

# NO RESEARCH ABOUT US WITHOUT US

**POLICY MEMO: PARTICIPATORY POLICY-ORIENTED RESEARCH  
WITH CHILDREN AND YOUTH AFFECTED BY CONFLICT**



UNITED NATIONS  
UNIVERSITY

Centre for Policy Research



ISBN 978-92-808-6510-3 © United Nations University, 2019. All content (text, visualizations, graphics), except where otherwise specified or attributed, is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike IGO license (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0). Using, re-posting and citing this content is allowed without prior permission.

Citation: Siobhan O’Neil and Kato Van Broeckhoven, “No Research About Us Without Us” (United Nations University: New York, 2019)

## Summary

In research on and programming aimed at them, children and youth are usually treated as passive subjects and beneficiaries rather than as partners. In an effort to address this gap in its own research, the United Nations University Centre for Policy Research (UNU-CPR) partnered with War Child UK to design and pilot a participatory research approach. The goal behind this effort was to examine the needs and goals of children who are exiting armed groups and reintegrating back into society after conflict involvement as well as those of the communities they settle in. This policy memo examines this challenge (p. 1), details the UNU-CPR/War Child approach (pp. 2-3), provides an overview of the process (pp. 4-7) and substantive findings (pp. 8-9) from the pilots, and lays out several policy and programming recommendations for consideration (pp. 10-13).

## The Problem

There have long been concerns that the international community's support for people exiting armed conflict can be overly rigid, formulaic,<sup>1</sup> and poorly suited to their needs.<sup>2</sup> This is particularly true with regard to children and women. Even research and assessments on the unique needs of children impacted by conflict often fail to sufficiently engage the very population that they seek to understand.<sup>3</sup> Rarely do young people have a voice in peace processes and related preparations for reintegration support, further reducing the likelihood that the policies and programming aimed at them will address their needs or capitalize on their potential.<sup>4</sup>

There is widespread demand for evidence-based approaches to policymaking and programme design; and specifically, when it comes to children, an appeal for a better understanding of what children, their families and their communities need after conflict association. Moreover, there is growing recognition of the value of including beneficiaries – especially those that have fewer official channels of expression, like children and youth – in crafting and implementing support programmes aimed at them. Indeed, research in other contexts has shown that when individuals – specifically children – are engaged in analysing the causes of violent conflict and developing tailored solutions, the potential for change is significantly enhanced.<sup>5</sup> Yet, doing the necessary outreach and participatory research and assessment is often seen as complicated,<sup>6</sup> expensive, difficult (especially within short-term funding timelines) and interfering with the timely delivery of essential services. As a result, it is rarely done or done in a robust or nuanced way.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Christine Ryan, *Children of War: Child Soldiers as Victims and Participants in the Sudan Civil War* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2012), pp. 20–23.
  - <sup>2</sup> *Do No Harm: International Support for Statebuilding* (OECD: Paris, 2010), p.93
  - <sup>3</sup> See Siobhan O'Neil, "Child Recruitment and Use by Armed Groups in Contemporary Conflict," in Siobhan O'Neil and Kato Van Broeckhoven, eds., *Cradled by Conflict: Child Involvement with Armed Groups in Contemporary Conflict*, (United Nations University: New York, 2018). Children involved with conflict can be a difficult population to access to due insecurity, state, armed group or community reticence, and research restrictions. Indeed, "Even when child soldiers can be identified, access or ethical concerns around engaging them often impede research (e.g., risk of being identified and targeted by their former group or the security services). In addition, stringent regulations govern scholarly research on child subjects (e.g., institutional review boards [IRBs]), discouraging scholars from pursuing research on the topic. In the United States, for example, beyond existing protections for human subjects, federal regulations and a wide range of state laws and requirements govern research with children or minors and can make it difficult to get approval for research on child soldiers or may impact the sample studied, thus potentially introducing unintended bias (e.g., parental consent when many child soldiers have lost or been separated from their parents). Given the requirements and potential for harm to child subjects, IRBs are wary to grant permission for such research." p. 39, n. 2.
  - <sup>4</sup> *Siobhan McEvoy-Levy, "Youth and the Challenges of 'Post-Conflict' Peacebuilding"*, available from <https://www.unicef-irc.org/article/1067-youth-and-the-challenges-of-post-conflict-peacebuilding.html>
  - <sup>5</sup> In one study in the United States, adult facilitators used semi-structured scripts and activity guides to help children develop their own student conflict-prevention programming specific to their schools, which resulted in significant declines in conflict. Those schools that had child-led interventions saw more than a 30 per cent reduction in conflict in just one year. Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Hana Shepard, and Peter M. Aronow, "Changing Climates of Conflict: A Social Network Experiment in 56 Schools", *PNAS*, Vol. 113, No. 3 (2016).
  - <sup>6</sup> "Engaging children and youth as research subjects has proven challenging for a number of reasons: First, the child protection community is divided about whether researchers should directly engage war-affected children. Some believe the potential for such interactions to re-traumatize vulnerable children outweighs any benefits of interviewing them. Others in the community fiercely advocate for direct engagement to ensure that children's voices are brought into policy discussions and that their agency, views, and needs help drive the design of policy and programmatic responses." Siobhan O'Neil, "Child Recruitment and Use by Armed Groups in Contemporary Conflict," in Siobhan O'Neil and Kato Van Broeckhoven, eds., *Cradled by Conflict: Child Involvement with Armed Groups in Contemporary Conflict*, (United Nations University: New York, 2018), p. 27.

This shortcoming is deeply problematic. Failure to engage in this type of participatory research and outreach reduces the likelihood that analyses of children’s needs are valid. Without accurate and nuanced information, the resulting programming is unlikely to be sufficiently tailored to be effective. More broadly, failure to engage beneficiaries<sup>7</sup> as partners reduces potential buy-in for interventions and likely their efficacy in supporting positive and sustainable transitions out of conflict.

## Piloting a Possible Way Forward

UNU-CPR’s previous research on the recruitment and use of children by armed groups in contemporary conflict identified this problem and highlighted the need for engaging children and youth “in the initial assessment, design, and implementation stages of prevention and release/reintegration programming”.<sup>8</sup> In an effort to address this need in its own work, UNU-CPR has strived to ensure that its follow-on initiative, Managing Exits from Armed Conflict (MEAC),<sup>9</sup> prioritized engaging with young people not just as research subjects, but as research partners. The MEAC project seeks to include the voices of young people impacted by conflict in its research on how to better design and implement programming aimed at young people like them.

To this end, UNU-CPR partnered with War Child, an NGO focused on addressing children’s pressing needs during and after conflict – particularly with regard to their education, protection, and livelihoods – to pilot a participatory approach to reintegration-related research.

For six months, UNU-CPR and War Child worked together to design a participatory workshop model to assess the needs of children and youth impacted by conflict (particularly those children once associated with armed forces and armed groups) and engage them in discussions around the design and administration of support that could assist young people like them.<sup>10</sup> The workshops were designed to be conducted through War Child’s VoiceMore programme, a multi-year advocacy training and mentorship project that empowers young people affected by war to have a say in the decisions that affect them. In August and September 2019, the model was pilot tested through War Child’s VoiceMore groups in Bossangoa and Paoua, Central African Republic (CAR).

The three-day workshops combined a variety of engaging, child- and conflict-sensitive activities to try to better understand:

- what exiting armed conflict meant in the local context to those who had experienced it and to the communities that receive them;
- what doing well in their society means and how war-affected youth can achieve their goals;
- what the challenges and risks, as well as the sources of strength and support, are for those leaving armed conflict;
- and how – if they were in charge – they would design and implement support for young people affected by conflict.

<sup>7</sup> The term beneficiaries suggests a passive relationship. War Child refers to “beneficiaries” as “programme participants” in recognition that service users should be participating in the service they receive.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> The Managing Exits from Armed Conflict (MEAC) initiative is a multi-year collaboration to develop a unified, rigorous approach to examining how and why individuals exit armed conflict and evaluate the efficacy of interventions meant to help support their transition to civilian life. MEAC is generously supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Switzerland’s Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), and run in partnership with DPO, UNDP, UNICEF, the World Bank and IOM.

<sup>10</sup> These two groups were established in the spring of 2019 with participants from across their communities, with an equal gender split and half of the children and youth having been formally associated with armed groups.

## Observations and Findings

Through the course of these workshops, several process observations and substantive findings emerged:

### PROCESS OBSERVATIONS:

- **Infrastructure for Engagement** – It is extremely difficult to do this type of participatory work with young people when there is rarely a culture to support it. Given the sensitivity of the subject matter, it is unlikely that young people, especially those who have been associated with armed groups or armed forces, will share their experiences and perspectives with strangers. Likewise, in many conflict-affected societies, there often is no culture of sharing such experiences. Young people often cannot access decision-making forums, and even when they can, their opinions are rarely valued and respected. For many young people who have not had access to education, there is no framework for conducting research and analysis, the basics of which need to be understood if they are to play a collaborative role in research (and possibly, even programme design and implementation). The CAR workshops made clear that investments in a safe forum for engaging young people, and training them to analyse problems in their society and speak up for solutions – like War Child is doing with VoiceMore – are key for building towards effective engagement.
- **Trust** – Having an existing engagement infrastructure was essential for the UNU-CPR/War Child workshops to ensure honest and forthright communication. With its three plus year timeline and in-town presence, the VoiceMore programme allowed for continued engagement with the same staff and facilitators, which helped build a safe space for sharing. Young people who have been through similar experiences, and who have been involved in the programme as participants, were well positioned to shepherd these discussions. Lastly, by working with a videographer who uses participatory approaches to capturing programme content, it was possible to document the workshops in a collaborative, rather than extractive, manner. There are concerns that filming could potentially discourage some participants from engaging in workshop activities, and a participatory approach can help mitigate this effect.
- **Conflict-sensitive Engagement** – To understand what ex-CAAFAG (children associated with armed forces and armed groups) need for reintegration requires an understanding of their specific experiences. Yet it is important that this line of inquiry does not further contribute to the stigmatization of ex-CAAFAG or to community tensions. The workshops were designed and implemented in a way that prevented identification of participants who had once been associated with armed groups, and sensitive questions were asked in an indirect manner to allow individuals to speak freely without identifying an experience as personal. In addition, as is standard for all War Child engagement, efforts were taken to protect the privacy of participants in any outputs of the workshop.
- **Child- and Youth- Sensitive Engagement** – The workshops were designed to be child-sensitive. They were tailored to shorter attention spans and employed a wide range of formats from plenary discussions, working groups, artistic and musical expression to different types of oral and written presentations. Such an approach is important from both an ethics and a research standpoint. Ensuring the workshop content and activities were accessible and engaging helped ensure the reliability of the information shared, as a child-sensitive format enhances participant understanding, encourages feedback, and reduces participant fatigue. Feedback from the Bossangoa and Paoua VoiceMore groups suggests more can be done to improve the accessibility of the workshop session plan and script and build the confidence of the participations. Most importantly, the workshops were built on the [child protection and safeguarding principles](#) that War Child uses in all its work and which had been previously introduced to the participants of its programmes in CAR.

- **Flexibility** – At times, the facilitators needed to adjust the schedule to accommodate the needs of participants and the nuances of the local context – and having flexibility built into the workshop schedule allowed them to do so. During the introduction to the workshop in Bossangoa, it became clear that some of the participants were struggling with the basic concept of exiting armed groups/forces, because in their community, a hard break from armed actors is rarely possible due to family ties and proximity. It was important to reserve sufficient time to ensure that the workshop’s basic scoping and orientation responded to the participants’ reality, and that everyone involved fully understood what they were being asked to do. Allocating sufficient time dedicated to this type of introduction, clarification, and consent – and the flexibility to adapt the workshop structure, language, and research questions, as issues are raised – was essential.
- **Lost in Translation** – Another challenge related to ensuring clarity of purpose in the workshops was translation. In translating the workshop script from English to French to Sangho there were times when it was difficult to identify the right words to capture important concepts. There were cases where the linguistic frame for certain concepts did not exist at all in some languages. This can be especially difficult when dealing with more abstract concepts like reintegration<sup>11</sup>, which youth participants may find difficult to tangibly place in their own experience. A related challenge was encouraging participants to communicate in the language they were most comfortable in. In their prior work, War Child realized that most participants – despite having Sangho as their mother tongue – felt they should express themselves in French, even though they did not have the same degree of competence in the language. To ensure all the participants fully understood the exercises and each other in the UNU-CPR/War Child workshops, however, the facilitators insisted that all sessions and participation occur in Sangho. While this created an additional translation requirement, it allowed for a more authentic and effective communication. To further enhance the exchange of information – as well as accommodate different levels of literacy and numeracy – the workshops also encouraged participants to choose different communication methods that they feel comfortable with, such as art and music. The added benefit of this approach was that it engaged another part of children’s brains and allowed them to express themselves in different and creative ways.
- **Participant Composition** – The groups in Bossangoa and Paoua were mixed - comprised of ex-CAAFAG and war affected youth, with equal representation of males and females (ages 15 to 24). There are benefits and challenges to working with mixed groups that needed to be addressed in the workshop design and facilitation. While it is important to understand differences between those who have been associated with armed groups and those who have not, the questions to get at these issues need to be posed carefully so as not to identify and further stigmatize certain participants. It is also important that the line of questioning does not assume a strict delineation between the experiences of non-affiliated children and youth and former CAAFAG, as this delineation may not exist with regard to the violence, hardships, and stressors they have experienced. Likewise, it is important to use such engagement opportunities to try to better understand the gender dimensions of conflict exit and transition, but without reinforcing structural inequalities and stereotypes. The composition of the break-out groups in the Bossangoa and Paoua workshops required careful consideration of when it made sense to separate the group along certain lines, whether the criteria for the sub-groups would or would not be articulated, and what additional steps were needed to draw out certain participants to ensure everyone regardless of gender or status could be heard.
- **Showcasing Skillsets and Maximizing Comfort** – Responding to the particular interests and skills of the young people in each community was important. Given the musical talent and interests in the Bossangoa group, UNU-CPR and War Child introduced a workshop session where participants composed a song to tell the world what kind of future they wanted for their children. This allowed the young people in the Bossangoa group to express themselves with confidence and creativity, and ensured enthusiastic participation and a varied, multi-media approach to inquiry.

---

<sup>11</sup> As defined by the Paris Principles, child reintegration is “the process through which children transition into civil society and enter meaningful roles and identities as civilians who are accepted by their families and communities in a context of local and national reconciliation.” *The Paris Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups* (2007), available from <https://www.unicef.org/emerg/files/ParisPrinciples310107English.pdf> p. 7.

- **Feedback Loop** – With all research, but particularly with participatory research approaches, it is important to communicate the findings back to participants. Closing the feedback loop is especially important with young people who are trying to find their voice as advocates for social change in their community. As part of their commitment to ensure that the young people of Bossangoa and Paoua know how their workshop participation and outputs will be used to inform the MEAC project and broader policy discussions in the UN, UNU-CPR and War Child have taken the following steps:
  - a. War Child held an initial follow-up session with each group a week after the workshops to provide a short update and gather feedback from them. War Child will hold subsequent meetings with the young people in both locations to provide an update on how the information they shared at the workshops is feeding into the MEAC project and informing the broader discussions around child reintegration and youth engagement at the UN.
  - b. UNU-CPR and War Child are documenting the uptake of this Policy Memo, related outputs, and events to share with the workshop participants. This effort to close the feedback loop was prioritized out of respect for the time and attention that the participants gave to the workshops. Moreover, it is the hope of UNU-CPR and War Child that this feedback will help the young people of Bossangoa and Paoua grow as advocates and reinforce their value and sense of purpose as agents for change in their communities.

## SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS:

- **A Clean Exit?** – Some of the young participants had trouble grasping the concept of armed group exit as it was initially presented because it did not align with their experience. Many young people have a hard time completely severing ties with armed groups because their families and communities remain involved and due to the proximity and continued influence of the groups.<sup>12</sup> This reaction echoes the findings of UNU-CPR's *Cradled by Conflict* research, which noted that “the international community maintains outdated and unrealistic notions of how children leave armed groups and their prospects for reintegration in unstable contexts.”<sup>13</sup> If children and youth are not fully disengaging from armed groups, it may be necessary for the international community to adjust the assumptions that underly its assessments and the expectations for programming to better reflect and respond to local realities.
- **Doing Well in Northern CAR** – When asked about what it meant to do well in life, the young people provided many characteristics that would be cited elsewhere: being polite, loving, kind, volunteering, showing intelligence and bravery. Counterintuitively, they also added being “a bad guy”. The facilitators were confused and asked if there had been a misunderstanding. No, the participants responded, every good, model person can become bad depending on the circumstances imposed on her/him. Again, this observation from young people in CAR reiterates evidence on child and youth involvement with armed groups from other contexts. Contrary to conventional wisdom, UNU-CPR found that hate and extreme ideologies are not the predominant driver for children to join armed groups.<sup>14</sup> Rather, children become associated with armed groups for a number of interrelated reasons that range from extreme coercion to the mundane. Under certain conditions, even the most pro-social, “normal” children are susceptible to involvement in violent organizations. These findings highlight the challenge of prevention: while some children certainly may be exposed to more risks than others, making them particularly vulnerable, there is no “type”, no single path into an armed group. Under the “right” circumstances, research suggests almost anyone could become involved with conflict actors.
- **Signs of Conflict Exit** – When asked what would signal that someone had left an armed group, the participants said those who: no longer attend group meetings, get rid of their weapons, and change their behaviour. Moreover, they mentioned the need for someone to change their heart and their mind – shifting their emotional attachment and identity away from the armed group. Beyond shifting one’s engagement in and orientation to conflict, the participants outlined positive transformations, such as becoming a role model

<sup>12</sup> Siobhan O’Neil and Kato Van Broeckhoven, “Executive Summary” in O’Neil and Van Broeckhoven, eds., *Cradled by Conflict*, p. 18.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>14</sup> Siobhan O’Neil and Kato Van Broeckhoven with research assistance from Kabba Williams, “The Road to a Better Future” in O’Neil and Van Broeckhoven eds., *Cradled by Conflict*, p. 238.

to others about following a good path and advising your community. The young people acknowledged that the community might not fully agree with the list of exit characteristics that they put together, highlighting that exiting a conflict is a two-way street and not something that occurs in a vacuum. Even if young people have every intention of remaining uninvolved after they leave an armed group, if the community refuses to recognize their exit or remains suspicious and closed to them, a full break from an armed group may be difficult. Likewise, if the environments young people reintegrate into remain under the influence of armed groups, it may be difficult to survive or function economically or socially without interacting with them in some way.

- **Retaining Weapons** – Despite identifying laying down arms as a key component to exiting armed conflict, the young participants acknowledged that many people retain their weapons. They shared their views that young people do so because they are awaiting Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) and believe they need the weapon to be eligible for DDR (or that it can be exchanged for cash) or think that the conflict may flare up again and require them to take up arms. These experiences further underline the research finding that exiting an armed group is unlikely a single event, and that neither desistance from conflict-related violence nor disengagement from an armed group are likely to be linear processes.<sup>15</sup> The young people who participated in the workshops seemed well aware that the continued stressors of daily life in a conflict-affected community could easily push young people back towards armed groups.
- **Challenges to Leaving Armed Conflict** – The main challenges identified by the young people of Bossangoa and Paoua overlapped significantly; they were stigma, being rejected by family/community, fear of revenge, fear of prison, uncertainty about if the conflict is actually over, unmet basic needs (e.g., shelter), not having alternative livelihoods and activities (including school), and not having the documentation necessary to travel.
- **Sources of Support After Leaving Armed Conflict** – The following sources of support for children and youth leaving armed groups were identified by participants: a supportive family, a welcoming community, friends/colleagues, programmatic support (e.g., DDR, which was specifically mentioned), community activities, and the presence of international organizations and NGOs. Interestingly, “having documentation” (to facilitate movement) and “being able to leave for another area” were cited, suggesting young people may not want (or be welcome) to return home or perhaps see more opportunity in larger cities and locales beyond their home communities. While it has long been the focus of child reintegration efforts to reunite children with their families after conflict involvement, it may be important during initial assessments to gauge where children would prefer to settle (recognizing this might change over time) and consider if interventions could be adapted accordingly.
- **How Young People Would Design Reintegration Support** – In both workshops, the young people felt they did not have enough time to address this question in the depth they would have liked. It is unclear if this was primarily due to time constraints (i.e. a flaw in the workshop design), or if the prospect of providing programmatic advice to international actors was unfamiliar or intimidating. Although the participants expressed concerns that their inputs were not fully formed, their discussions were quite informative. Particular aspects of support highlighted in Paoua, for example, were community sensitization and support for alternative livelihoods and activities (schooling, vocational training, income generating activities). The community, according to participants in Paoua, would need to be included – both as beneficiary and advisors and supporters of the programme. It is clear that to optimize child and youth inputs into reintegration programmes, more needs to be done to acclimatize young people to such discussions and concepts, engage them in ways they feel comfortable with, and work to boost their confidence.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 246.

# Moving Forward - Policy and Programming Considerations and Options

## 1. Raise Awareness about the Value of Participatory Research and Assessment to Support Effective Programming

– There are a number of key legal, policy, and research documents and agreements<sup>16</sup> that policymakers and practitioners can highlight and draw on for justification and guidance in initiating participatory work with war-affected children and youth. In addition, the benefits of regular consultations with conflict-affected young people and the need for and value of engaging them throughout the course of the programming cycle (i.e., pre-programme assessment, design, implementation, and impact assessment) could be further highlighted and championed.

## 2. Promote Meaningful Engagement with Young People About Programmes Meant to Serve Them

– There are numerous ways to encourage more robust engagement with young people in need of support after conflict involvement. For example,

- a. The Security Council, when mandating support for ex-CAAFAG, could consider strengthening the language around ‘taking into account the particular needs of children’ to ensure that peacekeeping missions actively engage young programme participants in decisions that will impact them.
- b. Donors could help encourage more meaningful engagement with young people by requiring contribution proposals and donor reporting to document how programmes worked to ensure young people’s voices inform or informed programming and how recipients are or were involved in its design and implementation.
- c. Donors could go further by requiring a certain percentage of contributions to reintegration programming to be allocated for participatory work (e.g., pre-programme assessment, programme design, implementation, and assessment).
- d. As part of their pre-programme assessments, practitioners could consider enhancing the focus on understanding what a full exit from an armed group means to those who have made/tried to make this transition, as well as the signs of a full exit in the eyes of community. This information could be used to influence interventions to target residual connections with armed groups after exit and other challenges to full and sustainable exits. Likewise, a better understanding of what exiting an armed group means in a particular location can help practitioners tailor impact assessment metrics to the local context.

Recognizing that stigma remains one of the main concerns and challenges for young people trying to exit armed groups, more needs to be done to address stigma. The young people themselves identified the need for more sensitization outreach with communities of return. Beyond specific interventions, the international community should also consider the ways in which its programmes could inadvertently reinforce stigmatization due to the composition and branding of programmes (e.g., the narrow targeting of certain groups, branding programmes as “deradicalization”).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> For example, see: the 1990 African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) and the 1996 European Convention of the Exercise of Children’s Rights (ECECR), which establish the right of children to express their views and be heard. For an example of participatory approach to impact evaluation see, Irene Guijt, *Participatory Approaches - Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 5* (Florence: UNICEF Office of Research, 2014), available from [www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/brief\\_5\\_participatoryapproaches\\_eng.pdf](http://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/brief_5_participatoryapproaches_eng.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> O’Neil and Van Broeckhoven with research assistance from Kabba Williams, “The Road to a Better Future” in O’Neil and Van Broeckhoven eds., *Cradled by Conflict*, p. 251.

**3. Amplify Emerging Practice and Share Participatory Research and Assessment Tools** – While, by most accounts, this type of participatory work with young people is not systematically included as part of reintegration programme design and implementation, there are some practices and guidance that are worth noting.

- a. It would be useful to highlight emerging practice and make tools and guidance available to reinforce the importance of this type of work and assist practitioners who would like to incorporate it into their research and/or programming. For example, UNICEF's Middle East and North Africa Office has just released *Yes We Can! A How-to Guide on Implementing Participatory Action Research with Adolescents and Youth*.
- b. As part of this effort, UNU-CPR and War Child have published their workshop scripts in two languages and a logistics guide to allow other researchers and practitioners to adapt this approach in other contexts.
- c. In addition, UNU-CPR and War Child have released a full costing of their pilot programmes in Bossangoa and Paoua (including costs absorbed by War Child in CAR) to share with donors, institutional partners, and implementing organizations as an example of the accessibility of incorporating such an approach into their programme planning.
- d. It is worth considering if there are central locations where these types of tools and resources could be stored. It may also be worth exploring how existing coordination mechanisms for child protection, reintegration and conflict transitions can encourage their use.
- e. If more researchers, practitioners, and implementing partners document their efforts in conducting participatory research and assessments with young people, different processes can be compared and approaches can be further strengthened.





UNITED NATIONS  
UNIVERSITY

Centre for Policy Research

