We discuss about many issues. She was traumatized to lose her first child. It was really traumatizing. But now as we interact; she is now hopeful. Maybe she will get another one, but she is happy now.

SM: Why do you think that you changed, what made the difference?

Ikizere: What I think is actually the time that I've had with stranger women, if I can say that they were strange.

SM: At NRC?
Ikizere: I did not know them; they did not know me, but I found myself free talking to them. It's not normal it wasn't it.

SM: Why wasn’t it normal?

Ikizere: Because I don't have time for other people. I only have time for my job, my family, and church but now for example Sunday. You see it used to be like that but now I feel more open with you. Remember, I interacted with kids at the workshop. Now their mothers we are not really friends, I was friends with him because they went to their kids went to church. I was been there teacher. I was more in the relationship with her kids, but now mamas they are free. I am free from each other now. Yes, of course of course now, I know that my problem might not be only myself in the same situation. Now I have some people that I know I can go to and discuss my problems with them and find a solution. (Ikizere, interview #3, 9 June 2017)

This participant’s perspective increased her hopeful view as the recognition of how community members can be a wealth of resources and solutions. Along with increasing a personal outlook, the data has shown that participants’ engaging and actively listening with different community members also supports shifting their hopeful views. In a number of instances, despair, false hope, and hope appeared in the same interview and at times in the same thought process and sentence.
Summary: Sub-threads in Reflecting on Critical Hope and Critical Despair

The first theme, reflecting on critical hope and critical despair weaves despair, false hope, and despair in complex ways. In many instances, participants were able to apply all three feelings in one context. For example, Tesifa said:

Higher education create peace because first of all the majority of the people who are dying, who are fighting have not gone to school. Now someone who is educated that will just go around they come and we will fight. We fight as a Dinga, we fight as a Neur, because were are fighting. But if the opportunity for education, higher education is given to you someone who is educated will not hold a gun and go and fight. Why would they go and fight because I can speak with the Neur and find out why do we keep on fighting. So definitely we are not allowed to send ourselves to school. We are allowed to use a tool to kill ourselves. I think that higher education, if I will have that opportunity in the future, I will use it as a tool to bring peace for young people, mostly for the youth. (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

The despair could be seen as the inability to stop the fighting when no one is willing to halt the fighting. The false hope and wish could be seen that just education will bring peace. The participant’s hope, perhaps was that eventually fighting will cease and peace will come to their country. Also most participants wanted to play a role in that peacemaking, and in order to do so, most indicated they needed education. This individual believed strongly that education does play a direct role in supporting this
peace process. Umwizero also interweaves this concept of despair, false hope, and hope.

Umwizero: You know to be a refugee it’s not the end of your life. Sometimes you go back to your country and you make things happen. You still make changes.

SM: Yeah.

Umwizero: Even you can get resettlement, going abroad to study. Even you can be rich. You go there and work, see, you set up your business in abroad countries. So some people pretty big can be integrated in the host country where they can instill those some things. That’s why some refugees that they have a hope. They are not alone. They are not the end of the refugees. Do refugees not stop (inaudible) at first they were refugees even the call the news of the day story about Jesus they were refugees. They are nowadays they are refugees. Refugees have a hope. (Umwizero, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

The despair could be seen as the reality of being a refugee. The false hope and/or wish could be seen as the possibility of resettlement that often takes years, if not decades and often results in not resettling. As well as, the want, the wish for more education can also be seen as a false hope due to the fact that only 1% of the refugee population actually is enrolled can pay for higher education degrees. Furthermore, many of the scholarships are capped at a certain age and many of the individuals that I have interviewed are beyond that age cap. The participant’s hope could be seen is that they are not alone is their situation. They found engagement in the workshops
that they are the experts of their own problems and that they can be a resource for others to develop different solutions.

Participants remarked that listening to people’s stories supported their hopeful views. They found similarities, offered their own processes, and were challenged by their own assumptions with regard to how to solve their own problem. They found that perhaps there were different ways of coping, doing things, and most of all they did not feel alone. They spoke of the act of getting together. The intentional hopeful exchanges created times, spaces, and places to have meaningful dialogues. They had the ability to share their own despair, false hopes, and hope in a place where they felt they were not alone. Umwizero illustrated:

Umwizero: Okay and these four weeks I used to feel hope when discussing different stories from different backgrounds like South Sudanese. They have a different background how they survived in the world how they were coming from South Sudan up to Kakuma. Also others. How did they call cope with the situations with schools how did they manage all the students all. So that gives me hope. I can feel that I'm not alone. Also we are many. Because sometimes I can feel real alone I'm alone but others have suffered than me.

(Umwizero, Interview #1, 8 February 2017)

Some of the stories started with hope, while most stories were full of immense struggle, loss, and empathy. However, through the process of psychosocial peace building education course, most participants said they left with new friends and
strategies to reconcile with the many identities they had to experience in their short span.

**Theme #2: Reconciling Identities**

Through the interviews and course, too often the stories that participants told were of trauma they experienced in and out of the camp. Although in the psychosocial peace building education course, the stories were fictional and were most likely a personification or have some factual foundation, some participants chose to focus on their own story. One particular narrative that was told repeatedly was about the process of running away from being killed. The stories followed the same rhythm: running, hiding in people’s homes, being found, and running again. What will stay with me is a comment that many of the participants said in so many words, “I am safe, but what about my family, my community, what about them?” The great loss of life and identity, as well as the inability to protect their family members was evident. Participants carried this with their words, as well as physically as they sat with us. One community member I vividly recall in a white button down oversized shirt explained a similar scenario. The participant’s face said everything without uttering a word.

The participants explained in so many ways (e.g., stories, interviews, observations, and so on) that they are continuing to reconstruct their lives as they leave one place and move to another. This reconciling of identities appeared to be one of the most difficult undertakings that most refugees face daily. Through the course, how they reconciled with their personal identities and collective identities
(e.g., refugees) was through empathy and offering empathic responses to participants
who shared the narratives that were presented in the workshop.

**Loss**

Loss is a sub-thread to the reconciling identities theme. Many participants
reported a sense of loss of loved ones, loss of self, loss of self-determination, and loss
of community. Ithemba explained all of these.

Ithemba: Here in Kakuma, okay the hope what is affecting me in
Kakuma. The environment itself is is [sic] hostile. Sometimes depending on
somebody because we are dependent by the UN. Because you you [sic] don't
get all the basic needs you demand. In this case I taking care of my relative
my family my mom and the rest. But someone who's not working it is very
hard that is a problem that I'm facing here in Kakuma currently. Before the
war broke out in South Sudan I was able to contribute to the welfare of my
parents, my family, my relatives. I was doing some work and I could support
them. No I cannot do anything with him. We are all dependent.

SM: What kind of work were you doing?

Ithemba: In 2011-2014, I was working with an organization I was the
registratician with the organization called [name withheld]. And after that I
changed to [name withheld]. From there I was also working as a field officer
for [name withheld] division and food division for the affected
population. My area was affected, and then I was withdraw from myself from
South Sudan. (Ithemba, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)
While living in South Sudan, Ithemba contributed to his family and his community. The individual had meaningful work. Now, as a refugee, Ithemba is dependent and not able to work however capable. Espérer also described how the family’s life changed as they traveled to Kakuma.

Espérer: Before I came here my country was not good. It was a crazy and I was in the second year of University. I was also the last boy. Before it was 2015 then the crazy start. When the crazy starts many people have been killed in my quarter. Then because in that quarter young people active in the contesting the president. Then many you people have been killed, friends, I mean friends that would give us base spending we came together. When we've been together they were killed. It arrived to me even that to sleep at night becomes impossible. Just laying at the door you start thinking how this is happening. I have even friends they have disappeared. We don't know where they are. We heard that they were arrested. We saw the vehicle taking them because when we arrived we are free. Then the day they come look for us when they catch you. We tried to look in the prison. We communicated with [name withheld] to look for in the prison, but they didn't find them in the prison. Until now one year or something, we don't know if they are dead or died or in prison. We don't know anything. So at that time I really feel hopeful, hopeless I mean until I decided to come here. When I came here [Kakuma]. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 Feb 2017)
The participant spoke of a loss of education, friends, and family before the participant arrived in Kakuma. Both Ithemba and Espèrer circumstances that they were faced with were out of their control and, although they were relatively safe in Kakuma, they continued to reflect on the trauma and the circumstances and the reasons why they fled.

**Trauma**

Trauma is also a sub-thread to the reconciling identities theme. Trauma is defined as, “involve[d] threats to life or bodily integrity, or a close personal encounter with violence and death” (Herman, 1997, p. 33). Most refugees, if not all refugees to some degree, have had extensive, severe, trauma called complex post-traumatic stress in their lives (Herman). This is seen when a participant explained what brought them to Kakuma.

Ithemba: Yeah you know as a human being when you see dangers you run. You run away from danger. You cannot be insist but the people who benefiting because of war. They may be part of that problem and then they like to be there when the problem is there, and also and the problem got them. But the people who don't want the problem, when you see someone being affected you feel more affected. Actually I know that some people are still in South Sudan working there trying to survive there but I me personally, I am a person who is more easily affected by the suffering of people.

(Ithemba, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)
Another participant explained that living in a refugee camp has brought on more stress and trauma.

Ikizere: You know when you are know you are not anytime soon to go back home, you feel like, how am I going to end? And sometimes when a neighbor dies, if I'm going to end like that one. Am I going to to [sic] burn here? Am I just going to survive on an incentive pay? You just asked yourself too many questions that you don't have answers to and now thinking about kids and their future and that again. You have some needs that you're not able to provide for, and you have people that need you. You can't do nothing and help them and some of the people are desperate and you feel like you are concerned but you have nothing. You lose hope (Ikizere, interview #3, 9 June 2017)

Rajo echoed the sentiment and explained the feeling of trauma in a metaphorical way.

Rajo: Horrible nightmares I have almost every night in my entire life. It's like finding, finding [sic] a small bad in an egg and finding and already it wants to get out of that shell. It wants to be free and that's what I want now. I want to be free from being a refugee. But that doesn't mean I just want to go and finish. But I want to give back to my community and to give back to my community you need to have something to give. I don't think I have something to give so far. (Rajo, interview #1, 7 February 2017)

When participants spoke of trauma, they also spoke of ways they were coping. One way was to have a sense that they were giving back to their host country, their own
country, and the world. The other way many cope is to shift their identity and leave
one identity, figuratively and literally, as they enter the gates of the refugee camp and
start anew. As they struggle again for yet another shifting identity, their past
identities and trauma linger.

**Empathy**

Empathy is the last sub-thread of the reconciling identities theme. Kakuma is
not only an intolerable environment, but also can be a very lonely place as one is in a
new place, new languages are spoken, and most often one is dependent on aid
agencies. Participants appeared to have the ability to empathize with their
community members.

Empathy is different than sympathy. On the one hand sympathy is feeling
sorry for someone’s hardship. On the other hand empathy is defined as the
“sensitivity to the ‘felt meaning’ which the client [participant] is experiencing in this
particular moment in order to help him or her to focus on that meaning and carry it
further to its full and uninhibited experiencing” (Rogers, 1980, p. 141). In other
words, it is a process of being present and showing up for the community member in
a way that is “as if” (Rogers, 1980) the participant not only understands, but also puts
themselves vicariously in the lived situation that allow them to feel (to a certain
extent) their pain, struggle, and/or hope. Roger’s (1980) version is geared toward a
therapist-client relationship, however many of the conditions of facilitating a dialogue
are also appropriate in the psychosocial peace-building course. Rogers defined
empathy in more concrete terms, when he said:
[The] therapist senses accurately the feelings and personal meanings that the client is experiencing and communicates this understanding to the client. When functioning best, the therapist is so much inside the private world of the other that he or she can clarify not only the meanings of which the client is aware but even those just below the level of awareness. This kind of sensitive, active listening is exceedingly rare in our lives. We think we listen, but very rarely do we listen with real understanding, true empathy. Yet listening, of this very special kind, is one of the most potent forces for change that I know. (p. 116)

Otherwise stated, participants applied active listening and a level understanding of “your pain is also my pain” that provided space for them to have “an empathic response” (Zembylas, personal communication, 2 March 2015). An example of this was when Tesifa said:

Tesifa: Basically I gained it in such a way because I realized through sharing the experiences that there other people have gone through similar experiences and I did not try to confine myself in my own situation. I also see others’ experiences and I see okay, this is the part of the world that we have to go through. Besides that there's only one thing that we need to stick to. It is our personal sharing and how we go about our problems. And that is how we go about our change. (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

While Rajo explained empathy in this way:

Rajo: Okay, it had a lot of parts, many parts of it. The most part that had a lot of meaning [was] the writing part the journaling part, while we made stories
and shared them, that is the part that had the lot of meaning. Listening to
different people listening to myself was really very amazing. It was also, I
don't know how to put that, but it kind of has a lot of emotions to it. It's like
listening to people, so listening to people in depth, it's like you get a lot of
ideas. You get how they deal with their own problems. You kind of have like
another class that you have another teacher teaching you how they (sic) it's
like seeing how they the other few, the other perspective, other people that is
very great. And that had a lot of meaning because it gives you a chance to
really know other people so that you really know yourself. If maybe you
knew people from one side from one perspective, it's kind of not good you are
kind of limiting, you kind of restricted, but when you can submerge into a
person and see them from their kind of sides, of course you have your own
view, own perspective and seeing the other side was one best things that had a
lot of impact on me and had a lot of meaning in me.

SM: You mentioned that you found out you talked a lot about finding out
about yourself. Can you say more about that?

Rajo: Yeah well, put in the shoes of others, you know, kind of makes you
kind of feel how they felt. It's like imagining that you had the same situation,
you are like in their place and kind of see another reaction in yourself that you
would have actually acted the way they are doing it right away due to that
thing that they're experiencing from their perspective, right now. All the
sudden in your place, you have another view, another feeling, another
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perspective and in them you kind of see your true self. When you kind of see things from other’s perspective. You kind of feel like okay, if you see this side, then then (sic) this is how I would have done it, this is how I would have felt.

And that really evokes a lot of hope. That evokes a lot of hope because some times back in our sessions I shared with you that I really wanted to go back to Somalia and really use this peace and change a lot of lives. Although I had contributed to my wanting to go back to Somalia, though it seems kind of very simple thing but it can trigger a lot of emotion, emotions in you that you really don't think of them all the time [which is] something very handy. The kind of hope that it puts in you is like it gives you to think, to think critically because you are kind of feel like you have the space and that matters a lot. That gives you the chance to think, but when you're preoccupied you're very busy; you don't have enough space to even think about what you want in the future or you just keep on doing the daily activities – you work, you do the same thing that you do yesterday. It comes on circle and you think just coming back and back. You just sit around in group of people kind of totally different gives you mental space, psychological space, and maybe a social space where will you interact with other people, when they otherwise people wouldn't interacted with this project. With this project it's kind of great because it gives the people time and space to share even if they are not told to say this and this in the
workshop. You're not even told what to expect. It's kind of shares what significant in them then that matters a lot. That reduces a lot of stress psychologically and also cracks the brain to think differently then they really do. (Rajo, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

The excerpt showed a progression of how the mindset changed as the individual intentionally engaged in meaningful dialogue. Most participants explained that some people they would have never met some people (due to proximity, ethnic/identity, and/or community) if they were not a part of the project. This meeting was different than just a meeting for they indicated that they had meaningful dialogues that seemed to change their perception of each other and their surroundings. This offered a time, place, and space for hope. As the interview progressed, Rajo indicated that through active listening and understanding people’s stories, empathy was felt. The participant continued on the same thread:

Rajo: It's just the personal thing I'm trying to figure out what you feel when you have that feeling. When others are happy you are all so happy regardless of their faith, their race, their nationality. Other humans are very happy you are also very happy. You are also satisfied fellow colleagues are very happy that kind of thing is what the workshop did. The other thing that was having friends and I was also one of the many people that do have a lot of friends, many friends, only this side of Kakuma because I never went to that side. What this thing help me to hope much more. It helps you interact with other people regardless of their nationality, just in general. They’re humans as long
as interact with them. Then it's like different when you just bump into somebody on your way and you say ‘Hi hello hello hello.’ And then tomorrow you don't remember them the guy you bumped [onto] or the lady you met somewhere. She may not remember you. Do you remember her or she? But it is different when you sit with someone when you just talk to to [sic] the person she listens to you. You listen to her. You kind of listen and see that and see that you people have other other [sic] person inside of them another human being inside them. Maybe from the facial expression or how they're sitting do to the environment maybe the person could be looking sad or looking angry then when you really sit with them the person or maybe he looks ugly when you sit with them, it's totally different. That's when they share that's deep-seated in their mind that's when you hear the real them.

(Rajo, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Rogers (1980) noted that when people are “empathically heard,” there is a tendency to be a more “real, more genuine” person (p. 117). In the participant’s case above, this thought also resonated with the individual. Often in the interviews, participants reported that they felt heard, seen, and valued. They indicated that listening without interruption to people’s stories and then examining them with strength-based approach helped them to be fully authentic and see the person sitting next to them. Often participants would embrace the storyteller and/ or hold her/his hand, as the storyteller would tell their stories. They listened. They questioned with strength-based questions. The participant responded to the questions. Only after they
did these steps, did they offer their own solutions. The process forced them to listen in a different way.

**Summary: Sub-threads in Reconciling Identities**

As participants’ identity shifts, so does their level of agency and how they see themselves in the world, and what they believe is true. Some participants explained how their identity evolved throughout the years of trying to survive and making do with what they had. This interview excerpt is a reflection of what many participants have to endure while they are reconciling their identities being: a citizen of their own country, a refugee, an employed person, a person that might be resettled, a parent, and back to being just a refugee. Tumaini explained:

Tumaini: It [Hope] changed towards a negative towards backward, okay, why there is a reason. First of all, last time I was a student in the same program with [name withheld], but at the same time I was planning to have a better job because currently as a refugee I am working incentive business paid. Ok, it's not a secret I am paid 6000 Kenya shillings money and I have a family of 5 people. I have to sustain them. So I have made some some [sic] arrangement so I can get a work permit here in Kenya where by, if refugees have a work permit you can now work and receive your salary according to your qualifications like any other Kenya or national staff. So I tried that process, but when I reach to the final stage the final people who called up assisted me I saw them they were not very transparent. I try to approach them. Even I went to their office in Nairobi capital city but unfortunately, okay, I don't hide
because it is common and it is country. They requested me to pay some money, in form of corruption. I don't believe in that, I didn't have that money, quite a lot of money, so I was discouraged. I tried every office I could go. Even I was crying in front of them inside. You just go if you don't have sodas for us. I just left and came back to Kakuma. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Tumaini took the initiative to explore how to get a work permit. The individual wanted a better job that paid more. When many refugees lose employment in their respective countries, there is a loss of identity. This is a loss of a social identity of being an “employed person.” Tumaini was employed as an incentive staff and this has a vastly different meaning from a national or salaried staff. It also comes with significant limited funding. In addition, receiving a work permit is nearly impossible (Goitom, 2016). If they do receive one, it is because a bribe was paid.

Tumaini continued and talked about resettling, which if it happened would make the participant take on yet another identity.

Tumaini: So I had a promise of a better job as long as I could get that work permit, but it didn't work. So that is one of the reasons my hope went down and the second reason I have done an interview resettlement for USA. Some years back by the time we were here, I was still having some little hope for that it will go through, but as the days go, I think things are changing not towards a good but bad, because they, okay, I did I met immigration officials in 2013. They cleared me. They have an approval, but immigration it took
two years. I said [I] know some of the people just going going going [sic] even those who completed the interview after me. So what's wrong with me? Did you maybe find I am a terrorist or I'm a bad person? What's wrong? There was no clear responsive, just be waiting, waiting. That was their response.

After 2015, I got my second child. Once you get another baby, the process starts again. So I went through the same application, I went to again and worked with people. So I went for the first primary interview. It was okay then I met the immigration officials. I went through the same interview, I did for the first time. Even for my newborn and again I got approval letter. Then but after again 2 years from that time, it is still just waiting waiting waiting [sic] unfortunately, because when you're approved now, you go through a medical process and some other final activities before the flight. But when we left here, when I opened my file, they said no. You will go again to start again. You will meet again immigration officials.

SM: Oh my gosh.

Tumaini: So now it's like I started this process like 2011. I've done it some interviews. Things went well, but I don't know what it is. Now the issue is coming he will again meet the immigration official. I was given a date which was given in April but almost April they changed the date. There is a program of refugee immigration, refugees to USA is suspended, so until further notice. So now upset, I wanted to write to them because, please, maybe even
before my case delayed, a lot some people who started process 2 years after, they have gone Australia to Canada or maybe they are here, but for me, let me give you an example for what the impact you have caused me. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Although this is a highly detailed situation, in general terms, this process that this individual has stated above is not unusual. Most often the disappointment and impatience increases as resettling becomes metaphorically speaking, a mirage.

One identity that remained consistent for this participant was being a parent. Like most parents, they want the best care for their child, and so did Tumaini. Tumaini reflected on the arduous steps of taking care of his child and how the possibility of resettling actually became a barrier. Tumaini continues:

Tumaini: When my child got sick I was told no. Okay you see he's in a critical condition. You are you're about to go to America so there he will get treated very well. So you [names withheld] feel they could treat well my child who was in a critical condition because they knew I'm almost going to America. When my child was almost dying I took the decision of selling out my small house. I got rent money from the Somali. And I took from the private I took on my own initiative in Nairobi for the care treatment. It cost me all the money that I have received from that house. So now I'm living in a 2 by 3 meters small house because the other one is sold [so] that I can take care of my child. He was operated on and it went okay. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)
As Tumaini continued to explain the situation, the individual received an opportunity for a scholarship for higher education. He would be able to have an identity of a student. However, as the participant explained yet again, the possibility of resettling becomes another barrier.

Tumaini: He [baby] is okay now but now I'm living in a very very [sic] unacceptable condition for human being and I got a chance for a scholarship. When I did the interview, have you ever replied for a resettlement? I said yes, I told them the truth. Oh no, we are sorry we don't take people under immediate consideration or settlement consideration. I told no, yes I am, I once the resettlement but it took more than 5 years I don't even know whether ever happen. They said, “Oh we are sorry; you can study.” 1 year. So it's like you are playing around. So when the chance came up for the scholarship, I can't get. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)

As the interview finished, the participant returned to the identity that the individual was trying to avoid—being a refugee.

Tumaini: So there are things that I can't get because of this issue of resettlement. And I see nothing coming out so I'm completely discouraged because those people I wanted to ask them to reject me so that my file is returned UNHCR. At least I'm in normal refugee [status] and that case, and if I am sick, I can be treated well. If there's a chance for maybe local scholarship, I will go for further study. But they said no, just be patient just be patient. I have copies of those letters that I wrote to America immigration
officials. They just know they just said to be patient. I said for how long? So that is the second thing, which is really disturbing me. And my hope is down so I'm just in the middle [and want] more assistance that I can't get. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Tumaini’s situation reflects many conversations that I have been a part of while running the psychosocial peace building education course. Participants speak about of their identities radically shifting in and out of what appeared to me to be false hopes.

What offered some reprieve to many participants was that some recognized that they were not alone in reconciling their identities. This recognition offered solace and support that is seen in this participant’s explanation.

Umwizero: Okay I feel it changes by meeting different people. Once we meet with people, we share different stories. We interact with them. I see that I'm not alone, that I'm not alone. You can meet with people and people can listen to me. I can get something to tell people. (Umwizero, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Although stories of loss and trauma were a consistent thread throughout the storytelling, there was also a sense of gratitude, hope, and movement through the loss and trauma. What appeared to support this healing process was actively listening to other participants’ narratives that countered existing narratives (both internally and externally).
Theme #3: Resurfacing Narrative and Creating New Narratives of Hope

The reader should bear in mind that the study is based on specific narratives because the main component of the psychosocial peace-building education course was story making and storytelling as well as critical hope. When critical hope is applied in the classroom, we are asking pertinent questions about whose voices are heard in describing the refugee and immigrant experience, and whose voices are absent. These questions support participants to create their own counternarrative so that they can defend themselves and resist systematic oppression (Freire, 2003; Yosso, 2005).

However, narratives can also inform participants’ beliefs about themselves and the world around them. According to Braddock and Dillard's (2016), “Exposure to narratives can affect message recipients’ beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors such that they move into closer alignment with viewpoints espoused in those narratives” (pg. 463). In other words, as participants have more exposure to different narratives, their beliefs, so did their behaviors shift (e.g., Talking to different people outside of their culture).

Narratives can be used in storytelling, songs, biographies, and ethnographies. Official narratives are defined as stories that legitimize the dominant narrative at the expense of the non-dominant narratives (Peters & Lankshear, 1996), while counternarratives are narratives that counter the dominant narratives. Steimel (2010) outlined two dominant narratives of asylum seeker that does not have refugee status when she stated that “asylum seekers occupy two primary roles in news coverage:
frauds or victims. Initially, asylum seekers are often depicted as deviants or frauds, requiring that the state act to protect local communities from the instability and vice they bring” (pg. 222). Counternarratives take into account the social and political contexts within which the official narrative is made. Steimel explained the power of framing asylum seekers or refugees as victims “may encourage American policy decisions which control refugee resettlement (where they choose to settle, which programmes they must enroll in, and so on) in a way that strips refugees of agency and hinders refugee empowerment” (p. 232). Furthermore, most often these dominant narratives are created externally and are often internalized as being authentic and real, even though most are just stereotypes, broad generalizations, and often factually incorrect.

By countering existing narratives, refugees’ expertise of lived experience appeared to be strengthened. This is seen in one of the groups, I initially ran by myself. Participants disclosed that news outlets offered a vastly different picture of themselves than theirs. They remarked because of their ethnicity, religion, clothes, and facial features, the media, and social media made them look like terrorists. Participants questioned why the world saw them this way. They continued to push back against the dominant narratives throughout the session. The result was that they insisted that I tell people back home and write that these dominant narratives are misleading, hurtful, and offer a false representation of refugees.
Narratives (Internal and External)

Narratives (internal and external) are sub-threads of the theme of resurfacing narratives and are creating new narratives of hope. According to Halverson (2011), stories are “event units,” whereas, narratives are “made up of several of these interrelated ‘event units’ that work together as a system. There’s no maximum number, but there is a minimum (at least two) (para. 4). I found that many of the stories refugees tell themselves happen internally and externally. As the stories multiply, the narrative strengthens of how they see themselves, how the world sees them, and what they want to change. By listening to a variety of stories with different outcomes, collective narratives can shift. For example, some participants who participated in a course I facilitated by myself, spoke about how their perspective shifted with regard to their perspective on people with different abilities. Espérer said:

Espérer: I heard someone saying that there's a common word that someone says when someone was saying that the doll is... handicapped. It can't fly; it can just stay there. Then I was thinking for example, when you hurt a child and that child is a handicap. Doesn't mean that he cannot do anything or yeah, when, I was doing that course you know there are many comments when someone bring up a story about the doll. There were many comments. When they were commenting there was a comment which you can get, which is I can say, which touched you you [sic] feel like it was very truthful of you and
others. For me it was helpful, hopeful. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

As the interview continued, Espérer offered a counternarrative on how the dominant masculine role shifted as the individual participated in the group.

Espérer: Yeah you know there is an our culture is different and when we are making the dolls someone said my child the doll my child is crying, and I don't know why he is crying. I tried even tried to make a doll for for [sic] my child.

SM: I remember that.

Espérer: Remember yeah that means that in different cultures, people cannot do that, cannot do that towards a man. Man cannot hold a child. While the wife [is there] he's not allowed. The wife has to go with the child and go with her. But that man stayed at home with the child. It was a small child that inspired me. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Espérer recognized that some of the dominant narratives that the individual had internally evolved and countered through the help and support of the peers dialogue.

**Counternarratives**

Counternarratives are sub-threads to the theme of resurfacings narratives and creating new narratives of hope. Counternarratives create spaces for refugees to voice their own narratives and oppose the dominant narrative. In this particular example, the dominant narrative was based internally. Initially, Ikizere thought that people who did not speak the same language and/or come from the similar ethnicities
would not be able to engage. However, through the experience Ikizere was offered a counternarrative.

Ikizere: At the end of the workshop when we started, no one, everyone was really shy, including myself. But as we moved on, I don't know later on, I realize that I'm getting to be free with everyone. And everyone in the workshop and I have seen those there. There were two Ugandan ladies. They were talking to themselves but again at the end the Ugandan the one Ugandan lady was talking to a Congolese lady. They were free to talk to each other.

SM: Do you feel like that is unusual that would happen?

Ikizere: Yeah it is.

SM: Ok

Ikizere: It is unusual because when you see someone you suddenly know that he she is not from your here culture and you not do not share the same language but you don't have to talk to that person. So when at the end you realize that she can talk to you in Swahili, why not talk to her? (Ikizere, interview #1, 9 February 2017)

In this situation, Ikizere recognized that the dominant narrative Ikizere’s has been told, that is, not to engage with people that they do not know or those who cannot speak their language was false. This individual encountered a new narrative, a new experience that people can communicate and have meaningful dialogues regardless of language or culture.
In contrast to the dominant narrative, another participant explained about a dominant narrative of their country of waiting for just external interventions in their country. In fact, while taking a higher education course at an organization, the participant was writing a paper about how to support the peace effort in the country.

Tesifa: Yeah I was saying it is great and I'm working on the paper trying to analyze the cause of the conflict in the our country. Right away when we sign the Accord in 2005 up to 2013 up to date. I'm trying to look at trying to find the conflict around the country try to come up with a summary what courses and what were some of the significant things that need to be taken care of. I think in relating to this this this [sic] learning if we go back to my country, I will use this knowledge that I'm working on this paper that I got from here to make sure my people gain peace (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Tesifa continued, explaining that the paper is about the biographies of their leaders. This research was done to understand the leaders’ positions and recognize that some of the positions and leadership styles need to be avoided in the future.

Tesifa: It is very amazing if course I first I have a vision my country will one day have peace, that peace must come if we all single out the courses of the conflict, of all the conflict[s], single it out the next step we need to share it with the stakeholders. We need to talk about it if we talk about it we will move on that way, we'll know as citizens, as whole citizens and this is what the end, this is how we'll do it and this is how peaceful come in my country. It is not been taking place in my country.
Also trying to look at individual but biography. How are leaders the way they are brought up into their current positions because of our problems, because they are not brought up to lead in a proper manner and so. So as I'm doing the analysis, I'm trying to figure out what their biography, one by one.

SM: Nice.

Tesifa:: Their biography. Some of their courses and some of their biography and the diversity of our people.

The participant continued to explain that there is a need to not only learn about their leaders, but also give this knowledge back to their community. In some aspects, if they were to return and teach this knowledge to others, which is the action of critical hope, they would be experiencing critical hope.

**Critical Hope**

Critical hope is the practice of teaching that uses a critical theory lens to address unjust systems through meaningful dialogue and empathic responses. Unlike critical despair, critical hope allows the participant and facilitator, the student and teacher, the community and the government, to interrogate the problem and offer empathic solutions that are respectful of the culture and the context. Critical hope can happen externally in the classroom and internally in the participant. An example of this happening internally for a participant, follows.

Ikizere: Yeah, remember when when they [participants] told us to close the door?

SM: Uh Huh.
Ikizere: The [sic] homework and write the stories. I'm not sure they were going to have time to write their stories. I myself know go through when I am at home. I cannot find time to do any extra work. So when I saw the doors closed. I said ‘wow.’ I feel very hopeful even if the stories are [not] written. I did not go through their notebooks. So so [sic] I felt like they got time to to [sic] lock the doors they have obviously written their stories. I try to imagine of how they were feeling when they were writing their stories at home and what their questions were that they are kids. Their husband might ask them what they are doing. So maybe maybe [sic] they just transferred what they got from here to there to the family because that would also happen to me at home.

SM: Can you explain more?

Ikizere: Yeah, when I went home with the doll. My kid asked me what was it, if I brought it for him? I told him like no this is mine. [He asked], why how come did you get this from? I had to explain everything, how we made the dolls because mine had hand, a broken hand. He asked me if he can untie the hand I said, No no no [sic] you can you can hurt him. He asked me questions, why why [sic]? I told him the whole story he was beaten by his wife that he will have to be okay with just remove the the [sic] thread the thread that joined his hand to the neck and then he just carefully put him somewhere and then everyday he asks me is he now okay?

SM: Oh, he is worried about him.
Ikizere: Yeah and I realize that it created some I was able to see that he has a heart. If he can worry about a doll what about a person, a fellow human person? He can even maturely.

SM: Did you find anything about yourself going through this?

Ikizere: It was fun; it was fun and inspiring.

SM: What made it fun?

Ikizere: The whole thing – how we made dolls, to listen to stories to just create stories from no end, to make a very interesting story. It was fun.

SM: Ok, what made it interesting to you?

Ikizere: It is how it transforms your thinking.

SM: Tell me more about that.

Ikizere: Since like before before [sic] you are in you don't know what to expect and you have your own beliefs. You are not free, but as the workshop goes on you find out you have completely transformed. You are no longer the shy person. Now you are open and you are willing to participate and you are willing to think deeply and bring something beautiful from what you're doing.

SM: What do you think, what do you think about what makes you think deeply, what is that?

Ikizere: I don't know.

SM: You don't know?

Ikizere: I think it's like this. Of trying to know to know more I don't know to know more.
SM: Is it basically the questions being asked or differ or what do you think is the mechanism that makes it you said, ‘Think deeper’, what do you feel like, pushes that?

Ikizere: I think it's the motive behind and also the questions that are asked. The whole plan of how the workshop, is planned it makes you understand. It makes you have a desire to understand more. (Ikizere, interview #1, 9 February 2017)

For Ikizere, the kind of questions drew the Ikizere’s curiosity and critical thinking. During conversations with the child, the participant found that the son’s motive was to support and help the doll. The empathic response changed the participant’s perception of the son. Thus, this kind of process helped individuals to think more deeply about their own motives and the motives of other people they are engaged in because of the workshop.

Critical hope appeared in another workshop. While facilitating the course, the co-facilitator, or I asked participants to take a piece a paper and tell us how many sides were on the piece of paper. Too often, participants said, one. Then we explained that actually there are two sides. We showed them the front and back. Then I asked for participants to count how many corners using their home language. Participants counted four. We pointed out that there were actually eight corners. As participants understood what was happening, I explained that sometimes in a conversation, we only see one side of the story and only the points/corners of the
story we want to see. In this course, we will be intentional to see multiple sides, angles, and points in the story.

Then I brought up the single piece of paper and asked them to imagine it as something other than a piece a paper. Participants were often concrete and said it was document and/or picture. We pushed them further and gave them examples, such as, it could be wings. We then acted out flying and used the piece of paper for wings. Espérer suggested a door.

Espérer: When we after doing a survey making dolls I cannot say that there is a big change but something there's something change because I remember when you was asking us to attend the survey. You are telling us to be flexible things like that. Then when I arrive there you just tell us to open the door. You showed the paper like this what can this be. Then then [sic] I said it could be door. You asked me to open it. And I just did this. It refreshed it was refreshing my mind. When we left my mind fresh. There wasn't any bad thinking having things in my home country, thinking about that I was not thinking like that. I was making a doll things like that so for me. It helps me; it help me at that time. (Espérer, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

Six months later, I followed up with Espérer.

Espérer: Yes, I think know what I hope. I was hoping there is a change there is a change because whatever we are meeting, what you are expecting, you do
change. You change from this. From that I think there is a change about what
I hope and what I was hoping before. I think it is not the same.

SM: Can you tell me about it?

Espérer: Now as days go as they go there is you change your perspective.
Something that you're expecting, there's something that I expect maybe I see
that is I can change, and I can change from one and another

SM: So what were you expecting to do the last time I saw you?

Espérer: The last time you saw me there was something teaching making
dolls. Before I was not seeing potential of making dolls. I was not aware of
this part now now [sic] I know and and [sic] as I want to do in my future.
That is what I was thinking before of making a project about planning a
planning a project in disability, and that way, after showing us making the
dolls we have seen that making the dolls can help me in my project
concerning disability. Come help me so before I take this training I was not
seeing anything from the dolls, but but [sic] after using and making dolls now
I see that it will help me the hope that I will have I will get help from these
dolls. It will help me to establish my peace building project. (Espérer,
Interview #3, 12 June 2017)

Prior to meeting me, Espérer had already begun developing an idea of a peace
building project with four other individuals from Kakuma. After the course they
integrated the course into their project. While the course brought tools (e.g.
storytelling, doll-making, and so on), their actions of applying what was learned to the context that served their community was critical hope.

A component of critical hope is also applying Freire's (2003) concept of praxis, that is, “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (pg. 51). In other words, the individual or group of people need to have meaningful conversations to understand the power structures, the context, and build upon their own knowledge so that by their own volition and agency they can transform their situation. Rajo explained how self-reflection helped change the individual’s perspective. Rajo said:

Rajo: Of course, I'm not kept me thinking people who have terrible things happen to them to her life have been so strong and still ready to fight and find solutions to her problems, his problems and the case in in [sic] the participants. And then I reflected why should I have done why should not have thought about why haven't I thought of that idea even before that person. It was like that discussion was an eye opener not within the discussion in the session but even after. Many days after the session I would remember what someone would say, that during the session would say to fit in my head that was very creative way of solving that it was kind of problem. There was a number of times, I've had a problem similar to that almost a similar issue, and I was glad that I had that participated days before because because [sic] I was trying to fit always trying to to [sic] learn from the sessions and interaction where possible in my life, and that was nice and that was why it's getting
better. The truth is I am not as hopeful as I was sometimes back. (Rajo, Interview #3, 12 June 2017)

Summary: Sub-threads in Resurfacing Narratives and Creating New Narratives of Hope

Some participants like Ithemba, asserted that education is the key and plays pivotal role in changing the minds in their country people and the world. They believe that if/when the opportunity arises when they can return to their country, they will bring back the knowledge, lessons learned, and problem-solving skills that resides in Kakuma. In many aspects, this is critical hope, that is, the hope of returning and the action of educating. Ithemba asserted:

Ithemba: You know in the world today there are more problems and as human beings we can also play a part in either advocacy for the right of people, and also and trying to reduce violence in other ways is another positive. But I can suggest that developed nations can also act quickly if there's any problem. Because if anything affected a part of the world today is more affecting the globe. Like what is happening in South Sudan; it was started as a problem of South Sudanese but now it has also carry a burden to other people. The United Nations is working hard to provide all the basic needs to refugees all over to the Africa and also other parts of the world. We have the capability and we have the political positive to stop all these. We cannot allow people the president in the world to play with their own people so that let the problem rely on everybody. I think the United Nations the world superpower can
immediately try to intervene while there is a problem because if we have peace in the world it is more important solving it later. Then instead of let the problem come and then later you work on it. You have resources which you can stop before before [sic] the resources lack are gone. Resources are very necessary.

SM: Do you feel you can play a part in that?
Ithemba: Yes.

SM: And what does it look like?
Ithemba: Yes I can play I can play my part to educate people and I will work for that. Violence is not solution of the problem. If we have differences we can sit and discuss. Then we can find a way forward. Whether or I’m right or you are right and also discuss find the best solution. And fighting, we do not have help us at all whether you kill me is not ending the problem. Killing somebody is not solving the problem because you kill so and so. You can solve the problem; you can sit down and discuss and you can reconcile that is the best solution because, if I kill you today maybe your relative or family members will come and look for me which is not…and if we solve our differences on the table we discuss them. And then solve them. It will not affect me. It will not affect me [you] also. (Ithemba, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Ithemba wants the people of South Sudan to understand that an educated society draws from multiple points of views and multiple solutions. Ithemba applied
persuasive narratives and counternarratives as counterpoints to compare and contrast why education is the main ingredient for peace. Ithemba is not an unusual case. In fact, in the majority of the conversations I had with participants like Ithemba, the person recognized and asserted that they play a vital part in creating a new narrative of what they want to see in their country. Not unlike Ithemba, most believed it starts with education, too.

**Theme #4: Restoring Hope and Agency: Higher Education**

I facilitated one course with Kenyatta University before my chair and I decided that it was going to be impossible to continue the study due to the faculty strike. During the course Tšepo remarked:

> We must remember. Remember we started sitting on stones. Then we moved to crowded classrooms. We wanted to learn. Most of us are sponsored by the UN. We must remember. Now, we are here at Kenyatta sitting in these chairs. (Tšepo, personal communication, 15 February 2017)

This statement is not only insightful but also, it showed the strength and hopeful view that what education brings to refugees. With this particular group, most participants did not feel alone in their process of remembering the past, acknowledging their present state, and their future plans for their education.

Participants spoke about the challenges of receiving a quality education. They also spoke about the benefits of an education, both personally and in a wider world perspective. Throughout my journey with my participants, they spoke of having
access and opportunity to higher education and how that would change their lives and their communities.

**Challenges**

Challenges are a sub-thread of restoring hope and agency: Higher education theme. Participants mostly spoke of their frustration and challenges of either not furthering their education and/or lack of resources or opportunities. Most participants spoke of the reality of their education from the perspective of being a student, as well as being a teacher. In this example, a participant spoke about a workshop we co-facilitated with teachers.

Rajo: Okay, I felt hopeful the people that I was working with when they are hopeful. From my perspective, from my experience, I felt hopeful because I have seen how little things could change many things. I couldn't imagine for example the people who we are working with yesterday in [name withheld]. I couldn't imagine that they were putting real life situations really very frustrating emotional stories, scenarios, from real life, in their classroom.

They had students actually learners who came to the camp later on when they were already grown ups; maybe they were soldiers. They were taught soldiers like like [sic] the teachers, this kind threatening things. It was really sharing such things when you have real life threat, real life situation that is kind of terrorizing you.

[The] example [of] the teachers who explained how felt like that he was here and bigger and stronger then he really is, but the teacher who has
finished high school, finished his college became post positive school, was
much younger, maybe less stronger then the learner, was really frustrated, but
then sharing such things was really something that never been found within
the school set up. Maybe they could have reported that it wouldn't have been
as helpful as sitting together and finding listening to the problem then asking
questions, finding a positive thing about the problem, and that gives the
chance of seeing even though the learner is very arrogant, very acting out
doing extra things, not doing the right things in the classroom, but then we
could still [be] here, still seeing that having the hard through all these
problems, all these difficult. Well the learner could be, could have, mental
problem and that's why we put in a psychosocial focus caseworker, counselor,
because the child may be having a maybe he has been traumatized. We doing
his training as a soldier, as a soldier he must have seen a lot of terrible things
done to him by grown ups, but he does not want it anymore, or maybe he
hates the thing that teachers walking around with, or maybe he is
psychologically or emotionally abused, [that’s why he] want to do such
things. (Rajo, Interview #1, 7 February 2017)

In Kakuma, aged out or over age students remain a complex issue. On the one hand,
refugees have similar circumstances that I discussed in my problem of practice, that
is, they want to learn, but they do not return to school because they have aged out.
On the other hand, at the time of this research, teachers are seeing more students that
want to learn and they do return to school even though they are in their 20s or 30s.

Wangari (2016) noted:

‘The high number of over-age students is one of the main issues our programme will address,’ says Musinga. At Peace Primary School, out of a total of 6,806 students, 4,719 are older than 15 years of age. At the nearby Hope Primary School the oldest student is 37 years old. ‘It has been extremely difficult to have students in their 30s in the same class as students young enough to be their children. The older students find it humiliating.’ (emphasis in original, para. 6)

Because this is a complex issue, we attempted to implement the course for teachers in one school. Although, I am unclear if we made a difference (the teachers said it did) we found out that the course gave them an opportunity to vent, feel heard, contextualize problems, and understand that as a group they can start solving some of the issues together.

The average class size was around 100+ students per teacher. A poster on one principal/headmaster’s wall, showed that they had over 5000 children (grades 1-8) in their school. Rajo offered an empathic response to the teachers because the individual could intimately understand what it meant to be in those circumstances. He was a teacher, too. Six months later, the participant reflected on the teachers and the individual’s own teaching experience.

Rajo: I taught teaching here. Is very tiresome, very draining. It is also very hard. I didn't understand and I really couldn't understand for the past 7 years a
certificate in teaching, teaching a classes, teaching from 6 to 5:40. Almost leave school. Is almost 6 teaching 210 students minimum, 250 students. That is working for more than 50 hours, which is very tiresome. But then again, if you endure all that hardship, it is very hard to engage the learners. Like you teach us a subject and let's say you teach, let's say you teach math and science. At the end of the day, the end of the lesson, it's only one or two students who have gotten your concept, that idea of the lesson. If you repeat that lesson or for one week every day, it will be again less than 10 who will be able to understand, to understand that lesson because of the situation, all the things that you have seen and I have seen in the schools here due to the high number of students. But if students were less the teaching condition and the environment was a little bit more conducive, it could be made. I know it's very expensive to do that, but [pause] but you know the only choice, the shot that the only kids that they've got, whether they get some work today, that's enough for them when you compare staying at their community and doing nothing and just learning bad stuff from school dropouts that would be very painful. But I would prefer to have 10 students who all understand the lesson then have 200 students who did not understand the lesson. What's the point of explaining the lesson nobody understands? It's really painful. Like you teach a lesson and nobody understands, doesn't make sense, and then you get paid. Why are you getting paid for standing there yelling? You lose using your energy. It really doesn't make sense. So I love teaching. I love kids. I love
children. I love working with children. I'd love it, but the environment isn't supporting. (Rajo, Interview #3, 12 June 2017)

In many aspects, Rajo is explaining a frustration that many teachers feel when they are teaching, that is: resources are limited, students’ lack of motivation, and limited support. What is different here is that the environmental conditions are severe, the classrooms are above capacity where children are literally sitting on each other, and many teachers are also refugees themselves, who are attempting to make sense of their own reality while teaching 100+ children in primary schools (Kelly, 2016). According to Kelly (2016), “The camp’s 21 primary schools have a net enrollment rate of 73%. The rate is lower than Kenya’s and Sub-Saharan Africa’s, respectively 85% and 77%” (para. 9). Although they have increased with the quantity of teachers, it is not matched with the quality of teachers. The reality is dire and yet, they have hope that things will get better.

On the other side, students in a higher education program, showed in their interviews a common thread of the challenges of what is next when they finish their program. In many aspects, students had the worries of what most/all stereotypical seniors who are graduating from college would have (e.g. senioritis), and yet the reality of their future is more unknown. A participant illustrated this feeling.

Rajo: Well, at some point I feel like I share it, that feeling that you have studied at least to a certain level. And then definitely that's not the end of the [sic] what you hope or what you've even, what is not there in the reality and the real life. I know colleagues who been with me here end [and] left and they
did finish their diploma. And they came back and they did agree and they came back, and I am still doing the same old diploma 3 years. I'm not saying that this is I changed a lot of life in my life. If it wasn't in my life. But I wouldn't even have met you. I would have left long ago. I wouldn't have been here. But I'm not proud to be here [Kakuma]. I don't want to be here (Rajo, Interview #3, 12 June 2017)

Another participant echoed this sentiment as the individual struggled to understand the next steps after finishing a program.

Tesifa: I think one of the constraints to my hope [is] the limit[ed] of the resources of my further studies. The one of the challenges for my hope, I think, and right now I've been thinking: what if I do when I finish this diploma and where will I have to go next? This is another thing I am not looking forward [to]. It is my hope and my prayer that [name withheld] will work around that situation, that we will keep building our hope. (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

This concept of “where will I go next” was also a common thread, not only in the education context, but also in the life context. Although the participants focused on the challenges, in the same breath many also commented on the benefits.

Benefits

Benefits are a sub-thread of restoring hope and agency: Higher education theme. Due to policies (such as UNESCO’s Education for All) basic education is
now mandated. This means that there is now, albeit limited, access to primary and secondary education. Ithemba explained the education for all concept.

Ithemba: Education is the whole. It starts from primary up to the higher level. Because you cannot go to [pause] to the higher-level if you don't have primary education. You start from primary to secondary to the higher education. Then, if you stop from primary, you will still have some gaps somewhere. Like those who are all making this chaos, all this destruction in Africa, are not the people, not the people who are educated. They went to school may-be the[y] did not finish; the[y] dropout from school. Then because of this lack of knowledge, proper knowledge, it is also affecting them seriously. Because having a bit of knowledge which is not full also more destruction.

SM: Where do you feel higher education plays a role?

P1628: Okay, you know as a sharing, growing is a gradual process. You start learning step by step until you become a human being. If a child is start learning from a child to maybe a teenager, and he stop from there, he will not see the other part of the human being. He will behave like the in between. That is also one of the problems so what is happening in education. If I start in primary education and stop there, I'm not fully educated a person. I am just in either between no full educated and people who are educated. Because people are confusion, cause more problems. But if I learn well and I understand the importance of things which are happening
in humanity, peace, justice, human rights, I will respect them as I have that knowledge. Yeah. (Ithemba, Interview #3, 8 June 2017)

Ithemba acknowledged that knowledge is a progression and not gained immediately. There are steps to gain the knowledge which starts with basic education. Many participants noted that they are grateful for the opportunity to have basic education. This gratitude and hopeful view can be seen, when ‘Amal said,

‘Amal: Okay, according to me living in Kakuma is not hopeless because there are many opportunities. Even I myself, if I were in my country, I would not [pause] would not get those chances, especially in terms of education. I am very sure if I was in my own country you could not get the scholarships, the school in right now. So I think, is not a hopeless place but I hopeful place.

(‘Amal, interview #1, 8 Feb 2017)

While another participant’s comment supported this same thread.

Tumaini: That's why I'm still learning at the center because I still receive. Even if things are very tough, you never know after two or three or four years receiving my diploma or whatever degree, I can be someone. So now the issue of education is really taking my time so because I know when you are educated something positive will become out of it. That is the first thing that is encouraging me because [if in] life you don't get a better job, you can at least be a better person on your own, on your own family, or for your own community. So that's why even if consider the future that is not quite right, or maybe I don't see any door which is open, then at least I say, no if I'm a better
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educated person, I will have a better future in my own or in my community.

And another factor is that people around us that are trying to encourage us to
stay focus, to continue to to keep our hope alive, even if the external factors
are affecting us, yeah. (Tumaini, interview #3, 8 June 2017)

One of the main points that were central in their thinking was that these
participants wanted education for education’s sake. They wanted to learn and
understood the value of education. This participant explained the value of education
in these words:

Tesifa: Higher education create peace because first of all the majority of the
people who are dying, who are fighting, have not gone to school. Now
someone who is educated that will just go around, they come and we will
fight. We fight was a Dinga; we fight as a Neur; because were are fighting.
But if the opportunity for education, higher education, is given to you,
someone who is educated will not hold a gun and go and fight. Why would
they go and fight because I can speak with the Neur and find out why do we
keep on fighting. So definitely, we are not allowed to send ourselves to
school. We are allowed to use a tool to kill ourselves. I think that higher
education, if I will have that opportunity in the future, I will use it as a tool to
bring peace for young people, mostly for the youth. (Tesifa, Interview #3, 8
June 2017)
While most of the participants recognized this significance of education for their community, so did they recognize the value of education for their families. This is observed when ‘Amal said:

‘Amal: Okay, in the community people are just reluctant. There's no one just [pause] to just transform their lives or tell them that they’re supposed to do this, or the importance of people of sending their kids to school, how it is important and how it helps the family, too. (‘Amal, interview #1, 8 Feb 2017)

When the participants spoke of their families in regard to education, they began to see themselves differently. Ikizere noted that education brought on more confidence to do more in their community.

Ikizere: Well, I think I'm different. I'm not the same as I was before I was with [name withheld]. I'm not the same. I used to stay at home. I volunteered in another school, but it was not coming. Really, I had to interact with other teachers [in] Swahili and English. It was just me and the book and nothing much. I learned from teaching them but [pause] but I don't learn from their lives. I think if I had a chance to interact with diploma students, interact with them with much confidence. I'm troubled with them telling them it's not like before.

SM: What gave you that confidence?

Ikizere: Education of course, higher education of course. (Ikizere, interview #3, 9 June 2017)
All participants spoke of higher education and what it has done and will do for them. They spoke of next steps and their wishes to further their education.

**Opportunities**

Opportunities are a sub-thread of restoring hope and agency: Higher education theme. Besides the obvious fact that all participants interviewed wanted to go to university to study, the five participants who eventually became participant-researchers/co-researchers spoke about the opportunity to research more. Ikizere explained:

SM: Ok, fantastic. Is there anything we have not talked about that has made you more hopeful in the past month we've been together?

Ikizere: Oh yes, I think the idea becoming a co-writer, co-researcher, it's something that creates hope in me.

SM: How so, tell me more?

Ikizere: I didn't think, I never thought, that this could happen, actually being a co-researcher with a someone in universities from US and being in Kakuma Refugee Camp. Is something that I am not able to do. It is something big. I hopeful that even if I am more.

SM: Tell me about the hopeful, the more. What would be the more part?

Ikizere: The more part is the research I will learn about. I learn a lot from the research on the outcomes and my skills are going to increase in researching and writing and I already love to write. It's going to be much stronger, my writings are going to be much stronger. (Ikizere, interview #3, 9 June 2017)
For the five who partnered with me, this was an on-going conversation outside of the semi-structured interviewing context. It was about what it meant for them to be co-researchers and co-authors of the chapter. As their curiosity increased, so did their critical thinking and also how they saw themselves. It was interesting to see how they evolved in seeing themselves as participants and then transitioning into the co-researcher mode. This act of seeing themselves as a co-researcher brought them into an active role and they became more assertive, more curious, and owned what they were doing.

**Summary: Sub-threads in Restoring Hope and Agency: Higher Education**

From the semi-structured interviews, observations, and conversations I found that all these participants wanted to see themselves as productive, capable, and competent individuals (which they were already in the researcher’s view). That is, wanted to be doing something for their community, family and society. They echoed the comment Tesifa appeared to echo this sentiment,

Tesifa: On my part then just like… hope what I have hope for what I possess hope for whenever I find myself doing something for someone. I am okay; I will think that the future is bright when I feel like I'm productive at least Someone is counting on me to survive. Whenever I will be able to do so I have hope (Tesifa, interview #2, 10 February 2017)

All the participants wanted people to know that they had something to give, something of worth and value to society. They are doing this already. We need to recognize this. While appreciating the challenges of receiving a quality education,
refugees need the opportunity to produce and share their knowledge so that they can apply their agency and ability to dictate what sort of action they want, who is promoting the action, where the action is coming from, and how that action will impact their communities (Brydon-Miller et al., 2003; Fine, 1994). They can do this, if there have time, space, and places for access and opportunity.

Quantitative: Pragmatic Approach

Since I took a pragmatic mixed method approach, the last section is derived from the findings from the quantitative results. My rationale for using quantitative research was to explore how the perception of hope changed in a span and breadth of time while participating in a psychosocial peacebuilding education course. The data collected was from three Hope Index of Staat’s (1989) surveys during three different points of time (January 2017, February 2017, and June 2017). The fixed time and time variables ranged from race, ethnicity, gender, education, and so on. The data collected were put in descriptive statistics, as seen in the methodology, and run through ANOVA tests. Due to constraints, my participants (n = 31) were limited and, because of this, a multiple linear regression model was not done. There was not any statistical significance and a null result was present in all the data points.

The Hope Index of Staat’s (1989) survey ran for six months. It was taken in the 2nd week of January (n = 31), second week of February (n = 22), and then the second week of June 2017 (n = 11). There was no statistical significance between the survey tests. However, the raw scores for pre-survey, post-survey, and follow-up
showed that for the intervention group (those who took the PBBE course) hope did increase or maintain.

*Table 4.1. Staat’s Hope Index Total Hope for Pre, Post, and Follow-up*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Hope Pre</th>
<th>Total Hope Post</th>
<th>Total Hope Follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T)206</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)173</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)…</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)141</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)206</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)178</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)249</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)265</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)215</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)400</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)178</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(... Missing parts of the survey)
(* Could not locate participant to administer survey)
(T Intervention Group)
In the Table 4.1, the participants who were trained are indicated with a (T). I started with 31 participants. Unfortunately, I could not calculate the scores of the ten participants because one to two answers were missing on their PRE Hope Index of Staats survey. When the POST Hope Index of Staats survey was done only 22 participants could be located. Then, when I followed-up six months later, only 11 could be located. Noted in the various sections, due to the limited amount of participants who filled out the survey, a null effect was in my statistical findings. Nevertheless, I compared the means for the Total Pre, Total Post, and Total Follow-up.

I compared the Kakuma Refugee Camp participants Hope Index of Staats (1989) time periods, Total Pre, Total Post, and Total Follow-up, to understand if there was any difference or change in their Total Hope scores when they were assessed over a period of time. Instead of an independent t-test sample, I chose to do a one-way Analysis of Variance, also known as ANOVA because I had more than two conditions (Total Pre, Total Post, and Total Follow-up) of a single independent variable. I chose the one-way ANOVA because there is only one grouping variable (e.g. versions of the survey). In contrast, if I were studying the effectiveness of different surveys, I would have used a two-way ANOVA.

The Table 4.1 offers statistical information for participants who participated in the PRE, POST, and Follow-Up survey. In total, there was not a consistent number that did the survey at each time period. This made running statistical models difficult.
However, I compared means to show that there was no significance. Based on the mean, or $\bar{x}$ pre-survey score that was assessed in January 2017, the participants had the highest at $\bar{x} = 242.000$, whereas the Follow-up survey was the lowest at $\bar{x} = 231.72$. The post-survey had a $\bar{x} = 237.45$. With regard to the $SD$, the post-survey appeared to be more stable and has the least amount of variance at $SD=56.63$. In contrast, even though the pre-survey score appeared to be scoring higher the variability also has increased thus, making them less stable. However, I can only infer this: there could be confounding variables I was not aware of and in order to see how reliable the data was, I would need to repeat the study using a larger sample, or test the sample again to keep the confounding variables under control.

I ran an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) model because I wanted to see if there was any statistical significance between variables, specifically pre, post, and follow-up Total Hope scores. The ANOVA had a null effect because it did not meet all the underlying assumptions of an ANOVA test and there simply wasn’t enough data to run any statistical test. There are three assumptions when using ANOVA. One assumption is that all sources of variability were accounted for, which means with the exception that these people are being randomly assigned everything else was the same. The second assumption was normality. Last, I needed to test the homogeneity of variance. I go in detail below about what these assumptions mean as they relate to my collected data.

First, not all of my sources of variability were accounted for due to the limitation of recruiting enough participants from my other site. I had hoped to have a
large Kenyatta University group of participants that would offer more than 70 surveys to supplement the 31 from Kakuma. However due to circumstances, beyond my control this did not happen. The second assumption was that the distributions of the Total Pre, Total Post, and Total Follow-up surveys were normal. Figure 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 offers a pictorial frequency distribution of three histograms of the PRE, POST, Follow-Up surveys that correspond to the descriptive statistics in Table 4.1.

![Figure 4.4. Total Hope Pre Histogram](image-url)
Based on the histograms, it appeared that there was normal distribution in each histogram, due to the fact the shape of the set of continuous data does not have in it
outliers, skewness, or kurtosis. The Levene’s test of equal of variance could not be run in fact none of the post hoc tests were not performed due to at least one group having fewer than two cases. In light of that a limitation of my data is that there I had a limited amount of cases to work with. Thus, ANOVA was not appropriate and the research hypotheses questions had a null effect.

Despite the statistics not being statistically significant, the numbers in combination with the qualitative data collected offered a richer picture of what happened during the six months on an individual level. These are the spaces in between that, if it weren’t for the quantitative and qualitative methods working in tandem, we may be missing key significant individual findings that support or discourage hopeful views. For example the Total Hope Score pre-survey for participants Ikizere and Esperanza scores were 206 and 220, respectively (Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2. Hope Index of Staats: Two Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ikizere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Hope Index (Staats & Partlo, 1993), the scoring of these individuals are in the typical range (e.g., 220 to 250 with standard deviations of about 50). Please see Appendix H for scoring. Both participated in the intervention
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(Psychosocial Peace-Building Education Course). Both increased their Total hope scores when the post-survey was done a month after.

The Hope Index (Staats & Partlo, 1993) focuses on particular events (in my case the intervention) or outcomes and contains four subscales: self-hope, other-hope, wishes, and expectations. The Total Hope scores are the “interactions between wishes and expectations” (Staats, 1989, pg. 367). All four subscales are derived from the total hope score. The wishes score signifies what is to be desired, whereas the expectation score signifies what is anticipated. The Hope Index is more focused on the cognitive than the affective aspect of hope. The self-hope and hope-others signifies how participants’ individual hopes and collective hopes are oriented.

During that month Ikizere participated in implementing the course into Kakuma community. Ikizere worked alongside me and co-facilitated a group, while the other participant did not. At that time, Ikizere was also going through the final stages of resettlement, as well.

Six months later, when I returned to Kakuma Refugee Camp, I ran a follow-up survey. Ikizere’s Total Hope score maintained the typical range, as well as the hope increased. The circumstance that contributed to this increase was that the resettlement was imminent. Ikizere noted that being a co-researcher/co-author of our chapter increased a hopeful view. Ikizere said,

Ikizere: Oh yes, I think the idea becoming a co-writer, co-researcher it's something that creates hope in me.

SM: How so, tell me more?
Ikizere: I didn't think I never thought that this could happen actually being a co-researcher with a someone in universities from US and being in Kakuma Refugee Camp is something that I am not able to do. It is something big. I hopeful that even if I am more…(Ikizere, interview #1, 9 February 2017)


In contrast Esperanza’s Total Hope score plummeted after six months, along with every other score. A circumstance that contributed to this decrease was that Esperanza disclosed while being an incentive staff person, s/he had her/his life threatened by another incentive staff person. Due to the extreme nature of Esperanza’s circumstances and her/his status of a refugee, Esperanza had little hope.

Since the writing of this dissertation, Esperanza has been supported by the local non-governmental agency to go through local channels (UNHCR, local police, and so on) to resolve the situation. Esperanza remains in a precarious situation and has indicated that s/he has limited hope.

Both of these situations are plausible in the lives of refugees. With both of the participants, their Hope of Others scores are within the typical range (e.g. 96 with a standard deviation of 35), 122 and 125, respectively. While both Hope for Self score (e.g. 140 with standard deviation of 30) are within the standard deviation, they are in
the lower scale. This could because both participants come from a background that favors a collectivist view rather than an individualistic view.

While there is a narrative behind all of these statistics, I chose these two plausible situations to show that with a mixed methods approach, researchers are able to offer a richer picture of what happened during a period of time. I also believe these two situations show why I took a pragmatic approach to my design. The pragmatic approach offered some flexibility due to the conditions and context in which, I lived, worked alongside, and learned with, albeit, temporarily. Although, nothing was found statistically significant, because there was not enough data, I attempted to show how these two approaches, quantitative and qualitative, are complimentary and are credible in their own right.

**Summary of Results**

At the conclusion of my thematic analysis, all the semi-structured interviews and collected surveys contained four themes: Reflecting on critical hope and critical despair; Reconciling Identities, Resurfacing Narratives and Creating New Narratives of Hope and; Restoring Hope and Agency: Higher Education. The last section described my quantitative pragmatic approach to the understanding the Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey.

All of these themes contributed in telling a system of stories (Halverson, 2011) that offer a larger narrative of refugees’ struggles, hopes, and capabilities to be critical thinkers. On one hand, most of us will not journey to any refugee camp to understand the breadth of hope and knowledge that exists in these camps. On the other
hand, most refugees were unable to understand why I would come to such a place called Kakuma (in Kiswahili means, *no where*).

The next chapter is the discussion piece. I will touch on the significance and recommendations for higher education in refugee protracted context as well as, touching on refugee policy, as a whole. In light of that, when I look over the collected data, a question that comes up for me is what are we trying to do with education? Are we trying to create a structure that people can survive or thrive? Perhaps our policies and our attempts are leading with false hopes and sending refugees into critical despair. However, if we urge our policymakers that by investing in the future of these creative, vibrant, and resilient youth, we are also investing in world’s future, as well. For it is their knowledge and hope that needs to be in the forefront of policy decisions because they know the way. Just like a South Sudanese refugee told me, “When you go to Maban, I will go with you and show you the safest way.”

**Limitation of Study**

The topics I explored were critical hope (Bozalek, et al., 2014; Zembylas, 2014), psychosocial peacebuilding education (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), 2012), and higher education in protracted refugee context which are emerging fields of which each have limited research. This section will offer some background on why my research is limited in qualitative and quantitative context. In the qualitative section, I address the semi-structured methodology and co-researching. In the quantitative section, I address the sample size and survey tool. In all the limitations, I also discuss what
countermeasures I took to lessen the limitation. I will also focus on how, as a researcher, I am attempting to address the potential issues, presently and in the future.

**Qualitative: Semi-Structured Interviewing Methodology**

According to Bowman (1993), there are limitations in getting participants to talk truthfully about particular topics. In broad terms, researchers have been cautious in seeking out participants’ perceptions because they may want to support a narrative that the researcher wants to see, doesn’t want to see, and/or avoid revealing, such as “moments of disharmony and conflict” (Bowman, 1993, p. 457). When I did my semi-structured interviews, I made a concerted effort to clarify what was said by doing a follow-up interview and making sure what I heard was correct. I also did a follow-up interview six months later. This approach offered some internal validity and a member check in.

I also believe that time and context played a role in minimizing this limitation. Jacobsen and Landau (2003) noted researchers who focus on refugee and forced migration issues need to have a prolonged stay in order to avoid bias. I stayed for five weeks in Kakuma Refugee Camp. To avoid bias, Diefenbach (2009) used “other sources (e.g. internal documents or other case studies) and spread[ing] the interviews over a certain time period” (pg. 883). I attempted to do this, too. Along with my initial interview, I did a follow-up interview and a follow-up interview six months later.

I also attempted to build a rapport with participants while implementing the psychosocial peacebuilding education course. My perception is that this rapport
offered more truthful answers that didn’t necessarily support my narrative but rather theirs. I know this because I received a fair amount of constructive criticism from the participants with regard to the survey. I will go more deeply into this topic in the quantitative section. In addition to that feedback, during the semi-structured interviews, some participants offered constructive criticism with regard to the course. For example, one participant asked why I didn’t add another component to the course as an income-generating project (e.g., selling the books and dolls that were made). In the same breath, the participant said, “But I couldn’t sell the doll I made. It means so much to me.”

I also stressed most often academic research is on certain populations and I wanted to work with the participants. I showed this through using a community-based action approach and co-researching.

**Qualitative: Co-researching**

The biggest limitations I found in my research was getting through the initial impression that I was like all the other researchers that came to ask them to do something. The result is that often they received nothing in return. Sukarieh and Tannock (2013) pointed out, “research may be seen as benefiting the lives and careers of researchers, but leaving the lives of those being researched unimproved in any significant way, regardless of the time, energy and resources they have contributed to the research effort” (p. 4). I attempted to avoid this by applying a participant-researcher/co-researcher approach so that we could learn together about the research
process, why research was needed, and how we can produce it in partnership. This co-researcher concept was incredibly new and there was skepticism.

As I slowly worked alongside them implementing the course, they let me in their homes, lives, and most of all their hopes. I continued to correspond and check in. When I returned to Kakuma in June much to the surprise of the co-researchers to co-author a chapter, I believe that was when I broke through the skepticism.

Also there could be limitations in that the co-researchers are not objective and bias. However I would argue, that their opinion, context, and lived experience is more realistic and closer to what is true than an outside observer, like me, who only has lived in Kakuma Refugee Camp for five weeks. I believe co-researching honors their viewpoint and challenges other viewpoints who are just on the peripheral. Later in Chapter 5, under recommendations, I talk more about co-researching and the lessons learned.

Another limitation of research in general is the problem of ‘othering’ (Fine, 1994). This term was coined by Fine (1994) and means “creating occasions for researchers and informants to discuss what is and is not, ‘happening between,’ when the negotiated relations of whose story is being told, whose story is being shadowed, why, for whom, and with what consequences” (p. 72). Researching along with participant-researchers allowed us to understand what is in between the moments of waiting for something to happen. By having the choice to write papers and present at conferences, the co-researchers took the opportunity to directly share their voices directly in the language they felt comfortable in using within the field of education,
particularly in protracted context, in a way that they have not been able to do before. Their participation also greatly informed my research.

**Quantitative: Sample Size**

My intention was to have a sample of 100+ participants for the survey and 30+ participants for the intervention. This did not happen. In light of my sample size being small (n=31) for the survey, I cannot draw any general conclusions from the Hope Index of Staats (1989), the survey instrument. My sample size for my semi-structured interviews is also small. However, I have interviewed multiple times (in depth) with the same participants for a six-month period.

**Quantitative: Survey tool**

In the process of administering the Hope Index of Staats (1989), I found that there were several limitations of the tool. For instance, the meaning of the words took on a different significance and the actual visual presentation of the survey became problematic. The way the survey was scored became an issue as well.

In my literature review, I noted that the Hope Index of Staats (1989) was used and adapted in other countries (Braun‐Lewensohn & Sagy, 2010; Pacico et al., 2013; Sagy & Adwan, 2006). The Hope Index of Staats was considered a social indicator that takes in account the social, economic, and psychological welfare of the individuals and communities. For these reasons, I chose this survey instrument for these reasons. However, I found certain survey questions did not translate to the refugee camp setting. I know this because, as I administered the survey, several questions were presented to me from various participants about certain survey
questions. For example question 8, “To have leisure time” was seen as being idle. In a refugee context, participants did not want to be seen as idle. The other question that raised concern was question 13, “Justice in the world.” Many participants expressed if there were justice in the world, they wouldn’t be in the refugee camp. Therefore, some did not see this question as relevant.

The structure in which the survey is laid out was also confusing to the participants. Participants are asked to fill out one Likert scale on either side, one was their expectations and on the other side was their wishes (Please see Appendix G). Although, during the pre-survey, the participants were repeatedly told to fill out both sides of the survey, some filled out only partial sides (n=10). Having partial sides filled out limited the scoring as well.

The survey instrument used a Likert scale that had a range of zero-five range (please see Appendix H for full scoring instructions). The survey wish score (0 to 5) is multiplied by the survey expectation score (0 to 5) for each of the 16 questions (Staats & Partlo, 1993). When a participant had a number of zeros in either the wish or expectation section, it created a situation where it just makes everything zero. This was a problem because it did not show the other numerical scores.

To remedy this, rescaling the Likert scale to one-six was an option. However, the survey had already been administered at three time periods and I was concerned there may be a psychological difference between one-six and zero-five Likert scale. Thus, I felt I was altering the participants’ responses. Furthermore, there was only one participant that had this issue. I will explain in the results section
why the participant responded with several zeros. So I have kept the Likert scale as is. However, I would strongly encourage that the Likert scale be rescaled to one-six.

**Summary of Limitations and Validation**

The limitation of study section offered some background on why my research is limited in qualitative and quantitative context. In the qualitative section, I addressed the semi-structured methodology and co-researching. In the quantitative section, I addressed the sample size and survey tool. In all the limitations, I discussed what countermeasures I took to lessen the limitation.

Shown in Figure 4.7 is how I cross-verified my data. I validated my data through a triangulation process that applied what the co-participants said through their research logs, what my own observations said, and with the data that I collected.
Chapter 5: Discussion

“Help them to speak for themselves” – Kakuma Refugee Participant

I open with a story about a single ride on a matatu (privately-owned minibus) because it highlighted metaphorically the process of how my research came together and provided possible future research areas. In Kenya, there are a variety of modes of transportation. They range from walking, bicycling, public bus, taxi, and a private bus called a “matatu.” I have only taken two matatus.

The matatu comfortably seated 10, maximum 14. It looked full to me. My Rwandan refugee friend gently pushed me into a single seat that I shared with him. Each stop, we would get out. They would shove more people in and we would reconvene in the single seat. The matatu carried 20 people inside and three people hung from the outside. The amount of body odor was palatable. My body was teetering between ¼ of a single seat and my friend was not intentionally hugging me, but hugging me. It was a mess. I was part of a sea of humanity and when I thought the sea wall could not hold anymore, they just shoved more people in. Minutes later, I peeled myself off the seat and tried to compose myself. As I was about to step off the bus, the matatu started to drive off. Another guy yelled, Kukomesha! (in Kiswahili, “Stop”). He took a hold of my arm, which startled me, and said, “Wait!” I noticed the road slowly moving under my feet and saw my friend with his hands out. I thought to myself, did he want me to jump to him? Meanwhile, I was tethered to this random fellow in the matatu. The matatu halted to a stop before I had to make
that decision. The guy gently (well, maybe not so gently) pushed me out the door as the matatu drove away.

I opened with this story because this situation was not unlike how my research came together. The background information, the collected data, and the participants were packed into my metaphorical matatu. I frequently stopped my research to question: What am I doing? Should I do this differently? How is the research connected to the existing research? What remained persistent in the data was that their was/is knowledge and hope in the lives of the Kakuma refugees I had the opportunity to work with, learn from, and walk alongside.

**Synthesis of Findings**

The main purpose of the presented research was to explore how refugee students’ (ages 18-35) perceptions of hope evolve through participation in a psychosocial peace building educational course in a higher education in protracted refugee context. I sought out different ways to measure hope from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective because I wanted to know what was the progression in participants’ level of hope over time, in the context of a changing reality and participation in a peace-building course. More importantly, I wanted to know if the higher education psychosocial peace-building education course had any effect on hope levels in a protracted refugee context.

As mentioned in the literature review, research was limited with regard to hope and refugees (Green, 2012). It was even more limited specifically in regard to refugees, higher education, and hope. Yet, Ai, Tice, Whitsett, Ishisaka, and Chim
CO-CREATING SPACES OF CRITICAL HOPE

(2007) explain education plays a role in strengthening hope in refugees. Ai et al., posit, “educated war refugees may have more hope and confidence in undertaking the demanding mental process for post-traumatic positive change” (pg. 61). In other words, if hope is applied appropriately, that is – striving to be better and cognizant of the tension between what was, what is, and what could be while creating goals, pathways to get to a goal, and the motivation to do so (Freire, 1994; Snyder, 2002; Staats, 1989) – hope can be a vehicle for healing, change, and stability.

Prior studies (such as Arafat & Musleh, 2006; Braun- Lewensohn & Sagy, 2010; Loughry et al., 2006) noted the importance of hope in a protracted context and indicate hope levels change when there is a state of conflict. Often when conflict continued, there was limited hope and people turned to other means to fill that need. such as drug and alcohol abuse (UNHCR & World Health Organization, 2008), increased violence, criminal activity (The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2011) and terrorism (Milton, Spencer, & Findley, 2013). Moreover Arman (2017) explained:

Overall, opportunity [for education] is extremely limited, making hope for the future impossible for many families to conjure. Not only does this lead to the significant obstacles to progress that the US assessment points to, it is a situation that gives extremism and terrorism–and the warped meaning and sense of purpose it can provide–an evergreen appeal. (para. 2) This “warped meaning” can be changed through education.
Returning to my collected data, I found my thematic analysis resonated with this sentiment, the only difference is that it is not external forces (U.S. government, UN, refugee polices, and so on) providing that hope. It is the refugees themselves who are creating that hope and knowledge. With this hope and knowledge they are countering narratives of extremism within their community and my hope through this research, is to address the broader global context.

**Statement of Results**

At the conclusion of my thematic analysis, I identified four themes across all semi-structured interviews and collected surveys. These themes were (a) reflecting on critical hope and critical despair; (b) reconciling identities; (c) resurfacing narratives and creating new narratives of hope; and (d) restoring hope and agency in higher education. The last section described my quantitative pragmatic approach to the understanding the Hope Index of Staats (1989) survey.

The results of my study showed higher education helped most of the participants shift their perception of how they saw themselves and others. This in turn helped them to generate more hopeful views following this education experience. This was seen when Ikizere explained hope as being contagious,

Ikizere : You can see someone and it’s just like if I feel this way, think about that one, and, when you talk to the person, you find out that he or she is full of hope. And then you think: Oh, why not me? I thought that she or he was the least person. To just I think someone who is poor, you tend to imagine that he or she is not happy, but when you talk to them, you find out he is even
happier. Then you say, ‘What? Why not me? I also have to be happy if she
or he does not have anything. What about me who has, who just has hope? I
have to be happy.’ That is how it is with hope. (Ikizere, interview #1, 1
February 2017)

On the question of what hinders a hopeful view, from the participants’
perspectives it was loss, trauma, and the conditions of the camp. Refugee camps are
supposed to be temporary but often become permanent. For 26 years, Kakuma has
been a place of refuge and hope. It also has been a place of misery and despair.
Globally these camps support refugees who are fleeing from their respective countries
(UNHCR, 2006). Boru (2013) interviewed a refugee from Kakuma who explained,

I'm in a voluntary prison, I was young when I arrived here 14 years
ago, said Elias Wondimu, an Ethiopian refugee in Kakuma. That has changed
now, I don’t see any reason as to why we celebrate refugee day. I hate life.
(para. 10)

In many aspects for participants, if they did not have coping skills or limited hope to
reconcile living in a temporary setting that often became permanent, critical despair
settled in. The uncertainty, limited agency, and limited control of their surroundings
remained a consistent theme throughout the narratives of the participants. However,
during the Psychosocial Peace-Building Education (PBBE) sessions, participants
explained that they felt some control over their situation, albeit temporary, and in a
short span of time. One participant remarked, “My head is clear. I can think about
something else. More hopeful.” (Kakuma refugee, personal communication, 12
February 2017). Perhaps, the program offered a space to hope more, like the participant explained, or it could be a deterrent, a respite from daily life, or it could be something in between. The data seemed to show that people needed a place to belong where their views are heard and valued.

The participants noted that the sessions brought engagement and opportunity to learn from each other. It gave them a sense that they could offer knowledge to a situation rather than being dependent on others to make decisions for them. This was consistent with UNHCR’s comment with regard to emotional protection. According to McCelland (2014) UNHCR representative said,

In a noncamp setting, Batchelor went on to say, if people are able to keep themselves engaged, that provides a healthy outlook, helps establish local integration, keeps alive their skill sets if they repatriate. The longer a refugee resides in a camp, the harder it can become to sustain psychological well-being. But camps remain the default solution. (para. 50)

In the data there were narratives of refugees attempting to find alternative solutions, only to find that the camp was the best solution because they had no other choices.

**Significance: Path to Critical Hope and Higher Education**

It was a blistering hot dusty day in Kakuma. Two co-facilitators and I were facilitating a course in their community when one participant remarked, “We created a space that was missing in Kakuma. A space that we can have different kinds of conversations” (Kakuma participant, personal communication, 12 February 2017).
This would be significant if we did. However, perhaps we created manufactured hope that the author of the *City of Thorns* described it in this way.

This is the ultimate contradiction of camp life: how to locate hope for the future in a desperate situation that appears permanent. People are trying. Life in Dadaab and all the other camps is a daily exercise in manufacturing hope. But for many, the fiction of temporariness no longer holds. And we are seeing the results of that realization washing up on Europe’s beaches. (Rawlence, 2015, para. 13)

A manufactured hope is different from a false hope that is unrealistic and will never materialize. False hopes can be seen in concrete terms such as participants wishing or expecting that they will have something in a certain timeframe and/or not playing an active role in making that something happen. Whereas a manufactured hope as I define it, is something that is an external action, and built to prop up a hope that will never exist.

Perhaps we need to define better what is hope in the lives of refugees. Are we co-creating spaces of hope for refugees to thrive or just to maintain and survive? When defined by the participants, the hope was more of a wish, a false hope, and/or a manufactured hope. In order to counter this kind of false hope, we need to have critical hope, that is, hope with action that is dictated by and for the individual in the context. This kind of hope can be generated through in general terms, through education, in specific terms for these participants, through higher education.
Through semi-structured interviews, conversations, and observations, refugees stressed that they often do not have any control and/or agency in their schooling and for that matter, in their lives. The participants wanted the ability to dictate what happens with their education and their lives. They wanted an opportunity to reflect critically together on what is happening in their communities, what their possibilities are, and how they can use their skill sets to be a part of the solution. Moreover, some participants found that the Psychosocial Peace-Building Education course offered a different opportunity than their regular higher education courses to apply their critical thinking skills that strengthened and acknowledged their own ability, knowledge, and skill set. What was significant was that they felt, not only did they receive acknowledgement of their own worth, knowledge, and skills through the researcher, but more importantly their peers. Perhaps, the co-facilitators of the course were engaging in a “co-intentional” education where co-facilitator and participants, “co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge” (Freire, 2003, pg. 69). In other words, co-facilitators and participants are interrogating together what is presently happening (e.g. conditions of camp, loss, hope, and so on) and reinforcing their own worth, knowledge, and skills.

Throughout the course, peers offered each other different narratives that dispelled the myths that were created internally and externally. One of the significant outcomes was that participants recognized that they could have meaningful dialogue despite not speaking the same language or coming from the same tribe. Some
individuals from varying backgrounds, despite limited languages in common, can transcend borders and languages. This cross dialogue surprised many.

Along with the course, meaningful dialogues, and opportunity to engage with different groups of people it appeared that higher education was the connector because it brought and/or created pathways, roads, and destinations to be engaged with people who were different from them.

The participants felt the practice of applying the TAG process (e.g. Tell something positive about the story, Ask a question, and Give a suggestion) was one of the most useful techniques they learned. In one of the sessions that I co-facilitated with Ikizere many participants thought the TAG process was rigid at first. The participants talked over each other. This led to a bit of chaos until the TAG process was securely in place. One participant would share their story and then we would go through the steps.

As co-facilitators, we would ask for participants to tell us something positive about the story. We used an appreciative inquiry approach, that is, a process in which questions are asked, such as what is appreciated, what is possible, and how do we put that in action? (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1990). At first this was a difficult task due to the fact that the stories were often about misery and despair. However by modeling, participants started to look at the good in the story. One example I used was, despite the horrible circumstances, I am glad you are here with us telling the story. Others remarked on how they were smart in navigating the process of getting help, and in seeing the love they had for their family and the risk they took to protect
Then we moved to the *asking* questions. We also used an appreciative inquiry approach. Appreciative inquiry does not ignore problems. It reframes the situation to “recognize the positive possibilities embedded in it that are not initially apparent” (Lehtimäki, Kujala, & Thatchenkery, 2014, p. 247). This process frames questions in a more possibility-oriented way, such as: What opportunities do you see in this particular situation? What conversations, if begun today, could ripple out in a way that creates new possibilities for the future? What seed might we plant together today that could make the most difference to the future of your situation? (Vogt, Brown, & Issacs, 2003). The questions offer space, time, and place to reveal the layers upon layers of strengths that refugees have and help co-create pathways for action. It also creates a space that offers the opportunity for possibility, hope, and deep reflection to understand what the person’s role is in developing a solution.

This approach offered time to deepen the story and make sense of what happened. Often the story brought emotional distress and the participants were able to hold that space for the storyteller. It is interesting to note, that this kind of “holding space” was unexpected by some of the participants, but not unexpected to by me, the researcher. Some participants remarked that they didn’t think they could do that. As I have developed this course in three other countries, I have found that participants have an innate ability to hold space for the storyteller. This type of holding creates empathic responses such as crying alongside the individual, offering an embrace, or holding a hand. Participants are not interested in solving the problem,
but are interesting in sitting *with* the emotion (be it pain, happiness, despair, or so on), *with* the problem, and *with* the individual. I have witnessed this empathic response in South Africa, Jamaica, Nepal, and now in Kenya. Umwizer o summed up this process:

Umwizer o: Okay and these four weeks I used to feel hope when discussing different stories from different backgrounds like South Sudanese. They have a different background how they survived in the world how they were coming from South Sudan up to Kakuma. Also others. How did they call cope with the situations with schools how did they manage all the students all. So that gives me hope. I can feel that I'm not alone. Also we are many. Because sometimes I can feel real alone I'm alone but others have suffered than me.  

(Umwizer o, Interview #1, 8 February 2017)

As the TAG process continued, only after this “holding of space” happened, did the solutions come. In the process of facilitating this program in four countries now, I have noticed that the solutions have had a sense of care, relevance, and hope that was different than what I have seen when someone is offering their opinion in everyday conversation.

While the TAG process was used in this specific course, the process could be applied in various higher education situations to promote critical hope. Since there is limited research on this process, the criticism is only anecdotal. Time, person, and context play a large role. One or several participants are able to dismantle the whole process very fast. In one instance, one participant refused to participate, or
interrupted, and/or was negative towards other individuals. As the facilitator, I could see the whole group slipping into despair. By co-facilitating, the facilitators can work together to help support the person. In this case, the actions of one became too toxic for the group.

As co-facilitators, we always make the disclaimer that they have a choice to be there and if they don’t want to participate, they can leave or stay and just listen. This participant decided to leave. The discussion resumed and the tone of the conversation and the feelings changed. When the participant returned, the toxicity started up again. However, something changed in the group, between the departure of the participant and the participant’s return. The group, without any facilitation, explained to him what was happening and why they perceived the work they were doing was useful. The participant stopped interrupting and started to listen. This situation could have turned out disastrously, but in this situation, the group held the space and counteracted the toxicity with care and hope. The group changed him, even if only temporarily, with little help from the facilitators. The TAG process appeared to answer what contributed to hope – empathy and meaningful dialogue. When empathy and meaningful dialogue were applied, people felt heard, valued, and needed.

The significance was that in the beginning of the course, for most participants they looked for external help (e.g. the researcher, UN, and so one). However, these participants started or continued to recognize their own power and volition to change their situations. Through the psychosocial peacebuilding education course reinforced
the value of their knowledge, skills, and worth.

**Recommendations: Path to Shared Education**

We met at Rojo’s home in Kakuma. Rojo’s home also served as place for an afterschool program. At that time, I had been meeting with the same middle school aged children and youth for the past four weeks. That day, we played a game where a Somali girl in a red hijab needed to hold my hand. It was weeks before this girl rarely gave me eye contact and would cover her mouth when she spoke in fluent Somali. When the game ended, she was told that we did not need to hold hands. She continued to hold my hand and even squeezed it. At the time, I was not sure (and still unsure) why she continued to hold my hand and yet, all I knew was that I loved it. As we played a Somali game that I barely understood, I was lost in her hand. I was lost in the connection of the squeeze and the peace it gave me as I received it. Even though I am never certain that I belong anywhere but for a split second I felt I belonged in that circle of friends.

I open with this story because, although nothing was said, I sensed from the girl and myself that there was a longing to be together and to belong. Hope (as Freire, 1994) indicates is an ontological need. Perhaps another one is a sense of belonging, a sense of connection. When a refugee is displaced, most often in a violent way, there is disconnection, dislocation, and internal and external reconstruction of lives. Connecting this concept to the greater educational significance of the research problem, education is “not simply a matter of technical policy, or of regional concern, but of crucial national-security importance for the
United States (LeBaron & Ashooh (2016, para. 3). Furthermore Abrahams (2017) asserted, “If disconnected youth are not engaged and connected, and they are disillusioned and marginalized, they may become easy targets for radicalization” (pg. 33). His research focuses on US radicalization, however I believe it can be extended to refugee camps, as well.

In my recommendations, I outline two directions that can be catalysts for reconnection, a sense of belonging, and support in the reconstruction of the lives of refugees. One is on an individual level and it is bringing participants in the research on itself and lessons learned. The other is a wider lens that urges policymakers to invest in higher education and opening doors to employment, not *incentive* work, but rather employment that not only feeds their families and communities, but also their hopes.

**Co-Researching and Co-Authoring**

Staci, you know I have met 26 researchers in my 27 years of life. You are my 26th. You are different; you are unique. You did your research *with* us. You said you would return to write a paper with us. You returned. All the researchers, I have met want something from me-- translation, interpretation, and/or connection to my community. You brought something different. (Co-researcher, personal communication, 9 June 2017).

In the quote above, the co-researcher is commenting on the psychosocial peace-building education course, as well as co-authoring a chapter in a book that will come out in February 2018. At the time, when I was doing research in Kakuma, I
didn’t believe that I was doing anything unique or different than any other researcher. Through conversations with participants, co-researchers, and staff from non-governmental organizations, I found out I was doing something different. My main concern was that I was doing justice to the issue of higher education in protracted context. At the moment, I am uncertain whether what I did was enough, or will ever be enough. What I do believe is that not only do researchers need to include participants in the research process, but also in the writing and authorship of the research. In light of this, I sent in a chapter proposal for the upcoming book, *Refugee Education: Integration and Acceptance of Refugees in Mainstream Society* edited by Kapur and Blessings, before I left for Kakuma in December 2016. It was accepted. Along with myself, six co-researchers authored the chapter, *Kakuma Refugee Camp, Where Hope and Knowledge Resides* and it will be published in February 2018.

This section highlights what was learned from both the researcher and co-researcher about the research process, why research is needed, and how we produced it together. Research is messy. I was told this by numerous professors and yet, the articles that I read in journals make research into neat, linear, and complete packages. Writing this chapter was neither neat nor linear. However, in the words of Lamott, (1999):

It turned out this man worked for the Dalai Lama. And he said gently-that they believe when a lot of things start going wrong all at once, it is to protect something big and lovely that is trying to get itself born—and that this
something needs for you to be distracted so that it can be born as perfectly as possible. (p. 107).

Our chapter was born perfectly enough that the co-researchers felt ownership and felt like they had their voices hear the discourse of refugee education.

One of the lessons learned in co-researching had to do with language. I assumed the skill of writing in English would be proficient. The level of writing in English varied. Co-writing with a group of people whose first language is English is hard enough, but the co-researchers were at different stages of written English competency. This made the project nearly impossible. So, instead of writing, I started to listen. For some I just began conversations, then I summarized what they said. I asked them if they wanted to expand more in particular areas and they took the written summary home with them. I told them to write in the language in which they felt most comfortable and we would talk it through. Some chose to write in their mother tongue, whereas others chose to write in English because they were not able to write in their mother tongue. When they returned the next day, we had another conversation about their new paragraph(s).

Another lesson learned was trying to figure out our audience was and why we were writing it. I wanted the chapter to be for their community and not only for the academic context. My intention was for the chapter to be accessible to their communities so I suggested that we write some of the chapter from whatever language the co-researcher felt most comfortable in writing. This led to something far more important than I had ever imagined. When I approached the co-researchers
with this idea, there was excitement and happiness that their language would be in a book about the discourse of refugee education. At the end of day, we ended up having five written languages (Somali, Amharic, Kirundi, Kinyarwanda and English) in the chapter. Below are two examples of the result of the chapter. One is in Amharic (Ethiopia) and the other is in Somali (Somalia). I am sharing the two excerpts as examples to show what the significance of writing is in the academic field and more importantly to the individual.

The Amharic section focused on our results about our participants’ critical reflection and how the course created time for participants to work together to co-create a meaningful dialogue to offer solutions.

**In Amharic (Ethiopia).**

Summary of the Amharic in English. We noticed when participants started to expand their thinking when participants chose to look at all different angles and found creative solutions. Participants explained space was freed up in their brain because they were not focusing on the intolerable conditions. The course created more space for engagement, fun, and cooperation while
deepening relationships and strengthening group work. Our participants noted that the TAG process helped them to see problems from different dimensions. For example, participants who presented themselves as lonely saw they had different options. Using the TAG process helped participants understand the context of a given incident, know how issues came into play, and consider aspects of cultural and inter-cultural issues. (Martin et al., in press)

The other example is in the Somali language. In our results section, we explained that despite being in a refugee camp that is supposed to be temporary but often becomes permanent, we co-created spaces in which participants do have choices. They do have some control over the events in our lives. And they can be a part of the solutions.

**In Somali (Somalia)**

Anigo so afmeerayo, tabo-barradeena waxey u abuureen gabdhaha iyo dumarka xarumo rajo galin ah iyo simnaan bulshadeena gabdhaha iyo dumarka wa kuwa la aamusiay waxana jiro qaabab xadiddan o ay isku qayixi karaan. Haweenka ka qeyb qaataay tabo-barradeena waxey ino sheeg in tabo-barkaa u siiyay xarumo ay oga hadli karaan arrimo an banaaneen sida (giilaafka kusa leesan qoyska iyo is qaqabqisiga ay ka mid yihiin furitaanka iyo gudniinka fircooniga ah) Sheekoooyinka badan kood waxey ku saab sanaayeeyn sida ay u rabin dumarka in markale la guursado, qaarkod waxey heleen taageero oga imaaneysay saxiibahooda dareemayay arrimo isku mid ah ama waxey u so jeediyeen qorsho saacideen karo halka kuwa kale ay muujiyeen in ay garab taagan yihiin gabdhaha sidoo kale waxey sharaxeeyn in tabo baraddaay ay so xasuusiyeen xaaladdo ay so dhaafeen waxeyna wacad ku mareen in aysan walalahod aysan dhebaatoonin kaligood.

**Summary of the Somali in English.** Our courses created physical places for girls and women to hope and to just be. In our societies, girls and women have often been silenced and have limited ways of expressing
themselves. Female participants said that these courses offered them a place to talk about taboo issues (such as domestic violence, other forms of violence, divorce, and female genital mutilation). Several of the stories were about the reluctance of being remarried. Some found support surrounded by their peers that expressed the same situation or offered strategies that helped them, while others expressed solidarity with their sisters and explained that these courses reconnected themselves to their past situations. Often the women vowed never to let their sisters suffer alone. (Martin et al., in press)

Although, co-writing and co-authoring had many “matatu” stops, and at times it was unclear if we were going to make it to our destination, one thing was clear. I wanted to make sure that we all played a role in creating the manuscript. I am also sharing the lessons learned to offer transparency and so that others can learn from my missteps.

When I co-wrote and co-authored with a colleague of mine and Portland Youth Builder students:

We stopped in various sections for our students to read what we wrote and to offer feedback [and] to contribute to the writing. The students served not only as a bridge to us, the university instructor, and the secondary teacher, but also offered validation to what was heard. (Burbach et al., 2017, p. 182).

I found this process helpful in writing with my colleague and the Youth Builders students. When we stopped to talk about a particular concept, we would debate on what we really meant by a word and whether that was what we really
wanted to put in this article. Through this process, our writing became clearer for my colleague and I who were the lead writers. I am grateful for the care, energy, and time, our co-authors put in. I was honored that I could share a byline with the students because they taught me about the complexity of alternative education and creating spaces for students who were “pushed out” of the traditional school system.

In light of this experience, I asked my co-researchers in Kakuma to read the manuscript aloud, each one taking a paragraph. This was unexpectedly frustrating because one of the co-authors did not want to read it out loud nor wanted anyone else to read it. The co-author argued that they had complete confidence that what I wrote was good and it was a waste of time to read it. This co-author was also frustrated because our English literacy varied. Perhaps my writing was good however that wasn’t the point. I found not reading it together problematic since the purpose of writing the paper together was for all of us to have ownership and, most importantly, for all of us to dictate what was written. Fortunately, another co-author understood why I insisted that we read it together and convinced this co-author to stay with us. I ended up reading the whole chapter aloud. I had attempted to avoid this because I felt that the students from the Youth Builders really owned the words as they were reading them and I wanted the same for my co-authors in Kakuma. My reading the manuscript was one condition that this co-author made in order to stay. So I read to them and we would stop and ask questions. At the end of the day, we changed some parts of the discussion section due to the influence of all the co-authors.
The situation up above where the student appeared to rely on my knowledge appeared to be consistent with banking style concept. This concept sees students as “containers,’ as ‘receptacles’ to be ‘filled’ by the teacher” (Freire, 2003, p. 72).

Although, Freire (2003) speaks of this concept in broad terms of education, I believe it can be expanded to refugee camps, in particular. Although I do not assert that this idea of ‘banking style’ is intentional, the conditions in the camp often create spaces in which the following is true.

For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, individuals cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other. (p. 72)

I would argue that limited hopeful inquiry could create critical despair. Living in a protracted refugee context adds to this critical despair. An individual had a legitimate complaint, such as not enough books, teachers, and /or supplies. In this case, it was books for a classroom. In this scenario, the refugee tells their supervisor that they need more books. The supervisor explained to them if they told the donor they need more, then they will know about the problem. They will expose that they have a problem. So, the problem does not get the attention that more books are needed and the refugee is conditioned not to bring up these kinds of issues anymore. Critical despair often settles in as the practice of this scenario slowly develops into a clear pattern of limited choice, limited ability to have agency, and lowering of self-worth. According to Abdi (2005),
Research in Dadaab [Refugee Camp] found that refugees are dismayed by their dependency on inadequate aid and express the loss of a sense of self-worth due to their inability to better their situation or to escape from the dire conditions of camp life. (p. 18)

Abdi continued,

Arguments against this type of encampment include that camps engender passivity, breaking down all initiative and sense of self-worth of refugees. The hand-to-mouth arrangement of waiting for others to provide for one’s needs eventually translates to complete dependency on donations. (p. 20)

Although, I am still unsure if our writing a chapter supported any agency, self-worth, and/or choices (the co-authors have disclosed it did), I would argue that there needs to be more opportunities for refugees to share their own knowledge in the academic sphere. Freire (2003) explained,

Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself [herself] taught in the dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. (g. 80)

When refugees receive the opportunity for higher education, they see themselves as research subjects in academic research, but rarely as producers of the research (Openjuru, Jaitli, Tandon, & Hall, 2015). Moreover, most vulnerable
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communities do not see themselves as producers of knowledge. They do not have the opportunity to access power and be jointly responsible.

I assert, knowledge needs to be both created from the Global North and South. Instead of focusing on best practices and policies from comparative countries, countries that are economically powerful are disproportionately represented in the refugee education policy debate. Space needs to be created where we can learn from our shared knowledge. Instead of seeing education as a weapon of control and power, access to create research from both the Global North and South needs to be seen as a shared responsibility that is a moral, just, and human right.

Creating spaces that allow more research that is cultivated, nurtured, and produced from vulnerable populations that are impacted most, will inform and strengthen countries’ capacity and countries ownership over their own educational systems. With this kind of research, the hope is that donor countries are learning just as much from the countries that are receiving the funding, thus having a shared education

Hope and knowledge reside in Kakuma, and it is not a stretch to say these two strengths exist in any refugee camp. I believe we need to support vulnerable populations to produce and share their own knowledge (Burbach et al., 2016; Martin et al., in press). By applying Kramer’s (1986) third hand approach, that is, supporting the co-researcher in a way that does not do the work, but remains the “extra/third hand” if the co-researcher needs assistance, we can create knowledge from the a perspective that is often missing in research.
Higher Education and Employment

A large part of the Psychosocial Peace-Building Education (PBBE) course that I developed is supporting the participants while they develop concrete actions that change their situations. These actions are created with, by, and from the group. The main component of the course is a process of story-making, story-telling, and problem-solving. One of the stories that came out of the course was a fable or story.

There was a tortoise and a lizard. The tortoise was carrying a bag of things around his neck. He dropped it. A lizard saw him drop it and picked it up. The tortoise insisted it was his. The lizard said that now it was his and left with the bag. As the tortoise was walking on the road, he found the bag again on the road and swung it around his neck and started to carry it again. The lizard saw him and was angry. They started to fight. (Kakuma Refugee, personal communication, 1 Feb 2017)

It is a clever story that had some underlying messages about what is happening globally with regard to conflict and rapid migration that is happening around the world. At the moment of writing this manuscript, the dominant discourse about refugees (and migrants, by association) emphasizes stories about their struggles, challenges, and hardships, and their burden on the social fabric of the globalized world. This dissertation does not ignore the hardships, but instead offers counter-narratives that illuminate for the reader how policies impact refugees, the possibilities of what is behind those struggles, and to offer spaces to nurture hopeful views.
One of the issues that have been directly and indirectly spoken about is this concept of living in a temporary place that has become permanent for most of its inhabitants. Refugee camps were once temporary refuge; now they have become permanent prisons. This is happening globally from refugees in Europe’s temporary refugee camps (Strickland, 2016) to places in Africa such as Dadaab (Tinsely, 2015) to Kakuma (Martin et al., in press) to places in the Middle East (e.g., Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey).

In my study, all of my participants have stayed a year or more. Most came to Kakuma with the impression they would stay for a couple of months and return to their country. Most never believed they would still be in Kakuma years later. Although, they have indicated they are grateful to their host country, they feel trapped and have the perception that they are unable to control any part of their lives. This is not unique to Kakuma. Long-term encampment with no end in sight continues to be a major issue across refugee camps.

Betts and Collier (2017) addressed long-term encampment through a story about Wuli, a refugee who has been living in a camp for decades. They state, Post-primary educational opportunities are limited, so Wuli provides informal education to young refugees, many born in the camp, in his own tent. He explained: ‘Man does not live on food and water alone but on hope. My hope is gone but I pass it on to the next generation. His situation is typical of so much wasted talent across the world’s refugee camps. (p. 54)
This scenario appeared to be consistent with my own study. Many of the participants were and are going out of their way to start informal schools in their homes. Two participants teach English as a Second Language on a regular basis in the evening and weekends. Another one is a part of a community-based organization that supports this notion of giving back. My data does not indicate that the participants are despondent to the extent that they have lost all hope, rather it appears that higher education is nurturing their hope, albeit temporarily.

Betts and Collier (2017) also argued that continued long-term encampment, that is, where people live in camps from cradle to grave offers a security issue. They argued, “without opportunity, they risk creating a lost generation” that provide a place which is an “ideal nurturing ground for recruitment and radicalization by rebel groups, militias, and terrorist organizations, who can exploit the presence of an alienated, unemployed, and bored youth population” (p. 54). Later, in their analysis Betts and Collier spoke of promoting training and skill-based opportunities while acknowledging the limited access to higher education. Although, my study does not show that my participants are interested in joining extremist groups that Betts and Collier have mentioned, what the data does indicate is that the participants want access to higher education. They want the ability to use their critical thinking skills like they did in the PBBE course, to co-research and co-create knowledge, and most importantly they seek a sense of belongingness—to be connected, worthwhile, and needed.
If we do not push for more education, specifically higher education, not only are we creating a lost generation in these long-term encampments, but we are also creating a forgotten generation. A generation that has so much potential, and yet within this tender box, we are seeing more young people who see no alternative to joining militias and other groups that have negative consequences (Obama, 2015).

Milton, Spencer, and Findley (2013) explained that the two key factors that contribute to radicalization are “the apparently hopeless conditions in which refugees find themselves upon fleeing, and the poor treatment of refugees by host countries” (pg. 625-626). In other words, refugees find themselves between two worlds, neither one desirable.

As it stands, these protracted contexts and long-term encampments are here to stay. Higher education cannot only play a significant role in individuals lives but also, in society as a whole. According to Betts and Collier (2017):

A recent analysis of post-conflict recovery suggests that the loss of educated workers (‘human capital’ in the ugly jargon of economics) is even more damaging than the physical destruction…countries like Laos, for example, have in the past suffered the economic impact of their young and educated refugee population assimilating abroad rather than returning to the country of origin.” (p. 120)

There are several universities and programs (Australia Catholic University, Borderless Higher Education for Refugees [BHER], Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins [JWL:HEM], Kelper, Kiron, and InZone at
University of Geneva) that are pushing for higher education in emergencies and protracted contexts. Two were my partners, Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins and Kenyatta University. I have highlighted the two partners in my literature review and participant section. Since I have done my research, I wanted to highlight three other programs that are doing some innovative work.

They are Borderless Higher Education for Refugees (BHER) that is based in Dadaab Refugee Camp, Kenya. InZone is in the Horn of Africa, the Middle East, and Europe, and Kepler that is based in Kigali, Rwanda. I am highlighting these three programs because they are doing some innovative things that offer a sense of belongingness – to be connected, worthwhile, and needed.

BHER (2017) is different than most Higher Education programs in protracted contexts in for three reasons: (a) BHER strengthens a multicultural exchange and discourse. Many of the courses offered through BHER include three populations (Canadian students from York University, Dadaab Refugee Students, and Kenyan nationals). They are taking courses simultaneously and are able to learn from each other. Most higher education programs are focusing just on refugees; (b) BHER is taught by faculty from the four BHER Partner Universities (online and in person) and there are additional supports in Dadaab that create a space for student success. Other higher education programs are taught by community members and have limited support onsite; (c) BHER offers 30 credit Certificates, 60 credit Diplomas and 90-120 credit Degrees. Credits earned in of these programs are internationally transferrable.
All students in BHER begin by studying Education and earn a teacher education credential that can be used in Kenya or Somalia.

Dr. Dippo, a faculty member from York University and teacher in the BHER program said, “BHER is giving access to students to get their credentials to teach. Refugees [predominately from Somalia] expect to return to Somalia. They want to open up schools and create infrastructures that will support their communities. BHER is helping them to do this” (D. Dippo, personal communication, 24 October 2017).

InZone (2017) is different than most Higher Education programs in protracted contexts for three reasons: (a) InZone offers a two-week course for practitioners and educators at University of Geneva. This is a course that addresses the policies, research, and application of post-secondary education in emergencies. This course is the only course that is available anywhere and brings the Connected Learning in Crisis Consortium to teach together which InZone co-leads with UNHCR; (b) InZone focuses on a number of areas (arts, peacebuilding, and medical training to mention a few) however they started out with a specialty that educates and supports humanitarian field interpreters. They have certificate programs that are done by University of Geneva and partnered with UNHCR and the International Committee of the Red Cross; (c) InZone also does research. Not only is InZone a program within the University of Geneva that delivers blended courses, but they also research that is grounded in their own theory of change. Dr. Barbara Moser-Mercer, founder and
director of InZone said, “Higher education also needs to be a part of the humanitarian action” ((Ladek, 2016, para. 1).

Kepler (2016) is different than most Higher Education programs in protracted contexts in for three reasons: (a) Kepler offers degrees. Graduates receive a degree from Southern New Hampshire University, USA. Most higher education programs only offer certificates or credits; (b) Kepler has a teacher fellow program where past students support new students. This brings an onsite and a local context; (c) Kepler provides a pathway for employment. Kepler’s program is based in Rwanda. Rwanda has one of the most progressive refugee policies that allows refugees the “freedom of movement and the right to work” (UNHCR, 2017b, para. 1). One of the main components of Kepler’s program is their required internship. Students are matched with local employees.

All three programs that I have highlighted are supporting students in creating a path of hope by anchoring their programs to employment, regardless if it is incentive work or a job. This is vital because the most recent conversations of refugee policies are urging policymakers to have “refugees fully engaged in the socioeconomic life of the host state” (Betts & Collier, 2017, p. 144). Some countries (e.g. Uganda, Rwanda) are attempting to do some innovative policies that allow refugees some self-reliance, which they lost when they fled by letting them start to take care of themselves (UNHCR, 2017b). With regard to Rwanda’s policy of right to work, Russell and Weaver (2017) urged that the policies need to go beyond low paying and low skilled employment. Rather, they believe that with higher education “refugees
can become competitive in national and global job markets. Particularly in the Global South, this offers huge potential for economic growth as well as refugees’ economic, social and political autonomy” (Russell & Weaver, 2017, para. 14). In other words, by educating, advocating, and producing future leaders, they can stabilize their own countries. In fact, my research showed that the participants whom I spoke with want to do just that – lead their country in innovative businesses, run for political offices, and more importantly, lead their country to peace.

Too often policies are made because of conflict. To co-create a path of hope, we need to start working on a path along with an end game. It is apparent that protracted refugee camps are here to stay (e.g. Dadaab Refugee Camp). If we infuse higher education in these camps, we also need to offer them a path to somewhere. In my brief three months in Kenya, I have seen critical despair set in when a student realizes that being educated and motivated does not necessarily offer them a future when they have nowhere to go.

I want to return to the tortoise and lizard story. I want to share a brief snapshot of our work in implementing our session. Our PPBE session met outside because there was not a room to sit in. As the participants shared their stories, I started to hear overflowing water and turned around. The enormous water tank was overflowing and was losing gallons of water by the minute. I stopped the discussion and asked if we could get a staff person to stop the flowing water. We asked one of the staffers and he remarked, “It is not my problem, it is UNHCR.” Fifteen minutes
later, a staff person came over and turned off one of the valves and the water slowly stopped after flowing another 15 minutes.

By that time, someone had shared another story about the war in South Sudan. I attempted to use the situation of the water as a metaphor, but failed miserably. My co-facilitator and another participant understood and tried to convey my point to the group, but it just seemed to frustrate the participants even more. I was noting, we have things happening like the overflowing water (e.g., war) and we have opportunities to help find solutions, but we have a tendency to say, “It’s not my problem.” I asked, how do we make it our problem so we can collectively fix it?

A conversation began about what they can do as a collective to create a space for themselves in Kakuma. This started a half-hearted conversation. I said, “You have a voice in this conversation.” My co-facilitator asked a man, “Do you think you have a voice?” The man hesitated and his voice cracked, “That is a hard question. I cannot answer it.” As those words left his mouth, I knew that is where we need to start--co-creating spaces for people to have their voice heard. There needs to be an empathic response to show these refugees their tremendous worth. One way could be providing more access and opportunities for higher education and skill-based training.

We ended the session with this understanding that we do not have to be the tortoise and lizard individually carrying the burdens. We can collectively share the burden and the resources. This expands beyond this small group locally and globally. We must come together and collectively share the burdens and resources.
Conclusion: Interdependence

Betts and Collier (2017) explained the refugee situation is becoming permanent and we as society need to treat the situation more like a development process. They stated, “For the period refugees are in limbo, we should be creating an enabling environment that nurtures rather than debilitates people’s ability to contribute in exile and when they go home” (p. 144). Offering access to higher education to refugees is one step that will not only nurture their mind but also their hopes.

Increasing access to higher education in the refugee camps is investing the very young people who will be rebuilding their own countries. And yet, this education needs to be culturally responsive to the needs of the community. Graduated refugees can play a huge role in developing curriculum, supporting teachers, and modeling the social and emotional health we are all striving for. The education needs to emphasize the community’s cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005), funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2013) and most of all, hope of vulnerable populations. By doing this, we will see solutions that we never could imagine but were there all along.

In collaborating together in curriculum and pedagogy, we, as teachers and learners, will have the opportunity to critically self-reflect and give ourselves the space to interrogate where our own stories, beliefs, and values are coming from. For this sort of transformation to thrive, spaces for reflexive dialogue and discourse need to be developed. This dialogue may create discomfort and unsettle students and
teachers, but it is essential for change and liberation to happen. There is hope that when we recognize why, how, and what we are complicit in, we can evolve.

Reading off statistics is far different than meeting the people who are the statistics, for they each have stories of resilience, struggle, survival, and believe it or not hope. There is hope and knowledge in Kakuma. If you are quiet you can hear hope breathing.
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### Appendix A: Data Collection

**Timelines and Procedures [Proposed and Actual]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Project</th>
<th>Proposed Activity</th>
<th>Actual Activity</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong> 1-7 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Recruitment Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL:HEM) at Kakuma Refugee Camp: ❖ Meet with JWL:HEM coordinator and meet with students at JWL:HEM at Kakuma Refugee Camp; ❖ Work alongside JWL:HEM students via tutoring, etc.; Administer pre-survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at JWL:HEM.</td>
<td>Visa issues; Flight delayed for a week; ❖ Met with Country Director, Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS); ❖ Psychosocial Peace Building Education (PPBE) at JRS (2 hours/12 Staff); ❖ Went in the field with Social Workers in Nairobi.</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong> 8-14 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Deliver psychosocial peacebuilding education course at JWL:HEM ❖ Recruit JWL:HEM for course; ❖ Coordinate times and places for the course to take place; Run at least 3-4 courses/10 students per each/4 hours.</td>
<td>KAKUMA/Delivered psychosocial peacebuilding education course at JWL:HEM ❖ Recruit JWL:HEM for course; ❖ Met with 38 students to discuss the project ❖ Coordinate times and places for the course to take place; o 19 students volunteered o 13 were trained o Delivered 2 trainings (12 &amp;14 Jan); ❖ Met with JWL Program Director; ❖ Went in the field with Education Coordinator in Kakuma; ❖ Administered pre-survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at JWL:HEM; ❖ Met with other Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) possible partnerships.</td>
<td>Field Notes Research Log: Activities Consent Forms Pre-Survey (Qualtrics)/Paper-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong> 15-21 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Implement curriculum with trained participants, if they want, in their own community as I work alongside them; ❖ Brainstorm where we would like to take the project (other teachers, other students, other aid workers, teach back); ❖ Implement with 2 groups that students have identified (ages 18-up);</td>
<td>KAKUMA/Implemented curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them; ❖ Worked with Sunrise Institute afterschool program (15 students); ❖ Trained JRS Social Workers at Kakuma (5); ❖ Worked with NGO partner in Kakuma 4 on 17, 18, 19, 20 Jan 2017/ 4 hours a day/30 participants in total; ❖ Worked with afterschool program at Lokitang (15 participants/3 teachers).</td>
<td>Field Notes Audio recording Transcripts Participant-Researcher Reflective Log</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week 4 | 22-28 Jan. 2017 | Implement curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
- Brainstorm where we would like to take the project (other teachers, other students, other aid workers, teach back);  
- Implement with 2 or more groups that students have identified (ages 18-up);  
- Administer Post Survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at JWL:HEM;  
- Run multiple linear regression model (pre/post);  
- Identify the participants who are outside of the trends;  
- Start scheduling interviews | KAKUMA/Implemented curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
- Worked with Sunrise Institute afterschool program (15 students/2 co-facilitators);  
- Worked with NGO partner in Kakuma 4 on 23, 24, 25, 26 Jan 2017/ 4 hours a day (30 participants in total/2 co-facilitators);  
- Worked with afterschool program at Lokitang (15 participants/3 co-facilitators). | Field Notes  
Audio recording  
Transcripts  
Participant-Researcher Reflective Log |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Week 5 | 29 Jan. – 4 Feb. 2017 | Implement curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
- Interview;  
- Start Thematic Analysis with JWL:HEM students;  
- Present to greater community of preliminary findings | KAKUMA/Implemented curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
- Worked with Sunrise Institute afterschool program (15 students/2 co-facilitators);  
- Worked with NGO partner in Kakuma 4 on 30 & 31 Jan, 1 & 4 Feb 2017/ 4 hours a day (60 participants in total/2 co-facilitators);  
- Administered Post Survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at JWL:HEM;  
- Worked with teachers at Lokitang (9 participants/2 co-facilitators). | Field Notes  
Audio recording  
Transcripts  
Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
Qualtrics (post-survey)/SPS S/Paper-based |
| Week 6 | 5-11 Feb. 2017 | Recruitment at Kenyatta University (KU):  
- Meet with Dr. Gitome and meet with students at KU;  
- Work alongside KU students via tutoring;  
- Administer pre-survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at KU;  
- Work with JWL:HEM remotely in Nairobi. | KAKUMA/Implemented curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
- Worked with Sunrise Institute afterschool program (15 students/2 co-facilitators);  
- Interviewed (8);  
- Follow-up with Post-Survey;  
- Recruitment at Kenyatta University (KU) via Dr. Gitome and youth coordinator. | Field Notes  
Audio recording  
Transcripts  
Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
Qualtrics (post-survey)/SPS S/Paper-based |
| Week 7 | Deliver psychosocial peacebuilding education course at KU: |
| 12-18 Feb. 2017 | - Recruit KU for course; |
| | - Coordinate times and places for the course to take place; |
| | - Run at least 3-4 courses/10 students per each/4 hours; |
| | - Work with JWL:HEM remotely in Nairobi. |
| | NAIROBI/Delivered psychosocial peacebuilding education course at KU: |
| | - Coordinate times and places for the course to take place; |
| | - 15 were trained |
| | - Delivered 2 trainings (13 & 14 Jan); |
| | - Administer pre-survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at KU; |
| | - Met with JRS Regional Director; |
| | - Conference in Kampala, Uganda |
| | Field Notes |
| | Audio recording |
| | Transcripts |
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log |
| | Qualtrics (post-survey)/SPS S/Paper-based |

| Week 8 | Implement curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them. |
| 19-25 Feb. 2017 | - Brainstorm where we would like to take the project (other teachers, other students, other aid workers, teach back); |
| | - Implement with 2 groups that students have identified (ages 18-up); |
| | - Training continued, if needed; |
| | - Ask 3-5 student volunteers that will support in the thematic analysis. |
| | NAIROBI/Returned and KU still on strike. Received texts and emails that students were returning to their respective camps. |
| | - Implemented the program at JRS parishes in coordination with social workers (Guthrie Parish/37 participants in total/3 co-facilitators); |
| | - Gender-based Violence Prevention meeting/JRS; |
| | - JRS Peer Mentors trained (6 participants/1 co-facilitator); |
| | - 4 Kakuma participants continued the program in their communities. Corresponded with researcher reflective logs. |
| | Field Notes |
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log |

<p>| Week 9 | Implement curriculum with trained participants, if they want, in their own community as I work alongside them; |
| 26 Feb. – 4 Mar. 2017 | - Brainstorm where we would like to take the project (other teachers, other students, other aid workers, teach back); |
| | - Implement with 2 or more groups that students have identified (ages 18 and older); |
| | - Administer Post Survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at JWL:HEM; |
| | - Run multiple linear regression model (pre/post); |
| | - Identify the participants who are outside of the trends; |
| | NAIROBI/Determined that KU was not going to be possible to continue. 2 students who were trained did support some of the co-facilitation in Nairobi. |
| | - Implemented the program with JRS social workers; |
| | - Implemented the program at JRS parishes in coordination with social workers (Kayole Parish, Eastleigh Parish, Riruta Parish, 54 participants in total/3 co-facilitators); |
| | - 4 Kakuma participants continued the program in their communities. Corresponded with researcher reflective logs. |
| | Field Notes |
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10   | Implement curriculum with trained participants in their own community as I work alongside them;  
      | - Interview;  
      | - Start Thematic Analysis with KU students;  
      | - Present to greater community of preliminary findings  
      | - Work with JWL:HEM remotely in Nairobi.  
      | NAIROBI/2 KU students who were trained did support some of the co-facilitation in Nairobi.  
      | - International Women’s Day;  
      | - Street-Connected Children and youth meeting;  
      | - Kenya’s Department of Refugee Affairs/4 hours (15 participants in total/2 co-facilitators) |
| 11   | Create evaluation report and preliminary findings and send it to participant-researchers (JWL:HEM/KU) for member check in:  
      | - Draft of statistical analysis;  
      | - Draft of thematic analysis.  
      | NAIROBI/2 KU students who were trained did support some of the co-facilitation in Nairobi.  
      | - Implemented the program at JRS parishes in coordination with social workers (Kitengela Parish/34 participants in total/0 co-facilitator)  
      | - JRS Rongai Parish fieldwork met with 20 families;  
      | - Trained 6 teachers from Heishma, Kenya;  
      | - Trained 15 South Sudanese Peace Group.  
| 12   | Wrap-up any research data collection and/or analysis.  
| 19-25 March 2017 | Left for Tanzania.  
| June 4-17 | Throughout the 4-5 months, corresponded with the group in Kakuma. I then, compiled all our notes and I returned to Kakuma and we wrote up our findings together. A chapter will be published in Feb 2018.  
      | - Administered follow-up survey Hope Index of Staats (1989) at KU;  
      | - Follow-up interviews.  
| | Field Notes  
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
| | Field Notes  
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
| | Field Notes  
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
| | Audio recording  
| | Transcripts  
| | Participant-Researcher Reflective Log  
| | Qualtrics (post-survey)/SPS S/Paper-based
Appendix B: Script of Introductions to Students

Hello, My name is Staci and I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at Portland State University in the United States of America. I am conducting research about hope in Higher education in protracted refugee context. I am seeking your participation.

Participation means answering a 5-10 minute confidential online pre-survey in _________(date), a post-survey ____________ (date) with a possible follow-up 30-minute interview during ____________(dates). You can access more information, consent to participate, and the survey by clicking on the following link: ________________ (link to Qualtrics Survey Software). You will be redirected to Qualtrics Survey Software and your responses will be confidential. I also have a paper-based survey. If you choose, you may also participate a course that will take 4 hours on ___________. This course is an arts and literacy peace-building course that engages participants in an interactive art-making, storytelling, and peacebuilding activity.

Thanks! Go well,

Staci Martin

Mar24@pdx.edu

Phone number based in Kenya
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form  
(Kakuma Refugee Camp/JWL:HEM)

**Study title:** Co-creating Spaces of Critical Hope through the Use of Psychosocial Peace-Building Education Course in a Higher Education in Protracted Refugee Context: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kenyatta University

**Principle investigator:**
Dannelle Stevens, Ph.D.  
Graduate School of Education  
Curriculum and Instruction  
PO Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207-0751  
503-725-3091  
Email address: bgsd@pdx.edu

**Co-Investigator:**
Staci B. Martin, MA Art Therapy  
Graduate School of Education  
Curriculum and Instruction  
527 SW Hall Street, Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97201  
Kenya Phone Number  
Email address: mar24@pdx.edu

**Introduction to the study:**
You are being asked to participate in a research study that is being conducted by Staci Martin, who is the Principal Investigator from the Department of Education, at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, USA. The purpose of the study is to explore how refugee students’ (18-35) perceptions of hope evolve in a Higher Education in Emergency setting. Your input is valued to advance the knowledge in this field.

It is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please ask JWL:HEM coordinator or me if this is not clear or if you need more information.

**What will happen during the study?**
This study asks you to fill out some demographic questions and complete a short Hope Index of Staats pre survey on________(date), a post-survey __________(date) with a possible follow-up 30-minute interview during __________(dates). The survey consists of 16 questions and will take approximately 10 minutes. This questionnaire will be conducted with an online survey (Qualtrics).

If you choose, you may also participate a course that will take 4 hours on _________. This course is an arts and literacy peace-building course that engages participants in an interactive art-making, storytelling, and peacebuilding activity.

Data will be gathered from your answers from the survey. The data collected includes an audio recording of our conversation, photos of your collages, interview
CO-CREATING SPACES OF CRITICAL HOPE

notes, and research reflections following the interview and from the course and interviews. The audio will be used to transcribe the conversation and check for concepts and themes from the interview. The artwork is yours to take anytime during or after the course. A copy of your interview transcription, photos of your participation, and final dissertation will be available on request.

Risks:
There are no known risks in this study, but some individuals may experience discomfort when answering questions. All data will be kept for 7 years in a locked file in Staci Martin’s office and then destroyed.

Benefits:
While, there will be no direct benefit to you from this study, you may experience pleasure of sharing your experiences. The findings from this project will provide information on deepening our understanding of hope and where we can co-create spaces of hope. If published, results will be presented in summary form only.

How is the participant’s (your) privacy protected?
All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential. All questionnaires will be concealed, anonymous, and no one other than the primary investigator will have access to them. The data collected will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant, Qualtrics-secure database until the primary investigator has deleted it. The Portland State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Kenyatta University Ethical Review Committee (KU-ERC) that oversee human subject research and/or other entities may be permitted to access your records, and there may be times when we are required by law to share your information. It is the investigator’s legal obligation to report child abuse, child neglect, elder abuse, harm to self or others or any life-threatening situation to the appropriate authorities, and; therefore, your confidentiality will not be maintained.

Contact:
If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Staci Martin (principal investigator), at Kenya Phone #, or mar24@pdx.edu

Institutional Review Board:
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may call the PSU Office for Research Integrity at (503) 725-2227 or 1(877) 480-4400. The ORI is the office that supports the PSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is a group of people from PSU and the community who provide independent oversight of safety and ethical issues related to research involving human participants. For more information, you may also access the IRB website at https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/research/integrity.
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Kenyatta University Research Center at www.research.ku.ac.ke. The Ethical Review Committee in Kenyatta University is anchored in the Kenyatta University Research Policy and mandated to review ethics of proposals and projects in accordance with the University Research Policy. The guidelines herein are intended to facilitate the review and clearing of researches involving human subjects both locally and internationally.  

**Voluntary Participation:**  
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your academic standing. If you desire to withdraw, please close your Internet browser before submitting your responses or in the case of the course, tell the researcher that you do not want to participate.

**Unforeseen risk:**  
There may be risks that are not anticipated. However, every effort will be made to minimize risks.

**Cost to participate:**  
There is no cost for your participation in this study.

**Compensation:**  
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

**PLEASE READ, THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN BELOW IF YOU AGREE.**  
I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study and my questions have been answered. I have read the information in this consent form and I agree to participate.

☐ I give permission for my identity to be used in the research _____ (please initials)

______________________________   ____________________
Signature of the participant        Date

______________________________  
Printed name of the participant

---

7 Taken from KU-ERC http://research.ku.ac.ke/images/docs/ethics_operational_guidelines_updated2015.pdf (p. 4)
Appendix D: Informed Consent Form
(Kenyatta University)

Study title: Co-creating Spaces of Critical Hope through the Use of Psychosocial Peace-Building Education Course in a Higher Education in Protracted Refugee Context: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kenyatta University

Principle investigator: Dannelle Stevens, Ph.D.
Graduate School of Education
Curriculum and Instruction
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751
503-725-3091
Email address: bgsd@pdx.edu

Co-Investigator: Staci B. Martin, MA Art Therapy
Graduate School of Education
Curriculum and Instruction
527 SW Hall Street, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97201
Kenya Phone Number
Email address: mar24@pdx.edu

Introduction to the study:
You are being asked to participate in a research study that is being conducted by Staci Martin, who is the Principal Investigator from the Department of Education, at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, USA. The purpose of the study is to explore how refugee students’ (18-35) perceptions of hope evolve in a Higher Education in Emergency setting. Your input is valued to advance the knowledge in this field.

It is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please ask Dr. Josephine Gitome or me, if this is not clear or if you need more information.

What will happen during the study?
This study asks you to fill out some demographic questions and complete a short Hope Index of Staats pre survey on___________(date), a post-survey _____________(date) with a possible follow-up 30-minute interview during ______________(dates). The survey consists of 16 questions and will take approximately 10 minutes or less. This questionnaire will be conducted with an online survey (Qualtrics).

If you choose, you may also participate a course that will take 4 hours on ___________. This course is an arts and literacy peace-building course that engages participants in an interactive art-making, storytelling, and peacebuilding activity.

Data will be gathered from your answers from the survey. The data collected includes an audio recording of our conversation, photos of your collages, interview notes, and research reflections following the interview and from the course and interviews. The audio will be used to transcribe the conversation and check for
concepts and themes from the interview. The artwork is yours during or after the course. A copy of your interview transcription, photos of your participation, and final dissertation will be available on request.

**Risks:**
There are no known risks in this study, but some individuals may experience discomfort when answering questions. All data will be kept for 7 years in a locked file in Staci Martin’s office and then destroyed.

**Benefits:**
While, there will be no direct benefit to you from this study, you may experience pleasure of sharing your experiences. The findings from this project will provide information on deepening our understanding of hope and where we can co-create spaces of hope. If published, results will be presented in summary form only.

**How is the participant’s (your) privacy protected?**
All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential. All questionnaires will be concealed, anonymous, and no one other than the primary investigator will have access to them. The data collected will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant, Qualtrics-secure database until the primary investigator has deleted it. The Portland State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Kenyatta University Ethical Review Committee (KU-ERC) that oversee human subject research and/or other entities may be permitted to access your records, and there may be times when we are required by law to share your information. It is the investigator’s legal obligation to report child abuse, child neglect, elder abuse, harm to self or others or any life-threatening situation to the appropriate authorities, and; therefore, your confidentiality will not be maintained.

**Contact:**
If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Staci Martin (principal investigator), at Kenya Phone #, or mar24@pdx.edu

**Institutional Review Board:**
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may call the PSU Office for Research Integrity at (503) 725-2227 or 1(877) 480-4400. The ORI is the office that supports the PSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is a group of people from PSU and the community who provide independent oversight of safety and ethical issues related to research involving human participants. For more information, you may also access the IRB website at https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/research/integrity.

If you have questions regard your rights as a research participant, you may contact Kenyatta University Research Center at www.research.ku.ac.ke. The Ethical Review
Committee in Kenyatta University is anchored in the Kenyatta University Research Policy and mandated to review ethics of proposals and projects in accordance with the University Research Policy. The guidelines herein are intended to facilitate the review and clearing of researches involving human subjects both locally and internationally.8

**Voluntary Participation:**
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your academic standing. If you desire to withdraw, please close your Internet browser before submitting your responses or in the case of the course, tell the researcher that you do not want to participate.

**Unforeseen risk:**
There may be risks that are not anticipated. However, every effort will be made to minimize any risks.

**Cost to participate:**
There is no cost for your participation in this study.

**Compensation:**
There is no compensation for this participation in this study.

**PLEASE READ, THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN BELOW IF YOU AGREE.**
I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study and my questions have been answered. I have read the information in this consent form and I agree to participate.

☐ I give permission for my identity to be used in the research ______ (please initials)

____________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of the participant  Date

____________________________________
Printed name of the participant

8 Taken from KU-ERC
http://research.ku.ac.ke/images/docs/ethics_operational_guidelines_updated2015.pdf (p. 4)
Appendix E: Psychosocial Peace Building Education Course
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Psychosocial Peacebuilding Education Curriculum

The psychosocial peacebuilding education curriculum is a course that works with youth using the arts and literacy to strengthen the participant’s personal voice and opens discourse for other alternative pro-social ways of reducing violence in schools and the greater communities.

Note: Start with making group rules. Spend 10 minutes discussing the rules. Please let the children make the rules, the facilitator can help get the children started but do not lead the process. If children have not included “Respect others and themselves,” please make sure you include it.

1. Journal-Making

*(One session, 50 minutes)*

Supplies: 8 pairs of scissors, 2 paper hole punchers, decorative paper, legal size copy paper, 6 pencils, yarn/string

Directive:

Participants will choose decorative cover (Note: Other possibilities could include collage work or natural materials). Fold in half and punch holes on the crease on either side. Fold the copy paper also in half and punch holes on the crease on either side. 10 pages will give you 20 pages.

Cut the paper to size of the cover. If you want to add some math skills ask what the size of the paper is, count pages, when you fold in half all the papers how many halves do you have . . . etc.

The journal is a major component of the program. Before each session, ask the participant to write 1-2 sentences about how they feel and why? (Note: This will be the baseline to see if change occurs in the session). After each session, the facilitator will ask 2 questions to the group. What did
you learn? How do you feel and why? Participants receive 5 minutes for each question to write down their answer in their journal. (Note: It is important that each participant does this independently.)

The journal is kept in a central area either with the facilitator or somewhere safe throughout the sessions. After the sessions, the journal is for writing down thoughts, feelings, drawing pictures, etc. It is not specifically for schoolwork.

Purpose of Directive:

a) To introduce and present the values of journaling
b) To assess the range of expression through art
c) To discuss feelings and thoughts
2. Figure-Making

(One session, 50 minutes)

Supplies: 6 pairs of scissors, fabric, and things to decorate the animal or figure, newspaper, Plastic bags cut in strips and/or yarn, 6 pencils

Directive:

Please review the group rules before you begin every session. Discuss what a figure is made up of (i.e. body, legs, etc.). Also, talk about why the doll is important because we will be writing about the doll.

Take a full sheet of newspaper and cut in half. Then cut the ½ into ¼. Separate times take the ½ and ¼ piece of newspaper and crush the paper into a small ball. This will be the head and body of the animal (Make sure the participant is using his/her whole body in this movement.). Set aside the two balls. Take the 1/2 piece of newspaper and carefully roll the paper up lengthwise. With a partner on both sides, twist the newspaper and use the tape to secure the twist (Make sure the participant is using his/her whole body in this movement.). Cut the twisted newspaper in half. Then fold the halves in half. These will be the legs or the arms.

Using yarn, start with the legs and cover the piece of newspaper. Put the body on top of the legs and wrap the yarn around the legs and body to secure the legs to the body. Put the arms on top of the body and wrap the yarn around the legs, body, and arms. Attach the head in the same fashion. It really depends on the participant if they want to cover the arms, head, and body with the yarn. Just make sure all parts are secure and will not come a part. Fabric and other material can be introduced to make clothes, hair, etc.

The journal is a major component of the program. Before each session, ask the participant to write 1-2 sentences about how they feel and why? (Note: This will be the baseline to see if change occurs in the session).
After each session, the facilitator will ask 2 questions to the group. What did you learn? How do you feel and why? Participants receive 5 minutes for each question to write down their answer in their journal. (Note: It is important that each participant does this independently.)

Purpose of Directive:

- To reduce stress and release energy through body movement
- To address soothing components through a repetitive process
- To create a reflection or personification of the participant
- To discuss feelings and thoughts
3. **Story-Making/Conflict Prevention**

(Two sessions, 50 minutes)

Directive:

Please review the group rules before you begin every session.

Ask each participant to write a story about their figure they made. The story's theme will look at how to deal with difficult situations such as fighting, loneliness, isolation, domestic violence, etc. Each facilitator must be particularly sensitive, understanding, and creative in supporting the participant in their endeavor. Participants could illustrate the story. Note: Please let participants to know that this will be their original draft and they will share it with their group in the next session. They will also be rewriting the story with a positive, pro-social way of dealing with conflict.

The second session, participants will have the opportunity to read their stories aloud. Group members will use the TAG approach.

1. Tell something you liked about the story
2. Ask a question
3. Give a suggestion

Each participant will individually take 30 minutes to rewrite their story, using their peer suggestions and stressing that the story needs to end on a positive note.

The journal is a major component of the program. Before each session, ask the participant to write 1-2 sentences about how they feel and why? (Note: This will be the baseline to see if change occurs in the session). After each session, the facilitator will ask 2 questions to the group. What did you learn? How do you feel and why? Participants receive 5 minutes for each question to write down their answer in their journal. (Note: It is important that each participant does this independently.)
Purpose of Directive:

- To assess participant's ability to resolve conflict in a pro-social way
- To give tools of other alternative coping skills
- To discuss feelings and thoughts
Appendix F: Interview Protocol: Semi-Structured Questions

**Introduction of Interviewer**

Hello, my name is ___________________________, and you have been asked to participate in the semi-structured interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Additional questions</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What had real meaning and hope for you from what you have heard from your peers, particularly in the course? What surprised you? What challenged you? In what ways, if and when, did you feel hopeful in a Higher Education in Emergency context? Where were you? Who were you with? What was happening then? What has been your/our major learning, insight, or discover with regard to listening to your peers and engaging in the course?</td>
<td>Some people think that we should not focus on Higher Education in Emergency, what do you think? If there was one thing that hasn’t yet been said in our conversation to reach a deeper level of understanding of hope, what would that be? In what ways, did your perceptions of hope change?</td>
<td>Describe any moments when you felt hopeful during the course? Some people would think that in your situation you would have little hope, what do you think? Please share about a person, thing, spiritual entity that grounded, nurtured, and evoked your hope?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Read the item below and circle 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on the left-hand side to indicate the extent that you would wish for the item mentioned. Then circle 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on the right-hand side to indicate the extent to which you expect the thing mentioned to occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Left-hand Side</th>
<th>Right-hand Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you wish</td>
<td>0 = not much</td>
<td>To what extent do you expect this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you expect for this?</td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To do well in school, in job, or in daily tasks.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To have more friends.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To have good health</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To be competent.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To achieve long-range goals.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To be happy.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To have money</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To have leisure time.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other people to be helpful.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The crime rate to go down.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The country to be more productive.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Understanding by my family</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Justice in the world.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Peace in the world.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Personal Freedom.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Resources for all.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Survey Instrument

Scoring for the Hope Index (Staats & Partlo, 1993)

Total Score

The numerical Score for wish (0 to 5) is multiplied by the numerical score for expect (0 to 5) for each of the 16 items. The results are summed for the 16 items. The possible range of scores is from 0 to 400. Sample means typically range from about 220 to 250 with standard deviations of about 50.

Scales

WISH: Sum the chosen "wish" responses for the 16 items. This score can range from 0 to 80. Sample means are typically around 70, with standard deviations of about 9 and are moderately skewed.

EXPECT: Sum the "expect" responses for the 16 items. This score can range from 0 to 80. The sample means are typically around 53 with a standard deviation of about 8. These scores are not skewed.

HOPE SELF: Multiply the score for wish and the score for expect for each of the 8 "self" items. The "self" items consist of items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 15. These scores are then added up. This score can range from 0 to 200. Typical hope self means are about 140 with standard deviation of 30.

HOPE OTHERS: Multiply the score for wish and the score for expect for each of the 8 "other" items. The "other" items consist of items 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16. These scores are then added up. This score can range from 0 to 200. Typical hope other means are about 96 with a standard deviation of 35.
Appendix I: Demographics Questions

How old are you?
1. 18-24
2. 25-30
3. 31-35
4. 36+

Which of the following best represents your racial or ethnic heritage? Choose all that apply:
1) Burundi
2) Democratic Republic of the Congo
3) Eritrea
4) Ethiopia
5) Rwanda
6) Somalia
7) South Sudan
8) Sudan
9) Uganda
10) ____________________

Which of the following terms best describes your gender?
1) Female
2) Male
3) ____________________

What is the highest level of education you completed?
1) No formal education
2) Primary education
3) Secondary education
4) Diploma
5) Bachelors
6) Masters
7) Doctorate

Which of the following terms best describes your relationship?
1) Married
2) Single
3) Not married but living with long term partner

Which following terms best describe your religious affiliations?
1) Catholic
2) Protestant
3) Muslim

---

9 Taken from HIV/AIDS Unit, UNHCR & Great Lakes Initiatives on AIDS (GLIA) (2004)
4) ______________________
5) Not religion

What school are you from?
1) JWL:HEM
2) Kenyatta University

Are you a refugee?
1) Yes
2) No

Which of the following terms best describes where you live?
1) Kakuma Refugee Camp
2) Nairobi
3) ______________________

How many languages are you fluent in?
1) Amharic
2) Arabic
3) Dinka
4) English
5) Somali
6) Turkana
7) ______________________

Income-generating activity
1) Unemployed/inactive
2) Trading
3) Pastoralist
4) Private Services
5) Public Services
6) Other

How long have you lived in Kakuma Refugee Camp?
1) Less than 12 months
2) More than 5 years
3) Always
4) Don’t know

Contact Information
1) First name, phone number, and email address
Appendix J: Letter of Affiliation

Kenyatta University

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR, RESEARCH,
INNOVATION AND OUTREACH

Ref: KU/DVCR/AFF/VOL1/10
P. O. Box 43844 - 00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. 254-20-810901 Ext. 026
E-mail: dvc-rio@ku.ac.ke

Ms Staci Martin
Graduate School of Education
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97201
USA

27th April, 2016

Dear Ms Martin,

RE: REQUEST FOR AFFILIATION TO KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

This is to inform you that your application for affiliation to Kenyatta University starting 1st January - 30th April, 2017 for the purpose of undertaking research in Kenya has been considered and approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

With this approval, you are requested to proceed to complete the process of requesting for a research permit from the National Council for Science, Technology and Innovation and the payment of affiliation fee to KU, if you have not already done so.

You are also reminded that under the terms of your affiliation, Kenyatta University is under no obligation to provide you with office space or any other resources. However, the University would wish to benefit from your affiliation by presentation of your research work in the School and getting a copy of your project report or thesis after you have completed it. In
addition, you may also wish to participate in the activities of the School of Security, Diplomacy and Peace Studies as may be approved.

We look forward to interacting with you during the period of your affiliation. Please contact my office on arrival in Kenya to enable us arrange for your KU identity card.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Prof. F. Q. Grovenir
Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Research, Innovation & Outreach
cc. Vice-Chancellor
   Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic
   Dean, School of Security, Diplomacy and Peace Studies
Appendix K: Letter of Affiliation

Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at Margins (JWL:HEM)

October 19, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves to verify that Staci Martin of Portland State University will be working in conjunction with Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins (JWL) to conduct research at our learning site at Kakuma Refugee Camp in Kenya. Ms. Martin has the approval of JWL to conduct the research that she outlined in her dissertation proposal, working under Yema Shema, our on-site coordinator. Shema will work with her to establish her research schedule while on-site, and she will be given access to work with our students who agree to be participants in her study. Through Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), she will be able to work at our learning center at Kakuma where our Diploma in Liberal Studies students meet daily. She is being given approval by JRS to operate at the site, and they will arrange her accommodations.

JWL has been in communication with Ms. Martin for the past 4 months as she has proposed her research to our organization, and in working with our students. We look forward to her work, and learning of her research findings.

Please let me know if there is anything further that you need from me.

Sincerely,

Tara Ross, PhD
Director of Academic Operations for the Americas
Jesuit Worldwide Learning: Higher Education at the Margins
Website: jwl.org
Phone: (941) 993-7013
Skype: taraross_7
Email: tara.ross@jwl.org
Appendix L: Letter of Affiliation Jesuit Refugee Services

Staci Bokhee Martin
Portland State University Researcher
USA

14th October 2016

RE: LETTER OF AFFILIATION

Dear Ms Staci,

Following your request letter to be attached to Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) in the Kakuma project to carry out research leading to Doctoral degree, I am writing to inform you that your request has been approved.

In your proposal, you are ‘seeking to extend the research on education in emergencies sphere, where youth are able to co-create spaces of hope and develop critical thinking skills, and play a pivotal role in rebuilding a stronger, just, and peaceful civil society’. You will be attached/affiliated to the Kakuma office and carry out your research under the supervision of the Project Director from January 2017 to February 2017. You will be supported with any relevant information/documentation that is available to the programs and any assistance you need to meet your objective.

As this research is for academic purposes, you will be required to sign an agreement before the start of your affiliation agreeing not to use any information that you will be provided with during your attachment other than the intended purposes. You will also be required to meet all the financial cost pertaining to your accommodation, flight and other transport, health, food and telecommunication.

Should you have any query, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned person.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Caterina Cirimelli
Country Director
Jesuit Refugee Service

JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE
KENYA COUNTRY OFFICE
P. O. Box 76490
NAIROBI-KENYA

Jesuit Refugee Service Gitange Road, P.O. Box 76490,
Nairobi 00508, Kenya
Mobile +254 (0)722894383/0727373505
Email kenya.director@jrs.net | Website www.jrsea.org
Appendix M: Portland State University
Institutional Review Board #163959

Date: November 16, 2016
To: Dannelle Stevens / Staci Martin, Graduate School of Education

From: Linsdey Wilkinson, HSRRC Chair

Re: HSRRC approval for your project titled, “Co-creating Spaces of Critical Hope through the Use of Psychosocial Peace Building Education Course in a Higher Education in Emergencies Context: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kenyatta University” HSRRC Proposal # 163959

Approval-Expiration: November 16, 2016 – November 15, 2017

Review Type: Expedited, Categories 5, 6, 7

In accordance with your request, the PSU Human Subjects Research Review Committee has reviewed your request for approval of the project referenced above for compliance with PSU and DHHS policies and regulations covering the protection of human subjects. The Committee is satisfied that your provisions for protecting the rights and welfare of all subjects participating in the research are adequate, and your project is approved. Please note the following requirements:

Approval: You are approved to conduct this research study only during the period of approval cited above; and the research must be conducted according to the plans and protocol submitted (approved copy enclosed).

Consent: Signed consent is required from all participants in this study

Changes to Protocol: Any changes in the proposed study, whether to procedures, survey instruments, consent forms or cover letters, must be outlined and submitted to the Committee immediately. The proposed changes cannot be implemented before they have been reviewed and approved by the Committee.

Continuing Review: This approval will expire on 11/15/2017. It is the investigator’s responsibility to ensure that a Continuing Review Report on the status of the project is submitted to the HSRRC two months before the expiration date, and that approval of the study is kept current. The IRB offices does not send out notifications of expiration dates. The Continuing Review Report is available at www.rsp.pdx.edu/compliance_human.php and in the Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP).

Adverse Reactions and/or Unanticipated Problems: If any adverse reactions or unanticipated problems occur as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Office of Research Integrity within 5 days of the event. If the issue is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending an investigation by the Committee.

Completion of Study: Please notify the Committee as soon as your research has been completed. Study records, including protocols and signed consent forms for each participant, must be kept by the investigator in a secure location for three years following completion of the study (or per any requirements specified by the project’s funding agency).

If you have questions or concerns, please contact the Office of Research Integrity in the PSU RSP at 503-725-2227.
Appendix N: Portland State University
Institutional Review Board (Revision) #163959

Date: March 02, 2017

To: Danelle Stevens / Staci Martin, Graduate School of Education

From: Lindsey Wilkinson, IRB Chair

Re: IRB review and approval of your amended protocol # 163959, entitled: “Co-creating Spaces of Critical Hope through the Use of Psychosocial Peace Building Education Course in a Higher Education in Emergencies Context: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kenyatta University”

Approval-Expiration: March 02, 2017 – November 15, 2017

Notice of IRB Review and Approval - Amendment
Expedited Review Categories 5, 6, 7; as per Title 45 CFR Part 46

The amendment submitted on 02/24/2017 for the project identified above has been reviewed and approved by the PSU Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects Research Review Committee) and the Research Integrity office using an expedited review procedure. This is a minimal risk study. This approval is based on the assumption that the materials, including changes/clarifications that you submitted to the IRB contain a complete and accurate description of all the ways in which human subjects are involved in your research.

This approval is given with the following standard conditions:

1. You are approved to conduct this research only during the period of approval cited below;
2. You will conduct the research according to the plans and protocol submitted (approved copy enclosed);
3. You will immediately inform Research Integrity within 5 days of any injuries or adverse research events involving subjects;
4. You will immediately request approval from the IRB of any proposed changes in your research, and you will not initiate any changes until they have been reviewed and approved by the IRB;
5. You will only use the approved informed consent document(s) (enclosed);
6. You will give each research subject a copy of the informed consent document;
7. If your research is anticipated to continue beyond the IRB approval dates, you must submit a Continuing Review Request to the IRB approximately 60 days prior to the IRB approval expiration date. Without continuing approval the Protocol will automatically expire on 11/15/2017.

Portland State University and the Research Integrity appreciate your efforts to conduct research in compliance with PSU Policy and the Federal regulations that have been established to ensure the protection of human subjects in research. Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB process. If you have any questions regarding your protocol or the review process, please contact the Research Integrity office in Research & Strategic Partnerships at hsrrc@pdx.edu or call (503) 725-2227.

Approved: Informed Consent – Kakuma Refugee Camp/JWL.HEM) version 02/24/2017;
Informed Consent – Kenyatta University version 02/24/2017.
Appendix O: Kenya’s National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation Research Permit NACOSTI/P/16/20776/14359

Staci Bokhee Martin
Portland State University
PORTLAND.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Co-creating spaces of critical hope through the use of psychosocial peace building education course in a higher education in emergencies context: Kakuma refugee camp and Kenyatta University,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Turkana County for the period ending 7th December, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Turkana County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

BONIFACE WANYAMA
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Turkana County.

The County Director of Education
Turkana County.