

personal level because it will help to ensure coexistence and tolerance within a community. Hence participation of villagers resulted in the fomenting of the sense of belonging and togetherness as one people.

Through workshops on peace building regarding the rights of children about four thousand (4000) children from Bindura, Shamva and Mutoko district participated in the constitution making process. Children wrote their book entitled “What About Us”. The purpose of the book was to inform and consult the three main political representatives from three political parties on their views on children’s rights, lives and responsibilities in a new constitution. Thus, in support of ACDPT workshops facilitation the children lobby for recognition in the new constitution of Zimbabwe. The main theme of the book is children’s rights to participate. Children are generally left out of the main decisions affecting their lives. Workshops in Masembura communal area have been very effective in changing lives and the status quo of the political and economic environment in Masembura.

Workshops have been fruitful and effective in Masembura because ACPDT integrated various government departments in executing its workshops. The involvement of government partners from the ministry of Youth Indigenization and Empowerment, ministry of Health and child welfare, ministry of Justice, the President’s office as well as the Zimbabwe Republic Police and District Administrator. These representatives from various government department help in facilitating some of the workshops through delivering some of the information which is essential to the community. For example, facilitation of workshops by representatives from ZRP and ministry of Justice enlighten people about the legal consequences of abusing children and the importance of protecting and upholding children’s rights as well as the effects of gender based violence (GBV). Therefore, the involvement of all these government departments in peace building workshops have made these workshops to be more comprehensive and effective in Masembura communal area.

However, some of the workshops were not effective especially during the first days from 2009 to 2010 because villagers had reservations patterning the background of the organization ACPDT since Non-Governmental Organizations were being perceived as agents of opposition political parties. As a result, some of the people could not attend these workshops and some could come with some after thoughts so much so that these workshops were being disturbed time and again and their effectiveness were limited. Nevertheless, with time these workshops gained momentum and transformed the community for better and development.

Is workshop approach efficient enough to ensure peace building, and what are the associated shortfalls of this peace building approach?

Workshops as an approach of peace building have been proved to be efficient and effective in Masembura. Despite the fact that workshops are Eurocentric and foreign in the African context particularly in the case of Masembura communal area. The findings of this research shows that workshops were efficient enough in ensuring peace building in Masembura communal area. The post conflict communal area of Masembura was in need of conflict transformation or peace building. Workshop approach have thus gone a long way in bringing people together, promoting reconciliation, forgiveness, truth telling as well as sharing of ideas which are constructive and bridging of relational gaps between antagonistic parties or people.

The empowerment of Masembura communal area through these workshops is a strong development which cannot went unnoticed. The capacitation of villagers through these workshops can be credited as a positive measure which have led to the development of the community. Since these workshops promoted the establishment of study circles and these study circles consists of twelve to fifteen (12-15) people. These people will be given support by ACPDT to start a project be it poultry, cattle fattening, piggery and society (*mukando*) as well as gardening projects. These study circles are as a result of workshops and this shows that workshop approach has proved to be efficient enough in ensuring peace building in Masembura communal area. These study circles consist of people of different political affiliations and backgrounds. Therefore, in a way these study circles promoted inclusiveness and fostered the sense of belonging and “us” mentality at the expense of “them” mentality which often highbred violence and animosity as well as tension in a community.

Moreover, by the virtue of being on the same study circle with a person of different political affiliation, both parties will learn to manage differences and personalities will be compromised and unity will usually take precedence. Through the sense of belonging cases of vandalism, theft, violence and sabotage have been reduced. Hence these study circles acted as bridges for community development, forgiveness, reconciliation as well as rebuilding of relations in Masembura communal area. Gultang (1995) emphasized on the importance of three Rs in peace building that is reconciliation, reconstruction and restoration. The outcomes of workshops in Masembura communal area addressed and concurred with Gultang’s notions of reconciliation. In most cases this reconciliation has been achieved through study circles. Since the projects which are associated with these study circles require people to work together and working together as people of the same ward was good to them and at the end it reconciliation has been achieved.

Reconstruction of relationships, attitudes and social fabric or infrastructure has been also achieved through workshop approach. These workshops have also enhanced the restoration of order and respect of the elderly in the community following the African philosophy of Ubuntu/ Hunhuism because Chief Masembura facilitated some of the workshops and in his facilitation he encouraged people to have morals and values as well as respect for the elders because as a community people are the same, "I am because we are". Thus people were encouraged to restore tradition and dignity during these workshops.

"Muno munzvimbo takaramba mhirizhonga nenyonga nyonga vechidiki vanofanira kuziva kuti mukuru wese mubereki wavo. Ma worksshops akauya muno mudunhu nana Ngingi arikutisimudzira pamagariro edu iye zvino takuita mikando tichitenga mombe nezvimwe zvipfuyo takabatana pamwe chete vemapato akasiyana siyana. Zvose izvi zvirikuunza runyararo nerudo kune mumwe nemumwe agare mudunhu muno".

(We have condemned violence in our community, the youths must and should know that all elderly person in the community are their parents and guardians. These peace building workshops which are being spear headed by programs director from ACDPT are alleviating us from poverty through projects like cattle fattening, poultry, animal husbandry we are doing all these projects together as one people of Masembura without political divisions and discrimination. All these initiatives are fomenting peace building to everyone in our community). Thus, in ensuring the efficiency of workshop approach in peace building the workshop facilitators after building relationships between people went a step further to establish study circles as a way of ensuring sustainable peace in the community. So much so that, these study circles up to now are very vibrant and instrumental in promoting unity, collective participation and community development in Masembura communal area.

Moreover, much to the research under study regarding the effectiveness of workshops in ensuring sustainable peace previous researches have come up with findings which partly highlight the effectiveness of workshop approach in peace building. However, their findings overlooked the importance of indigenous knowledge systems and the need to juxtapose the later and the former so as to ensure sustainable peace in a community. Dodo (2014) alludes that, religious and peace practitioners promote nonviolence through training communities in methods of non-violence and promoting reconciliation using the workshop approach. Churches are usually the first to respond after violence and they remain part of the community after humanitarian workers depart. Hence the church plays an important role in peace building as it is part of the community in conflict and religion acts as social cement that bonds people together. The role which have been played by church leaders during ACDPT

workshops on peace building cannot be overlooked in Masembura communal area from 2009-2015. Thus, workshop approach was and is very crucial in creating sustainable grassroots reconciliation and community cohesion. Grassroots reconciliation is important in that it creates a home grown solution which is likely to create durable peace in communities.

Moreover, in order to ensure sustainability and inclusiveness ACPDT engage the community in peace building and carried out activities known as informing the community. Informing the community was important in that it aimed at mobilizing the community in ACDPT peace building activities. ACDPT began by approaching community leadership such as Chiefs, village heads, councillors, youth leaders and church leaders or their representatives. Community leadership is important in peace building efforts in that they are also responsible for the prevalence of peace in their communities and these community leaders were often used as infrastructures of violence during conflict phase. ACDPT teams moved around visiting community leaders in areas where they intended to carry out their peace building projects and workshops. Community leaders welcomed the peace building projects which they said had been long anticipated after the disturbing political violence experienced in their communities in the run up to the June 2008 elections. Apart from engaging community leaders ACDPT also organized community meetings to engage the wider community through the local peace committees.

Challenges associated with workshop approach of peace building in Masembura communal area.

There was a general confusion in the community over the link between ACDPT and political parties and ACDPT was perceived as a sympathizer to the opposition party, MDC by some community members. Some of the people who attended peace building workshops at Jingo primary school in September 2009 had to pull out of peace building after they were interrogated by ZANU PF youths over their involvement in ACDPT activities. One participant who was a victim of the 2008 political violence after a peace building training workshop at Masembura Secondary school in 2010 told his counter parts that peace building was a project of the MDC and this caused confusion in the community. At one point in Zhenje village ward 4 a peace building volunteer was approached at his house at night by ZANU PF supporters being accused of working to support the MDC.

Moreover, during an outreach strategy for youth leaders' workshop held in Masembura at Zhenje children's village some of the participants widely believed that ACDPT was aligned to the MDC and all its peace building efforts were directed in support of the opposition party. This confusion caused panic in the community especially in ward 4 where people distanced

themselves from peace building activities for the fear of victimization by ZANU PF supporters.

“Mudunhu redu rino takagara taudzwa kuti madonor nemabazi asiri ehurumende varikuuuya kuda kutsigirana na Tsvangirai nevarungu veku Britain kuti vabvise baba Va Mugabe pachigaro. Zvaimbotiomera kushanda uye kuyenda kuma wokshops e ACDPT nekuti vakuru vemusangano ku Branch nekusero kwedu kuno havadi kunzwa nezvevarungu mudunhu medu muno”.

(We have been told that donors and NGOs they are sympathetic and in support of MDC T in order to unconstitutionally remove President Robert Mugabe from power. Therefore, it was complicated for us to attend peace building workshops because our local leaders are against regime change agenda which is being exacerbated by Western countries). However, ACDPT had to clarify to people that the organization is apolitical and it was a peace building organization working towards peace building to restore social cohesion in communities of Zimbabwe.

Antagonism between the state and civil society proved also to be a challenge in the operations of ACDPT. Civil society organizations are accused by the state of supporting the opposition party, MDC and also effecting regime change in Zimbabwe. A youth voices forum or workshop at Chinamhora business Centre in ward 16 was barred from happening by the police on unclear grounds after all the necessary arrangements had been made including acquiring of the clearance from ZRP provincial offices in Bindura. Participants from different villages had gathered for the event and had to disperse after the police cancelled the event. At Nyamutora village during a peace building training workshop for study circles three uniformed police officers invaded the venue and it caused panic in the participants. Also a peace committee member in Chinamhora was approached at her house by ZANU PF youths after a peace building training for peace committees had been held in that area. She later pulled out of the peace committee as she feared to be victimized.

There has been a low representation of men at ACDPT workshops and organized events and it is important that men play a leading role in peace building workshops as they constitute the majority of the perpetrators of the 2008 political violence. Out of four peace building workshops between July and December 2015 organized by ACDPT, 31.62% were men and women constituted the rest of the participants and out of five youth voices forums organized by ACDPT on the same period men constituted 38.71% of the participants. Most men spent most of their time at beer drinks and would not have time to attend peace building activities. Thus, the absence of men on these workshops have compromised conflict transformation and

peace building because these men are the very people who must benefit from these workshops and reform on their way of handling conflicts and differences in their community.

Some of the people who attended peace building workshops did not respect traditional leaders and workshop facilitators. The fact that, these facilitators were not from the same society, some of the people treat them as strangers and failed to comprehend and find value in whatever they say. More so, the fact that, these workshops were being facilitated by young people or female facilitators reduced the effectiveness of these peace building workshops because the community respect traditional values and customs and is also patriarchal. Since it is a norm in the Shona culture that young people should not see the forehead of the community elders (*vanavadoko havafaniri kumirapamberi pevakuru kuzvidzamazvo*)

(The youth should not stand in front of elders it's a sign of being disrespectful). Given these anthropological dynamics the effectiveness and significance of workshop approach in peace building has been reduced in Masembura. This, thus shows that this approach faced this challenge because it is foreign to the Korekore culture and Eurocentric so much so that its applicability without being blended with indigenous knowledge system is utopia. The cultural perspective of Korekore people concerning the role of women have also caused an obstacle to the effectiveness of workshop approach in peace building.

A challenge has been realized by ACDPT in that some organizations such as CCPJ gives allowances to its workshop participants and volunteers, while ACDPT does not pay volunteers because of its policy, so volunteers as well as participants in communities opt to participate where they are given money. Also some participants at ACDPT organized workshops have demanded sitting allowances and ACDPTs policy and budget for peace building do not cater for that. This has created an unfavourable atmosphere among the villagers so much so that they deliberately ignore some of the workshops since they regard them as not being financially beneficial to them.

The philosophy of workshop approach entails being open up, contributing and team working. However, respondents highlighted that this was more like a betrayal to cultural norms and values. The Masembura communal area firmly believe in the concept of Ubuntu or Hunhuism and people in the community should not openly say things which can cause humiliation to others' personalities. Hence confessing about past violence perpetrators and experiences which was caused by elders is a sign of lacking respect. This was revealed by respondents as *kufugurahapwa* (divulging secrets). This is not in line with the aforementioned concept of Ubuntu and this affected the operations of workshops negatively in Masembura communal area in as far as peace building is concerned. Additionally, the poor state of roads in

Masembura made it difficult to travel for peace building workshop facilitators and lack of adequate funds caused the organization to operate on a shoe string budget. In light of the above, it can be deduced that workshops as an approach of peace building can be easily affected by external factors of the environment such as politics, societal dynamics as well as relief and climatic factors. Many peace building workshops have been postponed due to weather conditions. Despite the challenges faced, ACDPT managed to be successful in its peace building workshops in Masembura communal area. Political tolerance increased and cases of political violence are on the decline.

The successes were measured by the desired objectives versus the outcomes of the peace building workshops. The peace building workshops aimed at increasing trust across political divides, better connect youths to their community after the 2008 political violence, overcome political divisions in communities as well as promote political tolerance and successes are drawn from the events which followed after the introduction of peace building by ACDPT in Masembura communal from 2009-2015. There is a notable increase in political tolerance as people from different political backgrounds can gather at peace building activities in their communities. Also, people from different political parties came together to propose undertaking collaborative projects in their communities with the consultation of ACDPT.

There is also a notable decrease in cases of political violence and this can be evidenced by the peaceful holding of the referendum as well as the 2013 harmonized elections in Masembura without any reported case of politically motivated violence but rather the flourishing of study circles projects which brought previously fighting people together for a common purpose. Some of the successes scored by the peace building project include gender equality which is an international obligation in peace building as well as the consent of key stakeholders in community peace building such as chiefs, government officials such as councilors, District Administrator Bindura, C.E.O Bindura Rural District Council and church leaders to take part in the peace building initiatives. This have however, gone a long way in enhancing comprehensive and sustainable peace building in Masembura communal area.

What are the opportunities for integrating workshop approach with indigenous knowledge systems in peace building?

Traditionally, the indigenous knowledge systems served the communities well and effectively through various mechanisms and strategies which are endowed in the indigenous understanding using concepts such as idioms, folk tales and counsels of the elderly to mention but just a few. (Makwerere and Mandoga, 2012) argued that, these indigenous knowledge systems are consultative and inclusive. This highlights the all-weather importance

of traditional and cultural knowledge in peace building in communities. They further note that, the Zimbabwean traditional architecture had responsive mechanism at family level up to the community level. The Shona traditional cultural norms and values which are often at the core of human development and informed coexistence, are founded and bonded on specific sets of principles that guide human behaviour in favourable ways.

Integrating workshop approach and traditional approach in peace building created a balanced community in Masembura which is based on inclusiveness, fairness and consultative. Most of the respondents highlighted that, the involvement of village heads, headman and Chief Masembura in workshops have helped the people to have a deeper understanding and they managed to forgive each other for the past atrocities. After these workshops traditional justice mechanisms were implemented to ensure community fairness and coexistence. During focus group discussions participants noted that the blending of workshop approach with traditional approaches of conflict transformation have helped the community to be compensated through the practice of (kuripa) on the side of those who have faced victimization. Thus, resorting to anthropological and traditional approaches and juxtapose them with modern approaches like workshops should therefore not be seen as depicting primitive undertones, but rather a way of retracing values that are pertinent to humanity.

Moreover, juxtaposing workshop approach and traditional knowledge systems have enacted truth and collective interests to be placed above individual interests. The traditional approach ensured that truth is rightfully said and blame was to be placed on the guilt and the guilt was supposed to compensate so as to ensure restitution and reconstruction. This reconstruction of social infrastructure concurs with (Gultang, 1995)'s findings on the importance of culture on peace building. Therefore, integrating the leaders of these traditional knowledge systems in peace building workshops have gone a long way in restoration of relational and social harmony in Masembura communal area. Thus integrating the later and the former in Masembura have created confidence in such a way that jointly developed decisions proved to be effective and long lasting in Masembura communal area.

The connection of these two peace building approaches have to a more profound and shared understanding of conflict in Masembura. The way workshop approach exposed the disadvantages and the negative side of conflicts as well as the methodology used by traditional leaders brought more enlighten about the pitfalls of conflicts in Masembura, so much so that participants were transformed and changed in the way they perceive violence. Integrating the two however made the transformation process participatory in a full sense, as it involves more than the inclusion of perpetrators and victims. It further promoted a sense of belonging, which contributed to the restoration, maintenance and reconstruction of

relationship in the community. All these are pillars of peace building and sustainable conflict transformation in Masembura communal area. Following the aforementioned opportunities which were derived from integrating these two peace building approaches, it is however noble to implement them in all forms of peace building in a community.

Much on this research question (Makwerere and Mandoga, 2012:2) postulated that, “there are strong links between culture, conflict, peace and peace building. Expressions of various forms of discrimination, including prejudices, stereotyping and ethnocentrism will also be important basic conceptual tools of peace building. Peace building mechanisms should, then, explore cultures which are inseparable from human beings because they are products of human intelligence, aspirations, struggle with the environment and the quest to understand and live in harmony with both the physical and metaphysical realities”. Given the above significance of culture on issues to do with peace building there is then no way in which workshop approach can solemnly be a success without the inclusion of indigenous knowledge systems in as far as peace building is concerned. It is noteworthy to elude that, there is a nexus between the two which should not be overlooked when transforming conflicts within communities. Lederach (2005) argues that we must develop a capacity to see and think strategically about social spaces because these are the actual places of life where unusual relationships cross and interact.

The integration of workshop approach and indigenous knowledge systems have necessitated comprehensive and grassroots peace building in Masembura communal area. Since the role of traditional leaders is regarded as sacred and as a result people have total respect and mutual appreciation of the role of traditional leaders as the highest sources of mediation and dispute resolution in their community.

“Kugadziriswa kwemakakatanwa nzira dzechivanhu pasi chigare makakatanwa emumhuri aigadziriswa kuburikidza nekupindira kwevakuru vemumhuri, madzishe kana masvikiro. Nzira dzakasiyana siyana dzaishandiswa kubva pakutaurirana kusvika pakupana mazano, mishonga kana kuti mabira. Saka kubatana kwenzira dzepasichigare nemaworkshop kunowunza runyararo nemufaaro sezvo madzimambo edu arikutiyananisa”.

(Traditionally conflicts were resolved through the wisdom of family elders, traditional leaders and spirit mediums. Different ways were used which ranged from negotiation, sharing of advises and rituals. Therefore, integrating workshops and indigenous knowledge systems enhance sustainable peace building). Their presence and their role in facilitating workshops have therefore promote sense of unity and the desire to work together among their subjects.

This was and is being witnessed by the formation of study circle groups which comprise of people of different political affiliations working together harmoniously without fighting each other. The involvement of traditional leaders in peace building workshops enhanced transformation of attitudes in Masembura communal area.

Integration of workshop approach and indigenous knowledge systems has bridged the gap between foreign ways of dealing with social conflicts with that of Shona culture. Resultantly restoration, restitution, reconstruction and reconciliation have been necessitated and comprehensively promoted by the juxtaposition of the two. However, some of the respondents highlighted the workshop approach does not properly and formerly respect the cultural and spiritual way of resolving disputes in Masembura.

Moreover, integrating the two have capacitated and empowered local people to have their own solutions to their own problems. This is very important because it enhances inclusiveness to all the grassroots people in the community than having approach which focuses on the elite and policy makers. Thus, inclusiveness and transparency on ways of transforming conflicts have been significantly enacted by the use of these two approaches together in Masembura communal area. Nevertheless, from the way participants responded it really shows that traditional approaches of peace building and conflict transformation are being regarded as primitive, second class and unfair and in most cases it is being ignored by traditional leaders' subjects especially those who live in urban areas.

In addition, out of this integration traditional leaders and workshop facilitators from ACDPT worked with study circles to create a platform whereby community leaders and youths would meet to discuss ways of dealing with conflict non- violently in their communities as well how can youths use their energy to participate in community development? During the 2008 political violence efforts of youths were directed towards the instigation of violence and after the violence there was need to map a framework to direct the efforts of youths to community development. Youth voices forums were held under the objective to better connect youth to their communities, to enable them to meaningfully participate in designing frameworks in responding to conflict non -violently with the community. However, participants also raised the notion that community leaders must give room for peace builders to operate in their areas such that more people are enlightened and engaged in peace building activities.

Discussion

In Lederach (1997)'s hierarchical conflict transformation both at the middle and grassroots levels, peace training and the building of peace commissions will help people to identify themselves with others. In this instance ACDPT trained individuals on peace through peace

building workshops using peace tournaments, conflict management and peace building workshops and worked and established grassroots study groups. Lederach (1997:39) asserts that these people are expected to play some of the following roles: problem solving workshops, training in conflict resolution, peace commissions and insider partial teams. The results obtained that local study groups were in the communities led by focal persons and at the middle range ACDPT directors and coordinators facilitated the process of peace education. The ACDPT in this case fall under the middle range leaders. Lederach (1997) put more emphasis on the middle range leaders as he views them as a connecting force between the elite and the grassroots. The ACDPT sat and discussed with the political structures to support those whom were internally displaced to come back into their societies. In this instance the ACDPT helped to connect the community members with their respective leaders thus MPs, Village heads and Councilors. Conflict transformation is about constructing broken relationships and bringing people together so that they start on a fresh page and work together.

The third level comprises the grassroots whom Lederach (1997:39) perceives as the bearers of the scars, traumatic experiences, day to day trials and tribulations. This category is characterized by fragmented and broken relationships, hatred and deep seated animosity. Results from all areas revealed that most societal relationships were broken and deep animosity existed among the people who are divided along political lines. It is within this level where Lederach suggests that solutions should be generated. In this regard, the ACDPT used dialogue openers to victims and perpetrators and preached the importance of reconciliation to broken relationships. "Reconciliation must be proactive in seeking to create an encounter where people can focus on their relationship and share their perceptions, feelings and experiences with one another, with the goal of creating new perceptions and a new shared experience" (Lederach, 1997:39).

Gultang (1995)'s perspective of peace building regarding reconstruction, reconciliation and rebuilding off relations which is anthropologically based have proved to be effective and relevant from the findings. The involvement of traditional leaders in peace building workshops have helped to increase reconciliation and forgiveness thereby enhancing reconstruction of relations in the community. In light of the above, it is plausible for one to note that Gultang's perspectives are very instrumental in ensuring peace building initiatives as highlighted by people in Masembura communal area.

It is therefore very prudent from the findings of this study for one to opine that Lederach and Galtang (1995)'s theories have limitations which are detrimental to peace building in the

context of Africa and Zimbabwe in particular. Their theories are Eurocentric and little did they appreciate the dynamics of African politics and realities. For example, politicization of peace building workshops in Masembura is a limitation which is beyond the hypothesis of vertical interaction in Lederach (1997)'s pyramid of conflict intervention and peace building. So is Galtung (1995)'s 3Rs of reconstruction, restoration and reconciliation, how can one reconcile with someone who burnt his or her house without being restituted and compensated. Therefore, for 3Rs to take precedence there is a strong need of restitution and compensation of the victims. These anomalies clearly highlight the limitations of these western theories because they were crafted in contexts which are far from practical African civilization and realities.

Furthermore, one can note that, executing workshops which are western and alien to the Zimbabwean context brings a lot of new dimensions which cannot be relevant in peace building, thus there is a need to understand the world view of the local people before implementing workshops. The best remedy is to first understand and appreciate the indigenous knowledge systems and then after appreciating them, blending workshop approach with indigenous knowledge systems can be very prudent in upholding cultural relativism. Cultural relativism encapsulates the notion that one person's experience of an event or activity will not be the same as that of another person (Plastow (1997)). Therefore, imposing workshop approach which is alien and western to local cultures without involving indigenous systems makes workshop approach irrelevant. The logic that sustains a commitment to cultural relativism is itself based on a claim that is relative to indigenous criteria and begs the question: given the cultural differences in the world, how is it feasible to motivate compliance and implement ethical norms, such as workshops? Therefore, ignoring issues to do with cultural relativism reduce the efficacy of workshop approach and its relevance in peace building. Moreover, fundamental to cultural relativism is the idea that a person's sense of reality is constructed through prevailing cultural frameworks and how these are expressed. Therefore, workshops can be integrated with cultural issues to be efficient in enhancing peace education through workshops as highlighted in Masembura communal area. Findings revealed that the community members view workshops as knowledge empowering and also with a belief that in the next general election every man shall respect another man and tolerate political differences like what has been experienced during 2013 harmonized elections. The community members tend to appreciate the strategy and have an interest to spread the workshops even to nephews of nephews since it involves community leaders as well as traditional leaders.

Through peace building workshops community members are capacitated with knowledge and skill to settle their day to day disputes and conduct in society. Many a time's people are abused and intimidated because they lack knowledge they will not be able to carry instruments of wisdom to defend their stance but with peace building workshops which tend to enlighten them with peace education one is empowered with knowledge. Rashady (2002) argued that peace building is all about creating and maintaining a conducive ground where peace education cultivate harmony. However, the fact that workshop approach is foreign in the context of Zimbabwean history and dynamics left a lot to be desired. The cultural norms and values are somehow at par with the methodology of workshops. The shona culture highly respect the elderly and there is a belief that with age then comes wisdom. The way workshops were being conducted were not somehow in tandem with cultural underpinnings of the people in Masembura communal area. This anomaly of workshop approach and anthropological relevance needs to be well addressed before executing the former as a peace building approach. In light of the aforementioned anomaly and lack of effective results after workshop activities at times calls for assessment of the relevance, need, effectiveness and contextual impact of the approach in relation with the culture before discharging it as a relevant approach. Perhaps there is a need to educate the facilitators as well as the peace building organizations on the dichotomy and dynamics of culture and workshop method of building peace in the context of Africa.

Conclusion

All in all, workshops can be solemnly being effective and relevant in the western context but in the context of Africa they cannot be effective if they are not integrated with indigenous knowledge systems. So in other words without indigenous knowledge systems workshops are contextually irrelevant in Africa in as far as peace building is concerned as highlighted in Masembura communal area which resembles the dynamics of anthropological issues among the korekore people of Zimbabwe in Southern Africa. These findings are however, different from the findings of Francis (2007) as well as Cohen and Kelman (1999) who pointed out that dialogue workshops are very effective in promoting reconciliation and conflict transformation. More so, workshops can be adequate in peace building only if they are appreciative to issues to do with cultural relativism. Failure to appreciate the former, workshops will not adequately meet 3Rs of reconstruction, restoration and reconciliation as noted by Galtang (1995)'s hypothesis on peace building.

References

- African Community Publishing and Development Trust. (2008). *Sowing our seeds: strengthening citizen participation in local decision making*. Cape Town: Fingerprint Co-operative Ltd.
- African Community Publishing and Development Trust. (2009). *Rising Again: Community Views on Local Control over Local Resources*. Cape Town. Fingerprint Co-operative Ltd.
- Babbie, E.R. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research* (12th Edition). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Chief Executive Officer Bandura Rural District Council (2012) Full Council Minutes September 30.
- Galtung, J. (1995). 'After Violence: 3R, Reconstruction, Reconciliation, Resolution: Coping with Visible and Invisible Effects of War and Violence' <http://www.transcend.org/>
Accessed 09 January 2016.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC. US Institute of Peace Press. Washington D.C.
- Makumbe, J. (2004). *Democracy and one Party State in Zimbabwe*, SAPES Harare
- Makwerere, D and Mandoga, E. (2012). Rethinking the Traditional Institutions of Peace and Conflict Resolution in Post 2000 Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow*.1 (4). Pp. 1-8.
- Plastow, J. (1997), *African Theatre and Politics, the Evolution of Theatre in Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zimbabwe, a Comparative Study*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Sekaran, U. (2000) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. (3rd Edition)
New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tuckman, B.W. (2001) *Conducting Educational Research* (4th Ed) San Diego: Macmillan.