

## What works in citizenship and values education: attitudes of trainers towards the *Itorero* training program in post-genocide Rwanda

Sylvestre Nzahabwanayo

University of Rwanda – College of Education and University of Johannesburg

---

### Abstract

The article contributes to the existing literature on the civic and citizenship contextual framework. It investigates ways in which trainers appreciate *Itorero*, a non-formal citizenship and values education program for high school leavers (hereafter HSLs) in the post-genocide Rwanda. The article also establishes the best predictor of the success of *Itorero* program according to trainers' perceptions. The research reported here used a survey questionnaire and interviews. The article shows that learners' motivation and ideological background are significant factors for the success of citizenship and values education. It also highlights a contradiction between *Itorero* teaching and home-based socialization particularly in relation to the question of ethnicity. While the *Itorero* training teaches that Rwandans are 'one people', parents tell their children that Rwandans have three ethnic groups: Hutu, Tutsi and Twa. The article argues that there is a need to look for civic influences beyond the civics classroom and the school.

---

**Keywords:** Citizenship and values education, *Itorero*, post-genocide Rwanda, trainers

### Introduction

It is very possible that one of the root causes of the 1994 genocide perpetrated against the Tutsi in Rwanda is a distorted understanding of citizenship. The latter was confined to ethnic belonging. Since the Tutsi were portrayed by colonialists (both Germans and Belgians) as being of the Hamitic origin, they were perceived in the eyes of their fellow Rwandans as foreigners, invaders and not really *bona fide* Rwandan citizens (Adejumobi, 2001; Kabwete Mulinda, 2002; Prunier, 1995). This situation suggests that one cannot envisage reconstruction, social cohesion and peace building in Rwanda while ignoring the issue of citizenship. As Davies (2005) points out, citizenship education is a crucial facet of reconstruction in post-conflict societies.

In this context, in addition to formal citizenship education, the Government of Rwanda (GoR) decided during the 12<sup>th</sup> of November 2007 cabinet meeting to revive its traditional citizenship education program – '*Itorero*' – to enable Rwandans to re-acquaint themselves with the values and taboos of their culture (NIC, 2012). This program was officially launched on the 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2007, and in 2013 it became presided over by the National *Itorero* Commission (NIC), as per Law N° 41/2013 determining its mission, organization and functioning. Pursuant to article 6 of the same law, the objective of *Itorero* consists of: "Bringing up a patriotic Rwandan who has values and taboos of the Rwandan culture and who has the culture of *Intore*". Although this non-formal training is meant for all categories of Rwandans, it is compulsory mainly for all HSLs. The scheme designed for this category comprises two phases: (i) a theoretical phase called *Gutozwa* (getting trained) involving moral, political and cultural education which lasts three months; and (ii) a practical phase named *Urugerero* (a camp) in the form of national service or volunteerism that lasts seven months (NIC, 2012). This article focuses mainly on the theoretical phase and seeks to answer the following questions: How do trainers appreciate the *Itorero* training? What is the best predictor of the success of the *Itorero* program according to trainers' perceptions?

The present study aims to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of traditional models in citizenship education. Furthermore, it is hoped that researchers, educationalists and policy makers will benefit from the findings of this study, particularly in relation to citizenship education practices in post-genocide contexts. This study hopes to contribute to the improvement of citizenship education of HSLs, which is crucial to the reconstruction process, social

cohesion, and peace building in Rwanda. This article is a quantitative-qualitative study, it follows an exploratory-correlational design.

### Literature review

This section contains general considerations regarding the link between citizenship and values education. Secondly, the landscape of citizenship education in post-genocide Rwanda is outlined in a bid to locate the revival of the *Itorero* scheme for HSLs. Finally, the theoretical framework informing the present study, which is the force field theory of change (Lewin, 1951), is articulated.

### General considerations regarding citizenship and values education

Citizenship is a rather contested, ambiguous and complex concept (Oliver & Heater, 1994; Ramphela, 2001; Riesenber, 1992; Wayne, 2004 ). Nonetheless, Carr (1991, p. 374) reminds us that contested concepts have an “uncontested common core” by virtue of which they convey a certain message. This article employs the following working definition, which of course will be enriched in what follows: “Citizenship is normally taken to mean the membership of, and participation in the activities of a community or group communities” (Bailey, 1998, p. 14).

In general terms, citizenship education can be understood as the transmission of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that will enable young people to participate meaningfully in the community which they are part of locally, nationally, and globally (Arthur, Davies & Hahn, 2008). In terms of content, citizenship education usually covers areas such as “national history, constitutions and political systems, citizen and human rights, international organizations and relations, economic and welfare, media, environmental issues, and civic virtues” (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001, p. 163). With regard to its mode of delivery, citizenship education may be formal, non-formal or informal (Chioncel & Jansen, 2004). This article focuses on non-formal citizenship education in post-genocide Rwanda particularly the *Itorero* training module meant for HSLs.

Fundamental to approaches used in citizenship education is to establish whether it should be ‘values-neutral’ or ‘values-explicit’. As Kerr (1999, p. 9) puts it, the question goes as follows: “should citizenship education promote distinct values – a nationally accepted system of public values and beliefs, or should it take a neutral stance to values and controversial issues, leaving the decision to the individual?” What is at stake here is to decide whether citizenship education should be a ‘private’ or ‘public’ matter.

Some studies (e.g. Kerr, 1999; McLaughlin, 1992) suggest that countries which take citizenship as ‘values-neutral’ promote a ‘thin’ or ‘minimal’ conception of citizenship education; nations that advocate citizenship as a ‘values-explicit’ are committed to a ‘thick’, or ‘maximal’ citizenship education. Research reveals, however, that the two positions have their inherent problems. While the ‘values-explicit’ approach is criticized for being biased and indoctrinating students, the ‘values-neutral’ approach is reproached for failing to help students to deal adequately with real-life and controversial issues (Kerr, 1999).

In the post-genocide Rwanda, citizenship education provided for HSLs in *Itorero* is ‘values-explicit’. As mentioned previously, the law establishing the NIC clearly stipulates that its mission consists of : “Bringing up a patriotic Rwandan who has *values* and *taboos* of the Rwandan culture...” (Law N° 41/2013 of 16/06/2013, article 6; emphasis added).

Values education can be understood as “the explicit attempt to teach criteria for determining levels of goodness, worth, or beauty” (Superka, 1976, p. xiv). It is premised on the view that there are values that can be

established as meaningful to all humankind, irrespective of individual, social and cultural circumstances. It also stems from the conviction that it is worthy for a society to transmit its core values to younger generations. Values education is the responsibility of several institutions, such as the family, church, school and the state. This article is limited to values education as envisaged by the state in the framework of citizenship education. It focuses on the values education involved in the *Itorero* training for HSLs in post-genocide Rwanda.

### **Citizenship education in post-genocide Rwanda: From 1994 to present**

The in-school and out-of-school citizenship education in the post-genocide Rwanda expresses an emphatic preference for national identity, i.e. the *Rwandanness*, over potentially divisive ethnic affiliations (Tutsi, Hutu, Twa). In primary school (Grade 1 to Grade 6), citizenship is called 'social and religious studies' and taught two periods (Grade 1 to 3), and five periods (Grade 4 to 6) per week, respectively. In high school, citizenship education is termed 'political education' and is a compulsory but non-examinable subject with the weight of two periods per week (Ministry of Education, 2008).

Although the out-of-school citizenship education is the concern of a number of institutions such as the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC), the Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Commission (RDRC), the National Electoral Commission (NEC) and the National Commission for the Fight against Genocide (*Commission Nationale de Lutte contre le Génocide* – CNLG), it is crucial to note that the National *Itorero* Commission (NIC) was established with a specific mandate, namely, to educate Rwandans for citizenship. In what follows, a discussion on '*Itorero*' is presented.

#### ***Itorero* teaching: The case for HSLs**

The traditional *Itorero* (before colonialism) focused primarily on military training and sports; it was a way of training a professional army. Secondary consideration was given to other domains of education such as moral (values and taboos of the Rwandan culture), political (vision and policies of the Rwandan kingdom), cultural (traditional songs and dances), and linguistics and literary education (poetry, debate and rhetoric) (Codère, 1973; Maison des Jeunes de Kimisagara, 2008; Ndaruhutse, 2008; Vansina, 2004).

In the revived *Itorero*, emphasis is placed on moral and political education. Concerning moral education, the NIC has defined seven key values that every Rwandan is expected to know and live by. These are *Rwandanness*, patriotism, integrity, courage, self-sacrifice, love for a well-done work, and upholding one's dignity. Taboos have also been defined and they include issues such as shedding blood, inattention to result, avoidance of accountability, untrustworthiness, and covetousness, etc. (NURC, 2009).

With regard to political education, the revived *Itorero* insists on the history of Rwanda and national development programs mainly Vision 2020, and the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy I and II (EDPRS I and II). These programs are aimed at uplifting Rwanda from poverty to a middle income country by 2020. In relation to the history of Rwanda, the historiography depicted in *Itorero* makes a distinction between three periods: the pre-colonial Rwanda or 'Golden age'; the 'dark age' (colonial rule: 1899-1962, first and second republics: from 1962 to 1994); and the 'renaissance' (1994 to present) (Sundberg, 2014). While the training of other categories of Rwandans (e.g. artists, journalists, local leaders, etc.) is subject to available time and means, that of all HSLs is mandatory.

The *Itorero* training for HSLs comprises two phases. The first phase (which involves schooling in relevant theory) is dedicated to the *Itorero* core teaching described earlier: moral and political education. It takes

three months and is concluded by an intensive four-day onsite training. The second phase is community service where HSLs after completing high school carry out various activities of public interest in areas, such as education, health, infrastructure, environment and conservation, safety and security, governance and leadership (NIC, 2011). The present article focuses on the first phase, i.e. moral and political training as part of citizenship education. It seeks to investigate the attitudes of trainers towards this phase.

### **The force field theory of change: Driving and restraining forces**

The present article uses the Force Field Theory of Change of Kurt Lewin (1951) as the working theory to investigate and analyze the attitudes of trainers towards the *Itorero* training program. According to this theory, if one wishes to produce change in a social setting, one should identify the forces beneath that change. On the one hand, there are driving forces, that is, forces that contribute positively to the occurrence of the change. In other words, these are forces that move towards a positive region and encourage the change to occur. On the other hand, there are forces that oppose the change or restraining forces. These are static forces that attempt to maintain the status quo. It is worth noting that it is not enough to identify driving and restraining forces; it is also important to establish the intensity or the magnitude of each type of force.

As far as this study is concerned, what is at issue is to investigate trainers' appreciation towards *Itorero* as a citizenship education program meant to convey values and taboos to HSLs. In view of this, the following items were suggested to trainers to be assessed as driving or restraining forces: the quality and availability of training manuals, regular training for trainers, satisfaction about the remuneration, motivation and prerequisites from learners, class size, training environment, duration of the training, encouragement of discussion and deliberation, enhancement of critical thinking skills, and trainers' participation in the evaluation and impact assessment of the whole training.

However, in order for change to be successful, Lewin's (1951) theory suggests that once driving and restraining forces have been identified, there is a need to strengthen driving forces, and weaken or eliminate restraining ones. Applying this theory, by virtue of trainers' assessment, this research will indicate concrete actions to be taken for driving forces to be strengthened, and strategies to be envisaged in order to weaken or eliminate restraining forces.

### **Methodology**

The present article is a quantitative-qualitative study, it follows an exploratory-correlational design. An estimate of 116 *Itorero* trainers were purposefully selected from Gasabo, Nyarugenge and Kicukiro districts only and responded to the survey questionnaire. In addition, four interviews were conducted with *Itorero* trainers from concerned districts. Data collection took place in Rwanda from November 2014 to March 2015. The questionnaire for trainers was developed, piloted and validated by the researcher.

In order to investigate trainers' attitudes towards the *Itorero* training program, trainers were presented with a list of 12 statements. The latter were evaluative in kind; they basically aimed at assessing the quality of the *Itorero* training. The focus was on the quality and availability of training manuals, regular training for trainers, satisfaction about the remuneration, motivation and prerequisites from learners, class size, training environment, duration of the training, encouragement of discussion and deliberation, enhancement of critical thinking skills, and trainers' participation in the evaluation and impact assessment of the whole training. The 12 items were suggested to

respondents to be ranked on a four-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; and 4 = strongly agree).

For the sake of ensuring reliability, the questionnaire was subjected to Cronbach's Alpha test. The obtained reliability is .76, which is a good score given that the standard is .60 and above. The obtention of this score required deleting one item that reads 'I'm happy with the remuneration I get for the work done'. The deletion of this item saw the reliability rise from .31 to .76.

## Results

### *Trainers' assessment of the Itorero training*

In a bid to make sense of responses from trainers, a benchmark mean score of 2.5 or greater is considered as an agreement with the statement; a mean score of less than 2.5 is interpreted as a disagreement with the statement. The benchmark mean is calculated as follows:  $(1+2+3+4)/4 = 2.5$ . Table 1 provides in a descending order the extent to which trainers agree with suggested statements.

It is apparent from Table 1 that trainers agree with nearly all suggested statements, because in all cases the obtained mean is above the benchmark mean of 2.5. This high rating is not surprising because trainers tend to be on the defensive side. As Nzahabwanayo (2016) demonstrates when documenting HSLs' attitudes towards *Itorero* training, a good number of items praised by trainers here have been found wanting by HSLs. Trainees raise the issues related to lack of didactic materials, training modules, and equipment for the practical part of the training [*Imikorongi*]. Trainees also point out the issue of congestion on training sites. They complain about some aspects of accommodation and especially poor sanitation in the training centers. In addition, HSLs emphasize that discussion and deliberation is not given ample time because trainers are rushing to complete the program. And yet, for trainers, *Itorero* fares better in all these mentioned themes, which is questionable. This is what I call a 'defensive' position.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics for trainers' attitudes**

Statements	Mean	SD
1. The training enhances critical thinking skills of HSLs.	3.57	.59
2. HSLs are motivated.	3.50	.66
3. Overall, the <i>Itorero</i> training is a success.	3.48	.95
4. I contribute in the evaluation and impact assessment.	3.47	.80
5. Training manuals are available and well elaborated.	3.46	.59
6. The class size is manageable.	3.45	1.0
7. The training environment is comfortable.	3.38	.63
8. HSLs have required prerequisites.	3.38	.56
9. I receive regular training in citizenship and values education	3.34	.65
10. The training encourages discussion and deliberation.	3.25	1.2
11. The duration of the training is adequate.	2.65	1.3

**Source:** Primary data

However, our results reveal that trainers are particularly concerned about the duration of the training: the obtained mean is 2.65 (SD = 1.3), which is only slightly above the benchmark mean of 2.5. These results suggest that, according to trainers, the duration of the *Itorero* training for HSLs is not adequate. The issue of duration is a restraining force and calls for a detailed examination. This issue is intimately linked to the increasing number of HSLs as a result of the free 12 Year Basic Education program (12 YBE) introduced in 2009. In fact, it is indicated by trainers that while the number of trainees was revolving around 20.000 HSLs from 2007 to 2009, it reached 80.000 in 2014 because of the 12 YBE program. While this increase requires greater financial means, the NIC claims that its budget has remained constant, making it increasingly difficult to train HSLs for longer than four intensive days.

Furthermore, it is also highlighted by trainers that, as of now, parents do not yet own the *Itorero* training program for HSLs. The idea is that parents are not yet ready to contribute financially to its organization because they only take it as an activity to be fully sponsored by the government. This situation raises serious concerns about the sustainability of the *Itorero* training for HSLs particularly in the context of the continued increase of HSLs. In short, the new approach for *Itorero* training is problematic. The approach currently used by NIC is such that HSLs start the *Itorero* training when they are still in their respective schools. They carry it on during the end term and long holidays (twice per week, i.e., March-April and June-July on Thursdays and Fridays), and they complete it by spending four intensive days accommodated in training sites.

It is suggested by trainers that the budget allocated to NIC for training HSLs be increased in order to respond to the needs brought about by the huge increase of HSLs. In this regard, the onus is on the GoR, specifically the Rwanda Ministry of Finance to rise the budget allocated to NIC. Equally, the duration could be extended to three weeks to allow full coverage of the training syllabus. This responsibility resides with the NIC.

### **Identification of best predictors of Itorero success**

The present study sought to investigate further attitudes of trainers by determining best predictors of the *Itorero* success based on 10 predictors. This was achieved by means of backward stepwise multiple regression with the equation:  $\hat{Y} = b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7 + b_8X_8 + b_9X_9 + b_{10}X_{10} + b_{11}X_{11} + a$ , whereby  $\hat{Y}$  is the predicted value of the success of the *Itorero* training scheme for HSLs;  $x$  is the predictor;  $b$  is the slope, i.e., the amount of change in the criterion or the predicted ( $Y$ ) produced by a unit-change in the predictor ( $X$ ); and  $a$  the intercept, i.e., the value of  $Y$  when  $X$  is equal to zero.

In other words, the assumption is that the best available rating of the *Itorero* training scheme for HSLs is the overall rating of its success ( $X_1$  – Overall, the *Itorero* training is a success). Therefore, the latter is used as the dependent variable ( $Y$ ), and a regression equation predicting  $Y$  on the basis of other predictors  $X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, X_{10}, X_{11}$  is derived whereby  $X_2$  = quality and availability of training manuals;  $X_3$  = regular training of trainers in citizenship and values education;  $X_4$  = HSLs' motivation;  $X_5$  = HSLs' prerequisites;  $X_6$  = class size;  $X_7$  = training environment;  $X_8$  = duration of the training;  $X_9$  = encouragement of discussion and deliberation during the training;  $X_{10}$  = critical thinking skills enhancement in the course of the training; and  $X_{11}$  = contribution in the evaluation and impact assessment by trainers.

The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) to be tested is that predictors – as put forward by trainers – have no impact on the overall success of the *Itorero* training. Put differently,  $H_0: \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \beta_5 = \beta_6 = \beta_7 = \beta_8 = \beta_9 = \beta_{10} = \beta_{11} = 0$ . With backward stepwise multiple regression, the output in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) usually indicates first the extent to which all independent variables predict the criterion. Next, it shows which variables that are to be removed and the order in which they must be removed. Variables to be removed are those whose slopes or regression coefficients are not statistically significant (poor predictors). At the last stage, the SPSS output shows the perfect or final model highlighting best predictors, i.e., those whose coefficients are statistically significant. In the present study, only the perfect model is considered, because the target is to identify best predictors.

It is worth noting that while running backward stepwise multiple regression, except homoscedasticity, linearity and independence of errors, the two remaining assumptions, i.e., multicollinearity and normal distribution of

errors were met. An attempt was made to remove outliers by means of Mahalanobis and Cook's distance and little difference was observed.

The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is tested by examining the standardized coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and its statistical significance ( $p$ -value,  $\alpha = .05$ ). While running stepwise multiple regression, it was also observed that some predictors correlated poorly with the outcome (the standard is that the correlation coefficient should be .3 and above (i.e.  $r > .3$ ); hence, they were removed from the regression analysis. These predictors are: the class size is manageable ( $r = .13$ ); the duration is adequate ( $r = .14$ ); the training encourages discussion and deliberation ( $r = .11$ ); and 'I contribute in the evaluation and impact assessment of the training' ( $R = .01$ ). Stepwise multiple regression engaged with the remaining seven predictors and the perfect model is provided in Table 2.

As Table 2 shows, the perfect model [3] statistically significantly predicts the overall success of the *Itorero* training for HSLs, with  $F_{115} = 12.741$  where  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = 18$ , which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). All the two variables in the perfect model have a significant impact on the overall success of the *Itorero* training scheme for HSLs. In other words, best predictors are the motivation of HSLs ( $\beta = .27$ ) and the prerequisites ( $\beta = .21$ ). These results suggest that HSLs' motivation and prerequisites correlate positively and significantly with the overall success of the *Itorero* training for HSLs. The idea is that they constitute the corner stone of the success of *Itorero*; hence, they deserve to be reinforced for optimal results.

**Table 2: Identification of the best predictor of the success of *Itorero* training**

Predictors	Regression weight ( $\beta$ )	Sig ( $\alpha = .05$ )	R <sup>2</sup> %
1. X <sub>4</sub> = HSLs' motivation	.27	.005	.18
2. X <sub>5</sub> = HSLs' prerequisites	.21	.029	

**Source:** Primary data.

Given the above findings, I further examined the motivation and prerequisites of HSLs at length to establish the actual role which they play in the *Itorero* training through the responses from interviews with trainers.

#### **Trainers' assessment of HSLs' motivation**

This article indicates that the HSLs' motivation is of paramount importance. It is the best predictor because it correlates positively and significantly with the success of the *Itorero* training scheme for HSLs ( $\beta = .27$ ). It is therefore crucial to investigate ways in which trainers assess HSLs' motivation. Results from interviews with trainers show that, to some extent, HSLs are motivated to attend the *Itorero* training. Nevertheless, there are a number of setbacks that affect the motivation of HSLs. These difficulties or restraining forces comprise mainly the attitudes of HSLs' parents and the new training formula.

With regard to the attitudes of HSLs' parents, it is revealed that some of them do not understand the purpose, mission and benefits of *Itorero*. Some take it to be a 'cultural-dance group' while others associate it with a 'religious organization'. Thus, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the mission and purpose of *Itorero* by parents, which may make them reluctant to send their children for training. It is suggested by trainers that sensitization and mobilization campaigns be organized to raise awareness among Rwandans about the core mission and activities of *Itorero*. This might be done largely by the NIC. The latter could for instance, organize something like '*Itorero* week', in

the course of which a clear message on the mission and purpose of *Itorero* could be sent to all Rwandans in various sectors of life. In relation to the newly devised training formula, trainers indicate that HSLs constantly raise the issue of transport from their homes to training sites. Though at this particular stage the *Itorero* training takes place at the sector level, some HSLs, particularly in urban areas, would still need to use public transport to and from training sites.

It is also important to note that trainers complain about HSLs' conduct. A large number of trainers mention that some HSLs are not motivated to attend the training, because they fail to grasp its relevance and purpose. It is indicated that most of them show little interest and are not attentive; they display uncondusive attitudes, such as arrogance, stubbornness and apathy. Trainers complain that during the intense four-day onsite training, some HSLs are unwilling to conform to the training program and others would want to stay in their dormitories sleeping. It is also mentioned that during the training, some trainees 'misbehave' by smoking and engaging in drug abuse. The following are exemplary of the opinions of trainers in this regard:

*Although HSLs are willing to learn, at the same time they are lazy and like soft life...It is a generation with a series of complaints. This is a big challenge for the Itorero training program. [P63]*

*In the course of the Itorero training program, most of the time high school leavers are lazy and their motivation leaves a lot to be desired. We struggle to have them focused. [P53]*

In order to increase HSLs' motivation, a number of courses of action are suggested. First, it is proposed by trainers that disciplinary measures be put in place, and acceptable forms of sanctions be administered, if necessary. Acceptable forms of sanctions would include things like running, doing some cleaning, reading a novel in a well prescribed time, etc. Some trainers also put forward the idea of starting the *Itorero* training [*Gutozwa*] at the early stages of schooling, i.e. from elementary and primary school. Finally, trainers regret that so far there is no enforcement mechanism put in place to make the *Itorero* training compulsory for all HSLs. The absence of such a mechanism greatly affects motivation and participation. In fact, some HSLs play truant, using the pretext of family obligations and/or work commitments. A suggestion is that the certificate issued at the end of the *Itorero* training could be part of required documents for HSLs to be enrolled either in public or private institutions of higher learning in Rwanda.

### ***Trainers' perceptions of HSLs' prerequisites***

The present research reveals that HSLs' prerequisites play a crucial role in ensuring the smooth running of the *Itorero* training. Here the term 'prerequisites' refers to issues such as prior knowledge acquired in schools, psychological and ideological dispositions of HSLs, information received at home about social, cultural, political and economic issues, etc. This study shows that HSLs' prerequisites correlate positively and significantly with the overall success of the *Itorero* training ( $\beta = .27$ ); they constitute the second predictor. It is therefore imperative to give them due consideration.

Results from interviews with trainers indicate that, as far as the form and content of the *Itorero* training are concerned, HSLs have required prerequisites. Nevertheless, it is mentioned that HSLs wrestle with physical exercises and the unremitting discipline pervading the *Itorero* training. Informants also mention that in order to mould HSLs into fully fledged Rwandan citizens, constant training would be needed. In other words, HSLs require to be acquainted with prevailing and ever emerging national development programs and policies. In general, results show that the appreciation of HSLs' epistemological prerequisites seems positive and satisfactory. Their prior knowledge allows

them to understand the teaching provided in the course of the *Itorero* training. Having completed high school, their intellectual background is sufficient to digest the *Itorero* content.

What is rather worrying is the lack of suitable ideological prerequisites. By the later, I mean mental dispositions of HSLs, like open-and fair-mindedness, tolerance, and the like. On the contrary, they exhibit preconceived ideas and internalized stereotypes, particularly with regard to ethnic identities in Rwanda. In fact, one of the most surprising results that emerges from interviews with trainers is that HSLs join the *Itorero* training already fed with biased ethnic ideologies. This situation sets an undesirable precedent and affects the assimilation process of the *Itorero* teaching particularly about the unity of Rwandans. Apparently, HSLs find it difficult to reconcile ethnic ideologies prevailing in their homes with the *Itorero* teaching about the unity of Rwandans. This issue calls for further consideration, which is done in the next sections.

It is revealed in interviews with trainers that some parents have not yet recovered from the formerly enforced worldview of ethnic division and separation; they keep indoctrinating their children with hate speech and ethnic ideologies. This ethnocentric self-perception – seeing oneself as a member of one ethnic group as opposed to other ethnicities – prevents *Itorero* from achieving its mission, which is primarily to reinforce the value of Rwandanness [*Ubunyarwanda*]. Therefore, there appears to be a discontinuation between the ‘socialization at home’ [*Ku ishyiga*] and the *Itorero* training. While the former teaches that Rwandans are not one, that some are Hutu, others Tutsi, and Twa, the latter strongly emphasizes that Rwandans are one. Facing this contradiction, there is little doubt that HSLs will get confused. What worsens matters is that when HSLs leave *Itorero* and go back home with the understanding that Rwandans are one people, they are again challenged by their parents saying that *Itorero* is misleading them and simply doing politics. One informant explains this challenge in the following terms:

*Some parents have not yet released their ethnic mindset. Such parents tell their children that Itorero is misleading them when it teaches that Rwandans are one people. In this context, you may train a high school leaver for one year; but if the fellow goes back home and is meant to believe that the Itorero teaching about ‘Rwandanness’ [Ubunyarwanda] is only a sham, then the whole teaching is washed away; it vanishes...We have been wrestling with this issue for quite some time. And it is not only about one side of Rwandans; it is about both sides. There are so many Rwandans across all categories who still perceive themselves as Hutu or Tutsi, and live accordingly. But the situation is improving slowly. [P61]*

These ethnic ideologies constitute restraining forces (Lewin, 1951) which impede the success of *Itorero* and hamper its achievements. It is suggested by trainers that organizing the *Itorero* for parents be considered as a matter of urgency. This entails a reinforcement of the *Itorero* at the village [*Umudugudu*] level. Parents need to be made aware that instead of indoctrinating their children with hate speech and ethnic ideologies, they have the responsibility to feed them with values and taboos of the Rwandan culture. However, in order for this to happen, they need to be trained and ‘enlightened’.

Overall, utilizing insights from Lewin’s (1951) Force Field Theory of Change, this article shows that *Itorero* training has the following driving forces: epistemological prerequisites of HSLs (academic prior knowledge) and adequate food. It is important to note that trainers also listed a good number of restraining forces: the duration (which is found short), the lack of suitable ideological prerequisites among HSLs, and poor hygiene on training sites.

Furthermore, trainers complain about the following issues: (i) the quality of trainers (lack of experience and requisite field of specialist study); (ii) attitudes of HSLs’ parents; (iii) new training formula; (iv) HSLs’ conduct in the

course of *Itorero* training; (v) lack of enforcement mechanism to make *Itorero* training compulsory; and (vi) lack of NIC-owned premises; (vii) late disbursement of funds and untimely communication of official training program; and (viii) lack of coordination at the sector level.

The central argument in this article is that for ensuring a healthy citizenship and values education of HSLs in the post-genocide Rwanda, the identified driving forces have to be reinforced and restraining ones weakened or eliminated. In addition, for optimal results, major emphasis should be placed – in order of importance – on HSLs' motivation and ideological prerequisites (mental dispositions, like open-and fair-mindedness, tolerance, and the like), chiefly because these two elements constitute best predictors of the success of *Itorero*.

## Discussion

Drawing on trainers' attitudes, the present article shows that there is a conglomeration of factors influencing the success of citizenship and values education. They include individual characteristics of trainees such as their motivation; family background or home environment; the wider community (local, national, regional and supranational); the training environment; and prevailing government's narratives and ideologies, i.e., the public discourse mainly in relation to political, economic, social, and cultural matters.

This finding concurs with the civic and citizenship contextual framework developed by the Evaluation of Educational Achievement Civic Education Studies (CIVED, 1971; 1999) [1] and the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS, 2009) [2]. The CIVED (1971; 1999) and ICCS (2009) contextual framework places the individual trainee (student) at the centre of citizenship (and values) education. In this process, the trainee is influenced by different 'agents' of socialization. In other words, individual trainees exist as the central agents in the civic world, in a mutual influence relationship with their multiple connections within civic communities. The idea is that young people learn about citizenship and values through their interactions with and within multiple civic communities (Schulz et al., 2008; Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

Put differently, according to the CIVED and ICCS model, in citizenship (and values) education the individual student is located within the overlapping contexts of school and home. Both contexts form part of the local community that, in turn, is embedded in the wider sub-national, national, and international contexts (Schulz et al., 2008; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). The CIVED and ICCS contextual framework distinguishes the following levels: context of the wider community; context of schools and classrooms; context of home environments; and the context of the individual (Schulz et al., 2008; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). The existence of various factors influencing citizenship and values education has also been pointed out by Quaynor (2015), who recommends willingness to look for civic influences beyond the civics classroom and the school.

At this point, I wish to consider the role of family background in citizenship and values education very briefly. The choice of this aspect is motivated by the fact that although in citizenship and values education the school has been depicted as more influential in its competition with the home background (Hess & Torney, 1967), research shows that family background remains a significant variable, particularly in the political development of adolescents (Schulz et al., 2008). The present article reveals that learners (in our case HSLs) come to school or training sites not as empty slates vis-à-vis citizenship and values education content. They come with a large variety of information received mainly at home. In fact, research indicates that in the context of citizenship and values education, home or family

contexts and characteristics considerably influence the development of young people's civic knowledge, competencies, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs (Kim, 2013; Schulz et al., 2008). The idea here is that what is taught at home plays a crucial role in assimilating the civic content provided in schools or other training programs.

The concern that some parents are still entertaining ethnocentric ideologies is also confirmed by the results of a number of studies (e.g. Institute for Research, Dialogue and Peace [IRDP], 2013; NURC, 2010) conducted to probe the question of ethnicity in post-genocide Rwanda. Despite the present-day public discourse that Rwandans should understand themselves as 'Rwandans' and not along ethnic lines (Shyaka, 2003), a good number of Rwandans still understand themselves as Hutu or Tutsi, and live and behave accordingly. Firstly, in the study conducted by IRDP (2013), it is revealed that 53.4% of respondents (with a population of 1.436) affirm that ethnicity is still a problem in Rwanda. The same study shows that 36.5% of respondents affirm to have been treated unjustly in relation to employment, justice and administration services on the basis of their ethnicity. Secondly, the Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (NURC, 2010, p. 54) indicates that 21.4% of Rwandans agree with the statement that "there are some Rwandans who see themselves as more Rwandan than others". The above evidence suggests that the Rwandanness philosophy or the *de-ethnicisation* project (Shyaka, 2003) is encountering setbacks. The Rwandan parents' understanding of the Rwandanness ideology is critical to the success of this project.

## Conclusion

This article shows that there is a contradiction between *Itorero* teaching and the socialization at home particularly in relation to the unity of Rwandans. While *Itorero* teaches that Rwandans are 'one', parents tell their children that this is 'mere politics'; that among Rwandans there are Hutu, Tutsi and Twa. Facing this contradiction, HSLs become confused, understandably. This finding suggests that for citizenship and values education to be a success, schools (in this case NIC) should have a discussion with parents in order to ensure continuity between the civic content provided in schools/training programs and the socialization at home.

Utilizing insights from Lewin's (1951) Force Field Theory of Change, the present article shows that epistemological prerequisites of HSLs (academic prior knowledge) and adequate feeding constitute driving forces for the *Itorero* training program. A good number of restraining forces are also highlighted. They mainly include issues such as the duration which is found short, and the lack of suitable ideological prerequisites among HSLs. Furthermore, trainers complain about the following concerns: attitudes of HSLs' parents; new training formula; HSLs' conduct in the course of *Itorero* training; and lack of enforcement mechanism to make *Itorero* training compulsory.

The overall argument in this article is that for ensuring a healthy *Itorero* citizenship and values education program for HSLs in the post-genocide Rwanda, the identified driving forces have to be reinforced and restraining ones weakened or eliminated. In addition, for optimal results, major emphasis should be placed – in order of importance – on HSLs' motivation and prerequisites (mental dispositions, like open-and fair-mindedness, tolerance, and the like), chiefly because these two elements constitute best predictors of the success of the *Itorero* program.

## End notes

[1] For details on findings of CIVED (1971) see (i) Torney, Oppenheim and Farnen (1975); and (ii) Walker (1976). In relation to results from the CIVED (1999) see (i) Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald and Schulz (2001); and (ii) Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt and Nikolova (2002).

[2] Concerning findings of the ICCS (2009) see Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr and Losito (2010).

[3] This model can be called 'perfect' only in relation to items under investigation. Since the model explains only 18% of the success of *Itorero*, it is far from being 'perfect' – at least in the strict sense. This finding suggests that there are other factors influencing the success of *Itorero* that the present study did not identify; hence reference to desirability of further studies.

## References

- Adejumobi, S. (2001). Citizenship, rights and the problem of conflicts and civil wars in Africa. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23(1), 148-170.
- Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002). *Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries*. Amsterdam:IEA.
- Arthur, J., Davies, I., & Hahn, C. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*. London: SAGE.
- Bailey, R. (1998). *Teaching values and citizenship across the curriculum*. Glasgow: Kogan Page Limited.
- Carr, D. (1991). *Educating the virtues. An essay on the philosophical psychology of moral development and education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chioncel, N., & Jansen, T. (2004). *Reviewing education and training for governance and active citizenship in Europe – A central and eastern European perspective*. Project RE-ETGACE.
- Codère, H. (1973). *The biography of an African society, Rwanda 1900-1960*. Tervuren: Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale.
- Davies, L. (2005). Teaching about conflict through citizenship education. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1(2), 17-34.
- Hess, R. D., & Torney, J. (1967). *The development of political attitudes in children*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Institut de Recherche et de Dialogue pour la Paix (IRDP), & Interpeace. (2013). *Identité ethnique et cohésion sociale au Rwanda* [Ethnic identity and social cohesion in Rwanda]. Kigali: IRDP.
- Kabwete Mulinda, C. (2002). La généalogie de l'idée du peuplement du Rwanda: Considérations sur l'autochtonie ou l'allochtonie des Rwandais [The genealogy of the idea of settlement in Rwanda: Considerations on indigenusness or allochthony of Rwandans]. In F. Rutembesa, E. Ntaganda, & J. Murwanashyaka (Eds.), *Peuplement du Rwanda. Enjeux et perspectives* [People's settlement in Rwanda: Challenges and prospects] (pp. 49-72). Butare: Editions de l'Université Nationale du Rwanda.
- Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education in the curriculum: An international review. *School Field*, 10(3/4), 5-32.
- Kim, H. R. (2013). *Citizenship education in comparative perspective: Cross-national variation in the effects of family background on adolescents' civic outcomes* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social sciences*. New York: Harper and Row. Maison des Jeunes de Kimisagara.
- (2008). *Rapport de la recherche sur l'école traditionnelle du Rwanda (Itorero)* [Report of a research on the Rwandan traditional school (*Itorero*)]. Kigali: Maison des Jeunes de Kimisagara.

- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- Ministry of Education (MINEDUC). (2008). *Social Studies Curriculum, Grade 1-6*. Kigali: MINEDUC.
- National Itorero Commission (NIC). (2011). *National Itorero Commission strategy*. Kigali: NIC.
- National Itorero Commission (NIC). (2012). *Volunteerism Policy Paper*. Kigali: NIC.
- National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC). (2009). *Itorero ry'Igihugu [national Itorero]. Policy note and strategic plan*. Kigali : NIC.
- National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC). (2010). *Rwanda reconciliation barometer*. Kigali: NURC.
- Ndaruhutse, E. (2008). *Les compagnies 'Amatorero' au Rwanda ancien et contemporain ['Amatorero' camps in ancient and contemporary Rwanda]* (Unpublished Bachelor's dissertation). Kigali Institute of Education, Kigali.
- Nzahabwanayo, S. (2016). *Citizenship and values education in post-genocide Rwanda: An analysis of the Itorero training scheme for high school leavers* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Oliver, D., & Heater, D. (1994). *The foundations of citizenship*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Prunier, G. (1995). *The Rwanda crisis. History of a genocide*. Columbia University Press.
- Quaynor, L. J. (2015). Researching citizenship education in Africa: Considerations from Ghana and Liberia. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 10(1), 120-134.
- Ramphele, M. (2001). Citizenship challenges for South Africa's young democracy. *Daedalus*, 130(1), 1-17.
- Riesenberg, P. (1992). *Citizenship in the western tradition: Plato to Rousseau*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008). *International civic and citizenship education study: Assessment framework*. Amsterdam: IEA .
- Shyaka, A. (2003). Refondation de la rwandité: Stratégie de résolution des conflits, de démocratisation et de développement durable du Rwanda [Regrounding rwandanness: Strategy for conflict resolution, democratization and sustainable development]. In F. Rutembesa, J. Semujanga, & A. Shyaka (Eds.), *Rwanda: Identité et citoyenneté [Rwanda: Identity and citizenship]* (pp. 206-219). Kigali: Pallotti-Press.
- Sundberg, M. (2014). *Training for model citizenship: An ethnography of civic education and state-making in Rwanda* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Uppsala University, Uppsala.
- Superka, D. P. (1976). *Values education sourcebook: Conceptual approaches, materials analysis, and an annotated bibliography*. Colorado: SSEC Publication.
- Torney, J. V., Oppenheim, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). *Civic education in ten countries: An empirical study*. Stockholm/New York: Almqvist & Wiksell International/John Wiley and Sons.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.

- Vansina, J. (2004). *Antecedents to modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya kingdom*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Walker, D. A. (1976). *The IEA six subject survey: An empirical study of education in twenty-one countries*. Stockholm/New York: Almqvist & Wiksell International/John Wiley and Sons.
- Wayne, R. E. (2004). Negotiating the politics of citizenship education. *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 249- 251.